

1 DAVID R. ZARO (BAR NO. 124334)
TED FATES (BAR NO. 227809)
2 ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE
MALLORY & NATSIS LLP
3 501 West Broadway, 15th Floor
San Diego, California 92101-3541
4 Phone: (619) 233-1155
Fax: (619) 233-1158
5 E-Mail: dzaro@allenmatkins.com
tfates@allenmatkins.com

6 Attorneys for Receiver
7 THOMAS C. HEBRANK

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10
11 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
COMMISSION,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 LOUIS V. SCHOOLER and FIRST
15 FINANCIAL PLANNING
CORPORATION d/b/a WESTERN
16 FINANCIAL PLANNING
CORPORATION,

17 Defendants.
18

Case No. 3:12-cv-02164-GPC-JMA

**RECEIVER'S NINTH INTERIM
REPORT**

Ctrm.: 2D
Judge: Hon. Gonzalo P. Curiel

1 Thomas C. Hebrank ("Receiver"), Court-appointed receiver for First Financial
2 Planning Corporation d/b/a Western Financial Planning Corporation ("Western"), its
3 subsidiaries and other specifically listed entities (collectively, "Receivership
4 Entities"), submits this Ninth Interim Report on his activities. This report should be
5 read in conjunction with the Receiver's prior interim reports, Dkt. Nos. 27, 49, 80,
6 184, 481, 517, 547, and 596. This report focuses on the Receiver's activities during
7 the second quarter of 2014.

8 I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

9 The Receiver has continued his work to preserve and protect the assets of the
10 Receivership Entities, including conducting an investigation as necessary to
11 identify, marshal, and preserve assets. During the second quarter of 2014, the
12 Receiver maintained operations of the GPs, including making mortgage, property
13 tax, and insurance payments, supervising the two Partnership Administrators, and
14 addressing other business and legal issues unique to certain of the GPs. Pursuant to
15 the Court's Order Approving Receiver's Eighth Interim Report, the Receiver
16 prepared and mailed letters and ballots to investors in the additional two GPs with
17 expiring terms. The results of the voting are discussed below. In summary, the
18 terms of these two GPs will be extended to December 31, 2019.

19 II. SUMMARY OF RECEIVER'S ACTIVITIES

20 The Receiver's primary focus since his appointment has been on identifying,
21 marshaling, and preserving the Receivership Entities' assets. These activities fall
22 into the following general categories:

23 A. Business Operations

24 The Receiver has continued to operate the Receivership Entities, carry out
25 Western's traditional duties with regard to the GPs, and reduce Western's operating
26 expenses. Western's payroll has been significantly reduced (it no longer has any
27 salaried employees - the one remaining employee is being paid on an hourly basis),
28

1 it no longer pays rent to LVS III (an entity controlled by Mr. Schooler), and it no
2 longer pays legal expenses (other than as approved by the Court in connection with
3 the receivership).

4 Two of Western's main sources of income - sales of GP ownership units and
5 incremental return of funds from Mr. Schooler - no longer exist. As the Receiver
6 advised, the reduction in expenses and sale of Western's automobiles, gold coins,
7 furniture, and other personal property was only a short term solution to Western's
8 cash shortage. Nevertheless, the Receiver has managed to continue to make
9 payments on mortgages secured by GP properties. The Court's December 10, 2013
10 Order has made it possible to make all underlying mortgage payments on a timely
11 and current basis and the Receiver will continue to do so.

12 **B. Asset Investigation & Recovery**

13 The Receiver has investigated various assets reflected on Western's books and
14 records, including the following:

15 **Notes Payable from LinMar Entities.** As discussed in prior reports,
16 Western, while under Mr. Schooler's control, made loans to LinMar
17 Management, Inc., LinMar Shaw, LLC, LinMar III, LLC, LinMar IV, LLC and
18 approximately 16 LinMar Tacoma entities (collectively, "LinMar Borrowers").
19 Mr. Schooler owns LinMar Management, LinMar III, and LinMar IV outright, and
20 has ownership interests in LinMar Shaw and the LinMar Tacoma entities. All of the
21 loans matured prior to the receivership and remain unpaid. As of February 2013, the
22 aggregate amount owing on the notes was approximately \$1.266 million. With the
23 exception of the LinMar Tacoma loan, the loans are unsecured.

24 Pursuant to the Court's August 16, 2013 Order, the Receiver filed complaints
25 against the three LinMar Borrowers Mr. Schooler owns outright (LinMar
26 Management, LinMar III, and LinMar IV) on September 13, 2013. The Defendants,
27 who are represented by Mr. Schooler's counsel, filed answers on October 8, 2013.
28

1 On October 28, 2013, the parties participated in an Early Neutral Evaluation
2 ("ENE") of the cases with Magistrate Judge Jan Adler. The Receiver lowered his
3 settlement demand at the ENE, but again, the LinMar Borrowers rejected the offer
4 and refused to make a counter-offer. On November 13, 2013, the parties, through
5 their counsel, participated in an FRCP 26(f) conference. When asked what factual
6 issues the LinMar Borrowers believe exist with regard to the amounts owed, the
7 LinMar Borrowers' counsel would say only that partial payments had been made,
8 but would not state how much was repaid or provide any specifics.

9 Accordingly, Mr. Schooler caused Western to make loans to entities he owns,
10 failed to repay them, rejected repayment proposals by the Receiver, and argued the
11 Receiver should not bother to collect the loans. Since the Court rejected that
12 argument and authorized the Receiver to collect, Mr. Schooler contested the
13 collection actions with vague references to partial payments, rejected further
14 settlement offers, and forced the receivership estate to incur fees and costs to litigate
15 collection of loans which Mr. Schooler made in the first place.

16 As the Receiver's forensic accounting shows, in the last nine years alone,
17 Mr. Schooler received more than \$28 million from the Receivership Entities in
18 payroll and pension benefits, rent and other payments to his entities, and
19 improvements made to properties owned by his entities. Dkt. No. 504, p. 12. The
20 amounts the Receiver is seeking to collect are a tiny fraction of \$28 million.
21 Nevertheless, rather than honor these obligations, Mr. Schooler is forcing the
22 Receiver to litigate collection for the sole purpose of ensuring, for as long as he can,
23 there are no funds available to pay Court-approved fees and costs of the Receiver
24 and his counsel – amounts the Court has confirmed are legitimate expenses.

25 The Receiver filed motions for partial summary judgment on May 22, 2014,
26 which were granted by the Court in orders entered on July 29, 2014. On August 12,
27 2014, as the prevailing party, the Receiver filed motions for attorney fees and costs
28

1 pursuant to the terms of the promissory notes. The motions are set to be heard on
2 October 10, 2014.

3 **Property Tax Appeals.** As directed by the Court, the Receiver obtained an
4 appraisal of each GP property for purposes of inclusion in his Real Estate Valuation
5 Report. Dkt. No. 203. Based on the appraised values of GP properties and the
6 assessed values of such properties in property tax statements, the Receiver appealed
7 the property tax assessments for certain GPs. To date, those appeals have generated
8 a savings of approximately \$10,000, net of fees owed to the property tax consultant,
9 who works entirely on contingency. The Receiver anticipates additional savings
10 will be generated from appeals yet to be resolved, including from appeals in
11 San Diego County, which has not reassessed the relevant properties since their last
12 sale transaction.

13 **Real Property Owned by Western.** As discussed in the Receiver's Forensic
14 Accounting Report, Part One, Western retained certain parcels of land purchased
15 from third parties when it sold such land to the GPs. Dkt. No. 182, p. 9. In his
16 Seventh Interim Report, the Receiver recommended the Western land parcels be
17 listed for sale with a licensed broker. The Court approved the recommendation.
18 Dkt. No. 549. The properties have since been listed with a licensed broker. The
19 Receiver will report any reasonable offers received to the Court.

20 **III. PENDING LITIGATION**

21 There are several pending lawsuits and FINRA arbitrations in which one or
22 more of the Receivership Entities are parties. Initially, the Receiver, with the
23 assistance of counsel, advised the applicable courts and parties of the TRO,
24 including the provision therein restraining and enjoining litigation against the
25 Receivership Entities. The Receiver has since provided updates to the courts and
26 parties regarding the status of this case and the receivership.

IV. RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a summary of the receipts and disbursements for the Receivership Entities for the second quarter 2014. Attached as Exhibit B is a statement of revenue and expenditures for Western for the second quarter 2014. This statement was prepared on a cash basis.

As directed by the Court in the August 16, 2013 Order, the Receiver instructed the two former Western employees who handle the day-to-day operations of the GPs, Alice Jacobson and Beverly Schuler ("Partnership Administrators"), to resume operational billings, including collecting amounts the GPs owe Western for loans to cover past GP operational shortfalls. After some delay by the Partnership Administrators, the operational bills went out in late November. Second and third notices to investors who had not paid were sent in March and May 2014. Thus far, the GPs have collected \$567,165.41, only 44% of the total amount billed.

V. INVESTOR COMMUNICATIONS

The Receiver has continued to update his website, www.ethreadvisors.com, with orders entered by the Court, Receiver reports, and briefs filed by the parties that pertain directly to the receivership. The Receiver and his staff have responded to numerous inquiries from investors and other interested parties about the receivership¹ and have updated the Case Updates section of the Receiver's website to address common questions and themes in correspondence from investors. The Receiver recently added answers to Frequently Asked Questions to address common investor questions and misconceptions about the receivership. Investors are reminded of the importance of informing the Receiver of any change in their address.

¹ Investors have been directed to contact the Partnership Administrators with inquiries regarding the day-to-day operations of the GPs. Inquiries received by the Receiver's office regarding such matters are forwarded to the Partnership Administrators for their handling.

1 In its July 22, 2014 Order on *Sua Sponte* Reconsideration of August 16, 2013
2 Order to Release General Partnerships from Receivership ("Reconsideration
3 Order"), the Court laid out instructions for GPs who want to be heard regarding the
4 Court's decision to keep them in the receivership. The Reconsideration Order
5 provides GPs with the opportunity to submit a brief, appear at the October 10, 2014
6 hearing, or both. The orders directs investors in each GP to communicate with each
7 other, determine their consensus position, draft a brief (including a statement of
8 whether the GP wants to be heard at the October 10, 2014 hearing), circulate the
9 brief to the investors in their GP, give investors who disagree the opportunity to
10 prepare a statement of their specific points of disagreement, attach such statement (if
11 any) to the brief, attach a list of the investors who sign on to the consensus position,
12 and file the brief (with attachments) with the Court on or before September 12,
13 2014. If a GP elects not to file a brief, but wants to be heard at the October 10, 2014
14 hearing, it shall file a notice of intention to appear at the hearing.

15 There has been a substantial amount of correspondence from investors since
16 the July 18, 2014 hearing. The communications indicate the following:

- 17 • A group of seven investors has attempted to form an investor
18 committee. It is not clear what authority the committee would purport
19 to have or what action it would attempt to take on behalf of other
20 investors, although the stated purpose is "to explore the avenues
21 available to remove our investments from the control of the Receiver."
22 The correspondence, which comes mostly from investor Dennis
23 Gilman, states the committee was "voted" by approximately
24 35 investors who met outside the courtroom directly after the July 18,
25 2014 hearing. An example of the emails sent to investors by
26 Dr. Gilman is attached hereto as Exhibit C. Gregory Post, an investor
27 whose motion to intervene is set for hearing on October 3, 2014, is also
28 on the purported committee.

