UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION, Plaintiff, v. OASIS INTERNATIONAL GROUP, LIMITED, ET AL., Defendants.	Case No. 8:19-cv-886-VMC-SPF

RESPONDENT MICHAEL J. DACORTA'S MOTION TO STAY, PENDING APPEAL, THE RECEIVER'S ACTIVITIES, FURTHER FEE PAYMENTS, AND COLLECTION AGAINST HIM

Respondent Michael J. DaCorta, appearing pro se from FCI Coleman Camp, moves for a stay, pending resolution of the civil appeal in this case (11th Cir. No. 24-10132-A, still pending) and his appeal of the September 4, 2026 Order (Doc. 989) (11th Cir. No. 26-13417-A; Doc. 992), of (1) the Receiver's activities in this case, other than those needed to preserve and safeguard Receivership assets and to comply with orders of this Court; (2) the payment of further professional fees and costs from Receivership funds; and (3) collection against him of any fee award. In the alternative, he asks for the narrower stay described in Part IV, limited to fees relating to the contempt proceedings and to collection against him.

I. WHY A STAY IS WARRANTED

The Receiver has asked the Court to award $239,306.36 against Mr. DaCorta, jointly and severally (Doc. 1000 at 3). He has asked that the $176,181.21 not yet approved be paid "initially from the Receivership" (*id.* at 12), which means paid from money that belongs to the claimants, before the Court has examined it and before anyone knows whether the order on which it rests will survive review. He has also told the Court that he "will likely seek appellate fees from the Eleventh Circuit" and "additional fees in connection with this matter in the future" (*id.* at 11). Doc. 1000 itself refers to the Receiver's twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth interim fee motions (*id.* at 11). The Receiver has been filing such motions since 2019, a period of more than seven years.

Each of those payments is spent first and examined afterward. If Doc. 989 is vacated or substantially narrowed, money paid to professionals for prosecuting it cannot easily be returned, and the Receiver himself acknowledges that collecting from Mr. DaCorta, who is incarcerated, "might prove difficult" (*id.* at 12). The result would be that claimant funds paid for a prosecution that the Court of Appeals later set aside. A pause costs the Receiver little, because the assets remain protected and his fees can be sought once the appeals are decided.

II. THE STANDARD

The Court has inherent power to control the disposition of cases on its docket, including by staying proceedings pending related review. *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). It also supervises the payment of fees from the receivership estate. Doc. 177 at 24 (¶ 62). In deciding whether to stay an order or related proceedings pending appeal, courts consider (1) whether the movant has made a strong showing of likely success on the merits, (2) whether he will be irreparably injured absent a stay, (3) whether a stay will substantially injure other parties, and (4) where the public interest lies. *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009).

III. ARGUMENT

A. The appeal presents substantial questions. Mr. DaCorta's challenges are set out in Doc. 990 and the record citations in Doc. 995. The Court denied reconsideration on October 21, 2026 (Doc. 1001), and he will present them to the Eleventh Circuit. In summary: the adverse-inference findings in ¶ 130 of Doc. 989 are identical, bullet for bullet, to ¶ 131 of the Receiver's proposed findings (Doc. 985); they rest on questions put to Mr. DaCorta at a hearing where he had no lawyer; and the Order's own cross-reference to "independent evidence" (Doc. 989 ¶ 131) does not address several of the inferences, including the finding that he

"knows the location" of the gold coins. Those questions are serious enough that fees built on the Order should not be paid out and collected while they are pending.

