Case 24-50142-BLS Doc 10 Filed 10/10/24 Page 1 of 17 Docket #0010 Date Filed: 10/10/2024

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Chapter 11

IN RE:

Case No. 24-11161(BLS)

EPIC! CREATIONS, INC.,

et al,

824 Market Street

Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Debtors.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Tuesday, October 8, 2024

CLAUDIA Z. SPRINGER,

CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE, . Adv. Proc. No. 24-50142(BLS)

vs.

STRIPE, INC. WELLS FARGO

BANK, NATIONAL

ASSOCIATION, WHITEHAT . EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY LLC, .

JOHN DOES 1-100

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

## TRANSCRIPT OF VIDEO HEARING RE:

TRUSTEE'S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRENDAN L. SHANNON UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

Audio Operator: Electronically Recorded by

Sharon A. Page, ECRO

Transcription Company: Reliable

1007 N. Orange Street

Wilmington, Delaware 19801

(302)654-8080

Email: qmatthews@reliable-co.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording transcript produced by transcripti

souna recording,

## Case 24-50142-BLS Doc 10 Filed 10/10/24 Page 2 of 17

APPEARANCES VIA ZOOM: (On the Record)

For the Chapter 11

Trustee: Henry J. Jaffe, Esq.

Joseph C. Barsalona, II, Esq. PASHMAN STEIN WALDER HAYDEN, PC

1007 North Orange Street Fourth Floor, Suite 183 Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Catherine Steege, Esq.

Melissa Root, Esq.

William A. Williams, Esq.

JENNER & BLOCK, LLP 335 North Clark Street Chicago, Illinois 60654

For GLAS Trust Company,

LLC: Ravi S. Shankar, Esq.

KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP 333 West Wolf Point Plaza Chicago, Illinois 60654

Also Appearing: Claudia Z. Springer, Chapter 11

Trustee

NOVO ADVISORS

Case 24-50142-BLS	Doc 10	Filed 10/10/24	Page 3 of 17	
				3
		INDEX		
				~
				PAGE
ARGUMENT BY MS. STEEGE				5
ARGUMENT BY MR. SHANKAR			11	
COURT DECISION				15

(Proceedings commence at 4:01 p.m.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon. This is Judge Dorsey.

We're on the record in In Re Epic! Creations, Case Number 24
11161.

I'll go ahead and turn it over to trustee's counsel.

MR. JAFFE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Henry

Jaffe, I am with Pashman Stein. I'm here today with the

trustee, Claudia Springer, who is on the line by Zoom. I'm

also here with my partner Mr. Barsalona. And I am here, as

well, with our co-counsel, lead counsel for the trustee,

Jenner & Block, and in particular Ms. Steege and Ms. Root,

along with Mr. Williams.

Your Honor, I'm going to turn the podium over to them in just a moment. But I really want to thank Your Honor for hearing us on such short notice. These are clearly urgent issues that deal with preservation of estate assets. I know this -- I know Your Honor has an affiliated case and this is not Your Honor's case, so I cannot tell you enough how much we appreciate your time in doing this and in hearing us. And we did -- I know it would have been nice if we could have gotten our papers to you a little sooner. We certainly all rushed to try to get them as quickly as possible, so my apologies for any delay.

But with that, I would like to turn it over to my

co-counsel.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jaffe.

MS. STEEGE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Catherine Steege on behalf of Ms. Springer.

And I'd like to echo Mr. Jaffe's comments, we really very much appreciate Your Honor scheduling this hearing on such short notice.

In terms of where we are and in terms of service of these materials, which I would assume Your Honor would be concerned with, we have been able to serve Stripe. We had sent them an email this morning, asking them, when we discovered this issue with regard to the accounts and the illegal activity that was taking place, in terms of funds going to parties who should not be receiving them, I did reach out to Ms. Walsh, who we understand to have a position of general counsel in their legal department.

I put "important," put the little exclamation point on the email, explained what the circumstances were, asked her to please confirm that they would freeze these accounts and not send money out any further and, to the extent that they could claw back the four hundred and some-odd thousand dollars that they had transferred yesterday, asked her if she would please take care to do that.

