



redemptions should receive priority of payment over other investors. The SDUTRP seeks to revise the proposed order to allow the SDUTRP to submit a proof of claim.

4. The SDUTRP misconstrues the Receiver's proposed order, which already provides that a claimant who "has previously submitted a proof of claim ... may, but is not required to, submit a new Proof of Claim ...." The proposed order also explains that if such a claimant does not submit a new proof of claim, then the previously-filed proof of claim is treated as timely. As the Receiver explained in her reply, she already possesses books and records that reflect the claims of unpaid redeemers, so there is no need for them to submit duplicative claims.

5. To the extent the SDUTRP is also objecting to a potential distribution of payment to claimants, its objection is premature. The Receiver's proposed order merely establishes a procedure for submitting additional proofs of claim. The proposed order does not propose any plan of distribution or payment.

6. The Receiver's [424] motion is GRANTED.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: Brooklyn, New York  
February 10, 2019

---

U.S.D.J.