- One investor reported he was contacted by Dr. Gilman with information the investor believed was incorrect and biased. The investor stated his disagreement with Dr. Gilman's position. As a result, the investor believes Dr. Gilman excluded him from future e-mail communications to investors.
- Dr. Gilman states that an investor in each GP has requested the Partnership Administrators disseminate ballots to investors in their GPs. Without notifying or consulting the Receiver, the Partnership Administrators e-mailed these ballots to investors and informed them they have until August 31, 2014, to complete and return the ballots. An example of these ballots is attached hereto as Exhibit D. In response to the ballots, a number of investors have contacted the Receiver's office wondering why they are being asked to pay legal fees.

VI. GP TERM EXPIRATIONS

As discussed in the Receiver's Eighth Interim Report, in addition to the nine GPs whose terms had previously expired and were extended pursuant to the vote taken earlier this year, there are two additional GPs whose terms expire this year – Tecate South and Twin Plant. The Court's Order Approving Receiver's Eighth Interim Report authorized the Receiver to take a vote of the investors in Tecate South and Twin Plant whether to (a) extend the term of the GP to a date in 2019, or (b) terminate the GP and sell their property interest after such property interest has been listed and marketed by a licensed broker. Dkt. No. 599. The Receiver sent the ballots to the Tecate South and Twin Plant investors, gave them 30 days to return them, and tallied the votes. The results are as follows:

	Results - % of Eligible Voters			
	Vote to Extend	Vote to Sell	Did not Vote	Total Eligible %
Tecate South	54.38%	10.23%	35.38%	100.00%
Twin Plant	12.74%	1.05%	86.22%	100.00%

1 Because neither GP had a majority vote to sell, both will be extended to
2 December 31, 2019. It is worth noting that the percentage of investors who are
3 ineligible to vote is very high for these GPs due to failure to pay notes and/or
4 operational bills – 36% of the investors in Tecate South and 40% of the investors in
5 Twin Plant are ineligible to vote.

6 **VII. RECOMMENDATIONS**

7 In addition to the recommendations discussed above, the Receiver
8 recommends the receivership over Western and the other Receivership Entities
9 continue pursuant to the Court's orders and the Receivership Entities' assets continue
10 to be preserved and protected pending the outcome of the litigation.

11 **VIII. CONCLUSION**

12 Based on the foregoing, the Receiver requests approval of this Ninth Interim
13 Report and his recommendations discussed above.

14
15 Dated: September 15, 2014

ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE
MALLORY & NATSIS LLP

17 By: /s/ Ted Fates

18 TED FATES
19 Attorneys for Receiver
THOMAS C. HEBRANK

EXHIBIT INDEX

Exhibit A	Summary of Receipts and Disbursements for the Receivership Entities for the Second Quarter 2014	11
Exhibit B	Statement of Revenue and Expenditures for Western for the Second Quarter 2014	15
Exhibit C	Example Email Sent to Investors by Dr. Gilman	17
Exhibit D	Example of Ballot	21

