

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
ORLANDO DIVISION**

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,**

**Plaintiff,**

v.

**Case No: 6:21-cv-694-CEM-DCI**

**HARBOR CITY CAPITAL CORP.,  
HARBOR CITY VENTURES, LLC,  
HCCF-1 LLC, HCCF-2 LLC, HCCF-3  
LLC, HCCF-4 LLC, HCCF-5 LLC,  
HARBOR CITY DIGITAL VENTURES,  
INC., HCC MEDIA FUNDING, LLC,  
JONATHAN P. MARONEY, CELTIC  
ENTERPRISES, LLC and TONYA L.  
MARONEY,**

**Defendants.**

---

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This cause comes before the Court for consideration of a Notice filed by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) that includes as an attachment a 24-page Proposed Order Appointing Receiver. Docs. 72 (the Notice); 72-1 (the Proposed Order). The Notice has been referred to the undersigned for consideration and issuance of a report and recommendation.

On June 16, 2021, the SEC filed a Motion to Appoint Receiver. Doc. 60. That motion was referred to the undersigned for consideration, and the undersigned issued a report recommending that the motion be granted in part (to the extent a receiver should be appointed) but denied in part (to the extent the SEC requested that a particular order should issue delineating the receiver's powers and responsibilities). Doc. 66. Indeed, as the undersigned noted, "the SEC provided neither a proposed order as an attachment to the Motion, nor set forth in the Motion what powers the Court should vest in the receiver." *Id.* at 4. The undersigned recommended that the Court

“direct[] the SEC to file a proposed order delineating the receiver’s responsibilities and powers.”  
*Id.*

Prior to the expiration of the objection period for that report, the SEC filed a Motion for Entry of Proposed Order Appointing Receiver and attached to that motion a proposed order appointing the receiver. Docs. 67; 67-1.

Then, with no objection having been filed to the report, the Court entered an order adopting the report. Doc. 68. In that order, the Court adopted the report and referred to the undersigned the foregoing motion. *Id.* at 2-3. But because that motion failed to comply with Local Rules 3.01(a) and (g), the undersigned denied that motion. Doc. 67. Finally, on August 18, 2021, the SEC filed the Notice and Proposed Order. Docs. 72; 72-1. Despite ample opportunity to do so, no party has objected to the Notice or the Proposed Order, and the undersigned notes that the Motion for Entry of Proposed Order Appointing Receiver was unopposed. The undersigned has reviewed the Proposed Order—which appears to be unopposed—and finds that it is due to be entered by the Court.

Accordingly, it is respectfully **RECOMMENDED** that the Court enter the Proposed Order (Doc. 72-1).

**Recommended** in Orlando, Florida on October 21, 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DANIEL C. IRICK  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE