

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

Netsphere Inc., et al

v.

Jeffrey Baron, et al

§
§
§
§
§
§

**Case No.: 12-37921-sgj7
Chapter 7**

APPELLANT JEFFREY BARON’S DESIGNATION OF THE RECORD

Appellant, Jeffrey Baron, subject to this court’s ruling on his Motion for Leave to File Appeal files this, his Designation of the Record in appealing the Order Denying Motion to Dismiss [Bk Dkt Doc. 20] and Partial Summary Judgment Order [111]. This Designation of Record covers both orders as the two orders are inextricably intertwined. District court pleadings and pleadings from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals will be supplied on cd to the Bankruptcy Clerk.

<u>Number</u>	<u>Docket Number / Docket Text</u>	<u>Date</u>
1	Bk Dkt Doc 1. Chapter 7 involuntary petition. Fee Amount \$306 Re: Jeffrey Baron Filed by Pronske & Patel, P.C., Shurig Jetel Beckett Tackett, Dean Ferguson, Gary G. Lyon, Robert Garrey, Powers Taylor, LLP, Jeffrey Hall (Pronske, Gerrit)	12/18/2012
2	Dist. Doc. 13. MOTION to Dismiss <i>or Alternatively to Stay Plaintiffs' Claims</i> filed by Jeffrey Baron, Ondova Limited Company with Brief in Support. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C, # 4 Exhibit D) (Vitulo, Anthony) Modified on 6/19/2009 (jyg). (Entered: 06/18/2009)	<u>6/18/2009</u>
3	Dist. Doc. 27. MOTION to Dismiss <i>or Alternatively Stay Plaintiffs' Claims</i> filed by Jeffrey Baron, Ondova Limited Company with Brief/Memorandum in Support. (Boisvert, Carter) (Entered: 07/06/2009)	<u>7/6/2009</u>
4	Dist. Doc. 28. Appendix in Support filed by Jeffrey Baron, Ondova Limited Company re 27 MOTION to Dismiss <i>or Alternatively Stay Plaintiffs' Claims</i> (Boisvert, Carter) (Entered: 07/06/2009)	<u>7/6/2009</u>
5	Dist. Doc. 35. ORDER denying 27 Motion to Dismiss <i>or Alternatively Stay Plaintiffs' Claims</i> ; denying 29 Motion to File	<u>7/7/2009</u>

	Documents Under Seal. (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 7/7/2009) (axm) (Entered: 07/08/2009)	
6	Dist. Doc. 36. ORDER denying 27 Motion to Dismiss or Alternatively Stay Plaintiffs' Claims. (see order) (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 7/7/2009) (axm) (Entered: 07/08/2009)	7/7/2009
7	Dist. Doc. 39. NOTICE OF FILING OF OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT of Status Conference Proceedings held on 7-9-09 before Judge Furgeson. Court Reporter/Transcriber Cass Casey, Telephone number 214-354-3139. Parties are notified of their duty to review the transcript. A copy may be purchased from the court reporter or viewed at the clerk's office public terminal. If redaction is necessary, a Redaction Request - Transcript must be filed within 21 days. If no such Request is filed, the transcript will be made available via PACER without redaction after 90 calendar days. The clerk will mail a copy of this notice to parties not electronically noticed. Redaction Request due 8/6/2009. Redacted Transcript Deadline set for 8/17/2009. Release of Transcript Restriction set for 10/14/2009. (clc) (Additional attachment(s) added on 7/20/2009: # 1 Main Document) (axm). Modified pdf on 7/20/2009 (axm). (Entered: 07/16/2009)	7/16/2009
8	Dist. Doc. 52 NOTICE OF FILING OF OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT of Status Conference Proceedings held on 7-28-09 before Judge Furgeson. Court Reporter/Transcriber Cass Casey, Telephone number Cassidi45@AOL.COM.	8/14/2009
9	Dist. Doc. 569 Fourth MOTION to Approve Assessment and Disbursement of Attorney Claims [<i>Corrected Version</i>] filed by Receiver with Brief/Memorandum in Support. (Golden, Barry) (Entered: 05/13/2011)	5/13/2011
10	Dist. Doc. 575 FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER ON 569 ASSESSMENT AND DISBURSEMENT OF FORMER ATTORNEY CLAIMS: The Court orders that once the Receiver has obtained cash to pay the Former Attorney Claims, and only if the Receiver receives a Waiver as set forth in paragraphs 36 and 37 below, the Receiver shall pay the following Former Attorney Claims. If Baron asserts the Baron Claims against any attorney, that attorney may bring his or her own Punitive Claims and/or claims to seek the amount of his or her own Fee Cap Reductions against Baron as counterclaims. (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 5/18/2011) (twd) (Entered: 05/18/2011)	5/18/2011
11	Dist. Doc. 586 . ORDER REGARDING BARON'S NOTICE OF APPEAL TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT (DOC. NO. 576). The Court advises the parties that it is STAYED from taking further action in the various matters involved in the instant appeal. (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 5/24/2011) (mfw) (Entered: 05/25/2011)	5/24/2011
12	Dist. Doc. 590. MOTION for Leave to File Motion to Stay	05/31/2011