I got no response from her, so we proceeded to prepare these papers this morning because of our concern that

we had been ignored from an earlier notice from Ms. Springer, asking that these accounts be frozen and that they only communicate with her with regard to them. And having not heard anything in response to my email, we prepared these papers and we filed them. I, again, served her at the same email address. It has not bounced back or come back in any way, shape, or form.

In terms of Whitehat, the party that received the funds, we had three email addresses available to us for those. Two of those have bounced back, one came back with an out-of-office response.

And we are in the process of trying to get notice to Wells Fargo. But Wells Fargo was really just to freeze the funds that are in the Whitehat account, to the extent that they are still there and have not moved forward.

So we would ask Your Honor to proceed with notice to Stripe, although I don't believe anyone is here for them, as best I can see from looking at the Zoom, and without notice as to the other two defendants at this point in time.

The basis for the relief is as follows:

Stripe collects funds from the debtors' customers and vendors, and as much as \$100,000 per day is collected and had been, for the most part, going over to a Wells Fargo account that Ms. Springer has since discovered and taken control of.

However, we discovered yesterday that, sometime around September 30th, right around the time that we served notice on Stripe -- Ms. Springer did send a letter indicating she was trustee and any accounts at Stripe were to be frozen -- there was activity coming from various email accounts that are shown in a chart in the complaint and in the motion for a temporary restraining order and the memorandum, seeking to make changes to the accounts, so that the funds would go to a different account.

There were some transactions in that interim period that failed, that they didn't send out the money.

Then, on October 2nd, about \$9,900 was sent out.

And then, yesterday, October 7th, the four hundred and some-odd thousand dollars was sent out.

Those two transfers went to the Whitehat account at Wells Fargo. And we've since discovered, and it's indicated in the complaint, that, between the time of Ms. Springer's appointment and the notice to Stripe, \$200,000 went over to this Whitehat account.

None of those transfers were authorized by Ms.

Springer. These are clearly funds of Epic!, its collection from customers for services that they provide. Under 542, Stripe had an obligation to turn those funds over to the trustee. She had, in fact, made a demand to receive those funds.

And in light of the fact that we cannot get anyone at Stripe to respond to our requests and given what's happened with the account, we're seeking a temporary restraining order ordering them not to transfer any funds out of that account, make any changes to the account, allow anyone else to have access to that account, and to turn over what funds are in those accounts to Ms. Springer going forward.

We are also asking, because we can see that the money went yesterday to an account at Wells Fargo for this Whitehat organization, that Wells Fargo freeze that account, so, to the extent that those funds are there, we can collect against them in due course, as the litigation proceeds, either pursuant to Section 542 or as an inappropriate transfer under 549.

We think that that's necessary and that the estate will suffer irreparable harm if these things don't happen because we understand that funds have been transferred to India, out of the U.S., from all of these entities where Ms. Springer is the trustee. So we have a trustee that, if the accounts aren't frozen and, in particular, the Whitehat account is not frozen, that those monies will transfer over to India and we -- they will be beyond the ability of Ms. Springer to collect.

And we don't have any reason to believe that

Whitehat, actually, is retaining any money here in the U.S. We think it's all a front for the BYJU family and what they're -- what they've been doing in the case in front of Your Honor and what they have been doing in the three cases in front of Judge Shannon.

So we think that there is irreparable harm here.

We think it's clear that these funds do belong to the estate and should be frozen for the estate's benefit, and that there's really no harm to the other side because they have no right or entitlement to any of these funds.

And so we would ask for this temporary restraining order with regard to Stripe, with notice; with regard to the other two defendants -- we've attempted to serve Whitehat, and apparently no one has seen it on their end; and then, with Wells Fargo, which of course we would get notice to immediately upon entry of any order.

So I don't know if Your Honor has any questions.

In support of this, we have attached Ms. Springer's declaration attesting to all of the matters in the complaint and the motion for a temporary restraining order.

THE COURT: Okay. No questions at this time.

Do we know if this is a hack attempt or is this actually the BYJU folks? Do we know for sure?