A-1. Why the broader stay. The Receivership has been administered for more than seven years under interim fee motions filed quarterly (Doc. 1000 at 11, referring to the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth). Each motion is approved, paid from the estate, and reviewed afterward, if at all, by a Court that hears only from the Receiver and the parties who take no position (*id.* at 20). The Receiver told the Court at the March 24, 2026 status conference that he had been "hesitant" to pursue these matters because "it's spending money" (Doc. 907 at 14:20–15:2). The Court has shared that concern: in December 2022 it said of the cost of this Receivership, "the dollar signs do bother me too," and "it's less money for the victims." Dec. 22, 2022 Hr'g Tr. (hearing at Doc. 703), Ex. A at 11:16–19. It added that it "just hope[s] that somebody is looking at it, you know, other than me." *Id.* at 19:6–7 (addressing CFTC counsel). In February 2025 the Court also asked why victims' funds should bear billing for a contempt motion filed in the wrong court. Doc. 859 (order on Doc. 856). That candor supports the point of this motion: while the civil appeal is pending, every dollar spent on discretionary activity is a dollar the claimants may not recover if the judgment is later vacated or modified. A pause in activity beyond preservation of the assets protects the claimants and the Court of Appeals' ability to give effective relief.

B. Irreparable harm. For Mr. DaCorta, the harm is a joint and several obligation of more than $239,000 imposed on an incarcerated Respondent who is proceeding without counsel in this Court. For the Receivership, which the Receiver has said will advance the third-quarter amounts, the harm is that claimant funds will be spent on a prosecution that may be reversed, with no practical way to restore them. Neither harm can be undone after the fact.

C. Injury to others. The stay in Request (1) is drafted to avoid loss to the Receivership. It excludes everything needed to preserve and safeguard the assets (insurance, taxes, maintenance, and compliance with this Court's orders), and it is limited to the period in which the appeals are pending. Its cost is delay, not loss. If the Court concludes that a full pause is broader than necessary, the narrower stay in Request (2) postpones only payment and collection of contempt-related fees. On the Receiver's own plan his professionals are to be paid from the Receivership in the meantime (Doc. 1000 at 12), so a pause does not leave work unpaid; it only decides whether payment should wait for the appeal.

D. The public interest favors preserving receivership assets for the claimants and avoiding payments that may later have to be reversed. The Eleventh Circuit's decision will also settle whether the contempt order stands, which is the basis for every fee the Receiver now seeks under it.

E. Duration and cost of the Receivership. The Receiver's fee motions have been filed quarterly since 2019, and Doc. 988 was the twenty-ninth (Doc. 988; Doc. 1000 at 11). The Court has raised the cost of this Receivership before. In 2022 it said it wondered "are we getting the bang for the buck here" (Ex. A at 18:23–25), and in 2025 it asked the Receiver to explain "why it is appropriate for these payments to be made from funds allocated for the victims" (Doc. 859), after which the Receiver absorbed $10,315.00 (Doc. 861-1 at 10 (corrected response filed Mar. 11, 2025); *see* Doc. 862), acknowledging that the motion "should have been brought in the Southern District of New York" (*id.* at 3). Of the $4,806,310.13 the Court has awarded across the Receiver's twenty-nine fee motions, $4,502,329.21 (93.7%) had been approved by the twenty-second, in December 2024. The seven motions since then total $303,980.92, an average of about $43,400 a quarter. Ex. C. The $176,181.21 in new fees now sought for contempt-related work (Doc. 1000 at 3) is more than four times that average and 58% of those seven quarters combined. Awards averaged about $297,000 a quarter across the first nine motions (2019–2021) and ranged from $23,397.20 to $64,345.92 across the six filed in 2025–2026, yet the contempt request is larger than any single award since the thirteenth motion in August 2022 ($248,939.02). Ex. C. Quarterly awards fell in each of the four quarters of 2025, from $61,101.88 to $23,397.20 (Doc. 893, Feb. 24, 2026), as the Receiver reported the work

