HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS KRAMER (US) LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 715-9100
(212) 715-8000
Kyle J. Ortiz
Ariel N. Lavinbuk
Jared C. Borriello
Michael C. Blackmon

Counsel for Eletson Holdings Inc.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:	:	Chapter 11
ELETSON HOLDINGS INC.,[1]	:	Case No. 23-10322 (JPM)
Debtor.	:	

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ELETSON HOLDINGS INC.'S MOTION PURSUANT TO BANKRUPTCY RULE 2004 FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND DEPOSITION TESTIMONY

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on September 2, 2026, Eletson Holdings Inc. filed *Eletson Holdings Inc.'s Motion Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 2004 for an Order Authorizing the Issuance of Subpoenas for the Production of Documents and Deposition Testimony* (the "Motion").

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that the Court has scheduled a hearing on the Motion (the "Hearing") for **September 16, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)** before the Honorable John P. Mastando III, United States Bankruptcy Judge for the Southern

[1] Prior to November 19, 2024, the Debtors in these cases were: Eletson Holdings Inc., Eletson Finance (US) LLC, and Agathonissos Finance LLC. On March 5, 2025, the Court entered a final decree and order closing the chapter 11 cases of Eletson Finance (US) LLC and Agathonissos Finance LLC. Commencing on March 5, 2025, all motions, notices, and other pleadings relating to any of the Debtors shall be filed in the chapter 11 case of Eletson Holdings Inc. The Debtor's mailing address is c/o Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer (US) LLP, 1177 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036.

District of New York, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (the "Court").

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that the hearing shall be held via "*Zoom for Government***"** before the Honorable John P. Mastando III, United States Bankruptcy Judge in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York. Parties wishing to participate on a "live" or a "listen only" line must make an electronic appearance through the "eCourtAppearances" tab on the Court's website: https://www.nysb.uscourts.gov/ecourt-appearances, no later than **September 15, 2026, at 4:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)** (the "Appearance Deadline"). Following the Appearance Deadline, the Court will circulate by e-mail the Zoom link to those parties who have made an electronic appearance. Further information on the use of Zoom for Government can be found at the Court's website at https://www.nysb.uscourts.gov/zoom-video-hearing-guide.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that, responses, if any, to the Motion must be made in writing, stating in detail the reasons therefor, and must be filed with the Clerk of the Court, so as to actually be received by the Honorable Judge Mastando III, with electronic copies emailed to Chambers at: JPM.chambers@nyscb.uscourts.gov, and upon: (i) Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer (US) LLP counsel for Eletson Holdings Inc., 1177 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036, Attn: Kyle J. Ortiz, Esq. (kyle.ortiz@hsfkramer.com) and Jared C. Borriello, Esq. (jared.borriello@hsfkramer.com); 2000 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20006, Attn: Ariel Lavinbuk, Esq. (ariel.lavinbuk@hsfkramer.com); and (ii) the Office of the United States Trustee for Region 2, Attn: Daniel Rudewicz, Esq. (Daniel.Rudewicz@usdoj.gov), One Bowling Green, Room 534, New York, New York 10004-1408, no later than **September 9, 2026 at 4:00 p.m. (ET)** and any reply papers shall be filed and served by 4:00 p.m. (ET) on **Monday, September 14, 2026**.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that all case filings can be viewed and/or obtained by: (i) accessing the Court's website www.nysb.uscourts.gov or by (ii) contacting the Office of the Clerk of the Court at the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York.

DATED: September 2, 2026
New York, New York

HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS KRAMER (US) LLP

By: */s/ Jared Boriello*

Kyle J. Ortiz
Ariel N. Lavinbuk
Jared C. Borriello
Michael C. Blackmon
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 715-9100
Email: kyle.ortiz@hsfkramer.com
ariel.lavinbuk@hsfkramer.com
jared.borriello@hsfkramer.com
michael.blackmon@hsfkramer.com

Counsel for Eletson Holdings Inc.

HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS KRAMER (US) LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Telephone: (212) 715-9100
Facsimile: (212) 715-8000
Kyle J. Ortiz
Ariel N. Lavinbuk
Jared C. Borriello
Michael C. Blackmon

Counsel to reorganized Eletson Holdings Inc.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:	:	Chapter 11
ELETSON HOLDINGS INC.,[1]	:	Case No. 23-10322 (JPM)
	:	**Hearing Date**:
	:	September 16, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. (ET)
Debtor.	:	**Objection Deadline**:
	:	September 9, 2026 at 4:00 p.m. (ET)

ELETSON HOLDINGS INC.'S MOTION PURSUANT TO BANKRUPTCY RULE 2004 FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND DEPOSITION TESTIMONY

[1] Prior to November 19, 2024 (the "Effective Date"), the Debtors in these cases were: Eletson Holdings Inc., Eletson Finance (US) LLC, and Agathonissos Finance LLC. On March 5, 2025, the Court entered a final decree and order closing the chapter 11 cases of Eletson Finance (US) LLC and Agathonissos Finance LLC. Commencing on March 5, 2025, all motions, notices, and other pleadings relating to any of the Debtors shall be filed in the chapter 11 case of Eletson Holdings Inc. The Debtor's mailing address is c/o Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer (US) LLP, 1177 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT....1

JURISDICTION AND VENUE....2

BACKGROUND....3

RELIEF REQUESTED....8

BASIS FOR RELIEF....9

I. The Court Should Authorize the Rule 2004 Examination by Holdings....9

A. Legal Standard....9

B. Good Cause Exists for the Rule 2004 Examination....11

II. Service of Subpoenas by FedEx or Other Means of Service Allowable Under Bankruptcy Rule 9016 is Appropriate....12

NOTICE....13

NO PRIOR REQUESTS....13

CONCLUSION....14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

In re 96 Wythe Acquisition LLC,
Case No. 21-22108 (SHL) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Aug. 8, 2022) 12

In re AOG Entertainment, Inc.,
558 B.R. 98 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2016).....10

In re Bressler,
Case No. 06-11897 (AJG), 2007 Bankr. LEXIS 93
(S.D.N.Y. Jan. 12, 2007).....10

In re Cinderella Clothing Indus., Inc.,
93 B.R. 373 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1988) 9

Cordius Trust v. Kummerfeld,
Case No. 99 Civ. 3200(DLC), 2000 WL 10268 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 3, 2000) 12

In re Ecam Publications, Inc.,
131 B.R. 556 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1991).....10

In re Enron Corp.,
281 B.R. 836 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002).....10

In re Hilsen,
Case No. 87-11261 (JMP), 2008 WL 2945996
(Bankr. S.D.N.Y. July 25, 2008).....10

In re Ionosphere Clubs, Inc.,
156 B.R. 414 (S.D.N.Y. 1993).....10

In re Kossoff PLLC,
Case No. 21-10699 (DSJ) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. May 24, 2021).....12

Medical Diagnostic Imaging PLLC v. CareCore Nat. LLC,
Case Nos. 06 Civ. 7764(CS)(THK), 06 Civ. 13516(VM)(THK),
2008 WL 3833238 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 15, 2008).....12

Picard v. Marshall (In re Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC),
Case No. 14-01840 (SMB), 2014 WL 5486279
(Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Oct. 30, 2014) 10

In re Recoton Corp.,
307 B.R. 751 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2004).....10, 11

In re Shur,
184 B.R. 640 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 1995).....12

In re Spoto,
Case No. 14-21357, 2015 Bankr. LEXIS 1711
(Bankr. W.D.N.Y. May 21, 2015).....10

Statutes

11 U.S.C. § 105.....1, 3

11 U.S.C. § 105(a).....11

11 U.S.C. § 1109(b).....9

11 U.S.C. § 1142.....3

28 U.S.C. § 157.....2

28 U.S.C. § 1334.....2

28 U.S.C. § 1408.....2

28 U.S.C. § 1409.....2

Rules

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004..... *passim*

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004(a).....9

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004(b).....9

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004(c).....10

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7008.....2

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9016.....1, 12

Fed. R. Civ. P. 45.....12

Other Authorities

9 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 2004.01 (16th ed. 2025).....9

TO THE HONORABLE JOHN P. MASTANDO III
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE:

Eletson Holdings Inc. ("Holdings"), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby submits this motion (the "Motion"), pursuant to section 105 of title 11 of the United States Code (the "Bankruptcy Code") and Rule 2004 and Rule 9016 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the "Bankruptcy Rules"), for entry of an order, substantially in the form annexed hereto as **Exhibit A** (the "Proposed Order"), authorizing Holdings to issue subpoenas for the production of documents from and the examination of Proskauer Rose LLP and its agents and representatives (collectively, "Proskauer" or the "Examination Parties")[2] to obtain information concerning the undisclosed individuals or entities that recently directed, funded, or otherwise caused Proskauer to take actions interfering with implementation of the Plan and the Confirmation Order, including the identity of those individuals or entities and the source of the funds used to finance such efforts. In support of this Motion, Holdings respectfully states:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. This Motion seeks basic information to which Holdings is entitled: who is directing ongoing efforts to interfere with the confirmed Plan and Confirmation Order, and who is funding those efforts.

2. The Plan transferred ownership and control of Holdings to its reorganized stakeholders and installed new management. Since confirmation, however, former insiders, their affiliates and related parties have repeatedly sought to challenge or circumvent that transfer of control by purporting to act on Holdings' behalf despite lacking authority to do so. Courts have

[2] Holdings reserves the right to seek permission to serve Rule 2004 discovery on Reed Smith and, among others, the former management of Holdings, including Laskarina Karastamati, Vassilis Kertsikoff and Vassilis Chatzieleftheriadis (also spelled Vasilis Hadjieleftheriadis), in connection with the facts set forth below.

rejected those efforts on multiple occasions. In September 2025, Proskauer joined Reed Smith as co-counsel before the Second Circuit purportedly on behalf of Holdings and Eletson Corporation ("Corp.") in the unauthorized appeal of Judge Liman's order endorsing the parties' stipulation of dismissal of the petition to confirm the arbitration award which lies at the center of the vacatur proceeding. Judge Liman expressly recognized that both entities have long been represented by their duly authorized counsel, Goulston & Storrs LLP ("Goulston"). Most recently, on July 29, 2026, Proskauer *again* filed notices of appearance and a notice of appeal in the vacatur proceeding, again purportedly on behalf of Holdings and Corp., this time challenging Judge Liman's final judgment (entered after he vacated the arbitration award on the basis of fraud in June 2026). Again, those filings were *not* authorized by Holdings.

3. Holdings therefore promptly requested that Proskauer identify who retained the firm, who directed it to act, and who is paying for those efforts. Proskauer declined to do so. Having been unable to obtain that information voluntarily and because it goes directly to the enforcement of the Plan and Confirmation Order, Holdings now seeks judicial authorization to obtain it through Rule 2004 discovery. The Motion should be granted.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. The United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (this "Court") has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and the Amended Standing Order of Reference M-431, dated January 31, 2012 (Preska, C.J.). Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 7008, Holdings confirms its consent to the Court's exercise of jurisdiction to the extent that it is later determined that the Court, absent consent of the parties, cannot enter final orders or judgments in connection herewith consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution.

5. Venue in this District is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

6. Pursuant to Section 11.1 of the Plan and Paragraph WW of the Confirmation Order, the Court retains exclusive jurisdiction over all matters arising out of, and related to, the chapter 11 cases, including the matters set forth in Article XI of the Plan and section 1142 of the Bankruptcy Code. In particular, the Court retains jurisdiction to "enter such orders as may be necessary or appropriate to implement or consummate the provisions of this Plan" and to "issue injunctions, enter and implement other orders, or take such other actions as may be necessary or appropriate to restrain interference by any Person or Entity with consummation, implementation, or enforcement of this Plan or the Confirmation Order." Plan §§ 11.1(d) & 11.1(h); *see also* Confirmation Order ¶ WW ("The Court may, and upon the Effective Date, shall retain exclusive jurisdiction over all matters arising out of, and related to, the Chapter 11 Cases, including the matters set forth in Article XI [of] the Plan and section 1142 of the Bankruptcy Code.").

7. The bases for the relief requested by this Motion are section 105 of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 2004 ("Rule 2004").

BACKGROUND

8. The Confirmation Order [Dkt. No. 1223] enjoined "all Holders of Claims or Interests and other parties in interest, along with their respective present or former employees, agents, officers, directors, principals, and affiliates . . . from taking any actions to interfere with the implementation or consummation of the Plan." Confirmation Order ¶ 12.

9. As this Court is well aware, since the Effective Date of the Plan (November 19, 2024), various parties, including Holdings' former management, shareholders and counsel have gone to great lengths to obstruct implementation of the Plan, including purporting to represent Holdings or its subsidiaries (including Corp. and Eletson Gas). As a result, Holdings brought a series of motions seeking to enforce the Confirmation Order (the "Sanctions Motions"). *See, e.g.*, Dkt. Nos. 1268, 1416, 1459, 1597, 1602, 1605, 1809, 1843. Former management and

directors and former shareholders (collectively, the "Violating Parties")[3] have been sanctioned multiple times by the Court. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. Nos. 1402, 1495, 1537, 1716, 1836, 1874, 1885, 1932, 1933, 2007, 2008, 2009.

10. Despite this Court's multiple orders making clear that the Violating Parties have no authority to act for Holdings or any of its subsidiaries, this has not stopped the Violating Parties from engaging in new strategies that ultimately seek to undermine the Plan.

11. One such strategy has been taking appeals in Eletson's name but without authority. For instance, Holdings and Corp. are parties in that certain proceeding before Judge Lewis J. Liman, Case No. 23-cv-7331 (LJL) (the "Vacatur Proceeding"). After the Effective Date, Goulston appeared in the Vacatur Proceeding on behalf of Holdings and Corp. On February 14, 2025, consistent with the Confirmation Order, Judge Liman displaced Reed Smith LLP ("Reed Smith") as counsel of record for Holdings or Corp., noting that former counsel was terminated pursuant to the unstayed and confirmed Plan. Case No. 23-cv-7331 (LJL), Dkt. Nos. 269-270.[4]

12. The Vacatur Proceeding continued and, ultimately, Holdings and Corp. entered into a stipulation with Levona Holdings Ltd. ("Levona") in which the parties stipulated to the dismissal of the petition to confirm the Arbitration Award that was the subject of the Vacatur Proceeding. Case No. 23-cv-7331 (LJL), Dkt. No. 321. Recognizing the parties' authority to

[3] These Violating Parties include: (a) Family Unity Trust Company, (b) Glafkos Trust Company, (c) Lassia Investment Company, (d) Elafonissos Shipping corporations, (e) Keros Shipping Corporation, (f) Vassilis Chatzieleftheriadis, (g) Konstatinos Chatzieleftheriadis, (h) Laskarina Karastamati, (i) Ioannis Zilakos, (j) Niki Zilakos, (k) Adrianos Psomadakis-Karastamatis, (l) Eleni Giannakopoulous, (m) Panos Paxinoz, (n) Emmanuel Andreulaks, and (o) Vasilis Hadjieleftheriadis.

[4] At the same February 14, 2025 hearing, in a related proceeding, Judge Liman labeled the notices of appearance filed by Rimon P.C. as "impostors" and struck those appearances, as well as the notice of appeal filed by Reed Smith and Rimon P.C. purportedly on behalf of Holdings. Case No. 24-cv-8672 (LJL), Dkt. No. 66; Feb. 14, 2025 Hr'g Tr. Case No. 23-cv-7331 (LJL), Dkt. No. 270).

direct their own litigation decisions, Judge Liman entered an order endorsing the stipulation of dismissal, thereby dismissing the petition to confirm. Case No. 23-cv-7331 (LJL), Dkt. No. 350.

13. On May 21, 2025, Reed Smith filed a notice of appeal from that stipulated dismissal purportedly on behalf of "Eletson Holdings, Inc. (a/k/a Provisional Holdings and/or Holdings Greece) and Eletson Corporation" ("Appellants"). Case No. 23-cv-7331 (LJL), Dkt. No. 370. The Second Circuit docketed the appeal as Case No. 25-1313 (the "25-1313 Appeal").

14. Then, on September 2, 2025—the day Appellants' opening brief was due in the 25-1313 Appeal—Proskauer entered appearances purportedly on behalf of Holdings and Corp. alongside Reed Smith and filed an opening brief. Neither the notice of appeal, the appearances, nor the brief were authorized by Holdings or Corp. This appeal has been fully briefed and is *sub judice*.

15. On September 5, 2025, Holdings and Corp., through Goulston, sent a letter to Proskauer (including its general counsel) in which they, *inter alia*, demanded that Proskauer immediately cease and desist from taking any action ostensibly on behalf of Holdings or Corp. or holding itself out as counsel to Holdings or Corp. in any capacity. *See* Ex. B. (9/5/25 Letter from Goulston to Proskauer). Proskauer never responded to the letter.

16. Most recently, on July 29, 2026, Proskauer filed another notice of appearance and a notice of appeal (collectively, the "Notices") purportedly on behalf of Holdings and Corp. in the case captioned as *Eletson Holdings, Inc. v. Levona Holdings Ltd.*, Civil Action No. 23-cv-7331 (LJL) in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (the "Vacatur Proceeding"). *See* Ex. C. (Notices).

17. Those filings were again made without the knowledge or authorization of Holdings or Corp. In an effort to avoid the need for judicial intervention, on July 31, 2026,

Goulston, as counsel to Holdings, contacted the Proskauer attorney that filed the Notices, requested that the Notices be withdrawn, and sought the identity of the person or entity that purportedly authorized Proskauer to act. *See* Ex. D (Goulston-Proskauer Email Correspondence). On July 31, 2026, Proskauer refused. Instead, it asserted that it represents Holdings and Corp. in related appellate proceedings while declining to identify who retained it, who directed it to act, or who is funding that representation.

18. After a call between Goulston and Proskauer, on August 10, 2026, Proskauer proposed to Goulston a stipulation by which Proskauer would withdraw its notices on behalf of Eletson—but only if Goulston would agree not to make certain arguments challenging the rights of Apargo Ltd., Fentalon Ltd., and Desimusco Trading Ltd. (collectively, the "Intervenors") in their own separate appeal. No explanation was given as to why Proskauer was linking its actions (purportedly on behalf of Eletson) to the Intervenors, nor did Proskauer disclose who was directing its actions.

19. On August 11, 2026, Goulston again asked Proskauer to identify the parties directing its actions. *See* Ex. E (Goulston-Proskauer 2nd Email Correspondence).

20. On August 18, 2026, Proskauer filed a motion to withdraw as counsel to Holdings and Corp. in the case captioned as *Eletson Holdings Inc. v. Levona Holdings Ltd.* (Case No. 26-2092) currently pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (the "Second Circuit") acknowledging that there exists "grounds under the applicable Rules of Professional Conduct for Proskauer to withdraw." Case No. 26-2092 Dkt. No. 21.1 ¶ 5. On August 21, 2026, the Second Circuit entered an order granting the motion to withdraw as counsel.[5]

[5] This order was also effective as to the following related proceedings that are also pending in the Second Circuit: *Eletson Holdings Inc. v. Levona Holdings Ltd.* (Case No. 26-2085) and *Eletson Holdings Inc. v. Levona Holdings Ltd.* (Case No. 26-2088), each of which were appeals from the Vacatur Proceeding.

21. On August 20, 2026, all parties to the *Eletson Holdings Inc. v. Levona Holdings Ltd.* (Case No. 26-2092) appeal filed a stipulation (the "Stipulation") stating that "Proskauer was never retained or instructed by Eletson" and to seek a dismissal of "this appeal with prejudice." Case No. 26-2092 Dkt. No. 22.

