

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TAMPA DIVISION**

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 8:09-cv-87-T-26TBM

ARTHUR NADEL,  
SCOOP CAPITAL, LLC,  
SCOOP MANAGEMENT, INC.

Defendants,

SCOOP REAL ESTATE, L.P.  
VALHALLA INVESTMENT PARTNERS, L.P.,  
VALHALLA MANAGEMENT, INC.  
VICTORY IRA FUND, LTD,  
VICTORY FUND, LTD,  
VIKING IRA FUND, LLC,  
VIKING FUND, LLC, AND  
VIKING MANAGEMENT,

Relief Defendants.

---

**RECEIVER'S MOTION TO APPROVE SETTLEMENT**

Burton W. Wiand, as Receiver, moves the Court for an order approving settlement of *Burton W. Wiand, as Receiver v. Richard E. Russell, individually and as Trustee of the Richard E. Russell Revocable Living Trust*, Case No. 8:10-cv-176-T-17MAP (M.D. Fla) (the "Russell Action") and *Burton W. Wiand, as Receiver v. Richard E. Russell, as Trustee of the Richard E. Russell Revocable Living Trust*, Arbitration Ref. No.: 33 512 234 12 AAA (the "Russell Arbitration") on the basis of the Settlement Agreement attached as Exhibit A.

## MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

The Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission” or “SEC”) instituted this action to “halt [an] ongoing fraud, maintain the status quo, and preserve investor assets . . . .” (Dkt. 1, Compl., ¶ 7.) Burton W. Wiand was appointed by this Court as the Receiver for Defendants other than Arthur Nadel and for Relief Defendants. (*See* Order Reappointing Receiver (Dkt. 140).) Additionally, the Receivership was expanded to include Venice Jet Center, LLC and Tradewind, LLC (Dkt. 17); Laurel Mountain Preserve, LLC, Laurel Preserve, LLC, the Marguerite J. Nadel Revocable Trust UAD 8/2/07, and the Laurel Mountain Preserve Homeowners Association, Inc. (Dkt. 44); The Guy-Nadel Foundation, Inc. (Dkt. 68); Lime Avenue Enterprises, LLC, and A Victorian Garden Florist, LLC (Dkt. 79); Viking Oil & Gas, LLC (Dkt. 153); Home Front Homes, LLC (Dkt. 172); and Traders Investment Club (Dkt. 454). All of the entities in receivership are collectively identified herein as the Receivership Entities.

Pursuant to the Order Reappointing Receiver (Dkt. 493), the Receiver has the duty and authority to:

2. Investigate the manner in which the affairs of the Receivership Entities were conducted and institute such actions and legal proceedings, for the benefit and on behalf of the Receivership Entities and their investors and other creditors as the Receiver deems necessary . . . against any transfers of money or other proceeds directly or indirectly traceable from investors in the Receivership Entities; provided such actions may include, but not be limited to, seeking imposition of constructive trusts, disgorgement or profits, recovery and/or avoidance of fraudulent transfers under Florida Statute § 726.101, et. seq. or otherwise, rescission and restitution, the collection of debts, and such orders from this Court as may be necessary to enforce this Order.

Further, the Order Reappointing Receiver (at paragraph 6) authorizes the Receiver to “[d]efend, compromise or settle legal actions . . . in which the Receivership Entities or the Receiver is a party . . . with authorization of this Court . . . .”

By a Complaint filed January 19, 2010, the Receiver originally sued Richard E. Russell, individually and as Trustee of the Richard E. Russell Revocable Living Trust (the “Defendants”). Pursuant to a court order, the claims asserted in the Russell Action were compelled to arbitration, and the Russell Action was stayed pending completion of arbitration. Accordingly, the Receiver initiated the Russell Arbitration to recover sums received from the Receivership Entities with a view to marshaling assets for an eventual distribution to investors with verifiable claims in an equitable and appropriate manner.

As shown by the attached Settlement Agreement, the Receiver and the Defendants, subject to the approval of this Court, have agreed to settle the Russell Action and Russell Arbitration for \$100,000.00, to be paid in accordance with a set payment schedule. In reaching this agreement, the Receiver considered the risks and expense of arbitration. The settlement reflected by the Settlement Agreement is in the best interests of the Receivership, the investors in the Receivership Entities, and Defendants, because resolution of the claim avoids protracted litigation, conserving Receivership assets and judicial resources, and avoids the cost of litigation to Defendants.

WHEREFORE, the Receiver moves the Court to approve the settlement reflected by the attached Settlement Agreement.

**LOCAL RULE 3.01(g) CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL**

The undersigned counsel for the Receiver is authorized to represent to the Court that the SEC has no objection to the Court's granting this motion.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

**I HEREBY CERTIFY** that on August 23, 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system.

**s/Michael S. Lamont**

Gianluca Morello, FBN 034997

Email: [gmorello@wiandlaw.com](mailto:gmorello@wiandlaw.com)

Michael S. Lamont FBN 0527122

Email: [mlamont@wiandlaw.com](mailto:mlamont@wiandlaw.com)

Wiand Guerra King P.L.

3000 Bayport Drive

Suite 600

Tampa, FL 33607

Tel: (813) 347-5100

Fax: (813) 347-5198

*Attorneys for the Receiver, Burton W. Wiand*