IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, Plaintiff, v. JOSEPH S. FORTE and JOSEPH FORTE, L.P., Defendants.	:	No. 09-CV-0063
COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION, Plaintiff, v. JOSEPH S. FORTE, Defendant.	:	No. 09-CV-0064

SIXTH REPORT OF MARION A. HECHT,
COURT-APPOINTED RECEIVER FOR
JOSEPH S. FORTE AND JOSEPH FORTE, L.P.

Lawrence T. Hoyle, Jr.
Arlene Fickler
Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP
1600 Market Street, Suite 3600
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
Telephone (215) 751-2000
Facsimile (215) 751-2205
Attorneys for Marion A. Hecht, Receiver

Dated: March 1, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBITS

Marion A. Hecht ("Receiver"), the Court's appointed Receiver for Joseph S. Forte ("Forte") and Joseph Forte, L.P. ("Partnership"), files her Sixth Report, showing the Court as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

On March 24, 1995, Forte executed a Certificate of Limited Partnership, which was filed with the Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of State on April 3, 1995. The name of the Partnership so created was Joseph Forte, L.P., with Forte named as its General Partner and his home, 225 Fawnhill Rd., Broomall, PA, listed as the Partnership's address. As set forth in the Limited Partnership Agreement dated February 28, 1995, its purpose was "[t]o form a fund to invest in securities futures."

In fact, however, Forte operated the Partnership as a Ponzi scheme from the beginning. Over the years, Forte consistently reported annualized returns of approximately 18% to 38% every quarter, regardless of market conditions, thus attracting an increasing number of investors who became limited partners with an interest in the profits of the Partnership commensurate with the amount of their cash investment. By the time that the Partnership filed its 2007 U.S. Return of Partnership Income (Form 1065), the Partnership had over 100 limited partners.

Following the exposure of the Madoff Ponzi scheme in late 2008, some investors sought assurances from Forte regarding the viability of the Partnership. While Forte may have given such assurances orally, he was unable to honor redemption requests. In late December 2008, Forte confessed to federal authorities about the fraudulent nature of the Partnership.

On January 7, 2009, the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") filed an action against Forte and the Partnership (collectively, the "Defendants"), alleging violations of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act") and seeking injunctive relief, disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, and civil penalties pursuant to various provisions of the Securities Act. That same day, the Commodities Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC") filed an action against Forte, alleging violations of the Commodity Exchange Act ("Commodity Act") and seeking injunctive relief, disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, and civil penalties pursuant to various sections of the Commodity Act. Also on January 7, 2009, this Court entered a Consent Order of Preliminary Injunction and Other Equitable Relief.

On March 30, 2009, this Court entered in both cases an Order Appointing a Receiver ("Receivership Order"), pursuant to which the Court took exclusive jurisdiction and possession of the Defendants' assets, monies, securities, choses in action, and properties, real and personal, tangible and intangible, of whatever kind and description, wherever situated, and any entities that the Defendants own or control or in which either of them have an interest (the "Receivership Assets"), as well as the Defendants' books, records, computers, and documents (the "Receivership Records"). In the same order, Marion A. Hecht was appointed Receiver for the Receivership Assets and Records (collectively, the "Receivership Estate"), with the goal and purpose of marshalling the Receivership Assets to maximize the recovery of defrauded investors. The Receivership Order also stayed all civil actions or other proceedings involving the Receivership Assets or Receivership Records, other than the Receivership proceedings and any additional charges in the actions brought by the SEC and the CFTC. Also in that order, Hoyle, Fickler, Herschel & Mathes LLP was appointed to serve as the Receiver's counsel.

On September 30, 2009, this Court entered Partial Final Judgment as to All Defendants in the SEC action and a Consent Order of Permanent Injunction and Other Equitable Relief Against Defendant Joseph S. Forte in the CFTC action.

On June 5, 2009, in the related criminal action brought by the U.S. Department of Justice, *United States v. Forte*, Criminal Action No. 09-304-1 (E.D. Pa.), Joseph Forte pleaded guilty to charges of wire fraud (18 U.S.C §1343); mail fraud (18 U.S.C. §1341); bank fraud (18 U.S.C. §1344); and money laundering (18 U.S.C. §1957). On November 24, 2009, Forte was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment, five years supervised probation, and restitution of approximately $35 million by the Honorable Jan DuBois of this Court. *Id.*, Docket Entry No. 35 (Nov. 24, 2009).

On July 11, 2011, the Securities and Exchange Commission filed an action against John Irwin, a certified public accountant who did work for the Partnership, including the preparation of investor account statements and the Partnership's tax returns, and Mr. Irwin's firm, Jacklin Associates, Inc., alleging violation of federal securities laws in connection with the Partnership, *SEC v. John N. Irwin and Jacklin Associates, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 11-cv-4429 (E.D. Pa.). On July 12, 2011, this Court entered judgments by consent against Mr. Irwin and Jacklin that, among other things, impose injunctive relief and require them to disgorge ill-gotten gains in amounts to be determined upon the SEC's subsequent motion. The Receiver has since completed her calculations of those ill-gotten gains, the numbers have been communicated to counsel for Mr. Irwin and Jacklin, and those defendants have recently initiated discussions with the SEC regarding a possible resolution of that action.

Currently pending before the Court is the Receiver's motion for entry of an Order Setting a Claims Bar Date, Establishing Claims Resolution Procedures, and Approving Distribution Methodology. That Motion, filed on May 12, 2011, requested:

- the imposition of a Bar Date for claims against the Receivership Estate;
- approval of procedures for the evaluation of both quantitative and qualitative aspects of claims against the Estate; and

- approval of a hybrid distribution methodology for the allocation of Estate assets to claimants under which 50% of the assets available for distribution would be distributed according to the Rising Tide methodology, and then the remaining 50% of the assets would be distributed according to the Net Investment methodology.

On May 16, 2011, the Court granted that Motion insofar as it sought the entry of an Order to Show Cause. Pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Order to Show Cause, the Receiver served the Order to Show Cause and the Bar Date Motion on all the Limited Partners and all known potential creditors. The Order to Show Cause provided that all responses or objections to the motion should be sent to the Receiver on or before June 15, 2011.

A total of forty limited partners (the "Objectors") raised timely objections to the Bar Date Motion through the transmission of four letters to the Receiver. One letter was submitted by a limited partner proceeding *pro se,* and the other three letters were submitted by counsel for various limited partners. The Objectors collectively raised objections to five aspects of the Bar Date Motion. Two of those objections, relating to the procedures for objecting to the Bar Date Motion itself and to the procedures for resolving disputed claims against the Receivership estate, were resolved between the parties pending approval by the Court. Three other issues raised by the Objectors were the subject of further briefing:

1. Objections that the proposed procedures and standards advocated by the Receiver, especially insofar as they called for an individualized evaluation of the state of mind of individuals who had been the recipients of transfers from the Partnership, would result in unnecessary and excessive costs to the Receivership Estate;

2. Objections that the interpretations of the Pennsylvania Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act, 12 Pa. C.S. §5101 *et seq.* ("PUFTA") advocated by the Receiver in her clawback litigation and incorporated into the Qualitative Claims Analysis provisions of the proposed Bar Date Order were erroneous, especially insofar as those interpretations related to the Receiver's standing to assert claims under PUFTA, the Receiver's inquiry notice standard for evaluating a transferee's good faith in receiving transfers of Partnership assets, and the statute of limitations applicable to the Receiver's claims under PUFTA; and

3. Objections to the proposed hybrid distribution methodology that incorporates both Rising Tide and Net Investment methodologies.

These issues were fully briefed by the SEC and the Objectors on August 8, 2011, and by the Receiver on August 29, 2011. The motion is currently pending before the Court.

Pursuant to the Receivership Order, this Sixth Report provides updated information regarding the known assets and liabilities of the Receivership Estate, a summary of the Receiver's activities to date, and information regarding the plan and estimated schedule for further anticipated activities of the Receiver with respect to the Receivership Estate.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE RECEIVER'S ACTIVITIES

During the six months since the Fifth Receiver's Report, the Receiver has continued her work to assume control of and ultimately liquidate the Receivership Assets with the objective of maximizing the recovery for defrauded investors.

During the current reporting period, the Receiver has diligently continued to pursue collection of the Estate's assets. As the Receiver first noted in her Fifth Report, liquidation of assets has slowed somewhat now that Joseph Forte's personal assets largely have been liquidated. One significant reason for this deceleration in asset liquidation is uncertainty relating to the resolution of the three disputed legal issues governing the Receiver's clawback claims that are currently before the Court in the context of the Bar Date Motion. These issues – the Receiver's standing as a non-creditor of the Partnership to bring the clawback claims or use those claims as offsets to investor claims; the application of the statute of limitations to the Receiver's claims under PUFTA and hence the temporal scope of the Receiver's clawback claims; and the standards governing a defendant's good faith defenses to clawback claims – deeply affect the viability and scope of the Receiver's clawback claims against limited partners, apprentices, and charities, among others. The disputes concerning these issues influence all parties' willingness to engage in productive discussions concerning the resolution of the clawback claims.

Because the proposed Bar Date Order was crafted with the intent of applying the same legal standards to limited partners' claims against the Receiver's Estate as those that the Receiver has asserted apply to her clawback claims, that motion presents a vehicle for resolving the issues in a fashion that will be binding on all limited partners. The Receiver believes that the Court's ruling on the Bar Date Motion will enable all parties to evaluate the strength of the Receiver's claims based on a single, known set of legal principles and that this will reduce litigation costs and speed settlements.

A. Work on Asset Recovery

As previously reported to the Court, the Receiver has an FDIC insured account at Eagle Bank and an account at Presidential Bank. There was a total of $1,505,086.94 in the Receivership accounts as of February 24, 2012. As shown in Exhibit 1 hereto and set forth in this Report and previous Receiver's Reports, the Receiver has successfully liquidated many of the assets, as well as a number of claims against third parties and against limited partners, that were illiquid at the time of her appointment. Additions to the Receivership bank account as a result of the liquidation of assets and the resolution of the Receiver's claims during the six months since the last Receiver's Report are addressed in Section III of this Report.