22. On August 21, 2026, Vasilis Hadjieleftheriadis, one of the Violating Parties, sent an email to Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, the Clerk of the Court for the Second Circuit, purporting to act as "a corporate representative of Unreorganized Eletson Holding Inc.", that he objected to the Stipulation, and that Unreorganized Eletson Holding Inc was "in the process of retaining new counsel" after the Proskauer firm, its counsel, had moved to withdraw. *See* Ex. F (Emails to Second Circuit). That same day, Goulston responded by e-mail and on August 28, 2026, the Clerk of the Second Circuit advised that the Second Circuit would not act on the e-mails. *See id.*

23. On August 31, 2026, the Second Circuit approved the Stipulation and permitted the appeal to be withdrawn. Case No. 26-2092 Dkt. No. 27.

24. In email communications spanning from August 17, 2026 to August 21, 2026, Goulston requested that Proskauer file a similar motion to withdraw as purported counsel in the 25-1313 Appeal which is also pending before the Second Circuit. *See* Ex. E (Goulston-Proskauer 2nd Email Correspondence).

25. On August 21, 2026, Proskauer finally responded that its purported representation of Holdings and Corp. in the 25-1313 Appeal was proper, and claimed that the Second Circuit "has no concerns about [Proskauer's] representation in 25-1313." *See id.*

26. On August 24, 2026, Goulston responded to Proskauer over email explaining that a "Clerk docketing Proskauer's appearance and accepting briefs does not constitute

an adjudication of Proskauer's authority to represent" Holdings and Corp. and that the same ethical concerns present in the above-mentioned motion to withdraw were also present in the 25-1313 Appeal. *See id.*

27. On August 26, 2026, Proskauer responded over email that Goulston's concerns were baseless and that its role in the 25-1313 Appeal as appellate counsel was proper. *See id.*

28. As of the time of the filing of this Motion, Proskauer has yet to respond on the questions posed to it including which person/s directed them to file the Notices or to continue its representation in the 25-1313 Appeal. Aside from Mr. Hadjieleftheriadis' communications to the Second Circuit, which indicate that he was involved with retaining Proskauer, Holdings and Corp. is unaware whether other Violating Parties were involved in Proskauer's retention. Holdings and Corp. is also unaware of what payment arrangements have been made to pay Proskauer nor which accounts are being used to pay Proskauer's fees.

RELIEF REQUESTED

29. By this Motion, Holdings seeks entry of the Proposed Order authorizing Holdings to issue subpoenas for the production of documents from each of the Examination Parties to obtain information concerning the acts and conduct related to implementation of the Plan and the Confirmation Order, and to undertake related depositions, as appropriate. Attached as Exhibit

1 to the Proposed Order is the form of document requests that Holdings proposes to include with any subpoenas served upon the Examination Parties.

BASIS FOR RELIEF

I. The Court Should Authorize the Rule 2004 Examination by Holdings

A. Legal Standard

30. Rule 2004 authorizes this Court to order an examination of any entity upon request of a party in interest. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004(a). A "party in interest" includes the debtor. 11 U.S.C. § 1109(b). Thus, there is no question that Holdings fits within the definition of a "party in interest." *See* 11 U.S.C. § 1109(b); *see also* 9 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 2004.01 (16th ed. 2025) ("Parties in interest in a bankruptcy case generally include the trustee, creditors, the debtor and entities related to the debtor, and persons obligated to the debtor.").

31. A Rule 2004 examination may relate to, among other things, "any matter that may affect the administration of the debtor's estate . . . the operation of any business and the desirability of its continuing; the source of any money or property the debtor acquired or will acquire for the purpose of consummating a plan and the consideration given or offered; and any other matter relevant to the case[.]" Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004(b)(1)-(2); *see also In re Cinderella Clothing Indus., Inc.*, 93 B.R. 373 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1988) (allowing Rule 2004 discovery in the post-confirmation context); *Id.* ("[T]he use of such a discovery tool to obtain information relevant to the continued administration of the case post-confirmation . . . is supportable."). After confirmation, Rule 2004's use is a legitimate vehicle to obtain discovery into whether a party "has acted in conformity with the terms, provisions, interest, and purpose of the confirmed plan . . . ." *Cinderella Clothing Indus*., 93 B.R. at 379 (internal quotations and citation omitted).

32. As is the case here, Rule 2004 may be used to take discovery from parties in interest or third parties, where such third party has a relationship with the debtor. Indeed, courts

have generally permitted the examination of "any third party who can be shown to have a relationship with the debtor." *In re Ionosphere Clubs, Inc.*, 156 B.R. 414, 432 (S.D.N.Y. 1993); *see also In re Ecam Publications, Inc.*, 131 B.R. 556, 559 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1991); *In re Recoton Corp.*, 307 B.R. 751, 755 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2004) ("Any third party who has a relationship with a debtor may be made subject to a Rule 2004 investigation"); *In re Enron Corp.*, 281 B.R. 836, 840 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002) ("[T]he Court may authorize the examination of third parties that possess knowledge of the debtor's acts, conduct, liabilities or financial condition which relate to the administration of the bankruptcy estate."). The Examination Parties, by submitting the Notices in the Vacatur Proceeding, have made themselves an appropriate target of a Rule 2004 examination.

33. "The party seeking Rule 2004 discovery has the burden to show good cause for the examination it seeks, and relief lies within the sound discretion of the Bankruptcy Court." *In re AOG Entertainment, Inc.*, 558 B.R. 98, 109 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2016) (citing *Picard v. Marshall (In re Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC)*, Case No. 14-01840 (SMB), 2014 WL 5486279, at *2 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Oct. 30, 2014)). Under Rule 2004, a moving party is entitled to both the examination of witnesses and the production of requested documents. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004(c). "Rule 2004 should be freely available to parties in interest in active cases as a means to discover facts regarding case administration . . . ." *In re Hilsen*, Case No. 87-11261 (JMP), 2008 WL 2945996 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. July 25, 2008). In this regard, a Rule 2004 movant need only set forth a *prima facie* case that a third party has some relationship with the debtor. *See In re Spoto*, Case No. 14-21357, 2015 Bankr. LEXIS 1711, at *5 (Bankr. W.D.N.Y. May 21, 2015) (holding that non-debtor spouse of the debtor and mortgage lenders of debtor and non-debtor spouse were subject to Rule 2004 investigation); *In re Bressler*, Case No. 06-11897 (AJG), 2007 Bankr. LEXIS 93, at *1 n.3 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 12, 2007) (finding that former employee of debtor may be subject to

Rule 2004 investigation where he had financial relationship with debtor); *In re Recoton Corp.*, 307 B.R. at 755 (permitting Rule 2004 examination of the former directors and officers of debtor). As long as the examination is not designed to "abuse or harass" a third party, the court will generally allow it. *Id.*

34. Finally, section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code authorizes the Court to "issue any order, process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title." 11 U.S.C. § 105(a).

B. Good Cause Exists for the Rule 2004 Examination

35. Here, good cause exists for the discovery requested by Holdings. As described in the Sanctions Motions, the Violating Parties have orchestrated an expansive campaign to retain, in defiance of the Plan and Confirmation Order, improper control of the Eletson business, including Holdings, Corp. and Eletson Gas.

36. Given the repeated attempts to sow confusion by the Violating Parties, Holdings has reason to believe that Proskauer was engaged by those same parties here. If so, such conduct would constitute another instance of the Violating Parties' direct interference with implementation of the Plan and the Confirmation Order. Mr. Hadjieleftheriadis' communications to the Second Circuit indicate that, at the very least, he was involved with directing Proskauer to file the Notices. However, Holdings must ascertain which other of the Violating Parties may have been involved. As such, Rule 2004 discovery is necessary to confirm the identity of the responsible parties, halt any ongoing interference, and preserve Holdings' ability to seek appropriate relief.

37. Here, because Proskauer is the party that holds the relevant information, a Rule 2004 examination of the firm is warranted. Moreover, even though Rule 2004 generally authorizes broad discovery, the proposed discovery is narrowly focused on obtaining the

information necessary to permit Holdings to address continuing efforts to undermine the Plan and the Confirmation Order.

II. Service of Subpoenas by FedEx or Other Means of Service Allowable Under Bankruptcy Rule 9016 is Appropriate

38. Service of subpoenas pursuant to the Proposed Order by FedEx or by e-mail and any other means of service allowable under Bankruptcy Rule 9016 is appropriate because personal service on all persons subpoenaed pursuant to the Proposed Order would be unduly burdensome, expensive and would delay Holdings' effort to obtain information relating to the Examination Parties' efforts to undermine the Plan and the Confirmation Order.

39. Courts in the Second Circuit have authorized alternative service when such service was reasonably "calculated to provide timely actual notice." *Medical Diagnostic Imaging PLLC v. CareCore Nat. LLC*, Case Nos. 06 Civ. 7764(CS)(THK), 06 Civ. 13516(VM)(THK), 2008 WL 3833238, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 15, 2008); *see Cordius Trust v. Kummerfeld*, Case No. 99 Civ. 3200(DLC), 2000 WL 10268, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 3, 2000) (allowing alternative service by certified mail because "alternative service by means of certified mail reasonably insures actual receipt of the subpoena by the witness"); *In re Shur*, 184 B.R. 640, 644 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 1995) (holding that Rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (and by extension Bankruptcy Rule 9016) does not require personal service and that other service is permissible provided service was reasonably calculated to give actual notice); *In re 96 Wythe Acquisition LLC*, Case No. 21-22108 (SHL) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Aug. 8, 2022) (Order Authorizing Discovery Pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Dkt. No. 647); *In re Kossoff PLLC*, Case No. 21-10699 (DSJ) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. May 24, 2021) (Order Authorizing Trustee to Issue Subpoenas and Obtain Testimony and for Injunctive Relief, Dkt. No. 27). Here, delivery of the subpoenas by FedEx, by

e-mail, other overnight-delivery service, or other means agreed to by the subpoenaed parties, is reasonably calculated by Holdings to ensure actual receipt by the subpoenaed parties.

NOTICE

40. Holdings will serve the Court's Order approving this Motion by email (if available) or first-class mail to: (a) the United States Trustee; (b) the Examination Parties; and (c) all parties that have filed a notice of appearance in these cases (the "Notice Parties"). Moreover, Holdings will serve a copy of the Proposed Order with any subpoena that it serves pursuant to the Proposed Order. Holdings requests that the Court find such notice to be good and sufficient notice of the Motion and the Proposed Order.

NO PRIOR REQUESTS

41. No prior Motion for the relief requested herein has been made by Holdings to this or any other court.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank]

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Holdings respectfully requests that the Court grant the Motion, enter the Proposed Order in substantially the form attached hereto as Exhibit A, and grant such other further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

New York, New York
Dated: September 2, 2026

/s/ Jared C. Borriello

HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS KRAMER (US) LLP
Kyle J. Ortiz
Ariel N. Lavinbuk
Jared C. Borriello
Michael C. Blackmon
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Telephone: (212) 715-9132
Facsimile: (212) 715-8000
Email: kyle.ortiz@hsfkramer.com
ariel.lavinbuk@hsfkramer.com
jared.borriello@hsfkramer.com
michael.blackmon@hsfkramer.com

Counsel to Eletson Holdings Inc.

Exhibit A

Proposed Order

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:	:	Chapter 11
ELETSON HOLDINGS INC.,[1]	:	Case No. 23-10322 (JPM)
Debtor.	:	

ORDER AUTHORIZING DISCOVERY PURSUANT TO RULE 2004 OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

Upon the motion (the "Motion") of Eletson Holdings, Inc. ("Holdings"), for entry of an order (this "Order"), pursuant to section 105 of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rules 2004 and 9016, authorizing Holdings to issue subpoenas for the production of documents from Proskauer Rose LLP and its agents and representatives ("Proskauer" or, the "Examination Parties"); to obtain information concerning conduct related to implementation of the Plan and the Confirmation Order since the Effective Date; and the Court having jurisdiction to consider the Motion and relief requested therein pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334; and it appearing that no other notice is necessary except as provided herein; and the relief requested therein raising a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b); and venue being proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409; and the relief sought being in the best interests of Holdings' estate, its creditors, and other parties in interest; and it appearing that good and sufficient cause for the relief sought in the Motion exists, therefore,

[1] Prior to November 19, 2024, the Debtors in these cases were: Eletson Holdings Inc., Eletson Finance (US) LLC, and Agathonissos Finance LLC. On March 5, 2025, the Court entered a final decree and order closing the chapter 11 cases of Eletson Finance (US) LLC and Agathonissos Finance LLC. Commencing on March 5, 2025, all motions, notices, and other pleadings relating to any of the Debtors shall be filed in the chapter 11 case of Eletson Holdings Inc. The Debtor's mailing address is c/o Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer (US) LLP, 1177 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Motion is granted as set forth herein.

2. Holdings is authorized to issue subpoenas, for the production of documents, substantially in the forms attached hereto as Exhibit 1, and for deposition testimony upon the Examination Parties, as applicable.

3. The subpoenas authorized by this Order may be served by FedEx or any other method of service permitted under Bankruptcy Rule 9016 or by other means agreed to by the subpoenaed entities or persons.

4. Holdings shall serve a copy of this Order with any subpoena that is served pursuant to this Order.

5. Any subpoena issued pursuant to this Order shall provide at least fourteen days' notice to the recipient to provide the recipient an opportunity to object in writing to the subpoena or to file any written motion with the Court.

6. If any entity or person who receives a subpoena for the production of documents pursuant to this Order withholds any documents on the basis of an asserted privilege, that entity is directed to provide a privilege log in accordance with Bankruptcy Rule 7026 to Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer (US) LLP, 1177 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036, Attn: Kyle J. Ortiz, Esq. (kyle.ortiz@hsfkramer.com) and Jared C. Borriello, Esq. (jared.borriello@hsfkramer.com), so as to be received with the document production required by the subpoena, or at such time as may be mutually agreed to by Holdings and the subpoenaed entity or person.

7. Holdings shall serve a copy of the Motion and this Order by electronic mail, FedEx or any other method of service permitted under Bankruptcy Rule 9016 to the Notice Parties within two (2) business days of entry of this Order.

8. The entry of this Order is without prejudice to the rights of Holdings to apply for any other or further relief, including but not limited to, further relief under Bankruptcy Rule 2004.

9. The Court shall retain jurisdiction to hear and determine any and all matters arising from the interpretation and/or implementation of this Order.

Dated: New York, New York
_____, 2026

_____
HONORABLE JOHN P. MASTANDO III
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

Exhibit 1

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:	§	Chapter 11
ELETSON HOLDINGS INC.,[1]	§	Case No. 23-10322 (JPM)
Debtor.	§	

NOTICE OF RULE 2004 EXAMINATION TO [PARTY NAME]

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to Rules 2004 and 9016 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Debtor Eletson Holdings Inc., ("**Holdings**"), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby serves this [Notice of/Subpoena for] Rule 2004 Examination (the "Examination") on [PARTY NAME].

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that, [PARTY NAME] is directed to produce the original, or a copy of, all Documents and Communications responsive to the Requests for Production listed in **Exhibit A** hereto to **Jared C. Borriello, Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer (US) LLP, 1177 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036**, or at such other mutually agreeable location, and by email to the following email addresses jared.borriello@hsfkramer.com and michael.blackmon@hsfkramer.com. The production of documents should be completed no later than **[•], 2026 at 4:00 p.m. (prevailing Eastern time).**

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that, the Debtor will take the oral examination of the person or persons designated by [PARTY NAME] as most knowledgeable on

[1] Prior to November 19, 2024, the Debtors in these cases were: Eletson Holdings Inc., Eletson Finance (US) LLC, and Agathonissos Finance LLC. On March 5, 2025, the Court entered a final decree and order closing the chapter 11 cases of Eletson Finance (US) LLC and Agathonissos Finance LLC. Commencing on March 5, 2025, all motions, notices, and other pleadings relating to any of the Debtors shall be filed in the chapter 11 case of Eletson Holdings Inc. The Debtor's mailing address is c/o Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer (US) LLP, 1177 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036.

the Topics for Examination listed in **Exhibit A**. The person or persons so designated by [PARTY NAME] is commanded to appear on [•], beginning at [•] (EST), or at such other mutually agreeable date and time. The examination will take place at the offices of **Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer (US) LLP, 1177 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036**, or at such other mutually-agreeable location, and will continue from day to day until completed. The examination will be taken before a court reporter authorized by law to administer oaths and may be videotaped.

New York, New York
Dated: [DATE[•]], 2026

[Draft]

HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS KRAMER (US) LLP
Kyle J. Ortiz
Jared C. Borriello
Michael C. Blackmon
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Telephone: (212) 715-9132
Facsimile: (212) 715-8000
Email: kyle.ortiz@hsfkramer.com
jared.borriello@hsfkramer.com
michael.blackmon@hsfkramer.com

Counsel to reorganized Eletson Holdings Inc.

Exhibit A

DEFINITIONS

As used herein, the terms listed below shall be defined as follows. Insofar as a term is not explicitly defined, the meaning to be used is the commonly accepted definition of the term. The definitions and instructions set forth the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (the "Federal Rules") and the Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure ("Bankruptcy Rules") are incorporated in these Requests for Production ("Requests") and Examination Topics ("Topics") by reference and shall apply. None of the definitions set forth below are intended to narrow the scope of discovery permitted by the Federal Rules or the Bankruptcy Rules, and the definitions, Requests, and Topics should be read as broadly as permitted by those rules.

1. "All," "each," and "any" shall be construed to mean all, each, every, and any, so as to be expansive as possible.

2. "Affiliate" is defined to be synonymous in meaning and equal in scope to the usage of the term "affiliate" as such term is defined in section 101(2) of the Bankruptcy Code.

3. The connectives "and" and "or" shall be construed either disjunctively or conjunctively as necessary to bring within the scope of each document request all documents that might otherwise be construed to be outside of its scope.

4. "Bankruptcy Cases" means the bankruptcy cases captioned *In re Eletson Holdings, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 23-10322 (JPM) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2023).

5. "Communication" or "Communications" means the transmittal of information in any form or medium including any letters, e-mail, instant messages, text messages, messages, messages sent over mobile-device chat services, including Instant Bloomberg, Bloomberg messages, BlackBerry Messenger, Google Hangouts, Apple iMessage, Facebook Messenger,

WhatsApp, KakaoTalk, Line, Slack, WeChat, Snapchat, messages on other messaging platforms, messages on other messaging platforms, telephone conversations (including recorded or taped telephone conversations and including messages left on cellular phones), correspondence, notes, facsimiles, facsimile confirmation sheets, blog entries, postings on internet websites, internal call notes, sales pipeline updates, or other forms of written or verbal intercourse (electronic or otherwise) and any Documents exchanged with or attached to such Communications.

6. "Confirmation Order" means the November 4, 2024 order confirming the Plan entered in the Bankruptcy Cases at docket number 1223.

7. "Concerning" and "relating to" shall mean concerning, relating to, referring to, reflecting, describing, involving, evidencing, constituting, or touching upon in any way, in whole or in part.

8. "Corp." means Eletson Corporation.

