IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:	Chapter 11
Apple Tree Life Sciences, Inc., *et al,*[1]	Case No. 25-12177 (LSS) (Jointly Administered)
Debtors.	**Ref. Docket No. 1050**

FEE EXAMINER'S FINAL REPORT REGARDING SECOND QUARTERLY FEE APPLICATION OF WALKERS (CAYMAN) LLP

Rucki Fee Review, LLC ("Rucki Fee Review"), the fee examiner appointed in the above-captioned chapter 11 cases and acting in its capacity as such (the "Fee Examiner"), hereby submits its final report (this "Final Report") regarding the *Second Combined Monthly and Interim Fee Application of Walkers (Cayman) LLP for Compensation for Services Rendered and for Reimbursement of Expenses as Cayman Islands Counsel to the Debtors for the Period of April 1, 2026, through June 30, 2026* (the "Second Quarterly Fee Application") [Docket No. 1050] filed by Walkers (Cayman) LLP (the "Firm").

BACKGROUND

1. In performance of its fee and expense review procedures and in preparation of its initial report provided to the Firm (the "Initial Report") and this Final Report designed to quantify and present factual data relevant to the requested fees, disbursements and expenses

[1] The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number include: Apple Tree Life Sciences, Inc. (4506); ATP Life Science Ventures, L.P. (8224); ATP III GP, Ltd. (6091); Apertor Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (3161); Initial Therapeutics, Inc. (2453); Marlinspike Therapeutics, Inc. (4757); Red Queen Therapeutics, Inc. (8563); Evercrisp Biosciences, Inc. (4437); Nine Square Therapeutics, Inc. (4503); and Nereid Therapeutics Incorporated (8493). The location of the Debtors' service address in these chapter 11 cases is 230 Park Avenue, Suite 2800, New York, NY 10169.

2512177261026000000000006

contained in the Second Quarterly Fee Application consistent with its appointment order, Rucki Fee Review reviewed the Second Quarterly Fee Application, including each of the billing and expense entries subsumed therein, for compliance with section 330 of the Bankruptcy Code, Bankruptcy Rule 2016 and Local Rule 2016-1, as well as the *U.S. Trustee Guidelines for Reviewing Applications for Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses Filed Under 11 U.S.C. § 330—Appendix A* and the Firm's retention order. Rucki Fee Review also reviewed for a reasonable effort to comply with the *Guidelines for Reviewing Applications for Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses Filed under 11 U.S.C. § 330 by Attorneys in Larger Chapter 11 Cases Effective as of November 1, 2013* (the "Attorney Large Case Guidelines").

2. Rucki Fee Review did not prepare informal memos related to the fee applications of the Firm, but instead included its issues and questions in its Initial Report provided to the Firm. Rucki Fee Review thereafter conferred with the Firm regarding the Initial Report, and following such conferral includes its recommendations in this Final Report.

DISCUSSION

3. For the compensation period of April 1, 2026 through June 30, 2026, as set forth in the Second Quarterly Fee Application, the Firm seeks interim bankruptcy court approval in the amount of $1,416,034.12 (after 15% discount) as actual, reasonable and necessary fees and for expense reimbursement of $35,988.64.

4. Although it examines the matter on a case-by-case basis based on the facts and circumstances of each case and each applicant's role within a case (such as whether a firm is responsible for coordinating filing and scheduling of and hearing on multiple

professionals' fee applications) regardless of whether any given threshold is exceeded such that fees below its presumptive threshold may be unreasonable and fees above its presumptive threshold may be reasonable, to accommodate firms with small fees Rucki Fee Review generally does not consider time spent on fee issues to be presumptively unreasonable where less than 7% of total time has been charged for preparing fee applications and addressing fee issues. It applies these guidelines on a cumulative basis. Through the conclusion of the second quarterly fee period the Firm has charged approximately $168,195.24 in fees ($197,876.75 prior to discounting) relating to the Firm's fee applications on a cumulative basis. This cumulative total is net of previously agreed fee reductions of $9,248.00 ($10,880.00 prior to discounting) on account of these fees, inclusive of fees incurred on account of including barrister and expert witness fees with the Firm's fee applications. This amounts to approximately 7.25% of the Firm's total cumulative fees through the end of the second quarterly fee period. Here, Rucki Fee Review considers it understandable for the Firm to have higher than typical fees on account of its fee applications given its lack of familiarity with fee application preparation and its work coordinating the inclusion of fees of Cayman barristers and a Cayman expert, but still requested a fee reduction on account of these fees. After discussion with the Firm, the Firm agreed to a fee reduction of $15,000.00 ($17,647.05 prior to discounting) on account of these fees in addition to the other agreed reductions set forth herein, of which $28,537.90 ($33,574.00 prior to discounting) of such other reductions set forth herein also are on account of fee application work. After accounting for these aggregate agreed reductions of $43,537.90 ($51,221.06 prior to discounting) on account of fee application work, Rucki Fee Review considers the balance of these fees reasonable, necessary and appropriate but