MS. STEEGE: We're pretty confident, Your Honor, that it's the BYJU folks because we can see from a screenshot

we were able to get that it's email addresses from individuals in India. Whitehat has been a party that has received money from the debtors in the past, and they seem to have connections with the folks in India.

And we can see on some of these accounts -- because we're going through a similar exercise with Apple, but they're communicating with us. We can see that, shortly after Ms. Springer's appointment, the account administrator was changed on the Apple collection account to an entity that is in India, but has a business address in the United Arab Emirates and appears to have some connection, again, with the BYJU brothers. So it seems like they have been scrambling since the order for relief in an effort to try to glom onto as much cash from these businesses as they could.

THE COURT: Okay. And no idea what this Whitehat entity is? Do we know anything about them?

MS. STEEGE: Not really. I turn to Ms. Springer, if she's learned something that I'm not aware of. But I think -- we just know that they're a funnel for dollars, I believe.

MS. SPRINGER: Yes, Your Honor. The Whitehat entity, I believe, is a U.S. entity, the LLC entity. It has a parent entity, also with the first name Whitehat, in India. And we think -- but the Whitehat entity is not directly obligated on the credit agreement to which the three debtors

Case 24-50142-BLS Doc 10 Filed 10/10/24 Page 11 of 17 1 and BYJU Alpha are obligated. So we think, though, there was 2 a request made that it be a guarantor. Evidently, under 3 Indian law, for whatever reason, that was not possible. 4 So we believe now they're using the Whitehat LLC 5 entity to be a recipient of funds that belong to one of the 6 three debtors, probably most likely Epic!, and then funneling 7 those funds up to their parent entity in India. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 9 Is there anyone else who wants to speak on behalf before I -- I guess -- well, let me ask first. Is there 10 anyone on the line for Stripe? 11 12 (No verbal response) 13 THE COURT: No answer. Okay. 14 Anyone else wish to hear -- be heard in support? 15 MR. SHANKAR: Your Honor, Ravi Shankar from

Kirkland & Ellis on behalf of GLAS Trust Company. If I may be heard?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHANKAR: Your Honor, first, to address Your Honor's question, my understanding is that Whitehat, the Indian entity, not the Delaware entity, provides coding programs and classes for kids.

Whitehat is the entity on which the Delaware Supreme Court found that its failure to accede to the credit agreement gave rise to an event of default, which then led to

a series of events, including today's hearing. 1 2 THE COURT: That's where --3 MR. SHANKAR: And in --THE COURT: -- I heard that before. I knew I heard 4 5 that name somewhere before. 6 MR. SHANKAR: Your Honor, given the summary 7 judgment hearing tomorrow in the Alpha case, it's hard for me 8 not to recognize the parallels between what's happening now, 9 as laid out by Ms. Steege, and what we saw in the BYJU's Alpha case, as well as our ongoing concerns about how to get 10 out ahead of the misconduct that we're continuing to see. 11 12 With Alpha, Your Honor may recall Mr. Pohl was put 13 into place and then, weeks later, an asset valued at over \$5 14 million is transferred place. For Epic!, we're seeing the 15 same story, Your Honor. It's a version of history, unfortunately, repeating itself. 16 17 An order for relief was entered on September 16th 18 at Docket 147. 19 Ms. Springer was appointed on September 23rd at 20 Docket 151. 21 And then there are more transfers that are 22 precipitated by a change of control, by an organization in 23 India that's using geography to try to move money out of U.S. entities. 24

And I'd just like to spend a moment, Your Honor,

just to address the macro and spin out why the conduct we see gets more brazen with each passing month.

Before commencing the involuntary petitions, our investigator identified over at least 17 transfers to Whitehat, the same Whitehat entity that's receiving the funds today, close to \$1 million.

We filed a motion under Section 303(f) of the involuntary code restraining further intercompany orders, and the Court granted that honor -- that order, Your Honor granted that order at Docket 69 on June 28th, specifically prohibiting the intercompany transfers we had saw because we had learned our lesson from the Alpha case about the fraudulent transfers.

During that case, Your Honor, we identified, based on disclosures, the then putative debtors, now debtors, had made, including 3 more transfers for close to \$135,000, again to Whitehat.

