

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iii

I. Preliminary Statement..... 1

II. Facts established by the summary judgment .....2

A. RK knew that Faulkner was Breaching his Fiduciary Duties by Causing the Breitling Entities to Engage in Fraud and to Violate Securities Laws .....2

1. *Breitling Retains RK for public company audits for FY 2011-2012 and 2013*.....4

2. *At the Initiation of the Audit work for Breitling, Defendants Determined that Breitling Employees were Offering and Selling Securities as Unregistered Brokers and that Faulkner was a Fraud Risk for Misappropriation of Cash* .....5

3. *RK Discovers all the Components of the Breitling Fraud by December 2013* .....6

B. Nymeyer Repeatedly Urges Matlock to Withdraw RK from the Breitling Audit .....15

C. Matlock Actively Conceals Breitling’s Fraud and Illegal Acts .....16

1. *Matlock “Buries” Nymeyer’s Audit Summary Memo Outlining the Fraud* .....16

2. *Matlock Conceals Nymeyer’s Fraud Findings from RK’s Reviewing Partners*.....18

3. *Matlock Conceals Nymeyer’s Findings from the Brietling Board and Audit Committee*.....20

4. *RK Issues Two Clean Audit Opinions for Breitling Knowing they will be Filed with the SEC*.....25

5. *Defendants Continue to Conceal RK’s Knowledge of and Involvement in Breitling’s Fraud throughout 2015* .....28

D. *Defendants’ Knew that Faulkner Created the Crude Entities to Continue the same (Fraudulent) Business Practices as BOG and BRC and Knew that the Crude Entities’ Financials were Consolidated with BECC’s Financials.* .....29

E.	<i>Faulkner used the Crude and Patriot Entities to continue to Fraudulently Raise Money from Investors and then Diverted the Investor Funds from Crude and Patriot to BECC so that Faulkner could Steal the Funds</i> .....	31
F.	Defendants’ Conduct Violated Auditing Standards and Securities Laws and the SEC Bans Matlock from Auditing Public Companies .....	33
III.	Argument and Authorities.....	36
A.	The Receiver’s Negligence Claim is Not Barred by Limitations .....	36
1.	<i>The Court Can and Did Toll the Applicable Statute of Limitations</i> .....	37
2.	<i>Faulkner, Wagers and Hoover acted Adversely to the Breitling Entities and Faulkner Adversely Dominated the Breitling Entities and the Innocent Members of BECC’s Board did not Discover Defendants’ Negligence until at the Earliest September 1, 2015 - less than Two Years before the Receiver’s Appointment</i> .....	38
3.	<i>Defendants’ Fraudulent Concealment Tolloed Limitations</i> .....	47
B.	Fact Issues Related to Defendants’ Knowledge and Proximate Cause Preclude Summary Judgment on the Receiver’s Negligence Claim .....	49
1.	<i>Defendants’ Privity Argument regarding Matlock is a Red Herring</i> .....	49
2.	<i>Defendants’ Negligence is Supported by the Record Evidence</i> .....	50
3.	<i>The Record Evidence Supports Reliance and Proximate Causation and Defendants are Liable for all Damages that were Foreseeable</i> .....	51
C.	Fact Issues Related to Defendants’ Knowledge Preclude Summary Judgment on the Receiver’s Participation in Breach of Fiduciary Duty Claim.....	57
D.	The Receiver has Standing to Pursue Increased Liabilities Damages .....	59
IV.	Conclusion .....	61