

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

|                              |   |                                 |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE      | § |                                 |
| COMMISSION,                  | § |                                 |
|                              | § |                                 |
| Plaintiff,                   | § |                                 |
|                              | § |                                 |
| v.                           | § | Civil Action No. 3:09-CV-0298-N |
|                              | § |                                 |
| STANFORD INTERNATIONAL BANK, | § |                                 |
| LTD., <i>et al.</i> ,        | § |                                 |
|                              | § |                                 |
| Defendants.                  | § |                                 |

**SCHEDULING ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Expedited Request for Entry of Scheduling Order and Motion to Approve Proposed Settlement with TD Bank,<sup>1</sup> to Approve the Proposed Notice of Settlement with TD Bank, to Enter the Bar Order, and for Plaintiffs’ Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses (the “Motion”) of Ralph S. Janvey (the “Receiver”), as Receiver for the Receivership Estate in *SEC v. Stanford International Bank, Ltd.*, No. 3:09-CV-0298-N (N.D. Tex.) (the “SEC Action”), and the Official Stanford Investors Committee (the “Committee”), as a party to the SEC Action and as a plaintiff in *Rotstain, et al. v. Trustmark National Bank, et al.*, Civil Action No. 4:22-cv-00800 (S.D. Tex.) (the “Rotstain Litigation”). The Receiver and the Committee are referred to herein collectively as the “Movants.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Terms used in this Scheduling Order that are defined in the settlement agreement that is attached as Exhibit 1 of the Appendix to the Motion (ECF No. 3246) (the “Settlement Agreement”), unless expressly otherwise defined herein, have the same meaning as in the Settlement Agreement (which is deemed incorporated herein by reference).

The Motion concerns a proposed settlement (the “Settlement”) among and between, on the one hand, the Receiver, the Committee, and the Rotstain Investor Plaintiffs;<sup>2</sup> and, on the other hand, The Toronto-Dominion Bank (“TD Bank”), as a defendant in the *Rotstain* Litigation.

In the Motion, the Movants seek the Court’s approval of the terms of the Settlement, including entry of a bar order in the SEC Action (the “Bar Order”). After reviewing the terms of the Settlement and considering the arguments presented in the Motion, the Court preliminarily approves the Settlement as adequate, fair, reasonable, and equitable. Accordingly, the Court enters this scheduling order to: (i) provide for notice of the terms of the Settlement, including the proposed Bar Order in the SEC Action; (ii) set the deadline for filing objections to the Settlement, the Bar Order, or Movants’ request for approval of Plaintiffs’ attorneys’ fees; (iii) set the deadline for responding to any objection so filed; and (iv) set the date of the final approval hearing regarding the Settlement, the Bar Order in the SEC Action, and Movants’ request for approval of Plaintiffs’ attorneys’ fees (the “Final Approval Hearing”), as follows:

1. Preliminary Findings on Potential Approval of the Settlement: Based upon the Court’s review of the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the arguments presented in the Motion, and the Motion’s accompanying appendices and exhibits, the Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and equitable; has no obvious deficiencies; and is the product of serious, informed, good-faith, and arm’s-length negotiations. The Court, however, reserves a final ruling with respect to the terms of the Settlement until after the Final Approval Hearing referenced below in Paragraph 2.

---

<sup>2</sup> John J. Little signed the Settlement Agreement as chair of the Committee. Mr. Little, the Court-appointed Examiner (the “Examiner”), also signed the Settlement Agreement in his capacity as Examiner solely to evidence his support and approval of the Settlement and to confirm his obligation to post the Notice on his website, but Mr. Little as Examiner is not otherwise individually a party to the Settlement Agreement or any of the above-referenced litigation.

2. Final Approval Hearing: The Final Approval Hearing will be held before the Honorable David C. Godbey of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, United States Courthouse, 1100 Commerce Street, Dallas, Texas 75242, in Courtroom 1505, at 9:30 a.m. on August 8, 2023, which is a date at least ninety (90) calendar days after entry of this Scheduling Order. The purposes of the Final Approval Hearing will be to: (i) determine whether the terms of the Settlement should be approved by the Court; (ii) determine whether the Bar Order attached as Exhibit B to the Settlement Agreement should be entered by the Court in the SEC Action; (iii) rule upon any objections to the Settlement or the Bar Order; (iv) rule upon Movants' request for approval of Plaintiffs' attorneys' fees; and (v) rule upon such other matters as the Court may deem appropriate.