9. "Document" or "Documents" is used in the broadest possible sense allowable under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 1001 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, and shall include the original, all non-identical copies, and drafts of any tangible or intangible item from which information can be derived or discerned, and specifically includes any written, recorded, or graphic material of any kind, whether prepared by You or by any other Person, and whether in print or in electronic form, that is in Your possession, custody, or control. The term includes, without limitation, agreements; contracts; letters; telegrams; memoranda; reports; records; instructions; specifications; notebooks; scrapbooks; diaries; plans; drawings; sketches; blueprints; diagrams; photographs; photocopies; charts; graphs; descriptions; drafts, whether or not they resulted in a final document; minutes of meetings, conferences, and telephone or other conversations or Communications; invoices; purchase orders;

bills of lading; recordings; published or unpublished speeches or articles; publications; transcripts of telephone conversations; phone mail; ledgers; financial statements; microfilm; microfiche; tape or disc recordings; and computer print-outs, letters, e-mails, text messages, instant messaging, and all forms of electronic data and other information stored on electronic media.

10. "Entity" is defined to be synonymous in meaning and equal in scope to the usage of this term as it is defined in section 101(15) of the Bankruptcy Code.

11. "Holdings" means Eletson Holdings Inc. and its officers, directors, employees, partners, agents, Subsidiaries (including Corp.), and Affiliates.

12. "Person" means any natural person, firm, corporation, entity, unincorporated association, partnership, or other form of legal entity or governmental body, including affiliates, agents, and representatives.

13. "Plan" means the chapter 11 plan of reorganization filed in the Bankruptcy Cases at docket number 1132, exhibit 1.

14. "Proskauer" means the law firm Proskauer Rose LLP, and its officers, directors, employees, partners, agents, Subsidiaries, and Affiliates.

15. "Vacatur Proceeding" means the case captioned as *Eletson Holdings et. al. v. Levona Holdings Ltd. et. al.*, Civil Action No. 23-CV-7731 (LJL) currently pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

16. "You" and "your" means the person or entity responding to these Requests.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. These Requests encompass all documents in Your possession, custody, or control, whether or not such documents were prepared by or for You. Where documents in Your possession, custody, or control are requested or inquired of, such Request or inquiry includes

Documents in the possession, custody, or control of each of Your current and former direct and indirect affiliates, subsidiaries, directors, employees, representatives, agents, advisors, attorneys, accountants, auditors and consultants, all other persons or entities acting or purporting to act on Your behalf or under Your control, any other persons or entities from whom You could obtain Documents, and each of their predecessors and successors.

2. If You contend that no Documents exist concerning all or part of a Request, You shall state this contention and respond as fully as possible to all parts of the Request for which Documents exist.

3. If You claim that any privilege or protection excuses production of any Document or part thereof, You must expressly make such claim in writing and describe the nature of each Document withheld on this ground, in sufficient detail for Holdings to determine whether there is an adequate basis for invoking privilege or protection.

4. In the event that any Document covered hereunder has been destroyed, discarded, or lost, You shall inform Holdings of this in writing and provide a general description of the categories of documents destroyed or lost and the circumstances of their destruction or loss.

5. If any Document cannot be produced in full, it shall be produced to the maximum extent possible and You shall specify in writing the reasons for Your inability to produce the remainder.

6. Each Document is to be produced with all non-identical copies and drafts thereof in their entirety without abbreviation or redaction (other than for a claim of privilege, consistent with these Instructions).

7. All Documents that are produced in electronic format shall be provided with: (i) Group W “tiff” images and IPRO-ready OPT files; (ii) a Concordance DAT delimited file with

boundaries; (iii) full text OCR, with OCR text files provided on a document level; and (iv) all metadata fields associated with each electronic Document. Holdings also request that all spreadsheets created in Microsoft Excel or a similar spreadsheet program be produced in their native format. Holdings reserves its rights to request that other Documents be produced in their native format if necessary. The following metadata fields shall also be produced with all Documents produced in electronic format:

Field Name	**Description**
BEGDOC	An automatically-generated number assigned to first page of the Document
ENDDOC	An automatically-generated number assigned to last page of the Document
BEGATTACH	An automatically-generated number assigned to the first page of the parent Document in a family
ENDATTACH	An automatically-generated number assigned to the last page of an attachment in a Document family
PARENT_ID	The beginning DOCID for a parent Document
ATTACH_IDS	The beginning DOCID for all attachments
ATTCOUNT	The number of attachments to an email
DOC_TYPE	The type of file from the header (*e.g.*, Microsoft Outlook, Excel, Word, etc.)
PARENT_CHILD	A vendor-populated field where "P" denotes a parent Document and "A" denotes an attachment
PAGECOUNT	The number of pages of each individual Document
FROM	The name of the sender of an email, from the "From" field
TO	The recipient(s) of an email, from the "To" field
CC	The name(s) of any Person(s) to whom a copy of an email was sent, from the "CC" field
BCC	The name(s) of any Person(s) that were blind copied on an email, from the "BCC" field
SUBJECT	The text in the "Subject" line or "Re" line of an email or application file
CUSTODIAN	The name(s) of the Person(s) from which a collection of
AUTHOR	The name of the author or the creator of an application file, from the "Author" field
DATE_SENT	The date on which an email was sent
DATE_RCVD	The date on which an email was received

Field Name	Description
DATE_LASTMOD	The date on which an email or application file was last Modified
DATE_CREATED	The date an email or application file was created
TIME_ CREATED	The time at which an email or application was created
TIME_SENT	The time at which an email was sent
TIME_RCVD	The time at which an email was received
TITLE	The text in the "Title" field of an application file
LAST_AUTHOR	The name in the "Last Author" field for an application file
LAST_SAVED	The date in the "Last Saved" field for an application file
LAST_PRINTED	The date in the "Last Printed" field for an application file
APPLICATION	The name of the application that generated the native file
FILEEXT	The filename extension of each email, attachment, or application file
FILENAME	The name of an application file, including its extension
FILESIZE	The size of a Document in bytes
SOURCEFOLDER	The full path information for email, attachments, and application files beginning with the original source-folder Name
HASHVALUE	The output of an algorithm-generated value for each individual file
SEARCH_HIT	The search term or terms that "hit" on a Document
NATIVE_FILE	A hyperlink to the native file

8. The use of the singular form of any word includes the plural and vice versa.

9. Unless stated otherwise, these Requests call for documents generated, transmitted or received on or after November 18, 2025, to the present (the "**Relevant Period**"). Holdings reserves the right to expand the Relevant Period.

10. These Requests shall be deemed to be continuing so as to require You to supplement Your responses if You or Your attorneys or agents become aware of, receive, or generate additional documents responsive to these Requests after the time of the initial response.

DOCUMENTS REQUESTED

1. Documents sufficient to identify all Persons and Entities that retained, directed, instructed, authorized, or purported to authorize Proskauer to act on behalf of Holdings or Corp. in the Vacatur Proceeding or any other matter, including all engagement letters, other similar agreements, and legal invoices.

2. Documents sufficient to identify all Persons or Entities that paid, agreed to pay, advanced, reimbursed, guaranteed, or otherwise funded any fees, expenses, or costs incurred by Proskauer in the Vacatur Proceeding or in any other actual or purported representation of Holdings or Corp.

3. Documents sufficient to identify the source of the payment, funding, or reimbursement of any fees, expenses, or costs incurred by Proskauer in connection with any actual or purported representation of Holdings or Corp. in the Vacatur Proceeding or any other matter.

4. All Communications with Reed Smith LLP concerning Proskauer's purported representation of Holdings or Eletson Corp. in the Vacatur Proceeding.

EXAMINATION TOPICS

1. The purported retention of Proskauer by Holdings and Corp. in connection with the Vacatur Proceeding, or any other matter, litigation, appeal, or proceeding.

2. The identity of all Persons or Entities who directed, authorized, requested, participated in, or were involved in the decision for Proskauer to purport to act on behalf of Holdings and Corp., including the preparation and filing of any notices of appearance, notices of appeal, motions, or other court filings.

3. The source of funding for the engagement of Proskauer, including all Persons or Entities that paid, agreed to pay, advanced, reimbursed, guaranteed, or otherwise funded Proskauer fees, costs, or expenses.

4. Proskauer's purported representation of Holdings and Corp., including any diligence, investigation, communications, corporate records, governance materials, engagement agreements, or other information reviewed or relied upon before making any filing on behalf of Holdings or Corp.

Exhibit B

9/5/25 Letter from Goulston to Proskauer

goulston&storrs
counsellors at law

Jennifer B. Furey
jfurey@goulstonstorrs.com
(617) 574-3575 (tel)
(617) 574-4112 (fax)

September 5, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Kevin J. Perra
Mark D. Harris
Shiloh A. Rainwater
Elliot R. Stevens
Hilda Kajbaf
PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
Eleven Times Square
New York, NY 10036
Tel: (212) 969-3000
kperra@proskauer.com
mharris@proskauer.com
srainwater@proskauer.com
estevens@proskauer.com
hkajbaf@proskauer.com

Re: *Eletson Holdings Inc. and Eletson Corporation v. Levona Holdings Ltd. v. Apargo Limited, Fentalon Limited and Desimusco Trading Limited*, Case No. 25-1313

Counsel,

We represent Eletson Holdings Inc. and Eletson Corporation (together, "Eletson") in connection with above-referenced matter (the "1313 Appeal"). We understand that your firm, Proskauer Rose LLP ("Proskauer"), is now purporting to represent Eletson in connection with the 1313 Appeal. However, Eletson has not retained Proskauer in connection with the 1313 Appeal (or otherwise) and has not authorized Proskauer to act for or on behalf of Eletson in any capacity.

Accordingly, we hereby demand that Proskauer ***immediately*** cease and desist from taking any action ostensibly on behalf of Eletson or holding itself out as counsel to Eletson in any capacity in connection with any actual or threatened matter, including the 1313 Appeal.

Additionally, on behalf of Eletson, we object to the use of any bank accounts or other property belonging to Eletson (including that of its direct or indirect subsidiaries) for any purpose, including but not limited to the payment of any legal fees or expenses incurred by Proskauer in connection with this engagement. For the avoidance of doubt, Eletson has not authorized, and does not now authorize, the use of its bank accounts or other property for *any* payments to or for the benefit of Proskauer.