The Receivership Estate still contains a number of other assets that have not yet been liquidated. Apart from the Receiver's clawback claims, these assets include:

- *Real estate.* The Receiver expects to recover $397,500 from the sale of a beach property which Forte helped finance. This property has been listed for sale for two years, and the listing price has been reduced repeatedly. The agreed reductions in the purchase price do not affect the Receiver's recovery of $397,500. See Section IV.B. of this Report.

- *Investments.* There are two remaining Forte investments in closely held businesses that the Receiver hopes to liquidate. She is monitoring both investments, one of which appears to have little value. See Section IV.D. of this Report.

- *Claims against John Irwin and Jacklin Associates.* John Irwin was one of the original limited partners of, and the accountant for, the Partnership. Jacklin Associates, a firm of which Mr. Irwin was president, provided accounting and other services to the Partnership. The Receiver concluded that she had significant claims against both in the amount of $34 million and, after failing to obtain a reasonable settlement offer, the Receiver filed suit on March 29, 2010. Jacklin and Mr. Irwin filed for protection under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code on May 27, 2010. Jacklin's bankruptcy case has since been dismissed, based in part upon its representation that it does not have sufficient assets to effectuate a plan of reorganization. On January 12, 2012, the Bankruptcy Court confirmed Mr. Irwin's Second Amended Plan of Reorganization, and the Receiver is now engaged in discussions regarding the implementation of that Plan. Also, on July 12, 2011, this Court entered Consent Judgments in the SEC's action against Jacklin and Mr. Irwin (case no. 11-cv-4429), with quantification of monetary relief against the defendants to be determined at a later date. Following the Receiver's analysis of the flow of money between Jacklin and Mr. Irwin, on the one hand, and Joseph S. Forte and Joseph Forte, L.P., on the other, Mr. Irwin and Jacklin have recently initiated discussions with both the SEC and the Receiver regarding a possible consensual resolution of the SEC's claims for monetary relief. See Section VII of this Report.

- *Claims against MF Global.* MF Global was the futures commission merchant that held the Partnership futures trading account. On December 21, 2010, the Receiver filed suit against MF Global, alleging negligence in light of contradictory statements regarding Forte's claim of exemption from registration that were in MF Global's possession and in light of unusual account activity. While MF Global's Motion for

Judgment on the Pleadings was pending, the Receiver reached a settlement in principal of the MF Global litigation. However, while the parties were in the process of negotiating the formal terms of the settlement, MF Global collapsed and was placed into receivership. The Receiver will assert her claim in the MF Global receivership proceedings. See Section VIII of this Report.

- *Claims against attorneys for the Partnership.* Crawford, Wilson, Ryan & Agulnick, P.C., Crawford, Wilson & Ryan, LLC, and Kevin J. Ryan, Esquire provided legal services to the Partnership over a period of years. Based upon discovery indicating that these attorneys had access to significant information about the Partnership during the course of their representation, the Receiver concluded that she has claims against the Partnership's attorneys. The Receiver filed suit on December 21, 2010, and that case is presently in the discovery phase. See Section IX of this Report.

The other assets of the Estate are the Receiver's clawback claims, whose resolution will be facilitated by resolution of the legal issues raised by the Bar Date Motion as discussed above:

- *Clawbacks—Gifts.* The Receiver holds claims against charities and individuals who received gifts from Forte using Ponzi money fraudulently obtained from the Limited Partners. Total current claims are in excess of $1,416,538 plus interest. Certain charities contend that significant portions of these claims are barred by the applicable statute of limitations or repose. During this period the Receiver reached a settlement in the amount of $1,350 with the Republican National Committee, to which Forte had given donations. Pursuant to a Consent Order, the Court, during this reporting period, entered a judgment in the amount of $96,275 resolving the Receiver's claims against gift recipient Laura Forte, Joseph Forte's mother. The Court also issued an Order directing gift recipient John Forte, Joseph Forte's brother, to pay the Receiver $400 per month and entered a judgment against John Forte in the amount of $78,000. Also during this period, the Receiver received, pursuant to Consent Orders approved before this period, payments totaling $4,500 from two individuals who had received gifts from Forte. See Section IV.C. of this Report for a discussion of Consent Orders filed during this period and the Receiver's ongoing negotiations.

- *Clawback—Limited Partners.* The Receiver holds claims against those limited partners who the Receiver alleges have received Partnership assets in violation of PUFTA. Foremost among these are limited partners who withdrew fictitious profits from the Ponzi scheme ("net winners") — that is, where distributions to the limited partner exceeded his or her cash investment. After settling net winning claims with eight limited partners who agreed to return a total of $665,003 in net winnings plus $4,380 in interest[1], there are 31 other limited partners who have failed to return $7,440,010 in net winnings despite demand. See Exhibit 2.2. During the reporting period, the Court approved Consent Orders relating to two other Partnership accounts,

[1] A total of $540 of this amount is still due from one investor as noted in Exhibit 2.2.

pursuant to which both associated limited partners agreed to return 100% of their net winnings, and one of them returned $4,000 in interest. With respect to claims for principal against limited partners, the strength of the Receiver's claims will be influenced by the resolution of the Bar Date Motion. See Section V of this Report.

- *Claims against apprentices.* The Receiver is evaluating the collectability of these claims, but the extent and strength of her claims to recoup the salaries of the three apprentices also will be affected by this Court's rulings on the Bar Date Motion. See Section VI of this Report.

As noted in prior Receiver's Reports, the Receiver continues to believe it is unlikely that there will be sufficient assets recovered to make the Limited Partners whole.

B. Administrative Tasks

In addition to preparing and filing the Bar Date Motion and performing the substantive work of evaluating and recovering assets described throughout this report, during this reporting period the Receiver continued to perform necessary administrative tasks and legal duties, including:

- Communicating with limited partners and their counsel about developments in the Receivership.
- Maintaining a website for the Receivership on which all publicly filed documents are posted.

During this reporting period, the Receiver also changed the accounting firm with which she is affiliated when her prior firm, Clifton Gunderson LLP, merged with another entity to become CliftonLarsonAllen LLP. She obtained the Court's permission to have her new colleagues support her work, as necessary, in this matter at the same rates previously approved by the Court. There were no changes in personnel working on Receivership matters as a result of the Receiver's change in firm, and the move did not (and will not) result in any additional charges to the Estate related to a change in personnel, technology, or otherwise.

Also during this reporting period, the Court on January 3, 2012, approved the retention of Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP as counsel to the Receiver. The shift of counsel was prompted by the fact that the firm previously representing the Receiver, Hoyle, Fickler, Herschel & Mathes LLP, ceased operations effective January 2, 2012, with certain of the lawyers who had represented the Receiver at the Hoyle firm, including Lawrence T. Hoyle, Jr. and Arlene Fickler, shifting their practices to the Schnader firm effective January 3, 2012. The hourly rates for the counsel working on Receivership matters will not change as a result of the move to the Schnader firm, and the Schnader firm will assume the cost of getting any newly-assigned personnel up to speed on Receivership matters. The move did not (and will not) result in any additional cost to the Estate related to changes in personnel, technology, or otherwise.

The Receiver and her Counsel hope to file with the Court by April 1, 2012, a fee petition covering the period October 2010 through December 2011 and, to that end, will seek to have all associated invoices to the SEC and CFTC for review by March 9, 2012.

III. RECEIVERSHIP ASSETS RESOLVED DURING THIS PERIOD

As provided in Section X, Paragraph F of the Receivership Order, the Receiver has the authority to dispose of Receivership Assets, provided that any action is described in the next filed Receiver’s Report. Accordingly, the Receiver hereby advises the Court of the following actions that involved recovery or abandonment of Receivership Assets. During this reporting period, several claims were resolved; however, the Receiver’s efforts were largely focused on the pursuit of litigation regarding large claims that have not yet been resolved.

A. Assets Recovered and Proceeds Added to the Receivership Estate

During the current reporting period, the Receiver has recovered an additional $409,223 in settlement of clawback claims against limited partners and donees of gifts, plus interest of $5,304.25 earned in the Receiver’s bank accounts, for a total of $414,527.25 in cash added to the Receivership Estate bank accounts.

B. Assets Evaluated as Worthless and Abandoned by the Receiver This Period

During the current period, the Receiver has not abandoned any assets as worthless.

IV. RECEIVERSHIP ESTATE ASSETS

A. Receivership Account at Eagle and Presidential Banks

As of February 24, 2012, the Receiver had $1,259,247.67 at Eagle Bank, and $245,839.27 at Presidential Bank, for a total cash bank balance of $1,505,086.94. Both banks are insured by FDIC. See Exhibit 1 for the Receiver's accounting of cash activity.

B. Forte-Boudwin Interest in Beach House – 3616 Sounds Avenue, North Unit, Sea Isle City, NJ

In 2002, Forte gave two checks totaling $397,500 to Michael and Diane Boudwin to help finance the acquisition of the beach property at 3616 Sounds Avenue, North Unit, in Sea Isle City, New Jersey. Michael Boudwin is Bernadette (Mrs. Joseph) Forte's brother. Title is vested in the names of Joseph S. Forte, Bernadette Forte, Michael Boudwin, and Diane Boudwin.

Near the end of the summer of 2009, the Receiver and the Boudwins entered into an agreement providing for the Receiver's recovery of $397,500 upon the sale of this property. The parties listed the property for sale at $879,000 through Freda Real Estate Agency, Inc., which agreed to receive a discounted commission of 4% negotiated by the Receiver. As previously reported to the Court, the listing agreement was renewed at the price of $849,000 in February 2011.

On July 27, 2011, the Receiver, the Boudwins, and Mrs. Forte agreed to a third price reduction, this time to $699,900. The Receiver's realtor advised that the continuing poor real estate market has had a negative effect on the prospects for immediate sale of this property at a reasonable price. The Receiver investigated the option of holding an auction to sell the property, but determined that it was not cost effective.

During the current reporting period, the listing contract with Freda Real Estate Agency, Inc. expired, and the Receiver re-listed the property with Weichert Realty – Hoey Group on a five percent commission basis, with that listing contract to expire on May 31, 2012. The listing price currently remains $699,900. The Boudwins continue to pay all tax, mortgage, and other expenses associated with the property.

