

**BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**IN RE: FTX CRYPTOCURRENCY
EXCHANGE COLLAPSE
LITIGATION**

MDL Docket # 3076

**REPLY BRIEF IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR TRANSFER OF ACTIONS
TO THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407
FOR COORDINATED OR CONSOLIDATED PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS**

Petitioners file this Reply in further support of their Motion to Transfer and Consolidate all Related Actions (the Insiders,¹ Brand Ambassadors and Influencers,² Professional Servicers³ and Financiers⁴) all stemming from the collapse of FTX, to the Southern District of Florida.

BACKGROUND

Since Petitioners initially moved for consolidation on February 10, 2023, several notable changes have occurred in circumstances surrounding the FTX collapse.

First, after many weeks of attempting service, 17 of the 18 FTX Defendants have now all been served in the *Garrison* (first-filed) matter and The Honorable K. Michael Moore today granted an extension until April 17, 2023, to serve Defendant Shaquille O’Neil (after Petitioners presented evidence he has been evading service) and ordered a Scheduling Conference be held at the earlier of 20 days after Mr. O’Neil’s service or May 8, 2023.

¹ Defendants Bankman-Fried, Trabucco, Ellison, Singh, Wang, and Friedberg.

² Defendants Brady, Bundchen, Curry, Golden State Warriors, O’Neal, Haslem, Ortiz, Lawrence, Ohtani, Osaka, David, O’Leary, Paffrath, Stephan, Jikh, Singh, Jung, Lefebvre, Nash, Armstrong, Kullberg, and Creators Agency, LLC.

³ Defendants Armanino, LLP, Prager Metis CPAs, LLC, Fenwick & West LLP.

⁴ Defendants Silvergate Bank, Silvergate Capital Corporation, Sequoia Capital Operations, LLC, Paradigm Operations LP, Signature Bank, Deltec Bank and Trust Company Limited, Farmington State Bank d/b/a Moonstone Bank, Temasek Holdings (Private) Limited, Softbank Vision Fund (AIV M2) L.P., Ribbit Capital, L.P., Altimeter Capital Management, LP, Multicoine Capital Management LLC, Tiger Global Management, LLC, Sino Global Capital Limited, Softbank Group Corp., Thoma Bravo, LP, Alan J. Lane.

In re: FTX Cryptocurrency Exchange Collapse Litigation

Second, the legal landscape has expanded. Additional cases from the same underlying nexus of facts have been filed (in the Southern District of Florida, against the FTX Influencers) and additional previously-filed cases have been tagged for potential inclusion in this MDL. All such currently pending cases are reflected, on the updated Schedule of Actions, attached hereto as **Exhibit A** (the “Related Actions”). The Defendants in those cases fall into four broad groups: Insiders, Brand Ambassadors, Professional Services, and Financiers⁵.

Third, two main Financier Defendants have ceased operations. On March 8, 2023, Silvergate Bank announced that it would wind down operations and liquidate. On March 12, 2023, the New York State Department of Financial Services closed Signature Bank, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was appointed receiver. *See* Dkt. 57 at 2-4.

Should the Panel grant this Petition and bring all related FTX cases together within this MDL, Petitioners submit the Transferee Court may implement separate tranches (if necessary) to avoid burdening the Related Actions with the Silvergate Bank and Signature Bank closure-related issues. *See, e.g., In re January 2021 Short Squeeze Trading Litig.*, S.D. Fla. Case No. 1:21-md-02989 (The Honorable Chief Judge Cecelia M. Altonaga) (implementing tranches with separate controlling complaints). Alternatively, should the Panel find including these Defendants in liquidation would not advance the objectives of § 1407, Petitioners support excluding these Financier Defendants from the MDL. *See In re W. Elec. Co., Inc. Semiconductor Pat. Litig.*, 415

⁵ Defendants Silvergate Bank, Silvergate Capital Corporation, Sequoia Capital Operations, LLC, Paradigm Operations LP, Signature Bank, Deltec Bank and Trust Company Limited, Farmington State Bank d/b/a Moonstone Bank, Temasek Holdings (Private) Limited, Softbank Vision Fund (AIV M2) L.P., Ribbit Capital, L.P., Altimeter Capital Management, LP, Multicoon Capital Management LLC, Tiger Global Management, LLC, Sino Global Capital Limited, Softbank Group Corp., Thoma Bravo, LP, Alan J. Lane.

F. Supp. 378, 380 (J.P.M.L. 1976) (excluding certain actions from consolidated pretrial proceedings to best promote efficiency).

ARGUMENT

I. THE RELATED ACTIONS, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, INSIDER AND BRAND AMBASSADOR ACTIONS, WARRANT CONSOLIDATION.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a), the JPML may transfer and consolidate cases where: (1) the cases “involv[e] one or more common questions of fact;” (2) transfer and consolidation or coordination will further “the convenience of parties and witnesses;” and (3) transfer and consolidation or coordination “will promote the just and efficient conduct of [the] actions.”