Finally, on behalf of Eletson, we object to the review or disclosure of *any* confidential or privileged information belonging to Eletson (including that of its direct or indirect subsidiaries), whenever dated, to Proskauer. These materials are Eletson's property and Reed Smith's current clients (*i.e.*, Eletson's former management) are not authorized to maintain, review or disclose these materials.

Eletson reserves all rights and waives none.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jennifer B. Furey

Jennifer B. Furey

cc: Louis M. Solomon (lsolomon@reedsmith.com)

Exhibit C

Notices

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ELETSON HOLDINGS, INC., and ELETSON CORP., Petitioners / Cross-Respondents, v. LEVONA HOLDINGS LTD., Respondent / Cross-Petitioner, and APARGO LIMITED, FENTALON LIMITED and DESIMUSCO TRADING LIMITED, Intervenors.	Civil Action No. 23-CV-7331 (LJL)

NOTICE OF APPEARANCE

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Mark D. Harris of Proskauer Rose LLP, with offices located at Eleven Times Square, New York, New York 10036, hereby appears on behalf of Petitioners/Cross-Respondents Eletson Holdings, Inc. and Eletson Corporation.

I hereby certify that I am admitted to practice before this Court.

Dated: July 29, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark D. Harris

Mark D. Harris
PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
Eleven Times Square
New York, New York 10036
(212) 969-3000
mharris@proskauer.com

Counsel for Petitioners and Cross-Respondents Eletson Holdings, Inc. and Eletson Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ELETSON HOLDINGS, INC., and ELETSON CORP., Petitioners / Cross-Respondents, v. LEVONA HOLDINGS LTD., Respondent / Cross-Petitioner, and APARGO LIMITED, FENTALON LIMITED and DESIMUSCO TRADING LIMITED, Intervenors.	Civil Action No. 23-CV-7331 (LJL)

NOTICE OF APPEAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Eletson Holdings, Inc. and Eletson Corporation, through undersigned counsel from Proskauer Rose LLP, hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from each and every part of the June 29, 2026 (Dkt. No. 748) order entering judgment in favor of Levona Holdings, Ltd. ("Levona") on Levona's motion to vacate and vacating the arbitral award (the "Order"), as well as from each and every holding, ruling, finding, and order set out or incorporated in the Order or subsumed therein.

Dated: July 29, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark D. Harris

Mark D. Harris
PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
Eleven Times Square
New York, New York 10036
(212) 969-3000
mharris@proskauer.com

Counsel for Petitioners and Cross-Respondents Eletson Holdings, Inc. and Eletson Corporation

Exhibit D

Goulston-Proskauer Email Correspondence

Archived: Friday, August 7, 2026 3:57:34 PM
From: Harris, Mark D.
Mail received time: Fri, 31 Jul 2026 21:50:21
Sent: Fri, 31 Jul 2026 21:50:00
To: Koslof, Nathaniel
Cc: Furey, Jennifer Gordon, Amy B.
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Activity in Case 1:23-cv-07331-LJL Eletson Holdings Inc. et al v. Levona Holdings Ltd. Notice of Appeal
Importance: Normal
Sensitivity: None

Nate:

Your demand that Proskauer withdraw its Notice of Appearance and Notice of Appeal (the "Appeal filings") submitted on behalf of Eletson Holdings, Inc. and Eletson Corp. is gravely mistaken.

As you are well aware, Proskauer already represents Eletson Holdings, Inc. and Eletson Corp. before the Second Circuit in Appeal No. 25-1313. While you misleadingly describe that case as "some matter" that "remains" before the Circuit, it is actually the appeal of the dismissal of the confirmation action, a key ruling in the case. The Second Circuit lists Proskauer as counsel to those parties on its docket report. The Circuit accepted the Opening Brief and the Reply Brief that Proskauer filed. And Proskauer was scheduled to participate in oral argument on their behalf. The notion that there is anything improper about Proskauer filing papers simply to preserve those entities' appellate rights is baseless.

As you are also well aware, the Circuit rejected your arguments the last time you made them. Reed Smith and Rimon filed Appeal No. 25-176 on behalf of the Eletson entities, appealing the order denying review of the bankruptcy confirmation. You moved to strike the notice of appeal and dismiss the appeal, or to remand to the district court for dismissal, because they were supposedly unauthorized. Dkt. 25-176, Dkt. Entry (D.E.) 27.1. The Circuit denied your motion, explaining that it would not decide in advance of the merits appeal questions concerning who controls Eletson—including whether it is your client or not—and what effect that control has on the appeal. *Id.* D.E. 50.1 at 2.

The gravamen of that ruling is that every party is entitled to pursue its own appeal and to engage counsel for that purpose. Nothing has changed since that ruling—certainly not by virtue of a few words the Circuit wrote in passing in a later order.

Accordingly, we decline to answer the questions you pose about our representation, nor will we withdraw the Appeal filings. We reserve all rights.

Mark

Mark D. Harris
Chair, White Collar Defense & Investigations Group
Co-Chair, Appellate Practice Group

Proskauer
Eleven Times Square
New York, NY 10036-8299
d 212.969.3530
f 212.969.2900
mharris@proskauer.com

From: Koslof, Nathaniel <nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com>
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2026 7:09 AM

To: Harris, Mark D. <MHarris@proskauer.com>
Cc: Furey, Jennifer <JFurey@GOULSTONSTORRS.com>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Activity in Case 1:23-cv-07331-LJL Eletson Holdings Inc. et al v. Levona Holdings Ltd. Notice of Appeal

This email sent by nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com originated from outside the Firm.

Mark,

We write in connection with the Notice of Appearance and related filings (the "Unauthorized Filings") you filed yesterday purporting to appear on behalf of Eletson Holdings Inc. and Eletson Corporation (together, "Eletson"). As you well know, Goulston & Storrs LLP represents Eletson, including in connection with Case No. 23-cv-7331 (LJL) (the "Vacatur Proceeding"). Proskauer Rose LLP does not.

You also know your Unauthorized Filings are inconsistent with Judge Liman's prior orders (as well as multiple orders of Judge Mastando) concerning substantially identical attempts by Reed Smith LLP and Rimôn P.C. to appear on behalf of Eletson. Judge Liman previously struck their unauthorized notices of appearance and notice of appeal, and alternatively issued an indicative ruling that the notice of appeal should be stricken and the appeal dismissed.

Although some form of the matter remains before the Second Circuit, its most recent statement (from October 2025) is consistent with the fact that Eletson under new management terminated its prior counsel (Reed Smith) and retained Goulston to represent it in connection with the Vacatur Proceeding. Eletson has not retained Proskauer. In particular, in denying Reed Smith's request for injunctive relief, the Second Circuit referred to our clients as the "**current owners of Eletson Holdings, Inc. (under the terms of the bankruptcy reorganization plan).**" Case No. 25-176, Dkt. Entry 93.

Accordingly, please immediately advise:

1. 1. Who purported to retain Proskauer Rose LLP on behalf of Eletson?
2. 2. Who specifically authorized Proskauer to file the Unauthorized Filings?
3. 3. Who is paying Proskauer's fees and expenses in this matter?
4. 4. What inquiry, if any, did Proskauer undertake before filing papers purporting to represent Eletson in this Court?

Eletson demands that Proskauer ***immediately*** withdraw the Unauthorized Filings. If Proskauer fails to do so, we will promptly seek appropriate relief, including orders striking the Unauthorized Filings and imposing sanctions under Rule 11, 28 U.S.C. § 1927, the Court's inherent authority, and any other applicable authority.

Please confirm, no later than **6:00 P.M. today**, that Proskauer will withdraw the Unauthorized Filings. Eletson reserves all rights.

Regards,
Nate

Nathaniel Koslof
nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com
(617) 574-0533
Bio

Goulston & Storrs
One Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109

****

This communication may contain information which is privileged and/or confidential under applicable law. Any dissemination, copy or disclosure, other than by the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us via return e-mail to nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com and delete this communication without making any copies. Thank you for your cooperation.

From: NYSD_ECF_Pool@nysd.uscourts.gov
Date: July 29, 2026 at 9:57:56 'a0PM EDT
To: CourtMail@nysd.uscourts.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Activity in Case 1:23-cv-07331-LJL Eletson Holdings Inc. et al v. Levona Holdings Ltd. Notice of Appeal

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.
*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS*** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.**

U.S. District Court

Southern District of New York

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered by Harris, Mark on 7/29/2026 at 9:56 PM EDT and filed on 7/29/2026

Case Name:	Eletson Holdings Inc. et al v. Levona Holdings Ltd.
Case Number:	1:23-cv-07331-LJL
Filer:	Eletson Corporation Eletson Holdings Inc.
Document Number:	758

Docket Text:
NOTICE OF APPEAL from [748] Order,,. Document filed by Eletson Corporation, Eletson Holdings Inc.. Filing fee $ 605.00, receipt number ANYSDC-33212919. Form C and Form D are due within 14 days to the Court of Appeals, Second Circuit..(Harris, Mark)

1:23-cv-07331-LJL Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Adam Kirschbaum kirschbauma@gtlaw.com, gtcourtalert@gtlaw.com

Alexander Jerome Van Dyke alexvandyke@quinnemanuel.com

Anna Goodell Adams aadams@maglaw.com

Barry H Berke BBerke@gibsondunn.com, barry-h-berke-7557@ecf.pacerpro.com, pacer-ny@gibsondunn.com

Benjamin Stephan Litman blitman@ef-law.com, amukaida@ef-law.com, djoseph@ef-law.com, helman@ef-law.com

Colin A. Underwood cunderwood@reedsmith.com, colin-underwood-7395@ecf.pacerpro.com, docketing-ecfnyc-4747@ecf.pacerpro.com

Daniel M. Kelly danielkelly@quinnemanuel.com

Elkan Abramowitz eabramowitz@maglaw.com, cseel@maglaw.com

Harold S. Shaftel shaftelh@gtlaw.com, christy.schaeffer@gtlaw.com, gtcourtalert@gtlaw.com, kirschbauma@gtlaw.com