"substantially complete" (Doc. 988-2 § VI). On April 3, 2026, the Receiver filed his Verified Motion for an Order to Show Cause. Doc. 904. The next quarterly request, $64,345.92, was more than 2.7 times the one before it. Through June 30, 2026, the Receiver reported having paid $4,733,129.58 to himself and his professionals, compared with $18,824,628.07 to investors, a figure unchanged from the one he reported at December 31, 2024. Doc. 988-1 at 3; Doc. 856-1 at 3. In opposing reconsideration, the Receiver titled Section V of his opposition "THE RECEIVER'S FEES ARE NOT RELEVANT ASIDE FROM THE FACT THAT DACORTA SHOULD PAY THEM," and told the Court that "[t]he Court always scrutinizes the Receiver's fee applications, and DaCorta does not identify any charges that are purportedly incorrect or improper," and that the share of fees devoted to the show cause proceedings is "meaningless" because "ongoing proceedings will generate more fees than completed proceedings." Doc. 994 at 15–16. Mr. DaCorta's response to Doc. 1000 identifies the charges, and the Receiver himself predicts that more will follow. Nor has the Receivership always sought value for the estate. The Receiver's asset schedule, attached to his Sixth Interim Fee Motion, lists a 2017 Maserati with an estimated value of $60,800.00 and a lien of $43,528.88, an estimated margin of about $17,000, yet records it as "Forfeited; Abandoned After Further Investigation," with $0.00 recovered. Doc. 331-23 at 52 (filed Nov. 20, 2020). The schedule does not say what the investigation found, and

the Receiver's 2026 report still lists the vehicle as abandoned. Doc. 988-2. On November 4, 2019, the Receiver's counsel asked Mr. DaCorta whether he objected to a motion to sell the Receivership's gold and silver. Mr. DaCorta answered the next morning that he would not object, but that he did "not feel it is in the best interest of the lenders for the metals to be sold at this time," because they "have increased substantially since the time they were seized and appear to have further to appreciate in the coming months." Counsel replied that "[t]he Receiver intends to sell the metals in a manner which best benefits the estate." Ex. B (emails of Nov. 4–5, 2019). The Receiver's Motion to Approve a Procedure for the Sale of Gold and Silver is Doc. 197 (Nov. 4, 2019). His amended certification told the Court only that Mr. DaCorta "will not object to the relief requested." Doc. 199 at 2 (Nov. 6, 2019). The Court granted the motion the next day as unopposed. Doc. 200 (Nov. 7, 2019). The Receivership's public website lists none of these filings; its 2019 page ends with Doc. 195 (Oct. 30, 2019) and its 2020 page continues with Doc. 215, omitting Docs. 197, 199 and 200, so a member of the public can read them only through PACER, which charges per page beyond a small quarterly allowance that a single docket can exhaust. Others cannot tell from the Receiver's reports how that was done. The asset schedule reports a single figure of $657,382.25 for "all Metals" sold, without identifying the buyer, the date, or the price of any item. Doc. 988-2. The same report values $322,000 in gold coins it attributes to the

Helpers Group at the July 28, 2026 spot price of $4,024.80 per ounce, "now valued at approximately $684,216." *Id.* at 16 & n.8. The Receiver values gold at today's price when it suits him. He recognizes that gold has appreciated, but the schedule gives no sale date or price for the metals the Receivership sold. The schedule lists 250 ounces of gold, which at the report's own July 2026 price would be worth roughly $1.0 million, more than the $657,382.25 reported for all metals. Mr. DaCorta understands that silver, which the Receivership also held and sold, has since risen by a much larger percentage than gold, yet, adding the quantities in its entries, the schedule lists about 18,025 ounces of silver (100-ounce bars and one-ounce coins) and 250 ounces of gold, every item marked "Forfeited; Sold," but gives no sale date or price for any of them. Mr. DaCorta asks only that the Receiver be required to account for the dates and prices at which the Receivership's precious metals were sold. The Receiver's own report states that, "[o]ther than efforts to stop the Helpers Group's continued fraud, interference with the Receivership, and violation of this Court's orders and the ATC Litigation, the work of Receiver is substantially complete." Doc. 988-2 § VI. What remains, in other words, is litigation, and the show-cause proceeding has become a principal source of new billing: it now supports a $239,306.36 request against individuals whom the Receiver himself says may be unable to pay. Doc. 1000 at 12. Until those fees are collected, the estate bears them. The Receiver also reports that the