C. Gifts and Donations

1. Donations to Charities

As set forth in previous Receiver's Reports, Forte made significant charitable donations to numerous organizations, and a few charities have returned the donations, including, as discussed in previous Receiver's Reports, Malvern Preparatory School. See Exhibit 1. In March of 2010, seven charities executed tolling agreements with the Receiver. These charities, listed below, are subject to demands from the Receiver for the return of gifts as follows:

Joseph S. Forte Donees Who Have Executed Tolling Agreements	**Current Demand Amount** [2]
Cardinal O'Hara High School	$623,297
Gundaker Foundation/Rotary Club	$3,000
Hill Top Preparatory School	$154,992
Monsignor Bonner High School	$206,636
Rotary Club of Haverford	$11,088
Rotary Foundation	$1,800
St. Anastasia Church and School	$415,725
TOTAL claims against donees who have executed tolling agreements	**$1,416,538**

As reported in the Fifth Receiver's report, the Receiver has been engaged in substantial and productive settlement negotiations with one of these charities. Although the parties have not yet reached agreement on the structure of a settlement, the parties have exchanged several settlement proposals and the Receiver continues to expect that the negotiations will result in a settlement that will be presented to the Court for approval. However, the Receiver's demands to the three largest charities are subject to those charities' contention that a portion of the Receiver's claims is barred by the applicable statute of limitations; resolution of the PUFTA statute of limitations issue before the Court in the context of the Bar Date Motion will facilitate settlement of these claims. Pending resolution of statute of limitations issues, the Receiver's primary activity relating to these charities during this reporting period has been engaging in the settlement negotiations noted above and investigating that charity's claimed inability to repay the gifts.

[2] Amounts listed in this column have been adjusted for exchange value where documentation exists, but *exclude* interest, unknown payments prior to 2002, and unknown in-kind contributions.

2. Gifts and Loans to Friends, Family, and Third Parties

The Receiver's investigation of loans and gifts made by Forte to friends, family and other third parties is ongoing. As reported in previous Receiver's Reports, the Receiver made demands to recipients of gifts and loans for amounts totaling in the aggregate approximately $696,000. The Receiver currently has tolling agreements with two such persons and filed suit against six donees on March 29, 2010, under the caption *Marion Hecht, as Receiver for Joseph Forte, L.P. v. Laura Forte, et al*, Docket No. 10-cv-1375.

During the current reporting period, the Receiver has continued to pursue resolution of the claims presented in 10-cv-1375. With respect to John and Laura Forte, Joseph Forte's brother and mother, respectively, two of the defendants in that action, the Receiver had, in April of 2011, conducted a mediation session before the Honorable Timothy R. Rice. Although the parties reached agreements in principle to resolve their claims during that mediation, John and Laura Forte refused to execute consent orders reflecting these agreements. Magistrate Judge Rice then held a further conference with the parties in November 2011 concerning the Fortes' failure to execute the consent orders.

Following the November conference, Laura Forte executed the Consent Order, which the Court approved on December 28, 2011. Pursuant to that Consent Order, the Court entered a judgment against Laura Forte in the amount of $96,275, which reflects the $146,275 she received from Joseph Forte less the $50,000 of that amount which was in repayment of loans she made to Joseph Forte. Because of Laura Forte's age and financial situation, the Receiver agreed to waive a requirement for monthly payments, in exchange for the entry of the judgment that the Receiver can enforce upon Ms. Forte's estate.

By contrast, despite the second conference with Magistrate Judge Rice in November, John Forte continued to refuse to execute the Consent Order reflecting the settlement agreement that the parties reached before Judge Rice in April. The Receiver was thereby compelled to file a motion to enforce the settlement agreement, which the Court granted on February 7, 2012. The Court ordered John Forte to pay the Receiver $78,000 through payments of $400 a month. The $78,000 total reflects the $73,000 he received from Joseph Forte plus $5,000 in prejudgment interest. The Court also entered a judgment against John Forte in the amount of $78,000 that the Receiver may seek to enforce if John Forte fails to make his monthly payments. John Forte's first monthly payment of $400 under the Consent Order is due on March 1.

During this reporting period, the Receiver also entered into negotiations with the Republican National Committee (the "RNC") to recover $5,800 which was donated to the RNC by Joseph Forte between 2003 and 2008. The parties reached a settlement whereby the RNC agreed to pay the Receiver $1,350; the Receiver determined that it was appropriate to compromise her claims against the RNC in light of, among other things, the RNC's position that such claims were subject to preemption by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. On October 18, 2011, the Court approved the Consent Order reflecting the settlement of the Receiver's claims with the Republican National Committee, and the RNC subsequently paid the agreed-upon amount.

During this reporting period, the Receiver also continued her communications regarding settlement with two other gift recipients whose claims are tolled.

During this reporting period, the Receiver has received $1,500 in periodic payments from Charlie Cannon, one of the defendants on case number 10-cv-1375, pursuant to a Consent Order approved by the Court on June 1, 2011; he has $24,000 remaining on his debt. The Receiver also received $3,000 in period payments from Gil Nassib, the defendant in *Hecht v. Nassib*, Civil Action No. 11-2716, pursuant to a Consent Order approved by the Court on August 4, 2011; he has $9,500 remaining on his debt.

D. Investments in Closely Held Businesses

Of Forte's sixteen original investments in closely held businesses, there are two that remain unliquidated. Pursuant to the Court's March 1, 2010, Order, the Receiver will post information about proposed sales on the Receivership website, as well as report any sales in subsequent Receiver's Reports. Specifics of the status of each of Forte's remaining investments in closely held companies follow.

1. Real Entertainment Group, Inc. ("Real")

Real operates World Café Live in Philadelphia, PA. Its business model is to develop a portfolio of live music and restaurant venues under the "World Café Live" brand name. The company reports that, in addition to its first location in Philadelphia, it now has a second location in downtown Wilmington, Delaware. The website is www.worldcafelive.com.

As previously reported, Forte invested $25,000 in Real, purchasing 25 shares of Series B Preferred Stock which currently represents 0.136% ownership. This interest is likely to be diluted to 0.13% upon completion of the company's current effort to raise additional capital. Real forwards updated financial information to the Receiver on a regular basis, which the Receiver monitors.

2. Gotham Capital, LLC ("Gotham Capital")

The Receiver now holds 18.43 units (approximately 1.774%) in Gotham Capital, an angel investor located in Radnor, PA. The Receiver reviewed Gotham Capital's updated report dated February 23, 2012 sent by the CEO. As reported, apart from certain joint venture interests that do not appear to have much value, Gotham Capital's primary asset is a 79% interest in Gotham Financial. However, Gotham Financial sold its only asset, an interest in a software developer, Power2Process ("P2P"), to Flint Telecom Group, Inc. ("Flint") in October 2010, and received 68,220 shares of Series H Convertible Preferred Stock in Flint with the possibility of receiving 34,110 additional shares on each of the first two anniversary dates of the closing provided certain revenue projections of P2P are met. By communications dated February 23, 2012, the Receiver has been told that funding by Flint of P2P has been erratic. Based on available information, it appears that in the event of a liquidation of Gotham Financial's interest in Flint, and Gotham Capital's interests in the other joint ventures, there would be insufficient capital to pay the debt of Gotham Capital. As a result there would be no residual assets available for the equity holders of Gotham Capital such as the Receiver. The Receiver will continue to monitor this asset.

V. INVESTOR ACCOUNTS

Because of the nature of the Ponzi scheme, investors' capital accounts were inflated with phantom profits. Starting with preliminary analyses undertaken by the SEC, the Receiver has reconstructed investors' capital accounts. Attached as Exhibit 2 is an updated summary schedule of reconstructed investor balances after elimination of phantom profits,[3] identified by investor number.[4] After reconstruction, account balances that appear in parentheses show the amount by which an investor was a "net winner" – in other words, an investor who received payments of

[3] In reconstructing the Limited Partners' capital accounts, it was necessary for the Receiver to take account of the fact that certain investors ("Transferor LPs") transferred some of their limited partnership interests to other limited partners ("Transferee LPs"); those intra-fund transfers have been honored to the extent there was available capital in the Transferor LP account.

[4] Investor numbers were assigned in order to maintain the privacy of the Partnership's investors. The SEC notified investors of their specific Investor Numbers. In addition, the Receiver assigned a new number, R01, to an investor identified by the Receiver. Investors are requested to contact the Receiver for any assistance with respect to their Investor Numbers via email at marion.hecht@cliftonlarsonallen.com.

false profits over and above the return of the investor's original capital contributions. Balances that do not appear in parentheses show the amount by which the investor was a net loser – that is, an investor whose investment exceeded withdrawals from the account. Attached as Exhibit 2.1 is a schedule showing the investor accounts that have been adjusted since the Receiver's First Report. This schedule includes, among other adjustments, those adjustments resulting from payments pursuant to settlement agreements. [5]

Specifics of the Receiver's activities in pursuit of claims against limited partners are detailed below. Overall, the Receiver currently has unresolved claims against 31 limited partners who received distributions greater than their investments in the Partnership; those false profits distributions total in the aggregate $7,440,010, as shown on Exhibit 2.2 to this Report**.** The Receiver may have additional claims against certain limited partners for principal, the strength of which depends, at least in part, on the resolution of the legal issues presented in the Bar Date Motion.

A. Claims Against Limited Partners Or Their Transferees That Were Resolved and/or Liquidated During This Reporting Period

During the current reporting period, the Court approved Consent Orders resolving the Receiver's claims against two investors in the Partnership.

On October 18, 2011, the Court approved a Consent Order resolving the Receiver's claims against Patricia Shields, as Executrix for the Estate of Eileen Maguire, who was an investor in the Partnership and a net winner. The Receiver had sought the return of $200,000 in net winnings that had been paid by the Partnership to the Estate. Pursuant to the settlement, the

---

[5] For the ten settling limited partners who have agreed to pay in full the agreed-upon settlement amount, the balance reflected in the Capital Account Balance column on Exhibit 2 is zero (shown by a dash). One settling limited partner has failed to remit his final payment of $540. The amount owed is reflected in the Settlement Amount Due column on Exhibit 2.2.

Executrix agreed to repay the entire $200,000 to the Receiver when authorized to do so by the Orphans' Court division of the Delaware County Court of Common Pleas, under the jurisdiction of which the Estate was administered. In this instance, the Receiver made an exception to her requirement that all settling net winners agree to pay prejudgment interest as part of the settlement; the Receiver made that exception because of, among other things, the finite amount of assets existing in the Estate and the existence of competing claims on that Estate. On November 1, 2011, the Orphans' Court approved the administration of the Estate and, in December, 2011, after the Orphans' Court ruling had become final, the Estate made the payment of $200,000 to the Receiver.