Howard Ian Elman helman@ef-law.com, amukaida@ef-law.com, djoseph@ef-law.com, ecf-2d0a67acb6d4@ecf.pacerpro.com

Isaac Nesser isaacnesser@quinnemanuel.com, ecf-a6a395936a55@ecf.pacerpro.com, newyorkcalendar@quinnemanuel.com

Jennifer B. Furey jfurey@goulstonstorrs.com

Jingfei Lu jingfeilu@quinnemanuel.com

John Nowlin McClain , III jmcclain@teamtogut.com, jgallego@teamtogut.com

Kyle James Ortiz kyle.ortiz@hsfkramer.com, corporate-reorg-1449@ecf.pacerpro.com, docketing@kramerlevin.com

Louis M. Solomon lsolomon@reedsmith.com, jcastillo@reedsmith.com, louis-solomon-6458@ecf.pacerpro.com, nancy-savitt-0072@ecf.pacerpro.com

Mark David Harris mharris@proskauer.com, LSOSDNY@proskauer.com, mark-harris-2837@ecf.pacerpro.com

Mark S. McNeill mark.mcneill@outlook.com

Marshall Ross King mking@gibsondunn.com, aarias@gibsondunn.com, MAO@gibsondunn.com, marshall-r-king-9149@ecf.pacerpro.com, NHart@gibsondunn.com, RFlores@gibsondunn.com, RVaughan@gibsondunn.com

Matthew Roznovak matthewroznovak@quinnemanuel.com

Michael Klurfeld mklurfeld@gibsondunn.com, michael-klurfeld-2898@ecf.pacerpro.com

Mioko Catherine Tajika MTajika@ef-law.com

Nancy Hart nhart@gibsondunn.com, aarias@gibsondunn.com, MAO@gibsondunn.com, nancy-hart-8032@ecf.pacerpro.com

Nathaniel R.B. Koslof nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com

Nicholas Cutaia ncutaia@goulstonstorrs.com, nydockets@goulstonstorrs.com

Odysseas Repousis odysseas.repousis@sterlingtonlaw.com, newyorkcalendar@quinnemanuel.com

Rae Berger rberger@goulstonstorrs.com

Richard Franklin Albert ralbert@maglaw.com

William Balden Adams williamadams@quinnemanuel.com

1:23-cv-07331-LJL Notice has been delivered by other means to:

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description: Main Document
Original filename:n/a
Electronic document Stamp:
[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1008691343 [Date=7/29/2026] [FileNumber=35168652-0] [7df56ca869afbce8e1973fffe23acdaa94adfd7ae5dc11360e059c88e262daa1f1ae40db823a872eda9d8da1c4bfd9283b6948c2461b1167e5fe56691b800191]]

****
This message and its attachments are sent from a law firm and may contain information that is confidential and protected by privilege from disclosure.
If you are not the intended recipient, you are prohibited from printing, copying, forwarding or saving them.
Please delete the message and attachments without printing, copying, forwarding or saving them, and notify the sender immediately.
****

Exhibit E

Goulston-Proskauer 2nd Email Correspondence

Archived: Tuesday, September 1, 2026 2:27:25 PM
From: Harris, Mark D.
Mail received time: Wed, 26 Aug 2026 19:28:36
Sent: Wed, 26 Aug 2026 19:28:01
To: Furey, Jennifer
Cc: Koslof, Nathaniel Perra, Kevin J. Gordon, Amy B.
Subject: RE: Eletson appeal, No. 26-2092
Importance: Normal
Sensitivity: None

Jen:

Your accusation that our positions in Appeal Nos. 26-2092 and 25-1313 are inconsistent is baseless. We did not state our grounds for withdrawing from 26-2092, nor did the Circuit request them. You have no basis to speculate whether those grounds would or would not apply to our representation in 25-1313.

There was no need to seek bankruptcy-court approval of our retention in 25-1313 under 11 U.S.C. § 327. That provision allows the trustee to retain attorneys "to represent or assist the trustee in carrying out the trustee's duties under this title." Our role as appellate counsel in 25-1313, which challenges the stipulation to dismiss the arbitral-confirmation action, does not count as "assisting the trustee in carrying his duties" under Title 11. Moreover, even on your theory, § 327 does not apply after the plan goes effective, which you claim already happened.

My reference to Appeal No. 25-176 below was imprecise. Proskauer did not file the notice of appeal; Reed Smith and Rimon did. But the point is exactly the same. You moved to strike their notice of appeal and to dismiss the appeal on the ground that those firms were not authorized to act for the Eletson entities. The Second Circuit denied your motion, explaining that it would not decide in advance of its merits decision "who controls Eletson Holdings, Inc., and what effect that control has on the appeal[.]" *Id.*, D.E. 50.1 at 2.

The logic of that Order applies just as much to Proskauer in No. 25-1313. You appeared to understand this point when you filed your opposition brief on the merits in that case. In accordance with the Order, you argued that the Circuit should ultimately rule in your favor because Reed Smith and Proskauer were not authorized to represent Eletson; we, in reply, rebutted your argument. Now, more than eight months after briefing was completed, you are trying to resurrect your contention that Proskauer is not permitted even to bring the appeal. To repeat, the Circuit rejected your position, and nothing has changed to justify your raising it again.

Mark

Mark D. Harris
Chair, White Collar Defense & Investigations Group
Co-Chair, Appellate Practice Group

Proskauer
Eleven Times Square
New York, NY 10036-8299
d 212.969.3530
f 212.969.2900
mharris@proskauer.com

From: Furey, Jennifer <JFurey@GOULSTONSTORRS.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2026 6:44 PM
To: Harris, Mark D. <MHarris@proskauer.com>

Cc: Perra, Kevin J. <KPerra@proskauer.com>; Gordon, Amy B. <AGordon@proskauer.com>; Koslof, Nathaniel <nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com>
Subject: RE: Eletson appeal, No. 26-2092

This email sent by jfurey@goulstonstorrs.com originated from outside the Firm.

Mark,

The Circuit never "denied a motion [Eletson] brought to strike [your] notice of appeal on behalf of Eletson in another appeal (25-176)." Nor could it have, as (i) Proskauer did not file a notice of appeal in 25-176, (ii) Eletson therefore did not move to strike Proskauer's notice of appeal, and (iii) the Second Circuit did not rule on any such motion.

I do not know the basis for your assertion that "[t]he Circuit has no concerns about our representation in 25-1313." Proskauer's authority to represent Eletson Holdings or Eletson Corp. has never been presented to, much less decided by, the Second Circuit. A Clerk docketing Proskauer's appearances and accepting briefs does not constitute an adjudication of Proskauer's authority to represent those entities.

Proskauer's position is also inconsistent on its face. Proskauer just represented to the Second Circuit that "there are sufficient grounds under the applicable Rules of Professional Conduct for Proskauer to withdraw from this representation." The same ethical issues concerning Proskauer's purported authority to represent Eletson Holdings and Eletson Corp. in No. 26-2092 apply to its purported representation of those entities in No. 25-1313. Moreover, as explained to your General Counsel, Proskauer claims to represent an alleged "unreorganized" Eletson entity but has not sought or obtained Bankruptcy Court approval of its retention under 11 U.S.C. § 327.

To be clear, Proskauer's continued assertion that it represents Eletson is causing documented concrete and ongoing harm. In light of these circumstances, Eletson reiterates its demand that Proskauer immediately withdraw from purporting to represent Eletson and respond to our previously raised questions.

As always, I am available to discuss.

Best,
Jen

From: Harris, Mark D. <MHarris@proskauer.com>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2026 4:07 PM
To: Furey, Jennifer <JFurey@GOULSTONSTORRS.com>
Cc: Perra, Kevin J. <KPerra@proskauer.com>; Gordon, Amy B. <AGordon@proskauer.com>; Koslof, Nathaniel <nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com>
Subject: RE: Eletson appeal, No. 26-2092

Jen:

I am puzzled that you are raising 25-1313 again. If you scroll down this same email chain, it was just last week that I referred you to my earlier email from July 31, which noted that Proskauer was representing Eletson Holdings, Inc. and Eletson Corp. in 25-1313. I pointed out that the Second Circuit had docketed our appeal on behalf of those entities; that it accepted our Opening Brief and our Reply Brief; and that Proskauer had been scheduled to participate in oral argument on their behalf, until it was postponed to a later date. I also pointed out that the Circuit denied a motion you brought to strike our notice of appeal on behalf of Eletson in another appeal (25-176). The Circuit has no concerns about our representation in 25-1313. Accordingly, we have no plans to withdraw.

Regards,
Mark

Mark D. Harris
Chair, White Collar Defense & Investigations Group
Co-Chair, Appellate Practice Group

Proskauer
Eleven Times Square
New York, NY 10036-8299
d 212.969.3530
f 212.969.2900
mharris@proskauer.com

From: Furey, Jennifer <JFurey@GOULSTONSTORRS.com>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2026 11:29 AM
To: Harris, Mark D. <MHarris@proskauer.com>
Cc: Perra, Kevin J. <KPerra@proskauer.com>; Gordon, Amy B. <AGordon@proskauer.com>; Koslof, Nathaniel <nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com>
Subject: RE: Eletson appeal, No. 26-2092

This email sent by jfurey@goulstonstorrs.com originated from outside the Firm.

Mark,

I am following up on my email below. Can you please let me know whether Proskauer is withdrawing from the 25-1313 appeal?

Best,
Jen

From: Furey, Jennifer
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 8:38 AM
To: 'Harris, Mark D.' <MHarris@proskauer.com>
Cc: Perra, Kevin J. <KPerra@proskauer.com>; Gordon, Amy B. <AGordon@proskauer.com>; Koslof, Nathaniel <nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com>
Subject: RE: Eletson appeal, No. 26-2092

Mark,

Thank you for filing a motion to withdraw your appearance from the 26-2092 appeal. For all of the same reasons we previously discussed, we request the Proskauer effectuate a withdrawal from the 25-1313 appeal.