	Receivership Pending Appeal filed by Jeffrey Baron (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit(s) EXHIBIT A) (Schepps, Gary) (Entered: 05/31/2011)	
13	Dist. Doc. 591 . MOTION for Leave to File Motion for Stay of Injunction Pending Appeal filed by Jeffrey Baron (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit(s) Exhibit A) (Schepps, Gary) (Entered: 05/31/2011)	05/31/2011
14	Dist. Doc. 592 . MOTION for Leave to File Motion for an Expedited Hearing on the 590 and 591 Stay Motions filed by Jeffrey Baron (Schepps, Gary) (Entered: 06/01/2011)	06/01/2011
15	Dist. Doc. 596 . ORDER denying 590 Motion for Leave to File Motion to Stay Receivership Pending Appeal. (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 6/2/2011) (mfw) (Entered: 06/02/2011)	06/02/2011
16	Dist. Doc. 597 . ORDER denying 591 Motion for Leave to File Motion To Stay or Vacate Injunction and Civil Lockdown of Jeff Baron. (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 6/2/2011) (mfw) (Entered: 06/02/2011)	06/02/2011
17	Dist. Doc. 645 . ORDER of USCA as to Appellant's motion for stay of the receivership order and the lockdown injunction pending appeal is DENIED. Appellant is cautioned that further frivolous filings could result in sanctions. (svc) (Entered: 07/13/2011)	07/11/2011
18	Dist. Doc. 655 . NOTICE of Motion to Dismiss in Part and to Lift Stay, or to Abate the Appeal of Jeffrey Baron, Novo Point, LLC and Quantec, LLC (Fifth Cir. Case No. 11-10501) from the District Court's May 18, 2011 Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order on Assessment and Disbursement of Former Attorney Claims filed in the Fifth Circuit filed by Carrington Coleman Sloman & Blumenthal, LLP (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit(s) A) (Sutherland, J) (Entered: 08/05/2011)	8/5/2011
19	Dist. Doc. 733 . ORDER of USCA IT IS ORDERED that the opposed motion of Peter S. Vogel to modify stay is GRANTED to the extent that the opposed motion of Peter S. Vogel for approval to pay receivership professionals is referred to the district court for ruling in the first instance. (svc) (Entered: 12/12/2011)	12/12/2011
20	Dist. Doc. 734 . ORDER GRANTING THE RECEIVER'S MOTION TO MODIFY STAY AND FOR APPROVAL TO PAY RECEIVERSHIP PROFESSIONALS. (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 12/12/2011) (Judge Royal Furgeson) (Entered: 12/12/2011)	12/12/2011
21	Dist. Doc. 909 . Emergency MOTION to Stay re 908 Notice of Appeal,, filed by Jeffrey Baron, Novo Point LLC, Quantec LLC with Brief/Memorandum in Support. (Schepps, Gary) (Entered: 05/03/2012)	5/3/2012
22	Dist. Doc. 910 . MOTION for Reconsideration <i>Motion of Daniel J. Sherman, Chapter 11 Trustee to Reconsider Stay Imposed by This Court's Order of May 24, 2011 (Docket 586)</i> filed by Daniel J. Sherman (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit(s) 1A, # 2 Exhibit(s) 1B, # 3 Exhibit(s) 1C, # 4 Exhibit(s) 1D, # 5 Exhibit(s) 1E,	5/4/2012