3. Notice: The Court approves the form of Notice attached as Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement and finds that the methodology, distribution, and dissemination of Notice described in the Motion: (i) constitute the best practicable notice; (ii) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise all Interested Parties of the Settlement, the releases therein, and the injunctions provided for in the Bar Order; (iii) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise all Interested Parties of the right to object to the Settlement or the Bar Order and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (iv) constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice; (v) meet all requirements of applicable law, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including Due Process), and the Rules of the Court; and (vi) will provide to all Persons a full and fair opportunity to be heard on these matters. The Court further approves the form of the publication Notice attached as Exhibit E to the Settlement Agreement. Therefore:

a. The Receiver is hereby directed, no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days after entry of this Scheduling Order, to cause the Notice in substantially the same form attached as Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement to be sent via electronic mail, first class mail, or international delivery service to all Interested Parties; to be sent via electronic service to all counsel of record for any Person who is, at the time of Notice, a party in any case included in *In re Stanford Entities Securities Litigation*, MDL No. 2099 (N.D. Tex.) (the “MDL”), the SEC Action, the *Rotstain* Litigation, or *Smith, et al. v. Independent Bank, et al.*, Civil Action No. 4:20-cv-00675 (S.D. Tex.) (the “*Smith* Litigation”), who are deemed to have consented to electronic service through the CM/ECF System; and to be sent via facsimile transmission and/or first class mail to any other counsel of record for any other Person who is, at the time of service, a party in any case included in the MDL, the SEC Action, the *Rotstain* Litigation, or the *Smith* Litigation.

b. The Receiver is hereby directed, no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days after entry of this Scheduling Order, to cause the notice in substantially the same form attached as Exhibit E to the Settlement Agreement to be published once in the national edition of *The Wall Street Journal* and once in the international edition of *The New York Times*.

c. The Receiver is hereby directed, no later than fourteen (14) calendar days after entry of this Scheduling Order, to cause the Settlement Agreement, the Motion, this Scheduling Order, the Notice, and all exhibits and appendices attached to these documents, to be posted on the Receiver’s website (<http://stanfordfinancialreceivership.com>). The Examiner is hereby directed, no later than fourteen (14) calendar days after entry of this Scheduling Order, to cause the Settlement Agreement, the Motion, this Scheduling Order, the Notice, and all exhibits and appendices attached to these documents, to be posted on the Examiner’s website (<http://lpf-law.com/examiner-stanford-financial-group>).

d. The Receiver is hereby directed promptly to provide the Settlement Agreement, the Motion, this Scheduling Order, the Notice, and all exhibits and appendices attached to these documents, to any Person who requests such documents via email to Peter Morgenstern at morgenstern@butzel.com, or via telephone by calling (212) 818-1110. The Receiver may provide such materials in the form and manner that the Receiver deems most appropriate under the circumstances of the request.

e. No less than ten (10) days before the Final Approval Hearing, the Receiver shall cause to be filed with the Clerk of this Court written evidence of compliance with subparts (a) through (d) of this Paragraph, which may be in the form of an affidavit or declaration.

4. Objections and Appearances at the Final Approval Hearing: Any Person who wishes to object to the terms of the Settlement, the Bar Order, or Movants' request for approval of Plaintiffs' attorneys' fees, or who wishes to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, must do so by filing an objection, in writing, with the Court in the SEC Action (3:09-CV-0298-N), by ECF or by mailing the objection to the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, 1100 Commerce Street, Dallas, Texas 75242, no later than July 18, 2023. All objections filed with the Court must:

- a. contain the name, address, telephone number, and (if applicable) an email address of the Person filing the objection;
- b. contain the name, address, telephone number, and email address of any attorney representing the Person filing the objection;
- c. be signed by the Person filing the objection, or his or her attorney;
- d. state, in detail, the basis for any objection;

e. attach any document the Court should consider in ruling on the Person's objection, the Settlement, the Bar Order, or Movants' request for approval of Plaintiffs' attorneys' fees; and

f. if the Person filing the objection wishes to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, make a request to do so.