We learned, after Ms. Springer's appointment, that there were bank accounts that were supposed to have been disclosed under Your Honor's order at Docket 69 that were never disclosed. We learned about more fraudulent transfers that were made in violation of the Court's order.

Again, Your Honor, it's hard for me not to see the parallels with the Alpha case, the disregard for corporate formalities, and the view by folks abroad that the money of

1 these Delaware entities is money they can take at their will. 2 So, Your Honor, on behalf of GLAS, on behalf of the lenders, we've lived with quite a bit of misconduct for a 3 long time. The misconduct is not dissipating and the 4 5 misconduct would be appropriately enjoined. So I would echo 6 Ms. Steege's comments regarding the micro, but I wanted, Your 7 Honor, to virtually rise to provide that bit of macro 8 commentary. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Shankar, I 10 appreciate it. 11 Ms. Steege, just so I'm clear, are you still 12 seeking an injunction against Bank of America or just Stripe 13 and Whitehat, or were you seeking one for Bank of America at 14 all? 15 MS. STEEGE: Pardon me, Your Honor. I was on -- I turned myself on mute. 16 17 Not from Bank of America, from Wells Fargo Bank. 18 THE COURT: Or Wells Fargo, I'm sorry. 19 MS. STEEGE: We are --20 THE COURT: Yeah. 21 MS. STEEGE: Yes, we're asking that they be ordered 22 to freeze the Whitehat account, zero eight -- which ends in 23 the four digits 0879. 24 THE COURT: But they haven't received notice of the

25

hearing.

MS. STEEGE: They have not. We've been working on that since we got the papers completed. But at this point, I cannot say that they have received notice.

THE COURT: I'm trying to remember what the rule is

THE COURT: I'm trying to remember what the rule is about entering a TRO without notice. I think it has to be only for a set amount of time, right?

MS. STEEGE: I believe, Your Honor, 14 days.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. STEEGE: And we do provide in the draft order for a further hearing, which we assumed Your Honor would set for further injunctive relief.

THE COURT: Yeah, this may -- that may be Judge Shannon who hears it --

MS. STEEGE: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: -- the next time.

But -- so I will -- I'm going to grant the motion.

I think the trustee has shown a likelihood of success on the merits. Clearly, someone is taking money from accounts that belong to a debtor, for which she is the Chapter 11 Trustee.

There's irreparable harm if the money is moved and shipped overseas and then out of the jurisdiction of this Court. And I can't see any harm to the defendants, at this point. And certainly the public interest is implicated in making sure that parties are not illegally moving funds out of an account and sending it somewhere else. So I will grant the order.

On the timing of the hearing, I'm not sure what to do since I don't want to put something on Judge Shannon's calendar without him knowing about it. But let's go ahead and just schedule it for 14 days from today, which would be the 22nd. And we'll say the 22nd at 1 p.m., just to have something on -- in the order. And then Judge Shannon may change that once he gets back from his travels and set a new date and time, but for now, that will be what we go with.

Anything else we need to do?

MS. STEEGE: No. Thank you, Your Honor. And again, we really appreciate your jumping in on this because we know the papers got to you very close to the hearing time, so we appreciate it.

THE COURT: It was enough -- I actually had enough time to read them before I took the bench, so that was good. And it's a TRO, so, you know, these things happen.

Let me see if there's anything else we need. Oh, are you going to submit a revised form of order with the date and time for the subsequent hearing and the --

MS. STEEGE: Yes.

THE COURT: -- date and time that I entered this order, so that we have that? That has to be in there, as well.

MS. STEEGE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. STEEGE: We will do that.  THE COURT: All right. All right. Well, thank you
ind cooks that region that region were, chains you
all very much. We are adjourned. And I'm sure
MS. STEEGE: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Judge Shannon's chambers will be in
touch.
MS. STEEGE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. STEEGE: Thank you.
(Proceedings concluded at 4:19 p.m.)
****
<u>CERTIFICATION</u>
I certify that the foregoing is a correct
transcript from the electronic sound recording of the
proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my
knowledge and ability.
October 9, 2024
Coleen Rand, AAERT Cert. No. 341
Certified Court Transcriptionist
For Reliable