	# 6 Exhibit(s) 1F, # 7 Exhibit(s) 1G, # 8 Exhibit(s) 1H, # 9 Exhibit(s) 2A, # 10 Exhibit(s) 2B, # 11 Exhibit(s) 3A, # 12 Exhibit(s) 3B) (Hunt, Richard) (Entered: 05/04/2012)	
23	Dist. Doc. 925 . ORDER denying as moot 909 Motion to Stay (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 5/14/2012) (Judge Royal Furgeson) (Entered: 05/14/2012)	5/14/2012
24	Dist. Doc. 969 . ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE MOTIONS PENDING PRIOR TO THE STAY. If the issues are still relevant, the parties may amend and re-file their motions no later than July 2, 2012. (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 6/8/2012) (Judge Royal Furgeson) (Entered: 06/08/2012)	6/8/2012
25	Dist. Doc. 972 . ELECTRONIC ORDER terminating 637 Motion for Attorney Fees per ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE MOTIONS PENDING PRIOR TO THE STAY 969 (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 6/8/2012) (Judge Royal Furgeson) (Entered: 06/08/2012)	6/8/2012
26	Dist. Doc. 976 . ORDER of USCA as to 227 , 814 , 759 , 136 , 908 , 340 , 614 , 576 , 341 Notice of Appeal: Appellants' opposed motion to stay the district court from entering further orders disbursing the receivership res until the appeal of this matter is ruled on by this Honorable Court is denied. (axm) (Entered: 06/12/2012)	06/12/2012
27	Dist. Doc. 980 . MOTION to Clarify Instruction to Receiver on Payments to Former Baron Attorneys filed by Receiver (Golden, Barry) (Entered: 06/14/2012)	6/14/2012
28	Dist. Doc. 988 . ORDER REGARDING WINDING UP THE RECEIVERSHIP: The Receiver's Report must be filed with the Court on or before 7/3/2012. (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 6/18/2012) (axm) (Entered: 06/19/2012)	6/18/2012
29	Dist. Doc. 1008 . ORDER MODIFYING RECEIVERSHIP ORDER AND ADDRESSING JEFF BARON'S INSURANCE (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 6/28/2012) (Judge Royal Furgeson) (Entered: 06/28/2012)	06/28/2012
30	Dist. Doc. 1013 . MOTION for Reconsideration re 987 Order on Motion for Miscellaneous Relief, filed by Pronske & Patel, P.C. with Brief/Memorandum in Support. (Pronske, Gerrit) (Entered: 06/28/2012)	06/28/2012
31	Dist. Doc. 1087 . MOTION to Stay <i>Fee Disbursements or in the Alternative to Appoint Counsel for Jeffrey Baron for Representation on Issues Regarding Applications by the Trustee and Receiver on Attorneys Fees, Request for Reconsideration of Order on Receiver's Second Dykema Application</i> filed by Jeffrey Baron with Brief/Memorandum in Support. (Attachments:	11/11/2012

	# 1 Proposed Order Granting Stay of Fee Disbursements) (Cochell, Stephen) (Entered: 11/11/2012)	
32	Dist. Doc. 1088 . ORDER of USCA...IT IS ORDERED that sales of the assets scheduled to be auctioned on November 9, 2012, not be closed prior to November 30, 2012, without order of this Court. (svc) (Entered: 11/14/2012)	11/13/2012
33	<u>Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, 10-11202. Document: 00512049121, COURT ORDER THAT On November 2, 2012, counsel for the Receiver informed us that a confirmation hearing was scheduled for November 13 on a plan to wind down the Receivership. On November 6, the day before oral argument, counsel for Appellants notified us that an auction of certain Receivership assets was to be held on November 9, 2012. Concerned after oral argument that these developments might moot some if not all the issues presented, we ordered the parties to submit written responses on four factual and legal issues. In their responses, both the Receiver and the Trustee assure the Court that the auction to be held on November 9 will not result in an immediate transfer of title to any property currently under the control of the Receiver. The Receiver states that no closing will occur with a successful bidder until sometime between November 14 and November 30. The Trustee states that he and the Receiver "will not close the asset sale if Mr. Baron acts expeditiously to bring the matter before this Court." In light of these representations, we conclude that the auction itself will not affect the issues before the Court, but the closing of a sale would present significant mootness concerns. In order to maintain our ability to resolve the relevant issues, it is essential that any closing with a bidder from the auction be delayed until the end of the time period identified by the Receiver and Trustee. Disbursement of any other assets of the Receivership should be as limited as possible until this Court resolves the appeals. We enter no order at this point to effectuate that determination, but we inform the parties of the Court's intent and willingness to entertain motions to stay significant disbursements. The Court intends to resolve these appeals on an expedited basis. IT IS ORDERED that sales of the assets scheduled to be auctioned on November 9, 2012, not be closed prior to November 30, 2012, without order of this Court.</u>	11/09/2012
34	Dist. Doc. 1091 . ORDER of USCA...Stay earlier entered by this court, prohibiting a closing on sales of assets prior to November 30, be extended indefinitely. Neither the Receiver nor anyone on his behalf may sell any assets subject to the Receivership prior to the decision of this court on these appeals. (svc) (Entered: 11/28/2012)	11/28/2012
35	Dist. Doc. 1101 . ORDER DENYING 1087 BARON'S MOTION	12/13/2012