On December 5, 2011, the Court approved a Consent Order resolving the Receiver's claims against Investor #1098, who was a net winner in the amount of $199,373. Under the Consent Order, Investor #1098 agreed to repay the $199,373 and $4,000 in prejudgment interest. Those payments were made to the Receiver by the end of December 2011.

B. Unresolved Claims Against Limited Partners and Their Transferees

With respect to Investor 1102, a defendant in Civil Action No. 10-1377, the Court granted the Receiver's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on June 2, 2011. The Court's Order awarded $519,547 in net winnings to the Receivership Estate. The Receiver is conducting an investigation regarding that defendant's assets, including by researching public records and serving subpoenas on third parties, in order to evaluate the collectability of the judgment and whether the pursuit of the remaining claims for principal against this investor is likely to be cost-effective.

The Receiver also sued in this Court the then-anonymous participants in two profit-sharing plans that were limited partners and net winners in the Ponzi scheme. These suits were captioned *Marion Hecht, as Receiver for Joseph Forte, L.P. v. John Does, Skee Ball Profit Sharing Plan Participants, Numbers 1-250*, Civil Action No. 10-1373, and *Marion Hecht, as Receiver for Joseph Forte, L.P. v. John Does, Crawford, Wilson and Ryan Profit Sharing Plan Participants, Numbers 1-250*, Civil Action No. 10-1376. The defendants in each of these actions filed a motion to dismiss the Receiver's First Amended Complaint; those motions were fully briefed on November 2, 2011, and are pending before the Court.

As set forth in the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Receiver's Reports, the Receiver also instituted litigation in this Court against charitable transferees of one of the limited partners in *Marion Hecht, as Receiver for Joseph Forte, L.P. v. Abraham Lincoln Foundation of the Union League of Philadelphia, et al*, Civil Action No. 10-1372. That action has been stayed pursuant to the Court's order of April 15, 2010. Accordingly, no activity has taken place in this case during the current period. The Receiver communicates with the transferees when contacted.

The Receiver is actively involved in negotiating additional settlements with limited partners who signed tolling agreements where settlement is possible notwithstanding the disputed issues addressed in the Bar Date Motion. As to the other limited partners who signed tolling agreements, the Receiver has continued her pursuit of these claims by:

- Conducting ongoing settlement negotiations and evaluating certain limited partners' ability to pay any judgment;
- Continuing to conduct discovery and reviewing documents produced to the Receiver by limited partners;
- Preparing for and taking a deposition of an individual with potential evidence regarding knowledge of red flags by limited partners against whom the Receiver has significant potential claims; and
- Responding to letters from investors' counsel.

With respect to the limited partners with whom the Receiver has not been able to achieve settlements that are in the best interest of the Receivership Estate, the Receiver believes that resolution of those claims will be facilitated by the resolution of the issues presented in the Bar Date Motion. If settlement cannot be reached upon clarification of those issues, upon compliance with Paragraph X.P of the Receivership Order, the Receiver anticipates commencing suits against those investors against whom she has viable claims, whether for net winnings only or for both net winnings and principal, unless the investors are able to provide the Receiver with adequate documentation of an inability to pay.

VI. RECEIVER'S CLAIMS AGAINST APPRENTICES TO JOSEPH FORTE

Jacklin Associates employed "apprentices" to Joseph Forte who were to learn Forte's trading system. The first apprentice was put on the payroll in 2000; there were three apprentices by the end of 2008. Two of these apprentices were also limited partners. Over the years, salary payments reflected on the three apprentices' W-2 forms totaled approximately $2,300,000, all of which was money stolen from the Limited Partners. As reported in previous Receiver's Reports, the Receiver has executed tolling agreements and engaged in discovery with all three apprentices. Settlement discussions have continued with one apprentice, with respect to whom the Receiver is awaiting the receipt of updated financial information. As to the other apprentices, the Receiver believes that the parties will be in a position to resolve the Receiver's claims upon resolution of the issues presented in the Receiver's Bar Date Motion. If the Receiver is unable to negotiate satisfactory settlements, she may then commence litigation.

VII. RECEIVER'S CLAIMS AGAINST JOHN IRWIN AND JACKLIN ASSOCIATES

As discussed in the previous Receiver's Reports, the Receiver has significant claims against John Irwin ("Mr. Irwin"), one of the original limited partners of, and the accountant for, the Partnership; and Jacklin Associates, Inc. ("Jacklin"), a company of which Mr. Irwin was President, and that provided accounting and other services for the Partnership. Mr. Irwin and

Jacklin provided diverse services to the Partnership, including the preparation of the Partnership's tax returns for and reports to the limited partners, as well as payroll and other record-keeping services. Mr. Irwin was also actively involved in the formation of the Partnership; the solicitation of new limited partners and of additional investments from existing partners; and the receipt from, and disbursement to, limited partners of Partnership funds.

As reported in the Third Receiver's Report, the Receiver determined that settlement negotiations with Mr. Irwin and Jacklin would be fruitless and filed a Complaint against Mr. Irwin and Jacklin in this Court on March 29, 2010, captioned *Marion Hecht, as Receiver for Joseph Forte, L.P. v. John N. Irwin and Jacklin Associates*, Civil Action No. 10-1371. That litigation was ongoing when on May 27, 2010, Mr. Irwin and Jacklin each filed a Voluntary Petition under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Mr. Irwin acknowledged that the filing of the Receiver's action precipitated the bankruptcies. The Receiver was the largest creditor identified in the schedules to Mr. Irwin and Jacklin's Chapter 11 petitions.

The bankruptcy filings resulted in an automatic stay of the Receiver's suit against these defendants. On August 27, 2010, the Receiver initiated an adversary proceeding within the bankruptcy case seeking a determination that Mr. Irwin's debt to the Receiver is not dischargeable in bankruptcy pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§523(a)(2), (a)(4), (a)(6), and (a)(19) on the grounds that the debt arose from, among other things, fraud, defalcation while acting in a fiduciary capacity, and/or fraud, deceit or manipulation in connection with the sale of any security. The Receiver voluntarily dismissed that adversary action on January 12, 2012, as further detailed below, because the Receiver concluded that the adversary action, even if successful, would serve only to permit the Receiver to pursue the same assets that will be subject to the SEC's action against Mr. Irwin and Jacklin, which is discussed further below.

On December 2, 2010, the Bankruptcy Court, over several objections, granted in part the Receiver's motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2004 for discovery to obtain information relating to the assets of Jacklin and Mr. Irwin's bankruptcy estate. The Receiver has obtained document discovery not only from Mr. Irwin and Jacklin, but also from Jacklin's other shareholders and certain of Mr. Irwin's family members, as well as from a group of individuals and entities that, according to Mr. Irwin's bankruptcy petition, collectively owe more than $2,300,000 to Mr. Irwin. Mr. Irwin and Jacklin's production of documents, including included bank statements, credit card statements, and accounting records covering more than a seven-year time period, has continued through this reporting period and has aided the Receiver's analysis of Mr. Irwin and Jacklin's finances. The Receiver has conducted several informal interviews of Mr. Irwin as an aid in interpreting the produced documents, and has also engaged in extensive communications with Mr. Irwin's counsel, which have continued during this reporting period, regarding the content of the document production and the information contained therein.

On July 20, 2011, the Bankruptcy Court overruled the Receiver's objections to certain items on Mr. Irwin's schedule of exemptions, but that determination was made expressly without prejudice to the Receiver's ability subsequently to assert claims that the Receiver, rather than Mr. Irwin, was the lawful owner of the allegedly exempt assets under theories of constructive trust or remedy for fraudulent transfer.

On August 11, 2011, the Bankruptcy Court granted Jacklin's motion to dismiss its Chapter 11 case, a motion that was based in part on Jacklin's contention that it was unable to reorganize because it had insufficient assets. The Receiver lodged an objection to that dismissal, which was resolved by a stipulation among the Receiver, Jacklin, and Jacklin's primary secured creditor. The stipulation provided for, among other things, continued financial reporting by Jacklin to the Receiver, Jacklin's continued cooperation with the Receiver's discovery efforts, and the secured lender's temporary forbearance of collection on the secured debt. As noted in the Fifth Receiver's Report, the Receiver has concluded that Jacklin does not now have sufficient assets to warrant restarting active litigation against Jacklin in Civil Action No. 10-cv-1374 that is pending before this Court and had been stayed by the pendency of the bankruptcy. This is particularly so because the SEC now has a consent judgment in place against Jacklin relating to its involvement in the Partnership as part of the SEC's action mentioned above. The Receiver will continue to monitor Jacklin's financial condition and to seek its cooperation as necessary in obtaining information relevant to Mr. Irwin or to recovery from other individuals such as Mr. Irwin's wife and daughters.

During the current reporting period, the Bankrutpcy Court on September 15, 2011, granted in part and denied in part the Receiver's motion for relief from the automatic stay. In particular, the Bankruptcy Court granted the Receiver's motion in declaring that the automatic stay did not apply to potential actions by the Receiver for recovery of Partnership assets that were transferred by Mr. Irwin to Mr. Irwin's wife and daughters, but the Bankruptcy Court denied the Receiver's motion in finding that the stay did apply to actions against Mr. Irwin himself to seek recovery of Partnership assets held in property that Mr. Irwin declared as exempt.

Following the Bankruptcy Court's decision on the Receiver's motion for relief from the automatic stay, the Receiver engaged in further negotiations with Mr. Irwin's bankruptcy counsel regarding the provisions of Mr. Irwin's Plan of Reorganization and associated Disclosure

Statement, to which the Receiver had objected when they were originally filed in May, 2011. On November 18, 2011, Mr. Irwin filed a Second Amended Disclosure Statement and a Second Amended Plan of Reorganization that addressed the Receiver's concerns. The Receiver therefore withdrew her objections and indicated her consent to the Second Amended Plan of Reorganization. Following a hearing on November 23, 2011, the Bankruptcy Court approved the Disclosure Statement and established a schedule for a creditor vote on the proposed Plan of Reorganization. Following a hearing on January 12, 2012, the Second Amended Plan of Reorganization was confirmed.