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

WFPC Receipts and Disbursements Schedule

Q2 2014

Bank Name	Balance at the end of Q4 2013	Balance at the end of Q2 2014	Ending Balance			Deposits			Disbursements			
			March	April	May	June	April	May	June	April	May	June
BANK ACCOUNTS:												
ABL Partners	25,667.12	23,254.52	22,517.34	22,117.34	22,017.34	-	-	-	-	737.18	400.00	100.00
Antelope Springs Partners	7,119.36	4,678.68	1,656.83	206.18	17,222.64	1,657.60	557.23	17,116.46	4,679.45	2,007.88	-	100.00
Big Ranch Partners	6,940.71	6,799.08	5,639.67	3,610.60	19,092.79	-	-	16,553.76	1,159.41	2,029.07	1,071.57	-
BLA Partners	12,603.93	24,469.29	13,505.47	15,599.85	15,865.35	4,235.87	2,769.38	553.00	15,199.69	675.00	287.50	-
Borderland Partners	3,705.05	7,837.09	4,299.16	4,395.52	4,262.80	647.55	236.79	194.62	4,185.48	140.43	327.34	-
Bratton View Partners	7,770.17	4,248.70	6,589.78	6,480.01	6,580.01	3,564.96	112.90	100.00	1,223.88	222.67	-	-
Cactus Ridge Partners	49,349.65	40,229.19	35,850.11	33,294.17	29,549.97	-	1,188.26	-	4,379.08	3,744.20	3,744.20	-
Carson Valley Partners	5,104.16	4,506.46	3,569.23	3,473.23	3,373.23	-	16.00	-	937.23	112.00	100.00	-
Checkered Flag Partners	15,932.84	24,956.88	11,262.86	13,631.40	15,082.83	2,100.67	2,468.54	1,738.93	15,794.69	100.00	287.50	-
Comstock Partners	29,244.32	25,903.83	24,232.66	23,322.69	22,412.72	1,180.18	1,260.18	1,260.18	2,851.35	2,170.15	2,170.15	-
Crystal Clearwater Partners	85,830.55	82,112.31	79,443.06	79,302.15	80,151.24	849.09	849.09	849.09	3,518.34	990.00	-	-
Dayton View Partners	41,588.62	41,031.99	40,594.75	39,923.75	39,823.75	-	16.00	-	437.24	687.00	100.00	-
Desert View Partners	55,092.37	49,287.14	45,964.30	43,713.63	40,630.84	419.36	832.12	-	3,742.20	3,082.79	3,082.79	-
Eagle View Partners	239,766.77	229,769.58	214,783.65	221,066.47	227,349.29	5,940.91	6,382.82	6,382.82	20,926.84	100.00	100.00	-
F-86 Partners	66,066.00	66,066.00	66,066.00	66,066.00	66,066.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fairway Partners	48,794.19	48,256.17	47,822.88	47,131.88	47,031.88	-	4.00	-	433.29	695.00	100.00	-
Falcon Heights Partners	234,517.08	231,760.38	213,522.92	217,172.79	217,072.79	-	8,706.06	-	18,237.46	5,056.19	100.00	-
Free Trade Partners	2,971.46	2,732.00	2,789.34	3,037.70	3,603.08	281.28	348.36	959.05	223.94	100.00	393.67	-
Frontage 177 Partners	50,854.93	47,488.34	44,167.51	44,495.73	45,373.95	978.22	978.22	978.22	4,299.05	650.00	100.00	-
Galena Ranch Partners	116,000.32	112,969.75	111,398.81	110,489.92	109,581.03	1,140.95	1,140.95	1,140.95	2,711.89	2,049.84	2,049.84	-
Gila View Partners	18,865.31	17,566.18	14,261.92	14,973.59	12,329.07	-	3,356.19	-	3,304.26	2,644.52	2,644.52	-
Gold Ridge Partners	178,097.81	177,062.47	176,384.83	176,284.83	176,184.83	-	-	-	677.64	100.00	100.00	-
Grand View Partners	213,547.51	212,496.66	212,315.73	211,715.73	211,615.73	-	-	-	180.93	600.00	100.00	-
Green View Partners	52,345.82	51,806.25	51,372.63	50,701.63	50,601.63	-	4.00	-	433.62	675.00	100.00	-
Heavenly View Partners	3,123.48	2,452.90	2,083.76	1,407.76	1,307.76	-	4.00	-	369.14	680.00	100.00	-
Hidden Hills Partners	15,624.10	6,160.38	9,172.73	8,509.46	5,489.98	3,232.34	-	-	219.99	663.27	3,019.48	-
High Desert Partners	79,640.05	75,799.25	70,406.52	71,095.39	72,334.26	1,638.87	1,638.87	1,638.87	7,031.60	950.00	400.00	-
Highway 50 Partners	67,968.99	58,018.02	54,704.65	50,730.46	47,404.45	1,234.62	1,038.26	1,136.44	4,547.99	5,012.45	4,462.45	-
Hollywood Partners	14,738.34	27,005.06	16,183.39	16,063.55	16,700.51	4,384.93	555.16	924.46	15,206.60	675.00	287.50	-
Honey Springs Partners	14,034.88	16,726.99	11,004.49	12,574.72	12,624.72	1,866.17	1,810.75	200.00	7,588.67	240.52	150.00	-
Horizon Partners	5,820.86	11,337.63	5,054.07	4,954.07	7,094.17	2,166.44	-	2,471.22	8,450.00	100.00	331.12	-
International Partners	15,221.85	6,780.47	9,486.89	7,898.95	7,217.95	3,486.51	-	-	780.09	1,587.94	681.00	-
Jamul Meadows Partners	2,566.87	1,573.87	1,358.81	5,162.06	9,313.72	-	4,567.39	4,595.33	215.06	764.14	443.67	-
Lahontan Partners	118,778.36	122,431.27	120,327.38	111,070.81	107,473.63	1,592.98	3,922.31	-	3,696.87	13,178.88	3,597.18	-
Las Vegas Partners	28,315.49	28,315.49	28,315.49	28,315.49	28,315.49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lyons Valley Partners	7,520.43	13,357.34	20,238.30	21,374.85	18,455.37	7,598.32	1,378.34	100.00	717.36	241.79	3,019.48	-
Mesa View Partners	96,456.00	92,214.50	90,841.05	88,956.62	87,657.19	1,876.84	1,876.84	1,876.84	3,250.29	3,761.27	3,176.27	-
Mex-Tec Partners	40,349.72	37,693.27	37,503.78	36,508.78	36,408.78	-	-	-	189.49	995.00	100.00	-
Mohawk Mountain Partners	77,668.53	69,910.16	67,422.10	64,264.81	61,754.64	2,650.15	2,455.91	2,553.03	5,138.21	5,613.20	5,063.20	-
Mountain View Partners	42,424.21	33,754.34	30,865.19	27,430.24	23,818.38	803.31	726.91	291.90	3,692.46	4,161.86	3,903.76	-
Nevada View Partners	19,443.93	10,974.34	8,740.70	5,991.02	3,836.34	2,560.07	2,560.07	2,560.07	4,793.71	5,309.75	4,714.75	-
Night Hawk Partners	284,270.51	275,831.14	256,499.52	259,488.65	262,598.78	3,089.13	3,089.13	3,210.13	22,420.75	100.00	100.00	-
North Springs Partners	73,528.98	67,848.74	65,989.84	63,637.20	61,859.56	1,273.91	1,273.91	1,273.91	3,132.81	3,626.55	3,051.55	-
Ocotillo View Partners	66,923.59	59,095.28	56,486.08	53,406.50	50,359.76	517.16	517.16	-	3,126.36	3,596.74	3,046.74	-
Orange Vista Partners	98,228.58	92,948.65	91,317.98	89,222.19	87,676.40	1,295.99	1,295.99	1,295.99	2,926.66	3,391.78	2,841.78	-
Osprey Partners	307,603.24	299,301.01	284,413.66	286,746.15	289,668.64	3,022.49	3,022.49	3,022.49	17,909.84	690.00	100.00	-
P-39 Aircobra Partners	141,615.91	139,678.80	133,621.93	134,116.49	135,586.05	1,469.56	1,469.56	1,469.56	7,526.43	975.00	-	-
P-40 Warhawk Partners	149,609.41	153,257.73	155,013.23	155,983.55	157,528.87	1,945.32	1,945.32	1,945.32	189.82	975.00	400.00	-
Painted Desert Partners	16,794.64	14,095.18	11,728.78	11,333.79	9,040.10	-	2,488.70	-	2,366.40	2,883.69	2,293.69	-
Par Four Partners	50,975.30	50,435.73	50,002.11	49,311.11	49,211.11	-	4.00	-	433.62	695.00	100.00	-
Park Vegas Partners	3,129.48	2,951.11	4,520.37	4,070.37	4,020.37	1,726.17	-	-	156.91	450.00	50.00	-
Pecos Partners	121,987.35	103,147.64	88,122.51	87,906.24	88,279.97	473.73	473.73	473.73	15,498.86	690.00	100.00	-
Pine View Partners	8,709.99	8,213.84	7,851.94	7,185.94	7,085.94	-	4.00	-	361.90	670.00	100.00	-
Production Partners	23,752.29	14,830.90	16,019.82	15,534.82	15,382.02	6,452.61	200.00	547.20	5,263.69	685.00	700.00	-
Prosperity Partners	8,748.51	10,175.48	8,354.49	7,846.26	7,518.92	1,789.82	227.20	-	3,610.81	735.43	327.34	-
Pueblo Partners	85,309.62	75,324.33	58,973.67	60,387.14	61,800.61	1,513.47	1,513.47	1,513.47	17,864.13	100.00	100.00	-
Pyramid Highway 177 Partners	40,166.52	38,361.67	34,124.46	34,361.38	34,598.30	336.92	336.92	336.92	4,574.13	100.00	100.00	-
Rail Road Partners	108,690.34	104,814.39	103,173.74	101,114.38	99,001.45	560.12	643.57	-	2,200.77	2,702.93	2,112.93	-
Rainbow Partners	2,757.18	18,021.88	17,716.77	17,904.58	23,543.88	5,422.51	772.81	6,070.42	5,727.62	585.00	431.12	-
Rawhide Partners	75,132.54	69,393.48	67,526.64	65,171.06	63,385.48	1,341.63	1,341.63	1,341.63	3,208.47	3,697.21	3,127.21	-
Redfield Heights Partners	109,728.56	104,683.81	102,998.33	101,670.27	99,182.13	875.04	1,750.08	-	2,560.52	3,078.14	2,488.14	-
Reno Partners	15,346.00	5,484.97	8,902.54	8,396.44	8,296.44	3,582.05	200.00	-	164.48	706.10	100.00	-
Reno View Partners	5,090.17	5,355.99	6,462.25	5,653.60	5,553.60	1,271.40	-	-	165.14	808.65	100.00	-
Reno Vista Partners	6,380.08	2,939.96	4,394.20	4,417.06	4,317.06	1,612.80	456.01	-	158.56	433.15	100.00	-
Road Runner Partners	106,776.59	104,064.13	103,131.95	101,728.07	100,573.12	301.07	301.07	-	1,233.25	1,704.95	1,154.95	-
Rolling Hills Partners	215,794.83	214,720.72	213,984.85	213,884.85	213,784.85	-	-	-	735.87	100.00	100.00	-
Rose Vista Partners	85,904.32	79,417.84	76,682.33	74,215.20	72,203.57	1,026.06	1,086.25	1,086.25	3,761.57	3,553.38	3,097.88	-
Santa Fe View Partners	52,048.40	34,397.72	19,753.97	22,039.59	24,875.21	2,935.62	2,935.62	2,935.62	17,579.37	650.00	100.00	-
Sierra View Partners	16,104.39	15,984.94	15,235.06	14,689.06	14,589.06	-	4.00	-	363.88	550.00	100.00	-
Silver City Partners	26,758.04	24,921.86	24,345.25	23,256.55	22,762.85	2,404.21	2,404.21	2,404.21	2,980.82	3,492.91	2,897.91	-
Silver State Partners	6,052.73	3,560.62	3,398.77	3,053.27	2,993.27	-	289.50	-	161.85	635.00	60.00	-
Sky View Partners	226,852.53	225,892.37	225,709.46	225,059.46	224,959.46	-	-	-	182.91	650.00	100.00	-
Snow Bird Partners	36,976.61	33,922.69	32,898.94	31,354.28	30,399.62	1,576.74	1,576.74	1,576.74	2,600.49	3,121.40	2,531.40	-
Sonora View Partners	101,172.54	98,594.89	97,036.77	96,289.71	95,542.65	1,294.12	1,476.22	1,476.22	2,852.24	2,223.28	2,223.28	-
Spanish Springs View Partners	21,937.95	7,861.82	8,501.49	7,819.49	7,719.49	1,336.83	16.00	-	697.16	698.00	100.00	-
Spruce Heights Partners	122,045.28	118,487.01	116,728.98	115,630.50	114,532.02	424.64	424.64	424.64	2,182.67	1,523.12	1,523.12	-
Steamboat Partners	84,740.82	80,420.20	78,974.03	77,071.62	75,759.21	696.72	761.72	761.72	2,142.89	2,664.13	2,074.13	-