ATC case is set for jury trial in May 2028 and that he "intends to continue aggressively prosecuting this action." Doc. 988-2 at 22. Costs of that kind should be projected and justified before more are charged to the estate. The Consolidated Order makes all fee applications "interim" and "subject to cost benefit and final reviews," Doc. 177 at 24 (¶ 62), and conditions the Receiver's authority on spending estate funds "in a reasonable and cost-effective manner," *id.* at 19 (¶ 44). A stay allows that review to occur before further sums are paid or collected. Yet that enforcement work generates additional professional compensation, including the $239,306.36 now sought. The award sought here is against an incarcerated respondent, unrepresented in this Court, whose ability to pay the criminal court has already assessed: it waived any fine and set payment at $25 per quarter, or 50% of any prison earnings, while he is in custody. Judgment, *United States v. DaCorta*, No. 8:19-cr-605-WFJ-CPT, Doc. 234 at 6 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 20, 2022). As early as November 2019 the Receiver himself told the Court that Mr. DaCorta "has a public defender." Doc. 199 at 2. The Receiver should be required to say what recovery he expects from Mr. DaCorta. Mr. DaCorta asks that, before further litigation is undertaken at the estate's expense, the Court require an updated statement of the probable recovery, estimated cost, likelihood of success, and effect on the timing of final distributions, together with a proposed schedule for terminating the Receivership. The Receivership exists to serve the victims, and they do not exist to

fund it indefinitely. A receivership should not continue indefinitely merely because continued litigation generates additional work for the professionals administering it.

IV. REQUESTED RELIEF

Mr. DaCorta respectfully requests that the Court:

(1) stay, pending the Eleventh Circuit's decisions in Nos. 24-10132-A and 26-13417-A, all activities of the Receiver in this case other than those needed to preserve and safeguard Receivership assets and to comply with orders of this Court, and the payment of further fees and costs from Receivership funds other than for those excepted activities;

(2) in the alternative, stay, pending the same events, approval and payment from Receivership funds of any fees and costs relating to the contempt proceedings under Doc. 989 (including the pending $176,181.21 in Doc. 1000) and to the appeals, and stay enforcement and collection against Mr. DaCorta of any fee or cost award entered under Doc. 989;

(3) require the Receiver, within thirty days, to file an accounting of the buyer, date, and price of each sale of precious metals and an identification of the domain, account, or service to which each "Web Related Expenses" charge (GoDaddy, RAD Technology, Amazon Web Services, GreenGeeks) relates, and a proposed schedule for terminating

the Receivership and, before undertaking further litigation at the estate's expense, a statement of its probable recovery, estimated cost, likelihood of success, and effect on the timing of final distributions;

(4) in the further alternative, direct that any contempt-related fees paid in the interim be accounted for separately, be identified in every fee application by timekeeper, date, and task, be served on Mr. DaCorta, be accompanied by a statement whether the CFTC reviewed the invoices, and be held subject to refund or credit if Doc. 989 is vacated or modified; and

(5) grant such other relief as the Court finds just.

LOCAL RULE 3.01(g) CERTIFICATE

Mr. DaCorta is incarcerated and cannot telephone counsel for the Receiver, Jared J. Perez and Maya Lockwood, from FCI Coleman, and he asks the Court to excuse conferral before filing. Doc. 1000 states that the Receiver did not confer with Mr. DaCorta before filing it (Doc. 1000 at 20). A copy of this motion is being emailed to counsel at his direction on the date in the certificate of service below, so that the Receiver may state its position in response. Local Rule 3.01(g).

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Michael J. DaCorta
Michael J. DaCorta
BOP Register No. 73181-018
Currently confined at:
FCI Coleman Camp
P.O. Box 1027
Coleman, FL 33521
Respondent, pro se

Attachments: Exhibit A, excerpts of the transcript of the December 22, 2022 hearing (Doc. 703). Exhibit B, emails between Receiver's counsel Eric R. Feld and Mr. DaCorta, Nov. 4–5, 2019 (sent through his wife's email account and signed by him). Exhibit C, summary of the Receiver's twenty-nine interim fee motions and the Court's orders.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on October 23, 2026, a copy of the foregoing was sent by electronic mail, at my direction, to counsel for Receiver Burton W. Wiand:

Jared J. Perez, Esq. (jared.perez@jaredperezlaw.com) and Maya Lockwood, Esq. (maya@burtonwwiandpa.com).