At the January 12, 2012, hearing, the Receiver voluntarily dismissed her adversary action against Mr. Irwin (docket number 10-ap-348) in which, as described more fully above, she contended that certain of Mr. Irwin's debts to the Receiver were not dischargeable in bankruptcy. The Receiver had concluded that there was no economic justification for continuing to prosecute the nondischargeability action because even were she to prevail in that action, that success would only entitle her to pursue assets of Mr. Irwin that the SEC could pursue in its action, and as to which the SEC had already obtained a Consent Judgment requiring payment of disgorgement.

As noted in earlier Receiver's Reports, the Receiver filed claims in bankruptcy against both Mr. Irwin and Jacklin in the amount of approximately $34 million based upon their transactions with and conduct in connection with the Partnership. The Receiver believes that her claim will ultimately constitute a large proportion of the unsecured claims against Mr. Irwin's estate. Under the confirmed Second Amended Plan of Reorganization, the assets available to the unsecured creditors from Mr. Irwin's estate are primarily comprised of a group of interests in non-public small-cap firms in which Mr. Irwin invested, and a group of accounts receivable, including loans made by Mr. Irwin to some of these same small-cap firms and to several individuals. The Receiver is currently working in conjunction with Mr. Irwin to implement the Second Amended Plan of Reorganization, including by negotiating the engagement of the Liquidating Agent who is given significant powers under the Plan to seek the recovery of assets of the bankruptcy estate, including the accounts receivable described above, and to disburse those assets to creditors such as the Receiver. Mr. Irwin's bankruptcy counsel has consented to the Receiver's appointment as liquidating agent of George L. Miller of Miller Coffey Tate LLP, who would in turn engage Whiteford Taylor Preston LLP as the liquidating agent's counsel in connection with the Irwin bankruptcy.

Also of significance to the Receiver's claims against Mr. Irwin and Jacklin is the action filed by the Securities and Exchange Commission against both of them on July 11, 2011, alleging violation of federal securities laws in connection with the Partnership, docketed at 11-cv-4429 (E.D. Pa.). On July 12, 2011, this Court entered judgments by consent against Mr. Irwin and Jacklin in that action that require, among other things, that Mr. Irwin and Jacklin disgorge their ill-gotten gains in amounts to be determined upon the SEC's subsequent motion. During this reporting period, the Receiver analyzed financial records of Mr. Irwin and Jacklin to determine the flow of money between Jacklin and Mr. Irwin, on the one hand, and Joseph Forte and Joseph Forte, L.P. on the other, for purposes of quantifying Estate claims against Mr. Irwin, Jacklin, and associated individuals and entities and determining the amount of ill-gotten gains received by Mr. Irwin and Jacklin. The SEC has not yet filed a motion for entry of monetary relief in its action against Mr. Irwin and Jacklin because of discussions recently initiated by Mr. Irwin and Jacklin with both the SEC and the Receiver regarding the provision of additional financial information by Mr. Irwin and a possible consensual resolution of the SEC's claims for monetary relief.

The Receiver believes the issues remaining to be resolved in Mr. Irwin's bankruptcy case are the formal appointment of the Liquidating Agent under the Plan, the Liquidating Agent's subsequent pursuit of any remaining assets available for collection into the bankruptcy estate, and the Liquidating Agent's disbursement of those assets to creditors such as the Receiver. There may also be issues associated with the precise quantification of claims against the estate, including the Receiver's claims, for the purposes of establishing a schedule for the pro rata distribution of the estate's assets by the Liquidating Agent.

Also in conjunction with her claims against Mr. Irwin and Jacklin, the Receiver, during this reporting period, continued her negotiations with counsel for Mr. Irwin's spouse and daughters regarding the return of Partnership assets transferred to those individuals through Irwin or Jacklin. She has entered into tolling agreements with those individuals, and, in order to promote the continuing negotiations, is in the process of providing documents to them documenting the asset transfers at issue. If the Receiver is unable to negotiate satisfactory settlements, she may then commence litigation.

VIII. RECEIVER'S CLAIMS AGAINST MF GLOBAL

As reported in the Fourth Receiver's Report, on December 21, 2010, the Receiver filed a Complaint against MF Global, Inc., the futures commission merchant that held the Forte Partnership account, on the ground that it was negligent in the conduct of its business by ignoring, among other things, the internally inconsistent paperwork in its files relating to Forte's claim of exemption from registration with the CFTC. The Complaint was placed on this Court's docket as matter number 10-cv-7441. MF Global filed a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) on March 29, 2011, and after substantial briefing by both parties the Court on June 10, 2011, this Court denied MF Global's motion to dismiss without prejudice. MF Global subsequently filed an Answer with affirmative defenses and on July 5, 2011, filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings which remained pending.

This Court referred the matter to mediation before the Honorable Timothy R. Rice, and a settlement conference with the parties was held on August 18, 2011, at which the parties reached agreement on the terms of a settlement in principle under which the Receiver would dismiss her claims against MF Global in exchange for a payment of $125,000. However, the parties could not immediately execute a consent order memorializing the settlement because MF Global rejected the standard release language that the Receiver had previously used in consent orders submitted to this Court. MF Global instead demanded an extremely broad release, the scope of which, in the Receiver's view, exceeded her legal authority. The Receiver was in the process of determining whether she could reach an acceptable compromise about the release language when MF Global collapsed and was placed into receivership on October 31, 2011. The Receiver intends to file a claim in MF Global's receivership, though the Receiver does not know whether and to what extent such claim will be approved or whether there will be sufficient assets in the MF Global estate for distribution to claimants such as the Receiver.

IX. RECEIVER'S CLAIMS AGAINST KEVIN RYAN, ESQ., ET AL.

As reported in the Fourth Receiver's Report, on December 21, 2010, the Receiver filed a Complaint against Crawford, Wilson, Ryan & Agulnick, P.C., Crawford, Wilson & Ryan, LLC, and Kevin J. Ryan, Esquire. The Complaint was filed in this Court and is pending as matter number 10-cv-7440. The defendants in the Ryan litigation provided legal services to the Partnership over a period of years, including drafting the Limited Partnership Agreement through which the Partnership was created; preparing the Certificate of Incorporation; drafting an Amended Limited Partnership Agreement; and consulting on the legal requests of investors in the Partnership, including the establishment of at least one Trust as an investor account in the Partnership. In addition to the legal work that Mr. Ryan provided to the Partnership, he was an investor in the Partnership through a corporation he established and a profit sharing plan of which he was trustee. As a result, Mr. Ryan would have received any documentation that the Partnership provided to investors. The Complaint asserts legal malpractice claims under Pennsylvania law seeking to recover damages from defendants for harm they caused the Partnership in violation of their duties to provide competent legal services by, among other things, failing to advise the Partnership of the General Partner's obligations under the Commodities Exchange Act. The Receiver filed her Certificate of Merit as required under Pa. R. Civ. P. 1042.3 on February 18, 2011. In answering the Complaint, Ryan has contended, among other things, that he had no duty to provide advice to the Partnership, that he informed Joseph Forte that his services would not include advice about the requirements of the business of the Partnership, and that Forte informed him that Forte had a source of advice relating to the business of the Partnership and that he was not relying to Mr. Ryan for such advice.

During this reporting period, the parties have participated in the Court's scheduling conference and are proceeding with written and testimonial discovery.

X. TAX MATTERS

The Receiver filed the tax returns for the Qualified Settlement Fund (QSF) for the year 2010 with the Internal Revenue Service and the District of Columbia government by the due date of September 15, 2011. As authorized, the Receiver utilized her firm to prepare the tax returns for the QSF, and will prepare and file the tax returns for the QSF for the tax year 2011.

The Receiver will continue to provide affidavits concerning the financial affairs of the Partnership to those investors interested in obtaining refunds of state taxes paid on the false profits and income reported to the investors by the Partnership. Investors who have not done so are encouraged to request such an affidavit from the Receiver for submission to the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue.

XI. RECEIVER'S PLAN

Fundamentally, this Receivership Estate has three categories of assets that the Receiver has been seeking to liquidate for the benefit of the Partnership's defrauded limited partners: Joseph Forte's personal and real property, including various investments; the Partnership's tort claims against its accountants, lawyers, and futures commission merchant; and the clawback claims against certain limited partners and others recipients of Partnership assets from Forte:

Real and personal property. The Receiver has sold most of those assets and continues active efforts to sell the Boudwin Sea Isle property and the remaining small business investments as soon as possible.

Tort Claims. The Receiver will continue to pursue her claim against Mr. Irwin and Jacklin through the administration of Mr. Irwin's Second Amended Plan of Reorganization, by supporting, to the extent requested, the SEC's action, and by pursuing Jacklin in this Court if it appears economically appropriate to do so. The Receiver will continue to pursue her claims against the Partnership's attorneys in this Court. The Receiver will continue to pursue MF Global by filing her claim in the MF Global receivership proceedings.

Clawback Claims. The Receiver believes that the viability and extent of these claims will be informed by the Court's resolution of the issues presented in the Receiver's pending Bar Date Motion, as well as by continued efforts to determine the financial ability of the affected investors to pay any judgment obtained. The Receiver intends, upon the resolution of the Bar Date Motion, to seek to resolve these claims as cost-effectively as possible.

Attached as Exhibit 3 is a timeline which reflects the Receiver's current best estimate of appropriate dates for the processing of the Receiver's tort and clawback claims and creditors' claims against the Receivership Estate. Although these dates may need to change depending on subsequent events, the timeline was developed with the goal of seeking to complete the vast majority of the activities necessary to wind up the Receivership, other than the trial of the Receiver's clawback and other claims, before the fourth anniversary of the Receiver's appointment. However, the Receiver's success in recovering funds to compensate investors for their losses, and the time required to do so, will inevitably depend on the defenses asserted by those persons from whom she is seeking to recover the assets.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Lawrence T. Hoyle, Jr.

Lawrence T. Hoyle, Jr.
Arlene Fickler
Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP
1600 Market Street, Suite 3600
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
Telephone (215) 751-2000
Facsimile (215) 751-2205

Attorneys for Marion A. Hecht, Receiver

Dated: March 1, 2012

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON March 1, 2012, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Sixth Report of Marion A. Hecht, Court-Appointed Receiver for Joseph S. Forte and Joseph Forte, L.P. to be filed electronically and made available for viewing and downloading from the ECF system of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record. The Receiver will also post a copy of the brief and related documents on the Receivership website, www.fortereceivership.com.