WFPC Receipts and Disbursements Schedule

Q2 2014

Bank Name	Balance at the end of Q4 2013	Balance at the end of Q2 2014	Ending Balance			Deposits			Disbursements		
Victory Lap Partners	11,329.96	20,161.08	6,465.83	7,514.85	8,182.74	2,092.60	1,149.02	955.39	15,787.85	100.00	287.50
Vista Del Sur Partners	102,052.54	95,703.43	93,075.52	91,085.78	87,222.01	1,874.03	1,874.03	-	4,501.94	3,863.77	3,863.77
Vista Tecate Partners	6,087.51	4,485.41	4,129.00	3,898.00	1,512.18	414.19	-	-	770.60	231.00	2,385.82
Wild Horse Partners	27,788.14	14,215.63	12,738.96	10,141.96	8,055.16	694.35	694.35	-	2,171.02	3,291.35	2,086.80
Clearwater Bridge, LLC	2,635.46	3,326.91	4,535.40	3,026.55	1,617.70	3,342.34	-	-	2,133.85	1,508.85	1,408.85
Eagle View Partners, LLC	26,792.78	26,387.53	36,912.00	27,550.50	18,510.00	20,139.97	4.00	-	9,615.50	9,365.50	9,040.50
F-86, LLC	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Falcon Heights Partners, LLC	27,749.63	24,660.98	33,543.20	24,573.90	16,375.60	18,005.52	4,382.19	-	9,123.30	13,351.49	8,198.30
Frontage 177, LLC	4,943.37	5,722.11	7,385.68	5,271.26	3,156.84	4,127.99	-	-	2,464.42	2,114.42	2,114.42
High Desert Shadow, LLC	5,946.80	6,028.43	9,763.94	7,446.15	5,578.36	6,853.30	-	-	3,117.79	2,317.79	1,867.79
Night Hawk Partners, LLC	22,296.73	19,597.39	33,302.65	26,471.12	19,960.59	21,640.79	4.00	-	7,935.53	6,835.53	6,510.53
Osprey Pescador, LLC	17,074.00	16,595.24	27,973.35	21,967.68	16,458.01	17,687.78	4.00	-	6,309.67	6,009.67	5,509.67
P-39 Aircobra, LLC	8,677.36	6,835.96	11,109.00	7,497.59	4,835.79	7,338.92	-	-	3,065.88	3,611.41	2,661.80
P-40 Warhawk, LLC	17,686.19	11,497.82	8,505.71	4,968.31	2,905.52	-	-	-	2,992.11	3,537.40	2,062.79
Pueblo Partners, LLC	16,840.38	15,330.69	25,876.15	20,440.92	15,097.02	17,080.69	-	-	6,535.23	5,435.23	5,343.90
Pyramid Highway 177, LLC	3,130.74	2,923.00	4,612.90	3,330.32	2,497.74	3,822.48	-	-	2,132.58	1,282.58	832.58
Santa Fe View, LLC	18,673.07	24,047.31	33,864.60	26,626.69	19,635.09	17,390.21	-	14.99	7,572.92	7,237.91	7,006.59
The Pecos Partnership, LLC	7,459.59	14,396.07	24,791.04	20,209.20	15,843.69	15,326.81	-	-	4,931.84	4,581.84	4,365.51
Total GP Bank Accounts	5,527,083.29	5,296,387.69	5,143,773.81	5,033,597.61	4,978,425.70	280,563.86	97,895.55	101,053.10	433,177.74	208,071.75	156,225.01

WFPC Receipts and Disbursements Schedule

Q2 2014

Bank Name	Balance at the end of Q4 2013	Balance at the end of Q2 2014	Ending Balance			Deposits			Disbursements		
Fernley I, LLC	5,854.10	184.02	260.66	0.30	2,876.94	2,876.64	3,198.64	2,876.64	2,800.00	3,459.00	-
P51 LLC	7,993.55	449.00	245.26	160.21	4,211.70	4,199.59	4,199.59	4,199.59	4,403.33	4,284.64	148.10
Santa Fe Venture	32,783.84	60,072.08	15,594.22	16,586.93	32,601.92	16,014.99	16,014.99	16,014.99	60,492.85	15,022.28	-
SFV II, LLC	5,691.94	7,357.32	6,557.64	8,575.84	11,072.84	2,497.00	2,497.00	2,497.00	3,296.68	478.80	-
WFPC - Corp	23,554.97	59,740.92	44,419.23	20,728.83	57,735.40	116,140.38	132,208.18	107,164.49	131,462.07	155,898.58	70,157.92
WFPC - Business	-	-	-	-	-	113,846.03	113,846.03	113,846.03	113,846.03	113,846.03	113,846.03
WFPC - Payroll	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WFPC - MMKT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WFPC - Special	64.22	64.22	64.22	64.22	64.22	-	-	-	-	-	-
WFPC - FFP	3,277.26	1,248.17	277.26	1,875.08	3,261.96	2,029.09	2,597.82	1,386.88	3,000.00	1,000.00	-
WFPC - Las Vegas Prop Tax	1,771.53	1,771.53	1,771.53	1,771.53	1,771.53	-	-	-	-	-	-
WSCC, LLC	66,390.57	12,614.72	18,797.57	3,852.47	17,499.28	203,469.42	201,879.02	199,660.44	197,286.57	216,824.12	186,013.63
First Financial Planning	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Receiver Operating Acct	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total WFPC Bank Accounts	147,381.98	143,501.98	87,987.59	53,615.41	131,095.79	461,073.14	476,441.27	447,646.06	516,587.53	510,813.45	370,165.68
Total All Bank Accounts	5,674,465.27	5,439,889.67	5,231,761.40	5,087,213.02	5,109,521.49						