/s/ Michael J. DaCorta
Michael J. DaCorta

CFTC v. Oasis International Group, Ltd., et al.
Case No. 8:19-cv-886-VMC-SPF (M.D. Fla.)

EXHIBIT A

Excerpts of the transcript of the December 22, 2022 hearing (Doc. 703)
Transcript pages 11, 18 and 19

10:15:20AM a forfeiture provision, but in addition, from the civil standpoint, the receiver has to come in and protect assets.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KURPIERS: He has to not only identify the assets but then secure them and then take appropriate steps to liquidate the assets and return money to folks. So I understood that, and I understand why he was involved, but there was a pause there.

THE COURT: Yeah. No, I mean I've had my own pause there, not just on this case but on others. I just don't know who else locally has the experience and -- I mean, generally speaking, I think Mr. Wiand and his group have done a good job, I have to tell you that.

MR. KURPIERS: No, I agree. And they're very experienced.

THE COURT: But the dollar signs do bother me too.

MR. KURPIERS: Yes.

THE COURT: It's not as if I'm paying it, but I know it's less money for the victims --

MR. KURPIERS: Understood.

THE COURT: -- so I am bothered by it.

MR. KURPIERS: And I don't mean to go off on a separate tangent, and my apologies to you for that.

THE COURT: That's all right. I went right with you on it. No apologies.

10:24:47AM mediation with Retired Judge Holder. He's been doing a really
10:24:52AM good job. We had an outstanding mediator here before and --
10:24:58AM who unfortunately became ill and is no longer able to work.
10:25:02AM But Judge Holder has sort of stepped into -- I don't want say
10:25:08AM into his shoes, that's not at all what I'm saying, but has
10:25:11AM filled the void by that gentleman's departure from the field of
10:25:16AM mediation. So he's been doing a really good job and I've been
10:25:19AM appointing him to a number of cases. So I'm glad that you'll
10:25:23AM be mediating whatever remains -- I mean, whatever you're not
10:25:27AM able to resolve.
10:25:28AM MS. AUXTER: That's right, Your Honor. We'd like to
10:25:31AM get it down as much as we can before that mediation and figure
10:25:34AM out who we're proceeding against.
10:25:38AM THE COURT: And so while I've got you here, I'm
10:25:38AM assuming that you are looking at -- and not to put Mr. Perez
10:25:41AM here on the spot, but it's -- because I did this work -- not
10:25:45AM what you're doing. I did a different version of it. I did
10:25:49AM forfeitures, but always looked at the numbers, and I always
10:25:54AM felt an obligation to try to have as much available.
10:25:59AM You know, it's sort of -- you know, you're kind of in
10:26:03AM a really challenged position, because you have to spend money
10:26:11AM to make money -- that's what I'll say, you have to spend money
10:26:13AM to bring money in. On the other hand, sometimes I see a lot of
10:26:20AM money being spent, and you wonder are we getting the bang for
10:26:27AM the buck here. Would it be better to just let it go.

10:26:30AM Anyway, as I said, Mr. Wiand is really the only one I know of here. And he's done -- I think judges have been -- my discussion with judges -- have been quite pleased with him. I don't have anything to say other than positive. I just -- I just look at those numbers, I do get concerned about it and just hope that somebody is looking at it, you know, other than me. I mean, I hope you are because you're the one here who we look to to make certain as much money as possible is made available to those from whom it's been taken.

10:27:11AM MS. AUXTER: That's our priority as well, Your Honor. And we do have those discussions in the background, kind of the cost-benefit analysis of recovering certain sums. We are really trying to make sure that the benefit that we're getting justifies the costs that it takes to -- you know, to recover the money.

10:27:29AM THE COURT: Well, like I said, we used to do that work -- "we" at the U.S. Attorney's Office, so we didn't pay outside lawyers. I just don't think you are all equipped -- am I correct in that? -- or you're not set up to do that.