recognizes that certain of these fees were billed on account of fee applications not filed until after the conclusion of the second quarterly fee period. Rucki Fee Review will continue to analyze these fees on a cumulative basis in future fee periods.

5. Subject to the agreed reductions set forth herein, Rucki Fee Review considers the staffing breakdown during the second quarterly fee period (percentage of hours billed by partners, senior counsel, associates, and paraprofessionals respectively) to be appropriate. The Firm's blended hourly rate during the second quarterly fee period was $1,296.24 prior to discounting ($1,101.80 after discounting), which is equivalent to a senior counsel at the Firm's current standard hourly rates. This compares to $1,337.93 prior to discounting ($1,137.24 after discounting) during the first quarterly fee period. The Firm's rate structure is relatively compressed, with multiple associates staffed on this matter billing as high as $1,200.00 per hour prior to discounting, further informing the blended hourly rate. Rucki Fee Review notes that the Firm's billable rates actually charged to the estate also reflect a discount provided to the debtors of 15% relative to standard hourly rates, in continuation of a prepetition arrangement.

6. Further to the Firm's staffing, Rucki Fee Review notes that the Firm utilized 14 professionals or paraprofessionals to perform its work during the second quarterly fee period. This is decreased from 18 during the first quarterly fee period. Six of the Firm's 14 personnel billed fewer than 15 hours during the second quarterly fee period. Rucki Fee Review gives additional scrutiny to time entries of those billing fewer than 15 hours in a quarter to address if the utilization of such particular persons was necessary for the case. After review, however, Rucki Fee Review considers the utilization of these persons to be

appropriate, subject to the agreed reductions set forth herein (which include all 11.9 hours billed by one of these persons, a paraprofessional).

7. Rucki Fee Review notes that it is customary in cases before the Bankruptcy Court for a "reasonable effort" to comply with the Attorney Large Case Guidelines to include preparation of a budget and staffing plan for each applicable law firm agreed to by the client (debtor or committee). Here, the Firm did prepare a prospective budget and staffing plan for the second quarterly fee period, which is a factor Rucki Fee Review considers in evaluating the staffing and total fees on this matter. The Firm's budgeted fees for the second quarterly fee period were $1,795,167.76 on an undiscounted basis, or $1,525,892.60 on a discounted basis after accounting for the 15% hourly rate discount agreed to between the debtors and the Firm. This means the Firm was under its budget by approximately 7.2%. Subject to the agreed reductions set forth herein, Rucki Fee Review considers the Firm's work to be well-coordinated within the Firm and with its fellow professionals.

8. Local Rule 2016-1 provides in section (d) that all fee applications shall include activity descriptions with sufficient detail to allow the Court to determine whether the time is actual, reasonable, and necessary, including complete and detailed activity descriptions with the time allotted to each activity and a separate description and a time allotment for each activity (i.e., activity descriptions should not be lumped). Each time allotment also shall include the nature of the activity (e.g., phone call, research) and subject matter of the activity (e.g., exclusivity motion, section 341 meeting). Local Rule 2016-1 also requires that activity descriptions individually identify meetings and hearings, along with each participant, the subject of the meeting or hearing, and the participant's role. Notwithstanding the Local Rule, and consistent with the practice of certain of the

Bankruptcy Court's Judges, Rucki Fee Review does not object to "lumping" where a single timekeeper bills less than 0.5 hours during an entire day in the aggregate (not multiple lumped 0.5 entries).