The following counsel were also served through electronic mail:

Catherine E. Pappas, Esquire
United States Securities and Exchange Commission
701 Market Street, Suite 2000
Philadelphia, PA 19106
pappasc@sec.gov

Kevin Batteh, Esquire
Timothy M. Kirby, Esquire
U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Division of Enforcement
Three Lafayette Center
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581
kbatteh@cftc.gov
tkirby@cftc.gov

s/George P. Podolin

EXHIBIT 1

Joseph Forte, LP and Joseph S. Forte Receivership
Cash Basis Fund Accounting Report
Cse Nos: 09-CV-0063 and 0064
Reporting Period: 03/30/2009 to 02/24/2012

FUND ACCOUNTING			Changes Since 5th Receiver's Report (8/30/2011)
Beginning Balance (As of 03/30/2009):		$ -	
Cash and Securities Transferred to Receiver:			
Citizens Bank	89,140.82		
MF Global	6,267.54		
		95,408.36	
Interest/Dividend Income:			
Eagle Bank interest income	17,857.63		4,951.75
Presidential Bank Interest	839.27		352.50
Diversified Private Equity Inv II, LP (dividend)	6,516.63		
Diversified Private Equity Inv, LP (dividend)	614.08		
Plenum Capital Management, LP (dividend)	266.17		
		26,093.78	
Personal Asset Recoveries:			
American Funds Forte 401K early distribution	125,619.20		
Augustinian Friars (return of contribution)	5,000.00		
Barry S Slossberg Inc (sale of Forte vehicles)	42,375.00		
Barry S Slossberg Inc (sale of jewelry)	9,378.75		
Barry S Slossberg Inc (sale of personal property)	28,935.35		
Charlie Cannon (return of gift)	2,000.00		1,500.00
Craig Williams for Congress (return of contribution)	6,900.00		
Dana Forte (purchase of household items)	700.00		
Evanfest (return of contribution)	3,500.00		
George Long (return of gift)	2,000.00		
Gilbert Nassib (return of gift)	3,000.00		3,000.00
Guardian Life Insurance proceeds	26,499.49		
Joe Devlin (return of loan)	15,019.49		
Lisa Saddler (return of gift)	4,000.00		
Malvern Prep (return of contribution)	700,000.00		
Marine Corps Scholarship Foundation (return of contribution)	10,500.00		
MF Global (mentee Jim Boudwin account)	2,371.53		
PowerLift (return of deposit)	10,000.00		
Republican National Committee (return of gift)	1,350.00		1,350.00
Sale of 55th Street house	105,253.00		
Sale of Fawn Hill Lane	33,581.21		
Sale of Personal Investment (DPEI I & II)	70,000.00		
Sale of Personal Investment (Knight, Nova Plex Plenum, Probaris)	12,000.00		
Sale of Personal Investment (PPB Advisors)	7,000.00		
Sale of Personal Investment (Yaupon)	55,000.00		
		1,281,983.02	
Forte LP Asset Recoveries			
Investor Recoveries:			
Investor 1103.0	272,433.00		
Investor 1098.0	203,373.00		203,373.00
Investor 1080.0	200,000.00		200,000.00
Investor 1073.0	122,424.00		
Investor 1026.0	95,467.00		
Investor 1119.0	92,000.00		
Investor R01	30,000.00		
Investor 1111.0	23,305.00		
Investor 1121.0	19,315.00		
Investor 1097.0	13,899.00		
		1,072,216.00	414,527.25
Total Funds Available Before Expenses		2,475,701.16	

EXHIBIT 1

Joseph Forte, LP and Joseph S. Forte Receivership
Cash Basis Fund Accounting Report
Cse Nos: 09-CV-0063 and 0064
Reporting Period: 03/30/2009 to 02/24/2012

Decreases in Fund Balance:			
Disbursements to Receiver and counsel	932,323.93		
Section 754 notices	2,847.00		
Website	10,492.50		1,682.50
Change of Registered Agent	763.60		
Due Diligence Investigator	650.00		
Expert Witness Fees	4,109.50		
Tax Services	13,600.00		
		964,786.53	
Bank Fees		131.02	
Personal Asset Upkeep and Protection Expenses:			
55th Street	2,443.57		
Fawn Hill Lane	3,175.10		
Administrative - regarding insurance recovery	78.00		
		5,696.67	
Total Disbursements for Receivership Operations		970,614.22	1,682.50
Total Funds Disbursed		970,614.22	
Ending Balance of Fund - Net Assets (as of 2/24/2012)		$ 1,505,086.94	
Eagle Bank Balance (as of 2/24/2012)		$ 1,259,247.67	
Presidential Bank Balance (as of 2/24/2012)		$ 245,839.27	
		$ 1,505,086.94	

EXHIBIT 2

JOSEPH FORTE LP

ALL LIMITED PARTNER ACCOUNTS - As of February 24, 2012

Draft Schedule - Subject to Revision - Based on Available Documents

Investor ID No.	Cash Beginning Capital Contribution	Cash Contribution	Intrafund Transfer-In	Cash Distribution	Intrafund Transfer-Out	Total Capital Additions	Total Capital Distributions	( ) = Increase Adjustments and New LP	False Profits Returned	Settlements Due	Capital Account Balance 2/24/2011	Interest Received
	LP accounts											
1001.0	-	3,250,000	-	(7,066)	-	3,250,000	(7,066)	-	-	-	3,242,934	-
1002.0	-	25,000	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	25,000	-
1003.0	-	250,000	-	-	-	250,000	-	-	-	-	250,000	-
1004.0	-	1,059,393	1,734,133	(1,083,000)	(1,278,000)	2,793,526	(2,361,000)	-	-	-	432,526	-
1005.0	-	271,091	44,000	(31,281)	-	315,091	(31,281)	-	-	-	283,810	-
1006.0	-	581,999	-	(135,500)	-	581,999	(135,500)	-	-	-	446,499	-
1008.0	-	50,000	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	50,000	-
1009.0	-	175,000	-	(3,681)	(171,319)	175,000	(175,000)	-	-	-	-	-
1010.0	-	1,285,430	-	-	-	1,285,430	-	-	-	-	1,285,430	-
1011.0	-	1,680,000	171,319	(1,996)	-	1,851,319	(1,996)	-	-	-	1,849,323	-
1012.0	-	-	120,000	(58,000)	-	120,000	(58,000)	-	-	-	62,000	-
1014.0	-	50,000	30,000	-	-	80,000	-	-	-	-	80,000	-
1015.0	-	-	120,000	(100,000)	-	120,000	(100,000)	-	-	-	20,000	-
1016.0	-	100,000	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	100,000	-
1017.0	-	1,000,000	-	(1,171,497)	-	1,000,000	(1,171,497)	(3,710)	-	-	(175,207)	-
1018.0	-	358,000	62,108	(1,212,000)	-	420,108	(1,212,000)	-	-	-	(791,892)	-
1019.0	-	62,108	-	-	(62,108)	62,108	(62,108)	-	-	-	-	-
1020.0	-	150,000	-	(288,000)	-	150,000	(288,000)	-	-	-	(138,000)	-
1021.0	-	60,000	-	-	-	60,000	-	-	-	-	60,000	-
1022.0	-	60,000	-	-	-	60,000	-	-	-	-	60,000	-
1025.0	-	83,750	-	(304,000)	-	83,750	(304,000)	92,250	-	-	(128,000)	-
1026.0	-	335,000	-	(430,467)	-	335,000	(430,467)	-	95,467	-	-	-
1027.0	-	250,000	-	-	-	250,000	-	-	-	-	250,000	-
1029.0	-	977,012	540,000	(1,939,218)	-	1,517,012	(1,939,218)	-	-	-	(422,206)	-
1030.0	-	850,000	-	-	-	850,000	-	-	-	-	850,000	-
1031.0	-	800,000	-	(165,756)	-	800,000	(165,756)	-	-	-	634,244	-
1032.0	25,000	8,172,054	4,644,500	(3,581,771)	(10,899,282)	12,841,554	(14,481,053)	-	-	-	(1,639,499)	-
1032.5	-	2,552,120	1,898,453	(865,951)	(3,296,500)	4,450,573	(4,162,451)	-	-	-	288,122	-
1033.0	-	330,000	1,093,766	-	-	1,423,766	-	-	-	-	1,423,766	-
1034.0	-	666,000	1,000,000	-	(1,666,000)	1,666,000	(1,666,000)	-	-	-	-	-
1035.0	-	217,175	-	(30,855)	(186,320)	217,175	(217,175)	-	-	-	-	-
1036.0	-	-	291,893	(5,740)	(291,893)	291,893	(297,633)	-	-	-	(5,740)	-
1037.0	-	-	291,893	(9,430)	(291,893)	291,893	(301,323)	-	-	-	(9,430)	-
1038.0	-	-	97,297	(6,930)	(97,297)	97,297	(104,227)	-	-	-	(6,930)	-
1039.0	-	-	291,893	(7,460)	(291,893)	291,893	(299,353)	-	-	-	(7,460)	-
1039.5	-	-	1,691,766	-	-	1,691,766	-	-	-	-	1,691,766	-
1040.0	-	-	1,691,766	-	-	1,691,766	-	-	-	-	1,691,766	-
1041.0	-	-	1,691,765	-	-	1,691,765	-	-	-	-	1,691,765	-
1042.0	-	-	-	(54,638)	-	-	(54,638)	-	-	-	(54,638)	-
1043.0	-	-	185,992	(97,260)	(185,992)	185,992	(283,252)	-	-	-	(97,260)	-
1044.0	-	18,869,634	1,773,983	(5,419,010)	(15,140,248)	20,643,617	(20,559,258)	-	-	-	84,359	-
1045.0	-	-	185,992	(66,660)	(185,992)	185,992	(252,652)	-	-	-	(66,660)	-
1046.0	-	613,444	1,712,133	(1,126,655)	(1,234,000)	2,325,577	(2,360,655)	-	-	-	(35,078)	-
1047.0	-	1,000	24,000	(742)	-	25,000	(742)	-	-	-	24,258	-
1048.0	-	25,685	24,000	-	-	49,685	-	-	-	-	49,685	-
1049.0	-	24,267	24,000	-	-	48,267	-	-	-	-	48,267	-
1050.0	-	25,300	24,000	(3,138)	-	49,300	(3,138)	-	-	-	46,162	-
1051.0	-	3,223,969	1,412,133	(3,267,881)	(920,000)	4,636,102	(4,187,881)	-	-	-	448,221	-
1052.0	-	2,984,242	13,638,984	(13,424,738)	-	16,623,226	(13,424,738)	-	-	-	3,198,488	-