10:27:40AM MS. AUXTER: That's correct, Your Honor. At our agency, this is -- when we have assets to recover -- that's not always the case. But when we have assets to recover, yes, we do really rely on receivers.

10:27:56AM THE COURT: Well, that's exactly what I thought the situation was, so there's not much you can do. And at least in

CFTC v. Oasis International Group, Ltd., et al.
Case No. 8:19-cv-886-VMC-SPF (M.D. Fla.)

EXHIBIT B

Emails between Receiver's counsel Eric R. Feld
and Mr. DaCorta, November 4–5, 2019
(sent through Carolyn DaCorta's email account; signed by Mr. DaCorta)

FW: Oasis - Motion to Sell Gold & Silver - LR 3.01(g)

Inbox

EF

Eric Feld
To: me · Mon, Nov 4, 2019 at 2:07 PM

Mr. DaCorta,

Please advise whether you have any objections to the attached motion to sell precious metals. We would like to file the motion today, so we appreciate if you could get back to us expeditiously.

Thank you

Eric R. Feld
Attorney
Wiand Guerra King PA
5505 W Gray Street
Tampa, FL 33609
Phone: 813.347.5107
Fax: 813.347.5198
efeld@wiandlaw.com
www.wiandlaw.com

W|G|K
WIAND GUERRA KING

Confidentiality Disclaimer: This e-mail message and any attachments are private communication sent by a law firm, Wiand Guerra King P.A., and may contain confidential, legally privileged information meant solely for the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, then delete the e-mail and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

FW: Oasis - Motion to Sell Gold & Silver - LR 3.01(g)

Inbox

EF

Eric Feld
To: me · Mon, Nov 4, 2019 at 2:07 PM

To: Carolyn DaCorta <cdacorta@yahoo.com>

Please advise whether you have any objections to the attached motion to sell precious metals. We would like to file the motion today, so we appreciate if you could get back to us expeditiously.

Thank you

Eric R. Feld
Attorney
Wiand Guerra King PA
5505 W Gray Street
Tampa, FL 33609
Phone: 813.347.5107
Fax: 813.347.5198
efeld@wiandlaw.com
www.wiandlaw.com

W|G|K
WIAND GUERRA KING

Confidentiality Disclaimer: This e-mail message and any attachments are private communication sent by a law firm, Wiand Guerra King P.A., and may contain confidential, legally privileged information meant solely for the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, then delete the e-mail and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

From: Carolyn DaCorta [mailto:cdacorta@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 5, 2019 8:05 AM
To: Eric Feld <efeld@wiandlaw.com>
Subject: Re: Oasis - Motion to Sell Gold & Silver - LR 3.01(g)

Mr. Feld,

I will not object, however, I do not feel it is in the best interest of the lenders for the metals to be sold at this time. They have increased substantially since the time they were seized and appear to have further to appreciate in the coming months.

Mike DaCorta

From: Eric Feld <efeld@wiandlaw.com>
To: 'Carolyn DaCorta' <cdacorta@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 5, 2019 at 11:07:19 AM EST
Subject: RE: Oasis - Motion to Sell Gold & Silver - LR 3.01(g)

Thank you, Mr. DaCorta. The Receiver intends to sell the metals in a manner which best benefits the estate.

Additionally—I do not believe that I received the mailed copies of the OIG share transfer and related documentation. Could you please confirm that you have mailed them to my attention?

Eric R. Feld

Attorney

Wiand Guerra King PA

5505 W Gray Street

Tampa, FL 33609

Phone: 813.347.5107

Fax: 813.347.5198

efeld@wiandlaw.com

www.wiandlaw.com



Confidentiality Disclaimer: This e-mail message and any attachments are private communication sent by a law firm, Wiand Guerra King P.A., and may contain confidential, legally privileged information meant solely for the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, then delete the e-mail and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

EXHIBIT C

Summary of the Receiver's Interim Fee Motions and Orders

CFTC v. Oasis International Group, Ltd., et al., No. 8:19-cv-00886-VMC-SPF (M.D. Fla.)
Compiled October 6, 2026; Notes 4 and 5 added October 20, 2026; Note 6 added October 22, 2026

Basis. Every figure below is taken directly from the Receiver's interim fee motions and the Court's signed fee orders on the public docket. All 29 rounds have been verified against signed orders.