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B

**Western Financial Planning
Statement of Revenues and Expenses
Q1 - Q2 2014**

Cash Basis

	<u>January</u>	<u>February</u>	<u>March</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Revenues							
Note Payments from GPs	171,703.80	111,940.43	134,040.43	115,627.23	131,379.17	106,890.92	771,581.98
Legacy Commissions	344.45	301.77	306.11	513.15	297.37	273.57	2,036.42
Reversal of Bank Fees	757.01	-	-				757.01
Repayment of GP Operational Loans	56,800.00	3,200.00	-				60,000.00
Miscellaneous	2,055.00	-	0.77		531.64		2,587.41
Total Revenues	231,660.26	115,442.20	134,347.31	116,140.38	132,208.18	107,164.49	836,962.82
Expenses							
Operational Expenses							
Storage	-	-	1,790.81	-	-	-	1,790.81
Phone	-	-	1,189.15	-	-	-	1,189.15
Mailing	-	-	1,442.01	1,442.01	1,442.01	-	4,326.03
Computer/IT	-	-	550.00	44.99	45.00	45.00	684.99
Operational Misc.	-	-	-	1,475.63	95.44	-	1,571.07
Accounting	2,692.31	1,754.08	1,058.00	-	-	992.31	6,496.70
Payments to Underlying Mortgage Holders	88,567.92	169,290.62	105,548.29	91,983.59	99,694.31	68,658.95	623,743.68
Bank Fees	757.01	-	-	515.85	482.82	461.66	2,217.34
Transfers to WSCC to Cover Intercompany Transfers	3,801.29	2,712.67	784.66	-	697.00	-	7,995.62
Corporate Filing Expenses	-	-	3,325.00	-	842.00	-	4,167.00
Court Approved Fees and Costs of the Receivership	-	60,000.00	-	36,000.00	52,600.00	-	148,600.00
Total Expenses	95,818.53	233,757.37	115,687.92	131,462.07	155,898.58	70,157.92	802,782.39
Net Operating Revenue/(Loss)	135,841.73	(118,315.17)	18,659.39	(15,321.69)	(23,690.40)	37,006.57	34,180.43
Beginning Cash	23,554.97	159,396.70	41,081.53	59,740.92	44,419.23	20,728.83	23,554.97
Ending Cash	159,396.70	41,081.53	59,740.92	44,419.23	20,728.83	57,735.40	57,735.40

EXHIBIT C

EXHIBIT C

-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Gilman <DPGilman@clindm-llc.com>

Sent: Wed, Aug 6, 2014 7:00 pm

Subject: Gold Ridge Partners

Dear investor,

If you have not previously received emails from me concerning your investments and the stranglehold held on them by the Receiver and Court, please review the attached word files dated 070214, 071904 and 072214. I am now, hopefully, using a more updated email list.

The purpose of this email is to give you a "heads up" to look for a ballot coming your way from the Administrative Secretary for your GP in the very near future. When you receive it, please act upon it immediately following the directions you receive with the ballot.

In my last email, I told you a small group was formed after the last court hearing on July 18 in San Diego. This group of seven investors volunteered to explore the avenues available to remove our investments from the control of the Receiver, and to communicate these means to our fellow investors. The group was voted to proceed to work in this regard by approximately 35 investors who met in the hall outside the court after the hearing. Understand, this "committee" has no official authority to do anything, but is formed as an informal group to seek the means to remove our partnerships from the control of the Receiver and Court, and to communicate the same to our fellow investors.

Again, let me repeat what I have conveyed to the investors before: unless we remove our properties from control of the Receiver we cannot proceed to sell the properties, or to do anything else with them. Therefore, the committee's focus has only one purpose: to identify the steps necessary to remove the General Partnerships from the receivership imposed by the Court; we will not attempt any action in any other direction.

So where are we? On July 30, the above Committee met in San Diego to review the court order of July 18 and to discuss how to act upon the Court's order. Essentially, the court set a hearing on October 10, 2014 at which time the GPs will be permitted to respond to the Court's decision to keep the GPs in the receivership. The Court ordered that "Each GP may file a single brief...in response to the Court's decision to keep the GPs in the receivership." So, we are now in the process of balloting each GP to see if the individual GPs want to stay under the control of the Receiver, or be removed from the control of the Receiver.

In order to initiate the above ballot, it is our understanding that at least one investor from each GP must make a request directly to the Administrative Secretary for the GP, in this case Alice Jacobson. This being the case, we have started the ball in motion by submitting a request to Ms. Jacobson from each of the Committee members for the properties in which they are invested. Their names and properties are listed below. Other investors are beginning to step forward for their respective GPs and make the request to the Administrative Secretary. The ballot will ask only one thing as follows (or in similar language):

() YES, I CAST ALL OF MY UNIT VOTES IN FAVOR OF REQUESTING THE PARTNERSHIP TO TAKE THE LEGAL STEPS NECESSARY TO REMOVE THE GENERAL PARTNERSHIP FROM THE RECEIVERSHIP

() NO, I CAST ALL OF MY UNIT VOTES TO KEEP THE GENERAL PARTNERSHIP IN THE RECEIVERSHIP.

Given the large number of responses I have received to date from the investors, I am confident the vote will be clearly overwhelming in favor of removing our investments from the control of the Receiver. If the vote is as predicted, a brief will be submitted to the court for each GP by the deadline of September 12, 2014. The brief will make the argument as to why the GPs should not be retained under the control of the Receiver, our vote tally, and whether or not we want to be heard in open court at the October 10, 2014 hearing. A pdf file of the court ruling is attached.

Understand, some investors are certain to vote to stay in the receivership (Vote NO). In this case, according to the Court Order: "If an individual investor within a particular GP disagrees with his or her GP's official response to the Court's decision, the individual's point of disagreement shall be included in a separate section of his or her GP's official response. ..." So, if you want to stay under the thumb of the Receiver, you will be able to voice your preference.

Now we come to the question of obtaining legal counsel for the purpose of filing the brief. You'll note the name of Greg Post on the list of Committee names below. He is an attorney who has already filed a brief on behalf of one partnership prior to the July 18 hearing, and, therefore, is intimately familiar with the SEC case against Louis Schooler and Western Financial Planning Corporation. Further, he is an investor in two properties, and, he has already written a draft brief to be submitted to the Court by September 12 on behalf of the GPs voting "yes" in the majority. He is also known by the lawyers defending the Defendants in the original case, Louis Schooler and Western Financial. In our opinion, we submit to you that it will be virtually impossible, in the time available, to find an attorney agreeable to the majority of folks in any partnership, and for that attorney to come up to speed on two years of Court documents, and to write a brief for each GP. Therefore, the Committee strongly proposes we move forward with Greg Post. If you disagree, vote "No" to stay in receivership.