EXHIBIT 2

JOSEPH FORTE LP

ALL LIMITED PARTNER ACCOUNTS - As of February 24, 2012

Draft Schedule - Subject to Revision - Based on Available Documents

Investor ID No.	Cash Beginning Capital Contribution	Cash Contribution	Intrafund Transfer-In	Cash Distribution	Intrafund Transfer-Out	Total Capital Additions	Total Capital Distributions	( ) = Increase Adjustments and New LP	False Profits Returned	Settlements Due	Capital Account Balance 2/24/2011	Interest Received
1054.0	-	-	185,992	(110,262)	(185,992)	185,992	(296,254)	-	-	-	(110,262)	-
1055.0	-	150,000	-	-	-	150,000	-	-	-	-	150,000	-
1056.0	-	1,020,000	-	-	-	1,020,000	-	-	-	-	1,020,000	-
1057.0	-	195,000	150,000	-	(43,500)	345,000	(43,500)	-	-	-	301,500	-
1058.0	-	20,000	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	20,000	-
1059.0	-	300,000	-	-	-	300,000	-	-	-	-	300,000	-
1059.5	45,771	1,275,114	1,018,500	(1,880,000)	(1,175,000)	2,339,385	(3,055,000)	(42,000)	-	-	(757,615)	-
1060.0	-	25,000	900,000	(90,000)	(925,000)	925,000	(1,015,000)	-	-	-	(90,000)	-
1061.0	-	50,000	-	-	(50,000)	50,000	(50,000)	-	-	-	-	-
1062.0	-	585,000	-	(175,000)	-	585,000	(175,000)	-	-	-	410,000	-
1063.0	-	283,000	-	(113,000)	-	283,000	(113,000)	-	-	-	170,000	-
1064.0	-	216,000	11,000	(345,000)	-	227,000	(345,000)	-	-	-	(118,000)	-
1066.0	-	300,000	-	(117,000)	(100,000)	300,000	(217,000)	-	-	-	83,000	-
1067.0	-	870,667	-	(799,346)	(62,000)	870,667	(861,346)	-	-	-	9,321	-
1068.0	-	131,000	11,000	(77,000)	-	142,000	(77,000)	-	-	-	65,000	-
1069.0	-	30,000	-	(65,000)	-	30,000	(65,000)	-	-	-	(35,000)	-
1070.0	-	265,500	-	(317,000)	-	265,500	(317,000)	-	-	-	(51,500)	-
1071.0	-	325,000	-	-	-	325,000	-	-	-	-	325,000	-
1072.0	-	50,000	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	50,000	-
1073.0	-	400,000	-	(522,424)	(30,000)	400,000	(552,424)	30,000	122,424	-	-	-
1074.0	-	50,000	-	(2,334)	-	50,000	(2,334)	-	-	-	47,666	-
1075.0	-	14,000	100,000	-	-	114,000	-	-	-	-	114,000	-
1076.0	-	483,000	-	(463,000)	-	483,000	(463,000)	-	-	-	20,000	-
1077.0	-	900,000	-	(1,300,000)	-	900,000	(1,300,000)	-	-	-	(400,000)	-
1078.0	-	700,000	-	-	-	700,000	-	-	-	-	700,000	-
1079.0	-	240,999	27,000	(225,000)	(42,999)	267,999	(267,999)	-	-	-	-	-
1079.5	-	104,262	13,000	(100,000)	(17,262)	117,262	(117,262)	-	-	-	-	-
1080.0	-	530,881	-	(487,850)	(243,031)	530,881	(730,881)	-	200,000	-	-	-
1082.0	-	135,000	-	(13,000)	-	135,000	(13,000)	-	-	-	122,000	-
1083.0	-	86,600	-	(149,000)	-	86,600	(149,000)	-	-	-	(62,400)	-
1084.0	-	105,000	-	-	-	105,000	-	-	-	-	105,000	-
1086.0	-	750,000	-	(100,000)	-	750,000	(100,000)	-	-	-	650,000	-
1087.0	-	1,052,594	1,769,304	(54,336)	-	2,821,898	(54,336)	-	-	-	2,767,562	-
1087.5	-	1,709,043	-	-	(1,709,043)	1,709,043	(1,709,043)	-	-	-	-	-
1088.0	-	295,000	-	(251,474)	-	295,000	(251,474)	-	-	-	43,526	-
1089.0	-	200,000	-	(360,738)	-	200,000	(360,738)	-	-	-	(160,738)	-
1090.0	-	67,000	-	(266,700)	-	67,000	(266,700)	-	-	-	(199,700)	-
1091.0	-	250,000	-	-	-	250,000	-	-	-	-	250,000	-
1092.0	-	-	30,000	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	30,000	-
1093.0	-	290,000	-	(620,000)	-	290,000	(620,000)	-	-	-	(330,000)	-
1094.0	-	1,250,000	-	-	-	1,250,000	-	-	-	-	1,250,000	-
1095.0	-	135,000	-	(2,000)	-	135,000	(2,000)	-	-	-	133,000	-
1096.0	-	1,049,915	-	(108,975)	-	1,049,915	(108,975)	-	-	-	940,940	-
1097.0	-	58,000	-	(72,439)	-	58,000	(72,439)	-	13,899	540	-	-
1098.0	-	-	-	(199,373)	-	-	(199,373)	-	199,373	-	-	4,000
1099.0	-	1,516,444	-	(1,787,000)	(7,149)	1,516,444	(1,794,149)	-	-	-	(277,705)	-
1100.0	-	140,000	-	(18,412)	-	140,000	(18,412)	-	-	-	121,588	-
1101.0	-	52,089	7,149	(154,819)	-	59,238	(154,819)	-	-	-	(95,581)	-
1102.0	-	2,200,000	-	(2,719,547)	-	2,200,000	(2,719,547)	-	-	-	(519,547)	-
1103.0	-	723,903	-	(1,005,336)	-	723,903	(1,005,336)	9,000	272,433	-	-	-

EXHIBIT 2

JOSEPH FORTE LP

ALL LIMITED PARTNER ACCOUNTS - As of February 24, 2012

Draft Schedule - Subject to Revision - Based on Available Documents

Investor ID No.	Cash Beginning Capital Contribution	Cash Contribution	Intrafund Transfer-In	Cash Distribution	Intrafund Transfer-Out	Total Capital Additions	Total Capital Distributions	( ) = Increase Adjustments and New LP	False Profits Returned	Settlements Due	Capital Account Balance 2/24/2011	Interest Received
1104.0	-	13,000	-	(2,000)	-	13,000	(2,000)	-	-	-	11,000	-
1105.0	-	6,000	-	(10,000)	-	6,000	(10,000)	10,000	-	-	6,000	-
1106.0	-	199,300	-	(21,889)	-	199,300	(21,889)	-	-	-	177,411	-
1107.0	-	200,000	-	(24,612)	-	200,000	(24,612)	-	-	-	175,388	-
1108.0	-	566,731	-	(165,000)	-	566,731	(165,000)	-	-	-	401,731	-
1110.0	-	750,000	-	(264,940)	-	750,000	(264,940)	-	-	-	485,060	-
1111.0	-	192,423	-	(215,730)	-	192,423	(215,730)	2	23,305	-	-	-
1112.0	-	217,000	250,000	(97,000)	-	467,000	(97,000)	-	-	-	370,000	-
1113.0	-	816,408	-	(844,890)	(250,000)	816,408	(1,094,890)	-	-	-	(278,482)	-
1115.0	-	130,108	-	-	-	130,108	-	-	-	-	130,108	-
1116.0	-	165,000	25,000	(10,000)	-	190,000	(10,000)	-	-	-	180,000	-
1118.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1119.0	-	91,380	-	(179,000)	-	91,380	(179,000)	-	87,620	-	-	4,380
1120.0	-	259,000	-	(587,525)	-	259,000	(587,525)	-	-	-	(328,525)	-
1121.0	-	280,685	-	(300,000)	-	280,685	(300,000)	-	19,315	-	-	-
1122.0	-	500,000	-	-	-	500,000	-	-	-	-	500,000	-
1123.0	-	-	24,000	-	-	24,000	-	-	-	-	24,000	-
1124.0	-	130,000	30,000	(60,000)	(24,000)	160,000	(84,000)	-	-	-	76,000	-
1125.0	-	200,000	-	-	-	200,000	-	-	-	-	200,000	-
1126.0	-	100,000	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	100,000	-
1127.0	-	332,914	-	(12,000)	-	332,914	(12,000)	12,000	-	-	332,914	-
1128.0	-	25,000	-	(10,000)	-	25,000	(10,000)	-	-	-	15,000	-
1129.0	-	200,000	-	(70,000)	-	200,000	(70,000)	-	-	-	130,000	-
1130.0	-	100,000	-	(60,000)	-	100,000	(60,000)	-	-	-	40,000	-
1131.0	-	25,000	-	(71,955)	-	25,000	(71,955)	-	-	-	(46,955)	-
R01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(30,000)	30,000	-	-	-
	70,771	78,548,633	41,063,714	(52,979,227)	(41,063,713)	119,683,118	(94,042,940)	77,542	1,063,836	540	26,782,096	8,380

Notes:

1. Phantom profits have been removed.
2. Intrafund transfer is a debit from a LP account to the extent of cash available at time of transfer with corresponding credit to a transferee LP account.
3. See Exhibit 2.1 for summary of Adjustments to Capital Account Balances.
4. Based on available records, there were 125 LP accounts at various times. Some of the LP accounts have been closed.