Round	Fee motion (Doc. / filed)	Period covered	Amount sought	Fee order (Doc. / entered / judge)	Amount awarded	Receiver's own compensation	Notes
1st	Doc. 114, 6/14/19	4/15/19–5/15/19	$130,386.81	Doc. 186, 8/13/19, Flynn	$130,386.81	$38,502.00	Granted in full. CFTC did not object; objections limited to pre-appointment fees.
2nd	Doc. 203, 11/14/19	5/16/19–9/30/19	$369,478.98	Doc. 207, 11/22/19, Flynn	$369,478.98	$47,340.00	Granted in full.
3rd	Doc. 234, 2/14/20	10/1/19–12/31/19	$185,107.02	Doc. 236, 2/21/20, Flynn	$185,107.02	$23,400.00	Granted in full.
4th	Doc. 272, 5/26/20	1/1/20–3/31/20	$256,350.73	Doc. 276, 6/3/20, Flynn	$255,500.26	$23,436.00	Reduced $850.47 (WGK costs) — see note 1.
5th	Doc. 311, 8/28/20	4/1/20–6/30/20	$372,770.18	Doc. 318, 9/14/20, Flynn	$372,770.18	$27,900.00	Montie's opposition (re $44,538.61 in clawback billing) overruled.
6th	Doc. 331, 11/20/20	7/1/20–9/30/20	$336,345.41	Doc. 337, 12/11/20, Flynn (MJ)	$336,345.41	$25,884.00	Granted in full.
7th	Doc. 377, 3/1/21	10/1/20–12/31/20	$318,574.27	Doc. 384, 3/31/21, Flynn	$318,574.27	$36,000.00	Granted in full.
8th	Doc. 410, 6/21/21	1/1/21–3/31/21	$350,135.48	Doc. 414, 7/9/21, Flynn	$350,135.48	$35,712.00	Granted in full.
9th	Doc. 431, 9/29/21	4/1/21–6/30/21	$358,001.67	Doc. 434, 10/14/21, Flynn	$358,001.67	$26,244.00	Granted in full.
10th	Doc. 459, 12/30/21	7/1/21–9/30/21	$154,196.30	Doc. 474, 2/4/22, Flynn	$154,196.30	$11,980.13	DaCorta's objection considered and overruled.
11th	Doc. 485, 3/17/22	10/1/21–12/31/21	$133,372.98	Doc. 587, 4/14/22, Flynn	$133,372.98	$9,912.00	Granted in full; no timely objections.
12th	Doc. 648, 6/16/22	1/1/22–3/31/22	$130,879.65	Doc. 653, 7/22/22, Flynn	$130,879.65	$27,986.11	Granted in full; no objections.
13th	Doc. 660, 8/15/22	4/1/22–6/30/22	$248,939.02	Doc. 676, 9/22/22, Flynn	$248,939.02	$39,586.95	Granted in full.
14th	Doc. 691, 11/22/22	7/1/22–9/30/22	$173,575.69	Doc. 692, 12/1/22, Flynn	$173,575.69	$13,505.16	Granted in full.
15th	Doc. 724, 2/15/23	10/1/22–12/31/22	$144,659.07	Doc. 729, 3/2/23, Flynn	$144,659.07	$18,675.56	Granted in full. Haas objected but missed the deadline; deemed unopposed.