	FOR STAY OF FEE DISBURSEMENTS OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT AS COUNSEL FOR JEFFREY BARON FOR REPRESENTATION ON ISSUES REGARDING APPLICATIONS BY THE TRUSTEE. (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 12/13/2012) (cea) (Entered: 12/14/2012)	
36	<u>Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, 10-11202. PUBLISHED OPINION FILED. [10-11202 Reversed 11-10113 Reversed 11-10289 Reversed 11-10290 Reversed 11-10390 Reversed 11-10501 Dismissed 12-10003 Reversed 12-10489 Reversed 12-10657 Reversed 12-10804 Reversed 12-11082 Reversed] Judge: HRD , Judge: LHS , Judge: SAH (Panel involvement data updated for cases: 12-10003, 11-10113, 11-10289, 11-10290, 11-10390, 12-10489, 11-10501, 12-10657, 12-10804, 10-11202) Mandate pull date is 01/08/2013 [10-11202, 11-10113, 11-10289, 11-10290, 11-10390, 11-10501, 12-10003, 12-10489, 12-10657, 12-10804, 12-11082] (ALSO FILED IN #12-10444) (RMF)</u>	<u>12/18/2012</u>
37	Dist. Doc. <u>1112. ORDER: The Fifth Circuit has delivered its opinion regarding the Receivership, nullifying the appointment of the Receiver. While the case has been reversed and remanded back to this Court, the mandate has not yet issued. Once the mandate has been issued, the Court intends to hold a hearing and to close the Receivership. In the meantime, the Court takes the following actions (see attached order). (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 12/20/2012) (Judge Royal Furgeson) (Entered: 12/20/2012)</u>	<u>12/20/2012</u>
38	<u>Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, 10-11202. COURT ORDER FILED that the opposed motion of Appellee Peter S. Vogel for clarification of the Court's November 9, 2012, order is GRANTED. As stated in Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 41, the mandate that signifies the finality of the court's decision is not in the usual course issued with the opinion. Instead, it issues later under the varying circumstances set out in the Rule. The December 18, 2012 decision of the Court is at this time still subject to alteration by the panel or by the en banc court, and consequently it is not final. The district court orders that were in place prior to the release of our opinion remain in place. Upon the issuance of the mandate by this Court, the conclusions of our opinion become final and the district court and parties may rely on the rulings it contains. We point out that our opinion did not dissolve the receivership immediately. We ordered a remand for an expeditious winding up of the receivership. No assets that were brought under the control of the receiver will be released immediately from that control even when the mandate is issued. The district court will thereafter have the authority to manage the process for ending the receivership as quickly as possible. If no rehearing is requested by any party, and absent any hold on the mandate requested by a member of the en banc court,</u>	<u>12/31/2012</u>

the madate will issue immediately after the expiration of the period to file for rehearing on January 2, 2013. A further order of this Court will be entered signifying whether the mandate in fact issues on that date. The Receiver has requested that we explain whether it is proper for further fees and expenses to be paid. As we said in the opinion and as the Receiver acknowledges, all fees and expenses need to be re-evaluated in light of our holding that the Receivership should not have been created. That conclusion neither authorizes nor prevents further necessary disbursements. The import of our order of November 9, 2012, has not changed, which said this: "Disbursement of any other assets of the Receivership should be as limited as possible until this Court resolves the appeals." We have resolved the appeals, but the only expenditures should be those appropriate for the Receiver to make until relinquishment of control of assets. It is for the district court to make the initial determination of whether approval of additional fees and expenses is appropriate at this time in light of the re-evaluation of all fees and expenses of the Receivership. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the opposed motion of Appellee Peter S. Vogel to clarify the status of the mandate is DENIED to the extent any clarification beyond what we have just given was requested. Baron filed a motion to claify who is to take custody of the receivership assets upon the dissolution of the receivership. The opinion stated that everything subject to the receivership other than cash "should be expeditiously returned to Baron under a schedule to be determined by the district court for winding up the receivership." Our utilization of a shorthand reference to Barron did not in any way affect the ownership of assets that were brought into the receivership. Assets are to be returned as appropriate to Baron or other entities that were subject to the receivership. Baron requests we clarify that he is not the principal beneficiary of Novo Point, LLC and Quantec, LLC. Such clarification is irrelevant to our holding and is DENIED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the alternative motion filed by Appellants Jeffrey Baron; Novo Point, LLC; quantec, LLC; and Gary Schepps to clarify that this Court's opinion of December 18, 2012, was issued "as and for the mandate" is DENIED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the alternative motions filed by Appellants Jeffrey Baron; Novo Point, LLC; Quantec, LLC; and Gary Schepps for a stay of the injunctions contained in the district court's order appointing the receiver dated November 24, 2010, is DENIED. [7259066-2], [7259066-3], [7259720-3], [7259720-4], [7259720-5] [7260392-1]

Judge(s): HRD, LHS and SAH. [10-11202, 11-10113, 11-10289, 11-10290, 11-10390, 11-10501, 12-10003, 12-10444, 12-10489, 12-10657, 12-10804, 12-11082] (DMS)

39	Dist. Doc. 1131 . Counter NOTICE re: 1130 Notice of Fifth Circuit Order filed by Jeffrey Baron (Schepps, Gary) Modified on 1/2/2013 (skt). (Entered: 12/31/2012)	12/31/2012
40	Bk Dkt Doc 20. Motion to dismiss case for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and lack of jurisdiction Filed by Alleged Debtor Jeffrey Baron (Rielly, Bill)	01/09/2013
41	<u>Bk Dkt Doc 21</u> . Motion for a more definite statement filed by Jeffrey Baron . (Rielly, Bill)	01/09/2013
42	<u>Bk Dkt Doc 22</u> . Provisional Answer and Counter-Claim to involuntary petition filed by Alleged Debtor Jeffrey Baron . (Rielly, Bill)	01/09/2013
43	<u>Bk Dkt Doc39</u> . Order (A) setting involuntary petition for trial hearing and (B) granting interim GAP period relief, along with report and recommendation to the District Court. Entered on 1/17/2013 (RE: related documents 1). Trial Hearing to be held on 2/13/2013 at 01:30 PM Dallas Judge Jernigan Ctrm for 1 , (Blanco, J.) Modified Linkage and text on 1/17/2013 (Blanco, J.).	01/17/2013
44	<u>Bk Dkt Doc 49</u> . Objection to (related document(s): 20 Motion to dismiss case filed by Alleged Debtor Jeffrey Baron, 21 Motion by Jeffrey Baron. filed by Alleged Debtor Jeffrey Baron)filed by Petitioning Creditors Dean Ferguson, Robert Garrey, Jeffrey Hall, Gary G. Lyon, David L. Pacione, Powers Taylor, LLP, Pronske & Patel, P.C., Shurig Jetel Beckett Tackett. (Goolsby, Melanie)	01/30/2013
45	<u>Bk Dkt 51, Transcript regarding Hearing Held 1/16/2013</u>	<u>2/1/2013</u>
46	<u>Bk Dkt Doc 52</u> . (1022 pgs; 17 docs) Motion for summary judgment <i>and Brief in Support</i> filed by Petitioning Creditors Dean Ferguson, Robert Garrey, Jeffrey Hall, Gary G. Lyon, David L. Pacione, Powers Taylor, LLP, Pronske & Patel, P.C., Shurig Jetel Beckett Tackett (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A # 2 Exhibit B # 3 Exhibit C # 4 Exhibit D # 5 Exhibit E # 6 Exhibit F # 7 Exhibit G # 8 Exhibit H # 9 Exhibit I # 10 Exhibit J # 11 Exhibit J-1 # 12 Exhibit J-2 # 13 Exhibit J-3 # 14 Exhibit J-4 # 15 Exhibit J-5 # 16 Exhibit J-6) (Goolsby, Melanie)	<u>2/1/2013</u>
47	<u>Bk Dkt Doc. 56</u> Response opposed to (related document(s): 52 Motion for summary judgment <i>and Brief in Support</i> filed by Petitioning Creditor Gary G. Lyon, Petitioning Creditor Pronske & Patel, P.C., Petitioning Creditor Shurig Jetel Beckett Tackett, Petitioning Creditor Dean Ferguson, Petitioning Creditor Robert Garrey, Petitioning Creditor Powers Taylor, LLP, Petitioning Creditor Jeffrey Hall, Petitioning Creditor David L. Pacione) filed by Alleged Debtor Jeffrey Baron. (Attachments: # 1 Appendix # 2 Exhibit D1 # 3 Exhibit D2 # 4 Exhibit D3 # 5 Exhibit D4 # 6 Exhibit D5 # 7 Exhibit D6 # 8 Exhibit D7 # 9 Exhibit D9) (Stromberg, Mark)	02/08/2013
48	<u>Bk Dkt Doc 57</u> . Objection to (related document(s): 52 Motion for summary judgment <i>and Brief in Support</i> filed by Petitioning	02/08/2013