A. The Related Actions Involve Common Questions of Fact.

At issue in the Related Actions is the common question of whether FTX’s business practices guided from Miami, Florida, and those of related individuals and entities (insiders, celebrities, and accountants) that promoted the platform and the unregistered securities it offered and sold, were fraudulent, deceptive, or misleading. The few parties opposing centralization argue that the fraud and deception is only generally relevant to the issues in each case and that most of the facts and legal issues are unique. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 56, at p. 10. This argument ignores, however, the fact that FTX’s alleged fraudulent and deceptive business practices trigger the entire litigation and, to some extent at least, condition the various plaintiffs’ right to recover in all the actions.

The nature and quantum of proof of the alleged fraud and deception necessarily depends on and varies with the legal theory of each case. Certainly, not all proof will be common to all actions. For example, the liability of the accountant defendants in the *Lam* cases may very well turn on operative facts not distinctly relevant to the claims against the Brand Ambassadors in the *Garrison* cases. Even so, it cannot reasonably be said that the alleged underlying fraud and

In re: FTX Cryptocurrency Exchange Collapse Litigation

deception is entirely irrelevant or non-essential to the establishment of each of the stated cases. To the contrary, the allegations as drafted speak loudly; the facts of the fraud and deception are consistently pleaded in each of the complaints filed in the Related Actions.

While the facts surrounding each defendant's participation in the fraud may vary between defendants, they will share substantial background questions of fact concerning its nature and extent. This strong overlap is sufficient to require these cases to be assigned to one judge for coordinated pretrial proceedings. *See In re Penn Central Securities litigation*, 322 F. Supp. 1021, 1022–23 (J.P.M.L. 1971) (“Although the extent of the factual overlap is not certain, it is sufficient to require these bond cases to be assigned with the other cases for pretrial purposes.”).⁶

B. Centralization Will promote the Just and Efficient Conduct of the Related Actions and Will Be More Convenient for the Parties and Witnesses.

The parties opposing centralization argue that it will not be more convenient to the parties because it would likely impose onerous, unnecessary burdens on parties with little commonality across the various cases. Actually, the Related Actions present a prime example of the need which gave rise to enactment of §1407. Absent transfer and consolidation, there inevitably would be repetitious depositions of scores of witnesses, examinations of thousands of documents, and other myriad duplications of pretrial proceedings, resulting in a massive, needless waste of time and effort for numerous parties, witnesses, attorneys and judges involved. That waste would be

⁶ The singular FTX Fraud—a massive conspiracy where all defendants in the Related Actions played their own role in a unified, common backdrop—differs from products liability cases like *In re Watson Fentanyl*, 883 F. Supp. 2d 1350 (J.P.M.L. 2012), where the Panel only consolidated actions brought against one manufacturer of Fentanyl patches and declined to consolidate as to competing manufacturers who utilized different manufacturing processes, or patent litigation like *In re Genetic Techs. Ltd. (%2C179) Pat. Litig.*, 883 F. Supp. 2d 1337 (J.P.M.L. 2012), where each case involved separate alleged instances of patent infringement by different defendants and patent litigation was largely an expedited proceeding requiring little, if any, judicial intervention.

In re: FTX Cryptocurrency Exchange Collapse Litigation

exceptionally serious here, due to the unusually complex issues raised. Centralization will also serve the salutary purposes of forestalling conflicting rulings and streamlining pretrial procedure.

An equally compelling reason for centralization is the potential for conflicting, inconsistent class determinations by courts in different jurisdictions. *See In re Equity Funding Corp. of America Securities Litigation*, 375 F. Supp. 1378, 1385–86 (J.P.M.L. 1973) (“We have consistently held that transfer of actions under Section 1407 is appropriate, if not necessary, where the possibility for conflicting, inconsistent class determinations by courts of coordinate jurisdiction exists.”). Except for the *Norris* and *Lucky D* cases, each of the other Related Cases contains Rule 23 class allegations based upon FTX’s fraudulent and misleading business practices. The transferee court, with all claims and all parties before it, will have a clear picture of the scope and complexity of the litigation, essential to making class determinations. *In re Equity Funding Corp. of America Securities Litigation*, 375 F. Supp. at 1386 (“Because of the potential if not likely conflict of class action determinations, we think this litigation should be assigned to a single judge with the sole responsibility for making the class action determinations ‘as soon as practicable. . . .’”).

Further, centralization in the Southern District of Florida will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation. That district encompasses Miami, Florida, FTX’s headquarters. *See In re M3Power Razor Sys. Mktg. & Sales Pracs. Litig.*, 398 F. Supp. 2d 1363, 1365 (J.P.M.L. 2005) (“We are persuaded that the District of Massachusetts is an appropriate transferee forum for this litigation. [It] is a likely source of relevant documents and witnesses inasmuch as Gillete’s headquarters are located there.”). Three of the Related Actions, including *Garrison*, the first-filed action in the country, and *Norris*, the most procedurally advanced, are already pending there before The Honorable K. Michael Moore. And several of the other judges in the Southern District of Florida have similar experience handling

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.