UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 26-60976-CIV-SINGHAL

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

INNOVATIVE PARTNERS, LP d/b/a
INNOVATIVE HEALTH PLAN or
HEALTHCARE PLAN, *et al.,*

Defendants.
_____/

ORDER

ATTORNEYS ARE ENTITLED to be paid by their clients. But the question before the Court today concerns who bears the burden of this expense. Defendant Ahmed Shokry and Corporate Defendants' filed an Expedited Motion to Modify Preliminary Injunction to Release Funds for Attorney Fees (the "Motion") (DE [66]). There is no question Defendants' attorneys are entitled to the requested fees—their fees are reasonable and their efforts have been prodigious. But Defendants do not get to use monies that may have been obtained via fraud.

Defendants do not allege they have no other means of paying. Defendants do not allege indigency. Defendants contest the factual basis undergirding the Receiver's argument that Defendants may possess other assets, but Defendants do not actually allege they have no other assets. *See* (DE [75] at 4-5). Defendants will need to exhaust all other financial avenues before the Court will consider unfreezing what likely is other people's money, to pay their defense. This includes, for example, mortgaging homes and selling personal assets to pay attorneys' fees. Or individual defendants may need to take

out a loan or work out an arrangement with their counsel to pay over time. Accordingly, on the record currently before the Court, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Motion (DE [66]) is **DENIED.**

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, this 24th day of June 2026.

RAAG SINGHAL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies furnished counsel via CM/ECF