	Creditor Gary G. Lyon, Petitioning Creditor Pronske & Patel, P.C., Petitioning Creditor Shurig Jetel Beckett Tackett, Petitioning Creditor Dean Ferguson, Petitioning Creditor Robert Garrey, Petitioning Creditor Powers Taylor, LLP, Petitioning Creditor Jeffrey Hall, Petitioning Creditor David L. Pacione) filed by Alleged Debtor Jeffrey Baron. (Stromberg, Mark)	
49	<u>Bk Dkt Doc 64</u> . Response opposed to (related document(s): 57 Objection filed by Alleged Debtor Jeffrey Baron) filed by Petitioning Creditors Robert Garrey, Jeffrey Hall, Gary G. Lyon, David L. Pacione, Powers Taylor, LLP, Pronske & Patel, P.C., Shurig Jetel Beckett Tackett. (Goolsby, Melanie)	02/12/2013
50	<u>Bk Dkt 72</u> , Transcript regarding Hearing Held 02/13/13	<u>02/21/2013</u>
51	<u>Bk Dkt Doc. 111</u> Partial Summary Judgment order. (related document # 52) Entered on 4/5/2013. (Blanco, J.)	04/05/2013
52	<u>Bk Dkt Doc. 112</u> . Order denying motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction . (related document # 20) Entered on 4/5/2013. (Blanco, J.)	04/05/2013
53	Dist. Doc. 1256 . JUDGMENT/MANDATE of USCA as to 227 Notice of Appeal, filed by Novo Point LLC, Quantec LLC. Judgment of the District Court is reversed and remanded for further proceedings. Issued as Mandate: 4/19/13. Pursuant to LR 79.2 and LCrR 55.2, exhibits may be claimed during the 60-day period following final disposition (to do so, follow the procedures found at www.txnd.uscourts.gov/Court Records). The clerk will discard exhibits that remain unclaimed after the 60-day period without additional notice. (Clerk to notice any party not electronically noticed.) (svc) (Entered: 04/29/2013)	04/24/2013
54	Dist. Doc. 1257 . JUDGMENT/MANDATE of USCA as to 340 Notice of Appeal,,,, filed by Jeffrey Baron. Judgment of the District Court is reversed and remanded for further proceedings. Issued as Mandate: 4/19/13. Pursuant to LR 79.2 and LCrR 55.2, exhibits may be claimed during the 60-day period following final disposition (to do so, follow the procedures found at www.txnd.uscourts.gov/Court Records). The clerk will discard exhibits that remain unclaimed after the 60-day period without additional notice. (Clerk to notice any party not electronically noticed.) (svc) (Entered: 04/29/2013)	04/24/2013
55	Dist. Doc. 1258 . JUDGMENT/MANDATE of USCA as to 341 Notice of Appeal,,,, filed by Novo Point LLC, Quantec LLC. Judgment of the District Court is reversed and remanded for further proceedings. Issued as Mandate: 4/19/13. Pursuant to LR 79.2 and LCrR 55.2, exhibits may be claimed during the 60-day period following final disposition (to do so, follow the procedures found at www.txnd.uscourts.gov/Court Records). The clerk will discard exhibits that remain unclaimed after the 60-day period without additional notice. (Clerk to notice any party not electronically	04/24/2013