No Person will be permitted to appear at the Final Approval Hearing without filing a written objection and request to appear at the Final Approval Hearing as set forth in subparts (a) through (f) of this Paragraph. Copies of any objections filed must be served by ECF, or by email or first class mail, upon each of the following:

Lynn K. Neuner  
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP  
425 Lexington Avenue  
New York, NY 10017  
Telephone: (212) 455-2000  
Fax: (212) 455-2502  
E-mail: lneuner@stblaw.com

and

Scott M. Berman  
Friedman Kaplan Seiler Adelman & Robbins LLP  
7 Times Square  
New York, New York 10036-6516  
Telephone: (212) 833-1120  
Fax: (212) 833-1250  
E-mail: sberman@fklaw.com

and

Peter D. Morgenstern  
Butzel Long, P.C.  
477 Madison Avenue, Suite 1230  
New York, New York 10022  
Telephone: (212) 818-1110  
Fax: (212) 898-0123  
E-mail: morgenstern@butzel.com

and

John J. Little  
John J. Little Law, PLLC  
8150 N. Central Expressway, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75206  
Telephone: (214) 989-4180  
Fax: (214) 367-6001  
E-mail: john@johnjlittlelaw.com

and

Ralph Janvey  
Krage & Janvey, L.L.P.  
2100 Ross Ave  
Suite 2600  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone:  
Fax:  
E-mail: rjanvey@kjllp.com

and

Kevin Sadler  
Baker Botts LLP  
1001 Page Mill Road  
Building One, Suite 200  
Palo Alto, California 94304-1007  
Telephone: (650) 739-7518  
Fax: (650) 739-7618  
E-mail: kevin.sadler@bakerbotts.com

Any Person filing an objection shall be deemed to have submitted to the jurisdiction of this Court for all purposes of that objection, the Settlement, and the Bar Order. Potential objectors who do not present opposition by the time and in the manner set forth above shall be deemed to have waived the right to object (including any right to appeal) and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing and shall be forever barred from raising such objections in this action or any other action or proceeding. Persons do not need to appear at the Final Approval Hearing or take any other action to indicate their approval.

5. Responses to Objections: Any Party to the Settlement may respond to an objection filed pursuant to Paragraph 4 by filing a response in the SEC Action no later than August 1, 2023. To the extent any Person filing an objection cannot be served by action of the Court's CM/ECF system, a response must be served to the email and/or mailing address provided by that Person.

6. Adjustments Concerning Hearing and Deadlines: The date, time, and place for the Final Approval Hearing, and the deadlines and date requirements in this Scheduling Order, shall be subject to adjournment or change by this Court without further notice other than that which may be posted by means of ECF in the MDL, the SEC Action, *Rotstain* Litigation, and the *Smith* Litigation.

7. Retention of Jurisdiction: The Court shall retain jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the proposed Settlement.

8. Entry of Injunction: If the Settlement is approved by the Court, the Court will enter the Bar Order in the SEC Action. If entered, the Bar Order will permanently enjoin, among others, Interested Parties, including Stanford Investors and Claimants, from bringing, encouraging, assisting, continuing, or prosecuting, against TD Bank or any of the TD Bank Released Parties, the *Rotstain* Litigation, the *Smith* Litigation, or any other action, lawsuit, cause of action, claim, investigation, demand, complaint, or proceeding of any nature, including, without limitation, contribution or indemnity claims, arising from or relating to a Settled Claim.


9. Use of Order: Under no circumstances shall this Scheduling Order be construed, deemed, or used as an admission, concession, or declaration by or against TD Bank of any fault, wrongdoing, breach or liability. Nor shall the Order be construed, deemed, or used as an admission, concession, or declaration by or against Plaintiffs that their claims lack merit or that the relief requested is inappropriate, improper, or unavailable, or as a waiver by any party of any



defenses or claims he or she may have. Neither this Scheduling Order, nor the proposed Settlement Agreement, or any other settlement document shall be filed, offered, received in evidence, or otherwise used in these or any other actions or proceedings or in any arbitration, other than to enforce the terms and/or intent of the Settlement and the Settlement Agreement or to defend against or facilitate a dismissal of any other proceeding against TD Bank.

10. Entry of This Order: This Scheduling Order shall be entered on the docket in the SEC Action. The Committee shall cause a notice of the Scheduling Order to be entered on the docket of the *Rotstain* Litigation and the *Smith* Litigation.

Signed on March 14, 2023.

  
DAVID C. GODBEY  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE