

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

CASE NO. 20-CV-81205-RAR

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

**COMPLETE BUSINESS SOLUTIONS
GROUP, INC. d/b/a PAR FUNDING, et al.,**

Defendants.

_____ /

ORDER STRIKING MOTIONS

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court upon Michael and Alan Laude’s Notice of Motion and Motion for Leave to File Late Claim, [ECF Nos. 2210, 2211]. On April 14, 2026, Michael Laude, proceeding *pro se*, filed two duplicative Motions seeking leave from the Court “to be added to the PAR Funding Receivership claims list and file late claims based on lack of notice and equitable considerations.” *See* [ECF No. 2210] at 1.

The Court will not entertain Mr. Laude’s Motions. On December 23, 2022, the Court entered an Order (1) Approving Proof of Claim Form; (2) Establishing Claims Bar Date and Notice Procedures; and (3) Approving Procedure to Administer and Determine Claims (“Claims Order”). [ECF No. 1471]. The Claims Order set a March 22, 2023 deadline for Claimants to submit a Proof of Claim Form to the Receiver and set out the procedures by which the Receiver would provide notice to Claimants. *Id.* The Claims Order also provided “[t]he Receiver shall have the authority to compromise and settle claims from any Direct Claimant or Administrative Claimant, or resolve any Notice of Deficiency, at any time, as appropriate, without further order of this Court” and “retains the sole and absolute right to propose a plan of distribution.” *Id.* at 11–12.

As such, pursuant to the Court’s Claims Order, any claims must be directed to the Receiver—*not* the Court. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Mr. Laude’s Motions, [ECF Nos. 2210, 2211], are hereby **STRICKEN**.¹

DONE AND ORDERED in Miami, Florida, this 15th of April, 2026.



RODOLFO A. RUIZ II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies provided to:

Michael Laude
41 Saint Marks Place
Massapequa, New York 11758

¹ The Court also notes several other problems with Mr. Laude’s Motions. First, as indicated by the Clerk’s Notice of Filing Deficiency, Mr. Laude’s Motions are deficient for missing the signatures required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a). [ECF No. 2212]. Also, Michael Laude seeks to file these Motions on behalf of himself and his father, but a *pro se* litigant may not represent any parties other than himself. *See FuQua v. Massey*, 615 F. App’x 611, 612 (11th Cir. 2015) (“The right to appear *pro se*, however, is limited to parties conducting ‘their own cases,’ and does not extend to non-attorney parties representing the interests of others.”). But even if Mr. Laude were to cure these deficiencies, the Court would still strike his Motions given that all claims must be directed to the Receiver.