EXHIBIT 2.1

JOSEPH FORTE LP

ADJUSTMENTS TO CAPITAL ACCOUNT BALANCES - As of February 24, 2012

Draft Schedule - Subject to Revision - Based on Available Documents

Capital Balance as of 8/27/2009 - First Receiver's Report							$ 25,640,178	
Note: ( ) denotes Net Winner (negative Capital Balance)								
Investor Identification No.	Balance as of 8/27/2009 First Receiver's Report	Adjustments (A)	False Profits Returned (B)	Settlement Amounts Due (C)	Balance as of 2/24/2012 Sixth Receiver's Report	Change in Account		Interest Received
1017.0	(171,497)	(3,710)	-	-	(175,207)	(3,710)		
1026.0	(95,467)	-	95,467	-	-	95,467		
1073.0	(152,424)	30,000	122,424	-	-	152,424		
1097.0	(14,439)	-	13,899	540	-	14,439		
1103.0	(281,433)	9,000	272,433	-	-	281,433		
1105.0	(4,000)	10,000	-	-	6,000	10,000		
1111.0	(23,307)	2	23,305	-	-	23,307		
1121.0	(19,315)		19,315	-	-	19,315		
1127.0	320,914	12,000	-	-	332,914	12,000		
R01	-	(40,000)	30,000	-	-	-		
R01		10,000		-				
1080.0	(200,000)		200,000		-	200,000		
1025.0	(220,250)	92,250	-		(128,000)	92,250		
1059.5	(715,615)	(42,000)	-		(757,615)	(42,000)		
1098.0	(199,373)		199,373		-	199,373		4,000
1119.0	(87,620)	-	87,620	-	-	87,620		4,380
		77,542	1,063,836	540				8,380
Net Change to Capital Account Balances (Columns A + B + C)							1,141,918	
Capital Balance as of 2/24/2012 - Sixth Receiver's Report							$ 26,782,096	

EXHIBIT 2.2

JOSEPH FORTE LP

LIMITED PARTNER ACCOUNTS NET WINNERS ONLY - as of February 24, 2012

Draft Schedule Subject to Revision - Based on Available Documents

Investor ID No.	Cash Beginning Capital Contribution	Cash Contribution	Intrafund Transfer-In	Cash Distribution	Intrafund Transfer-Out	Total Capital Additions	Total Capital Distributions	Adjustments and New LP	Revised Net Winnings	Net Winnings Payment Received	Settlement Amounts Due	Net Winnings Due 2/24/2012	Interest Received
1017.0	-	1,000,000	-	(1,171,497)	-	1,000,000	(1,171,497)	(3,710)	(175,207)	-	-	(175,207)	-
1018.0	-	358,000	62,108	(1,212,000)	-	420,108	(1,212,000)	-	(791,892)	-	-	(791,892)	-
1020.0	-	150,000	-	(288,000)	-	150,000	(288,000)	-	(138,000)	-	-	(138,000)	-
1025.0	-	83,750	-	(304,000)	-	83,750	(304,000)	92,250	(128,000)	-	-	(128,000)	-
1026.0	-	335,000	-	(430,467)	-	335,000	(430,467)	-	(95,467)	95,467	-	-	-
1029.0	-	977,012	540,000	(1,939,218)	-	1,517,012	(1,939,218)	-	(422,206)	-	-	(422,206)	-
1032.0	25,000	8,172,054	4,644,500	(3,581,771)	(10,899,282)	12,841,554	(14,481,053)	-	(1,639,499)	-	-	(1,639,499)	-
1036.0	-	-	291,893	(5,740)	(291,893)	291,893	(297,633)	-	(5,740)	-	-	(5,740)	-
1037.0	-	-	291,893	(9,430)	(291,893)	291,893	(301,323)	-	(9,430)	-	-	(9,430)	-
1038.0	-	-	97,297	(6,930)	(97,297)	97,297	(104,227)	-	(6,930)	-	-	(6,930)	-
1039.0	-	-	291,893	(7,460)	(291,893)	291,893	(299,353)	-	(7,460)	-	-	(7,460)	-
1042.0	-	-	-	(54,638)	-	-	(54,638)	-	(54,638)	-	-	(54,638)	-
1043.0	-	-	185,992	(97,260)	(185,992)	185,992	(283,252)	-	(97,260)	-	-	(97,260)	-
1045.0	-	-	185,992	(66,660)	(185,992)	185,992	(252,652)	-	(66,660)	-	-	(66,660)	-
1046.0	-	613,444	1,712,133	(1,126,655)	(1,234,000)	2,325,577	(2,360,655)	-	(35,078)	-	-	(35,078)	-
1054.0	-	-	185,992	(110,262)	(185,992)	185,992	(296,254)	-	(110,262)	-	-	(110,262)	-
1059.5	45,771	1,275,114	1,018,500	(1,880,000)	(1,175,000)	2,339,385	(3,055,000)	(42,000)	(757,615)	-	-	(757,615)	-
1060.0	-	25,000	900,000	(90,000)	(925,000)	925,000	(1,015,000)	-	(90,000)	-	-	(90,000)	-
1064.0	-	216,000	11,000	(345,000)	-	227,000	(345,000)	-	(118,000)	-	-	(118,000)	-
1069.0	-	30,000	-	(65,000)	-	30,000	(65,000)	-	(35,000)	-	-	(35,000)	-
1070.0	-	265,500	-	(317,000)	-	265,500	(317,000)	-	(51,500)	-	-	(51,500)	-
1073.0	-	400,000	-	(522,424)	(30,000)	400,000	(552,424)	30,000	(122,424)	122,424	-	-	-
1077.0	-	900,000	-	(1,300,000)	-	900,000	(1,300,000)	-	(400,000)	-	-	(400,000)	-
1080.0	-	530,881	-	(487,850)	(243,031)	530,881	(730,881)	-	(200,000)	200,000	-	-	-
1083.0	-	86,600	-	(149,000)	-	86,600	(149,000)	-	(62,400)	-	-	(62,400)	-
1089.0	-	200,000	-	(360,738)	-	200,000	(360,738)	-	(160,738)	-	-	(160,738)	-
1090.0	-	67,000	-	(266,700)	-	67,000	(266,700)	-	(199,700)	-	-	(199,700)	-
1093.0	-	290,000	-	(620,000)	-	290,000	(620,000)	-	(330,000)	-	-	(330,000)	-
1097.0	-	58,000	-	(72,439)	-	58,000	(72,439)	-	(14,439)	13,899	540	-	-
1098.0	-	-	-	(199,373)	-	-	(199,373)	-	(199,373)	199,373	-	-	4,000
1099.0	-	1,516,444	-	(1,787,000)	(7,149)	1,516,444	(1,794,149)	-	(277,705)	-	-	(277,705)	-
1101.0	-	52,089	7,149	(154,819)	-	59,238	(154,819)	-	(95,581)	-	-	(95,581)	-
1102.0	-	2,200,000	-	(2,719,547)	-	2,200,000	(2,719,547)	-	(519,547)	-	-	(519,547)	-
1103.0	-	723,903	-	(1,005,336)	-	723,903	(1,005,336)	9,000	(272,433)	272,433	-	-	-
1111.0	-	192,423	-	(215,730)	-	192,423	(215,730)	2	(23,305)	23,305	-	-	-
1113.0	-	816,408	-	(844,890)	(250,000)	816,408	(1,094,890)	-	(278,482)	-	-	(278,482)	-
1119.0	-	91,380	-	(179,000)	-	91,380	(179,000)	-	(87,620)	87,620	-	-	4,380
1120.0	-	259,000	-	(587,525)	-	259,000	(587,525)	-	(328,525)	-	-	(328,525)	-
1121.0	-	280,685	-	(300,000)	-	280,685	(300,000)	-	(19,315)	19,315	-	-	-
1131.0	-	25,000	-	(71,955)	-	25,000	(71,955)	-	(46,955)	-	-	(46,955)	-
R01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(30,000)	(30,000)	30,000	-	-	-
	70,771	22,190,687	10,426,342	(24,953,314)	(16,294,414)	32,687,800	(41,247,728)	55,542	(8,504,386)	1,063,836	540	(7,440,010)	8,380

Notes:

1. Phantom profits have been removed.
2. Intrafund transfer is a debit from a LP account to the extent of cash available at time of transfer with corresponding credit to a transferee LP account.
3. See Exhibit 2.1 for summary of Adjustments to Capital Account Balances.

EXHIBIT 3 TO RECEIVER'S SIXTH REPORT
RECEIVER'S PROPOSED PLAN FOR RECEIVERSHIP ESTATE ACTIVITIES

ANTICIPATED DATE*	ACTION ITEM
March 14, 2012	Completion of discovery in the malpractice action against the Partnership's attorneys
April 26, 2012	Settlement conference before Magistrate Judge Rice in the malpractice action against the Partnership's attorneys
April 2012	Filing of claim in MF Global receivership proceedings
≈ April 2012	Anticipated issuance of Court Orders resolving motions to dismiss in the *Skee Ball Profit Sharing Plan* case, 10-cv-1373 and *Crawford Wilson & Ryan Profit Sharing Plan* case, 10-cv-1376
May 2012	Completion of investigation regarding Investor 1102's finances and determination of whether to seek return of principal from that investor in *Hecht v. Investor #1102*, 10-cv-1374
September 1, 2012	Receiver files Seventh Receiver's Report
March 1, 2013	Receiver files Eighth Receiver's Report
To be determined	Anticipated issuance of Court Order resolving objections to Receiver's Bar Date Motion and Court's entry of Bar Date Order
≈ 1 month after resolution of Bar Date Motion	Anticipated deadline for Receiver to provide notice of the Bar Date and claims procedures to potential claimants through direct mail and publication in newspapers or as otherwise directed by the Court.
≈ 2 months after resolution of the Bar Date Motion	Anticipated Bar Date for Claims against the Receivership Estate.
≈ 3 months after resolution of the Bar Date Motion	Receiver communicates her quantitative claim determinations to claimants pursuant to Bar Date Order
≈ 7 months after resolution of the Bar Date Motion	Receiver communicates her qualitative claim determinations to claimants pursuant to Bar Date Order
≈ 9 months after resolutionof the Bar Date Motion	Receiver institutes clawback litigation against any persons against whom she believes she has viable claims that have not been resolved and who have not demonstrated an inability to pay.
≈11 months after resolution of the Bar Date Motion	Receiver files proposed claims distribution report. Distribution to occur as directed by the U.S. District Court.

* The dates set forth in this Plan reflect the Receiver's current best estimate of a timeline for the processing of both the Receiver's clawback claims and creditors' claims against the Receivership Estate, assuming that the Court approves the Receiver's anticipated motion for claims bar date and claims procedures. These dates may need to change depending on subsequent events.