THE WITNESS: Correct.

DARREN AZMAN

Having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Does anybody have any questions they'd like to ask of Mr. Azman?

MR. AMIN: I do, Your Honor. Mr. Azman, can you hear me okay?

THE WITNESS: I can.

MR. AMIN: Good afternoon, I guess, if you're in New York. My name is Ismail Amin I'm here on behalf of the Stably Corporation and Coinbits, Inc. Mr. Azman, I understand that your firm was charged with the task of undertaking a forensic analysis of why the wallets were inaccessible, is that fair to say?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that is part of our engagement for Prime.

MR. AMIN: And do you have -- did your firm engage any technical expert outside of McDermott, Will and Emery to assist in that process?

THE WITNESS: I think what you're asking for really is attorney/client privileged and I'm not comfortable answering that information. We are engaged for the purpose that you just described and obviously our number one goal is to return as much crypto and fiat as possible to creditors including your clients but naturally with that engagement we have an attorney/client privilege with our client and so when it comes to engaging outside experts for our firm providing legal guidance to our client Prime it's important that we're not disclosing confidential information that could be used to hinder that investigation. What I can tell you is that prior to our engagement there were two forensic companies that were retained generally to address the issues that you're describing. We intend to retain another firm outside -- that's outside of those two firms that was already engaged because we do believe

there are some, as Mr. Guedry described, gaps in the investigation that was previously done but beyond that I would not feel comfortable describing to you in a public setting what those efforts are going -- going to be.

MR. AMIN: Your Honor, I certainly don't want to step on the attorney/client privilege at all, I simply wanted to know if -- if outside experts were retained outside of the firm.

THE COURT: Well, hasn't he answered that question?

MR. AMIN: I think he said that there are two firms that were previously engaged before they got involved and that they're talking a third firm.

THE COURT: Yeah, but fill in the gaps.

MR. AMIN: Okay. Mr. Azman, just another question. Did -- were -- do you have any non-privileged reports or opinions from any of the third parties that you just mentioned a minute ago?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. AMIN: Did your firm undertake any efforts to conduct an accounting of non-trust funds?

THE WITNESS: No. We are a law firm.

MR. AMIN: Sorry. Say that again.

THE WITNESS: I was -- I was adding -- supplementing. We are a law firm.

MR. AMIN: Okay. Did your firm engage anyone to conduct an accounting of the non-trust funds?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. AMIN: Your Honor, I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else have a few questions for Mr. Azman?

MS. GRIFFITH: Your Honor, may I ask a few questions?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. GRIFFITH: Again, this is Blakely Griffith on behalf of Polaris. Mr. Azman, has there been a conclusion reached on whether and to what extent customer deposits are missing?

MR. AZMAN: No, not that I'm aware of.

MS. GRIFFITH: Do you know what the -- what the deficiency --

MR. AZMAN: Well, sorry, let me -- sorry, I thought -- I thought where you going -- excuse me, I thought where you were going was do we have a conclusion on, you know, why it happened. I think what you're asking is much more narrow than that which is the amount.

MS. GRIFFITH: Yes, that's right.

MR. AZMAN: I don't have those amounts in front of me but my understanding from Mr. Guedry and the company is that there is a conclusion and understanding of the precise amount of crypto that I don't think I would characterize it as missing, I think I would characterize it as not accessible.

MS. GRIFFITH: Okay. For the crypto. What about for the, you know, the cash, the liquid assets?

MR. AZMAN: You're asking if we have an understanding of the exact amounts of fiat currency as opposed to crypto that is not accessible or is that a different question?

MS. GRIFFITH: I'm asking as to the amount of fiat that is --is missing from -- from customer accounts. Not --

MR. AZMAN: Yes.

MS. GRIFFITH: -- assess -- my guess would be the same thing but --

MR. AZMAN: Yes. Yes. Same -- yes, same --

THE COURT: Okay, okay. Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Guys, do me a favor. I know that when we are on video we are not getting the queues from each other but my court recorder is having a difficult time taking you guys down both at the same time. I hired her almost 17 years ago and she has never mastered the art of taking down two people at the same time. I -- maybe after 20, 30 years maybe but not now. Okay.

MR. AZMAN: I apologize, Your Honor, if I was speaking too quickly or speaking over Ms. Griffith. We will try to speak a little more slowly. It is difficult over video.

THE COURT: Ms. Griffith, would you ask your questions again, please.

MS. GRIFFITH: Sure. So, Mr. Azman, do you have a conclusion as to the amount of fiat currency that is, you know, missing or non-accessible from customer -- from customer accounts?

MR AZMAN: Yes, the company does.

MS. GRIFFITH: Do you know what that amount is?

MR. AZMAN: I don't have it in front of me but it is the -- it is the number that was reported in pleadings that have been filed before this Court and to my knowledge those numbers have not changed.

MS. GRIFFITH: And, Mr. Azman, could the receiver direct the bankruptcy filing without the special committee?

MR. AZMAN: I don't know, we're not counsel to the receiver.

MS. GRIFFITH: Okay. And who are you counsel to

MR. AZMAN: We are counsel to the Prime entities that are the subject of this receivership.

MS. GRIFFITH: And did the receiver hire you or did the Prime entities hire

you?

MR. AZMAN: There was -- the Prime entities hired me at the direction of the receiver.

MS. GRIFFITH: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Counsel, this is what I'm going to do. I am going to grant the -- the relief that's asked for by the receiver. We're going to keep him permanently in place. Sir, you do have the power to appoint a special committee. I am however going to limit the retainer to an additional 500,000. You do have the expansive powers. I don't -- you know, if you think that bankruptcy I best -- by the way, why would it be an 11 as opposed to a -- is 13 personal, an 11 corporate? I always get that mixed up.

MR. GUEDRY: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Right now as far as I'm concerned though there isn't a bankruptcy, there's no bankruptcy until there's a filing. So, I'm gonna treat it as a regular case until then. So, I assume that the -- everybody has been served and all of that kind of stuff. And what would you like to do next? Should I have a status check?

MR. DETMER: Mike Detmer for the Petitioner. And just for clarification on the order. I heard Your Honor say that the receiver is permanently appointed, are -- is the injunction permanently in place as well?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DETMER: Thank you, Your Honor. A status check would be fine.

THE COURT: Okay. How long would you -- I don't want to have you guys rotating in and out if all it does it burn fees.

MR. DUSHOFF: Do you want to do a sixty day status check or a thirty day