Round	Fee motion (Doc. / filed)	Period covered	Amount sought	Fee order (Doc. / entered / judge)	Amount awarded	Receiver's own compensation	Notes
16th	Doc. 737, 5/30/23	1/1/23–3/31/23	$125,073.17	Doc. 740, 5/31/23, Flynn (MJ)	$125,073.17	$23,187.60	Granted in full. Haas objected.
17th	Doc. 764, 9/12/23	4/1/23–6/30/23	$171,141.30	Doc. 765, 9/27/23, Flynn (MJ)	$171,141.30	$27,281.51	Granted in full.
18th	Docs. 776/777, 11/28/23	7/1/23–9/30/23	$130,153.12	Doc. 779, 12/5/23, Flynn	$130,153.12	$18,802.44	Granted in full.
19th	Doc. 804, 2/28/24	10/1/23–12/31/23	$92,748.17	Doc. 807, 3/22/24, Flynn	$92,748.17	$20,353.43	Granted in full. Haas/Montie not consulted (settlements approved).
20th	Doc. 817, 5/22/24	1/1/24–3/31/24	$112,684.43	Doc. 820, 6/17/24, Flynn (MJ)	$112,684.43	$20,272.33	Granted (same figures).
21st	Doc. 837, 8/27/24	4/1/24–6/30/24	$127,026.63	Doc. 844, 10/16/24, Flynn	$127,026.63	$38,828.09	Granted (same figures).
22nd	Doc. 849, 12/2/24	7/1/24–9/30/24	$81,579.60	Doc. 853, 12/27/24, Covington	$81,579.60	$28,481.73	Granted (same figures).
23rd	Doc. 856, 2/7/25	10/1/24–12/31/24	$55,111.89	Doc. 862, 3/11/25, Covington	$44,796.89	$5,974.40	Voluntary reduction $10,315 (see note 2).
24th	Doc. 869, 5/29/25	1/1/25–3/31/25	$61,101.88	Doc. 870, 6/23/25, Covington	$61,101.88	$13,303.06	Granted (same figures).
25th	Doc. 878, 8/13/25	4/1/25–6/30/25	$33,668.32	Doc. 880, 9/5/25, Covington	$33,668.32	$9,013.50	Granted in full.
26th	Doc. 885, 12/4/25	7/1/25–9/30/25	$29,450.48	Doc. 887, 12/19/25, Covington	$29,450.48	$7,378.64	Granted in full.
27th	Doc. 890, 2/4/26	10/1/25–12/31/25	$23,397.20	Doc. 893, 2/24/26, Covington	$23,397.20	$5,747.07	Granted (same figures).
28th	Doc. 924, 5/29/26	1/1/26–3/31/26	$64,345.92	Doc. 930, 6/15/26, Covington	$64,345.92	$15,361.44	Granted (same figures).
29th	Doc. 988, 8/31/26	4/1/26–6/30/26	$47,220.23	Doc. 991, 9/22/26, Covington	$47,220.23	$12,685.56	Granted (same figures).
	Verified totals		**$4,817,475.60**		**$4,806,310.13**	**$652,734.71**	**See notes below.**

Key notes.

1. The Court reduced the requested amount once: $850.47 in the 4th round (Doc. 276, after questioning WGK cost line items in Doc. 274).

2. In the 23rd round the Receiver voluntarily reduced his own fee request by $10,315.00 (from $16,289.40 to $5,974.40) in his Corrected Response (Doc. 861-1, filed 3/11/25; original response Doc. 860, filed 3/10/25), after the Court took the motion under advisement (Doc. 859, endorsed order, 2/24/25) to question billing for the contempt motion filed in the wrong court (Doc. 834, denied on jurisdictional grounds in Doc. 850).

3. Actually disbursed to the Receiver and his professionals, inception through 6/30/26 (Doc. 988-1): $4,733,129.58. Disbursed to lenders over the same period: $18,824,628.07.

4. Between the 27th and 28th rounds, on 4/3/26, the Receiver filed his Verified Motion for an Order to Show Cause Why Respondents Should Not Be Held in Contempt (Doc. 904).

5. Doc. 1000, filed 10/13/26, asks for a further $239,306.36 in fees and costs for the contempt-related work. It is not included in the totals above. As of 10/20/26 the Court has not ruled on it.

6. *The Receiver's website.* The docket pages of www.oasisreceivership.com, as viewed on October 22, 2026, contain no entry for the following fee motions: Docs. 114, 203, 234, 272, 311, 377, 431, 459, 648, 660, 691, 776, 804 and 856. The entry for Doc. 764 links only to the Notice of Electronic Filing, not to the motion.