Best,
Jen

From: Harris, Mark D. <MHarris@proskauer.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 3:48 PM
To: Furey, Jennifer <JFurey@GOULSTONSTORRS.com>
Cc: Perra, Kevin J. <KPerra@proskauer.com>; Gordon, Amy B. <AGordon@proskauer.com>
Subject: RE: Eletson appeal, No. 26-2092

More likely tomorrow.

Mark D. Harris
Chair, White Collar Defense & Investigations Group
Co-Chair, Appellate Practice Group

Proskauer
Eleven Times Square
New York, NY 10036-8299
d 212.969.3530
f 212.969.2900
mharris@proskauer.com

From: Furey, Jennifer <JFurey@GOULSTONSTORRS.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 3:33 PM
To: Harris, Mark D. <MHarris@proskauer.com>
Cc: Perra, Kevin J. <KPerra@proskauer.com>
Subject: RE: Eletson appeal, No. 26-2092

This email sent by jfurey@goulstonstorrs.com originated from outside the Firm.

Mark,

Are you filing your motion to withdraw today?

Best,
Jen

From: Harris, Mark D. <MHarris@proskauer.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2026 11:53 PM
To: Furey, Jennifer <JFurey@GOULSTONSTORRS.com>
Cc: Perra, Kevin J. <KPerra@proskauer.com>
Subject: RE: Eletson appeal, No. 26-2092

Jennifer:

As I stated in my email on July 31, 2026 to Nate Koslof and you, Proskauer already represents Eletson Holdings, Inc. and Eletson Corp. in Appeal No. 25-1313, and we refer you back to that email for our substantive response to the issues you continue to raise. We filed the notice of appeal in No. 26-2092 on behalf of the same clients to preserve their appellate rights, and to ensure that all issues decided by the district court can be properly considered by the Second Circuit. That said, it is Proskauer's intention to move promptly to withdraw as counsel in that latter appeal. To the extent you continue to have issues with the propriety of the appeal, you should take them up with new counsel if and when they appear in our place. Although we do not believe it is necessary for our motion, please let us know whether you have any objection to our motion to withdraw.

Mark

Mark D. Harris
Chair, White Collar Defense & Investigations Group
Co-Chair, Appellate Practice Group

Proskauer
Eleven Times Square
New York, NY 10036-8299
d 212.969.3530
f 212.969.2900

mharris@proskauer.com

From: Furey, Jennifer <JFurey@GOULSTONSTORRS.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 1:56 PM
To: Harris, Mark D. <MHarris@proskauer.com>
Cc: Perra, Kevin J. <KPerra@proskauer.com>
Subject: Re: Eletson appeal, No. 26-2092

This email sent by jfurey@goulstonstorrs.com originated from outside the Firm.

Mark,

Thank you for your email. As an initial matter, we do not agree that this exchange is subject to Rule 408 and I also do not agree that during my call with Peter an "idea was floated of a stipulation between the parties providing that [Proskauer] would withdraw the NOA and [Eletson] would agree not to contest the Intervenors' standing." I don't know what you mean by "standing" (in your email or in the stipulation) but even before we get to that we can't agree to anything with Proskauer without first knowing on whose behalf you are speaking. And neither would the Court, as even your proposed stipulation doesn't say (while acknowledging that my firm currently represents Eletson Holdings Inc. and Eletson Corp.). And so I'll ask again: Who purported to retain and give you direction on behalf of Eletson? The Intervenors? Reed Smith? Someone else? On what basis did Proskauer conclude that person is authorized to speak on behalf of Eletson? And who are you expecting to pay Proskauer's fees and expenses in connection with this appeal—Eletson or someone else?

I received your voicemail and am happy to schedule a call for this afternoon or tomorrow to further discuss.

Best,
Jen

Jennifer Furey
(617) 574-3575

goulston&storrs

From: Harris, Mark D. <MHarris@proskauer.com>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2026 11:28 AM
To: Furey, Jennifer <JFurey@GOULSTONSTORRS.com>
Cc: Perra, Kevin J. <KPerra@proskauer.com>
Subject: Eletson appeal, No. 26-2092

Confidential communication
FRE 408 treatment

Jennifer: I understand from Kevin that you spoke last week concerning our notice of appeal on behalf of Eletson, and the idea was floated of a stipulation between the parties providing that we would withdraw the NOA and you would agree not to contest the Intervenors' standing. I have attached a draft of the stipulation for your review. To keep things moving, we're free to discuss today, if that works for you.

Mark

Mark D. Harris
Chair, White Collar Defense & Investigations Group
Co-Chair, Appellate Practice Group

Proskauer
Eleven Times Square
New York, NY 10036-8299
d 212.969.3530
f 212.969.2900
mharris@proskauer.com

****
****
This message and its attachments are sent from a law firm and may contain information that is confidential and protected by privilege from disclosure.
If you are not the intended recipient, you are prohibited from printing, copying, forwarding or saving them.
Please delete the message and attachments without printing, copying, forwarding or saving them, and notify the sender immediately.
****
****

Exhibit F

Emails to Second Circuit

Archived: Wednesday, September 2, 2026 12:12:07 PM
From: Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe
Mail received time: Fri, 28 Aug 2026 15:58:07
Sent: Fri, 28 Aug 2026 15:57:54
To: Furey, Jennifer Koslof, Nathaniel isaacnesser@quinnemanuel.com williamadams@quinnemanuel.com danielkelly@quinnemanuel.com management@eletsoncorp.com
Subject: Eletson Holdings, Inc v. Levona Holdings Ltd., US Court of Appeals Docket No. 26-2092
Importance: Normal
Sensitivity: None

Dear Sir and Madam:

This is to advise that the emails below, sent to the Court's e-boxes on August 21, 2026, are irregular submissions to the Court and will not be deemed filings or otherwise acted upon.

Any further submissions must be made by actual or proposed parties to the appeal who have filed a notice of appearance and must be in the form of a motion or other type of submission recognized in the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure or the Second Circuit's Local Rules. All filings must comply with FRAP and the LRs and be filed on the docket electronically in the ordinary course.

No further response will be made to any other email.

Very truly yours,
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe
Clerk of Court
United States Court of Appeals
for the Second Circuit
40 Foley Square
New York, NY 10007
646.584.2696

From: Furey, Jennifer
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2026 3:02 PM
To: 'management@eletsoncorp.com' <management@eletsoncorp.com>; civilcases@ca2.uscourts.gov; efilerheldesk@ca2.uscourts.gov
Cc: Koslof, Nathaniel <nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com>; isaacnesser@quinnemanuel.com; williamadams@quinnemanuel.com; danielkelly@quinnemanuel.com
Subject: RE:

Dear Ms. Wolfe:

Eletson Holdings Inc. and Eletson Corporation (together, "Eletson") respectfully respond to the August 21, 2026 email from

Vasilis Hadjieleftheriadis, who erroneously purports to be a corporate representative of a fictitious entity he entitles "Unreorganised Eletson Holdings." *See, e.g.*, Bankr. Dkt. Nos. 1223, 1402; Case No. 23-cv-7331 (LJL), Dkt. 268; Case No. 25-cv-1312 (LJL), Dkt. 17, at 22–23 (the confirmed Plan "did not create a new entity" but instead changed the ownership and control of Eletson; "there are not two separate Eletson Holdings"). Eletson respectfully requests that the Court disregard the email and enter the dismissal.

Mr. Hadjieleftheriadis is not a party to this appeal, is not a "corporate representative" of a party, and has no authority to act for a party. Mr. Hadjieleftheriadis has also been held in contempt and subjected to sanctions for refusing to recognize the Chapter 11 reorganization of Eletson, *see* Bankr. Dkt. Nos. 1537, 1836, 1862, and is subject to an arrest warrant for his ongoing contempt of Bankruptcy Court orders, *see* Bankr. Dkt. Nos. 1971, 1973. Even the Eletson-branded email address used for his submission demonstrates further obstruction of the Plan, misappropriation of Eletson's corporate identity and trademark infringement.

Finally, Mr. Hadjieleftheriadis is not counsel and cannot make submissions on behalf of a corporation in this Court. *See Eagle Assocs. v. Bank of Montreal*, 926 F.2d 1305, 1308–09 (2d Cir. 1991) (reaffirming the longstanding rule that a corporation may appear in federal court only through licensed counsel and rejecting attempted representation by a non-lawyer purportedly associated with the entity). His unauthorized email therefore should be disregarded and provides no basis to delay entry of the Stipulation of Dismissal.

Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer B. Furey
Counsel for Eletson Holdings Inc. and Eletson Corporation

From: management@eletsoncorp.com <management@eletsoncorp.com>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2026 11:44 AM
To: civilcases@ca2.uscourts.gov; efilerheldesk@ca2.uscourts.gov
Cc: Furey, Jennifer <JFurey@GOULSTONSTORRS.com>; Koslof, Nathaniel <nkoslof@goulstonstorrs.com>; isaacnesser@quinnemanuel.com; williamadams@quinnemanuel.com; danielkelly@quinnemanuel.com; management@eletsoncorp.com
Subject:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

Clerk of the Court

United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse

40 Foley Square

New York, NY 10007

Re: Case No. 26-2092

Dear Clerk of the Court,

I act as a corporate representative of Unreorganised Eletson Holding Inc., and, as such, write in response to the proposed Stipulation dated 20 August 2026, Dkt. No.22.1., Unreorganised Eletson Holding Inc. objects to the Stipulation, in which other parties purport to dismiss its appeal.

Counsel who filed our Notice of Appeal and Forms C and D, the Proskauer law Firm, has moved to withdraw. We are in the process of retaining new counsel who we anticipate will make a filing opposing the Stipulation.

We, accordingly, respectfully request that any action regarding the Stipulation be deferred.

Respectfully,

Vasilis Hadjieleftheriadis