

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE NO. 1:17-CV-20848-DPG

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

vs.

WORLD PATENT MARKETING, INC.,
a Florida Corporation, et al.

Defendants.

NOTICE OF FILING PROPOSED ORDER

Defendants World Patent Marketing, Inc., Desa Industries, Inc., and Scott Cooper, through undersigned counsel, respectfully file this proposed order related to the hearing on September 29, 2017, which the Court has requested. The language of this proposed order has been prepared jointly by the FTC and the Defendants to ensure it conforms to the Court's rulings at the hearing.

Dated: October 17, 2017

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Michael A. Pineiro

Daniel L. Rashbaum
Fla. Bar No. 75084
drashbaum@mnrlawfirm.com
Michael A. Pineiro
Fla. Bar No. 41897
mpineiro@mnrlawfirm.com

MARCUS NEIMAN & RASHBAUM LLP
2 South Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 1750
Miami, Florida 33131
Telephone: (305) 400-4268

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 17, 2017, a true and correct copy of the foregoing notice was served via CM/ECF on all counsel or parties of record.

By: /s/ Michael A. Pineiro
Michael A. Pineiro

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No. 17-cv-20848-Gayles-Otazo-Reyes

Federal Trade Commission,

Plaintiff,

v.

World Patent Marketing, Inc., et al.,

Defendants.

[Proposed] ORDER

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court on Defendant Scott Cooper's Motion for Additional Partial Relief from Asset Freeze [ECF No. 86], and on scheduling and other matters raised at a hearing on September 29, 2017. The Court has reviewed the matters and the record and is otherwise fully advised. It is therefore **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** as follows:

A. *Repatriation and Attorneys' Fees*

Defendant Scott Cooper's Motion for Additional Partial Relief from Asset Freeze is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**.

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Section F of the Preliminary Injunction (pgs. 41-42) [ECF No. 105] is amended to allow Defendants through November 13, 2017 to comply with its provisions.

2. Nothing in Sections D or E of the Preliminary Injunction (pgs. 39-41) should be construed to constrain Defendants' ability to comply with Sections F and G of the Preliminary Injunction (pgs. 41-42). Defendants and their attorneys and agents are authorized to take actions necessary to ensure Defendants' compliance with Section F of the Preliminary Injunction, including liquidating or selling any securities or other assets held outside of the United States.

3. The Receiver is **ORDERED** to transfer \$30,000 of the funds transferred to him pursuant to Section F of the Preliminary Injunction to the trust account of Marcus Neiman &

Rashbaum LLP, which is counsel for Mr. Cooper in this proceeding. Defendants' counsel may use these funds to pay Defendants' legal fees and costs in this proceeding.

4. The Preliminary Injunction is otherwise not modified, and remains in full force and effect.

5. To the extent not granted herein, Defendant Scott Cooper's Motion for Additional Partial Relief from Asset Freeze (the "Motion") [ECF No. 86] is **DENIED**.

B. Scheduling

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Scheduling Order [ECF No. 112] is amended as follows:

1. Written lists containing the names and addresses of all fact witnesses intended to be called at trial are due by October 23, 2017

2. The parties shall select a mediator pursuant to Local Rule 16.2 and shall schedule a time, date, and place for mediation by October 30, 2017.

3. The Scheduling Order is otherwise unchanged, and remains in full force and effect.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Defendants' Affirmative Defendants and Jury Demand [ECF No. 118], if any, is due by October 20, 2017, and Plaintiffs' reply in support thereof, if any, is due by October 27, 2017.¹

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at Miami, Florida, this ___ day of ____, 2017.

Darrin P. Gayles
United States District Judge

Copies furnished to:

Magistrate Judge Otazo-Reyes
All counsel of record

¹ Additionally, at the hearing on September 29, 2017, Defendants withdrew their Motion for Order to Show Cause Why the FTC Should Not Be Sanctioned [ECF No. 38]. Accordingly, that Motion is **DENIED AS MOOT**.