This now brings us to the attorney costs. After substantial discussions with Greg Post and reviewing the work he has already completed, we estimate the cost to each investor in each partnership will not exceed \$30.00 each. We do not think it will be necessary to pay any monies up front; the GPs will be billed directly – much like any other expense. Folks, have any of you heard of lawyer costs being this reasonable? And the \$30.00 is our maximum estimate.

As of the date of this email, I have not received any notice from the Receiver concerning the results of the July 18th hearing. Have you? This doesn't surprise me, since any delay by the Receiver to keep the investor in the dark works to his advantage. The shorter the time to act will make it unlikely the GPs will be able to notify the Court of its wishes. But, we have a plan and we are executing it. With a little luck and your quick response, we will get the Receiver and Court off our backs.

Stay tuned for updates. If you don't want to receive my emails, let me know.

Dennis P. Gilman, Ph.D.

Committee

Bill Loeber (Poway): Big Ranch, Twin Plant, Hidden Hills
Elena Luz Gomez (San Diego): Twin Plant, Suntec
Chris Boore (Poway): Vista Del Sur, Pueblo, Pyramid Highway 177, Falcon Heights, Silver City
Bruce Case (Fountain Valley): Antelop Springs, Storey County, Rose Vista, Ocotillo View
Greg Post: Road Runner, Silver City

Peter Kuilema (Temecula): Nighthawk Partners, Dayton#2

Dennis Gilman (Sparks, NV): Lyons Valley, Honey Springs Partners, VIA 188, Checkered Flags

This message and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your system. E mail may be susceptible to data corruption, interception and unauthorized amendment, and we do not accept liability for any such occurrence or the consequences of it.

EXHIBIT D

EXHIBIT D

GOLD RIDGE PARTNERS,
A California General Partnership

BALLOT
REMOVAL OF RECEIVER PLACED UPON
GENERAL PARTNERSHIP

(Please Print)

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

PHONE: _____ EMAIL: _____

This ballot is requesting your immediate vote on the following issues:

1. Request the above partnership to take the legal steps necessary to remove the partnership from control of the Receiver.

() YES, I CAST ALL OF MY UNIT VOTES IN FAVOR OF REQUESTING THE PARTNERSHIP TO TAKE THE LEGAL STEPS NECESSARY TO REMOVE THE GENERAL PARTNERSHIP FROM THE RECEIVERSHIP

() NO, I CAST ALL OF MY UNIT VOTES TO KEEP THE GENERAL PARTNERSHIP IN THE RECEIVERSHIP.
2. Request that each investor in our general partnership agree to an assessment of not more than Thirty Dollars (\$30.00) per investor to enable our general partnership to retain legal services related to the removal of the receivership.

() YES, I CAST ALL OF MY UNIT VOTES IN FAVOR OF ASSESSING EACH INVESTOR IN THE GENERAL PARTNERSHIP NOT MORE THAN THIRTY DOLLARS (\$30.00) FOR RETAINING LEGAL SERVICES RELATED TO THE REMOVAL OF THE RECEIVERSHIP.

() NO, I WILL RETAIN MY OWN ATTORNEY.

Date: _____ Print Name: _____ Signature: _____

Date: _____ Print Name: _____ Signature: _____

In order for your vote to count you must return your ballot on or before: AUGUST 31, 2014
Return your completed ballot either by:

Scan the ballot & EMAIL it to: Alice@wcas.sdcoxmail.com or Bev@wcas.sdcoxmail.com, OR
FAX the completed ballot to: 760-295-4632, OR
MAIL the completed ballot to: West Coast Administrative Service
270 North El Camino Real, #F 533, Encinitas, CA 92024

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen (18) and am not a party to this action. My business address is 501 West Broadway, 15th Floor, San Diego, California 92101-3541.

On September 15, 2014, I served the within document(s) described as:

- **RECEIVER'S NINTH INTERIM REPORT**

on interested parties in this action by:

☒ **BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING ("NEF"):** the foregoing document(s) will be served by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the document. On September 15, 2014, I checked the CM/ECF docket for this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding and determined that the following person(s) are on the Electronic Mail Notice List to receive NEF transmission at the email addressed indicated below:

- Lynn M. Dean - deanl@sec.gov; larofiling@sec.gov; berryj@sec.gov; irwinma@sec.gov; cavallones@sec.gov
- Philip H. Dyson - phildysonlaw@gmail.com; jldossegger2@yahoo.com; phdtravel@yahoo.com
- Edward G. Fates - tfates@allenmatkins.com; bcrfilings@allenmatkins.com; jbatiste@allenmatkins.com
- Eric Hougen - eric@hougenlaw.com
- Sara D. Kalin - kalins@sec.gov; irwinma@sec.gov
- Sam S. Puathasnanon - puathasnanons@sec.gov; haackk@sec.gov; berryj@sec.gov; irwinma@sec.gov; cavallones@sec.gov
- Edward P. Swan, Jr. - pswan@jonesday.com; dpippin@jonesday.com

☐ **BY MAIL:** I placed a true copy of the document in a sealed envelope or package addressed as indicated on the attached Service List on the above-mentioned date in San Diego, California for collection and mailing pursuant to the firm's ordinary business practice. I am familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on September 15, 2014, at San Diego, California.

Ted Fates
(Type or print name)

/s/ Ted Fates
(Signature of Declarant)