	noticed.) (svc) (Entered: 04/29/2013)	
56	Dist. Doc. 1259 . JUDGMENT/MANDATE of USCA as to 341 Notice of Appeal,,,, filed by Novo Point LLC, Quantec LLC. Judgment of the District Court is reversed and remanded for further proceedings. Issued as Mandate: 4/19/13. Pursuant to LR 79.2 and LCrR 55.2, exhibits may be claimed during the 60-day period following final disposition (to do so, follow the procedures found at www.txnd.uscourts.gov/Court Records). The clerk will discard exhibits that remain unclaimed after the 60-day period without additional notice. (Clerk to notice any party not electronically noticed.) (svc) (Entered: 04/29/2013)	04/24/2013
57	Dist. Doc. 1260 . JUDGMENT/MANDATE of USCA as to 449 Notice of Appeal,,,, filed by Novo Point LLC, Jeffrey Baron, Quantec LLC. Judgment of the District Court is reversed and remanded for further proceedings. Issued as Mandate: 4/19/13. Pursuant to LR 79.2 and LCrR 55.2, exhibits may be claimed during the 60-day period following final disposition (to do so, follow the procedures found at www.txnd.uscourts.gov/Court Records). The clerk will discard exhibits that remain unclaimed after the 60-day period without additional notice. (Clerk to notice any party not electronically noticed.) (svc) (Entered: 04/29/2013)	04/24/2013
58	Dist. Doc. 1261 . JUDGMENT/MANDATE of USCA as to 759 Notice of Appeal,, filed by Novo Point LLC, Jeffrey Baron, Gary Schepps, Quantec LLC. Judgment of the District Court is reversed and remanded for further proceedings. Issued as Mandate: 4/19/13. Pursuant to LR 79.2 and LCrR 55.2, exhibits may be claimed during the 60-day period following final disposition (to do so, follow the procedures found at www.txnd.uscourts.gov/Court Records). The clerk will discard exhibits that remain unclaimed after the 60-day period without additional notice. (Clerk to notice any party not electronically noticed.) (svc) (Entered: 04/29/2013)	04/24/2013
59	Dist. Doc. 1262 . JUDGMENT/MANDATE of USCA as to 982 Notice of Appeal, filed by Novo Point LLC, Jeffrey Baron, Quantec LLC, 908 Notice of Appeal,, filed by Novo Point LLC, Jeffrey Baron, Quantec LLC. Judgment of the District Court is reversed and remanded for further proceedings. Issued as Mandate: 4/19/13. Pursuant to LR 79.2 and LCrR 55.2, exhibits may be claimed during the 60-day period following final disposition (to do so, follow the procedures found at www.txnd.uscourts.gov/Court Records). The clerk will discard exhibits that remain unclaimed after the 60-day period without additional notice. (Clerk to notice any party not electronically noticed.) (svc) (Entered: 04/29/2013)	04/24/2013
60	Dist. Doc. 1263 . JUDGMENT/MANDATE of USCA as to 1080 Notice of Appeal,, filed by Novo Point LLC, Jeffrey Baron, Quantec LLC. Judgment of the District Court is reversed and remanded for further proceedings. Issued as Mandate: 4/19/13.	04/24/2013

	Pursuant to LR 79.2 and LCrR 55.2, exhibits may be claimed during the 60-day period following final disposition (to do so, follow the procedures found at www.txnd.uscourts.gov/CourtRecords). The clerk will discard exhibits that remain unclaimed after the 60-day period without additional notice. (Clerk to notice any party not electronically noticed.) (svc) (Entered: 04/29/2013)	
61	District Court 3:09-cv-00988-F Dkt 1264, ELECTRONIC ORDER finding as moot [1013] Motion for Reconsideration per issuance of the mandate by the Fifth Circuit. (Ordered by Judge Royal Furgeson on 4/29/2013) (Judge Royal Furgeson)	4/29/2013

Very respectfully,

/s/ Stephen R. Cochell
Stephen R. Cochell
The Cochell Law Firm, P.C.
Texas Bar No. 24044255
7026 Old Katy Rd., Ste 259
Houston, Texas 77096
(713)980-8796 (phone)
(713)980-1179 (facsimile)
scochell@cochellfirm.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On this date I electronically submitted the foregoing document with the Bankruptcy Clerk for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas, using the electronic case filing system of the court. I hereby certify that I have served all parties who receive notification through the electronic filing system.

/s/ Stephen R. Cochell
Stephen R. Cochell