9. Rucki Fee Review identified certain entries that it considers lumped or otherwise not fully compliant with the Local Rules. After conferral with the Firm, the Firm has agreed to a reduction of $9,000.00 ($10,588.24 prior to discounting) on account of these entries in compromise of Rucki Fee Review's request. For its remaining future fee applications, as with all other firms, Rucki Fee Review has requested the Firm minimize the number of entries that employ phrasing such as "attention to" and "coordinate" which sometimes are vague as to what work was performed *(i.e.*, drafting, reviewing, conferencing, etc.). Rucki Fee Review further requested that preparation time be separately billed from other activity, such as attending calls or hearings, and that the work done to prepare be specified wherever preparation time exceeds 2.0 hours in the aggregate for a given hearing or other event. Likewise, Rucki Fee Review requested the Firm ensure all e-mail correspondence and conferences identify the counterparties to the same and made certain other requests as to future entries.

10. Administrative tasks that are generally not compensable by a non-chapter 11 client or are clerical in nature are not compensable in chapter 11. Rucki Fee Review identified certain work it considered administrative in nature, and the Firm agreed to a fee reduction of $16,640.88 ($19,577.50 prior to discounting) on account of these fees in compromise of Rucki Fee Review's request.

11. Rucki Fee Review identified certain conferences, telephone calls or other matters that were billed inconsistently by the respective professionals, and/or conferences where the counterparty to the conversation did not bill an itemized charge for the discussion. Rucki Fee Review acknowledges that the latter can result from a professional intentionally or inadvertently not billing for a conference that actually occurred, or otherwise not being billed. After discussion with the Firm, the Firm has agreed to a reduction of $1,802.00 ($2,120.00 prior to discounting) on account of these entries, representing the full amount of the difference in the non-matching entries and no reduction for the entries without a corresponding entry, which Rucki Fee Review considers an appropriate compromise.

12. In addition to those other matters referenced herein, Rucki Fee Review requested the Firm waive or reduce certain fee entries for miscellaneous reasons. After discussion with the Firm, the Firm has agreed to a reduction of $25,832.23 ($30,390.85 prior to discounting) on account of these entries in compromise of Rucki Fee Review's request.

13. With respect to the Firm's expense reimbursement request, Rucki Fee Review notes that for travel meals and lodging, it enforces the following per diem limitations: $25/breakfast, $35/lunch and $55/dinner, for Wilmington and all other U.S. locations, except for New York City and London, $35/breakfast, $55/lunch and $70/dinner; for Washington DC, Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco, $30/breakfast, $45/lunch and $65/dinner. With respect to hotel charges, Rucki Fee Review generally considers room charges (inclusive of taxes) in excess of the following rates to be excessive absent satisfactory explanation from an applicant of the justification for exceeding such charges: $375/Wilmington; $550/New York City; $450/Boston and San Francisco; $400/ Washington, DC, Los Angeles, and

London; $325/Chicago, Miami, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh; $300/Dallas and Houston; $275/Baltimore and Denver; $250 for all other U.S. locations.

14. Here, Rucki Fee Review requested and obtained additional information with respect to certain expense entries. After review and consideration of the same and conferral with the Firm, Rucki Fee Review requested the Firm reduce its expense reimbursement request by $3,644.65 on account of a hotel charge that slightly exceeded the foregoing limitations and to reduce one airfare charge, which the Firm agreed to in compromise of Rucki Fee Review's request. Rucki Fee Review considers the balance of the Firm's expense reimbursement request to be reasonable, necessary and appropriate for reimbursement as sought in the Second Quarterly Fee Application. Rucki Fee Review also has agreed to provide an expense credit of $2,928.55 to the Firm against these expense reductions on account of an invoice previously waived from the Firm's first quarterly expenses at Rucki Fee Review's request that was inadvertently labeled as a prepetition invoice on the Firm's invoice but was actually a post-petition invoice on account of a post-petition expense. Net of this credit, the Firm's expense reimbursement request will be reduced by $716.10.

15. After accounting for the agreed fee reductions of $68,275.11 ($80,323.66 prior to discounting) and net expense reductions of $716.10 discussed herein, Rucki Fee Review considers the balance of fees and expenses sought in the Second Quarterly Fee Application to be reasonable, necessary and appropriate under the circumstances.

CONCLUSION

16. Rucki Fee Review recommends the approval of the Second Quarterly Fee Application in the amount of $1,347,759.01 with respect to fees and the reimbursement of expenses in the

amount of $35,272.54, which amounts reflect the reductions agreed to with the Firm set forth herein on account of the Second Quarterly Fee Application.

Dated: October 26, 2026
Wilmington, Delaware

Respectfully submitted,

RUCKI FEE REVIEW, LLC
FEE EXAMINER

By: */s/ Justin H. Rucki*
Justin H. Rucki
President of Rucki Fee Review, LLC