INDEPENDENT PUBLIC-RECORDS COMPILATION

The Ryan Burke Public Record

Court orders, sworn testimony, judgments, bankruptcy filings and news reports about the promoter behind VEW Live and BZR WKND Jamaica, 2011–2026, with links to every source and redacted copies of the filings.

KEY FACTS FROM THE RECORD

- **May 13, 2024.** A Broward County judge found "beyond any reasonable doubt" that Burke lied under oath about being in Las Vegas when he was served, adjudged him guilty of indirect and direct criminal contempt, and ordered three days in jail. Chapter 08
- **January 9, 2013.** A federal court in Miami treated as undisputed that Burke's companies "were never authorized representatives of Lady Gaga," after one of them received $1.5 million toward her booking. Chapter 04
- **October 17, 2014.** A federal court in New York rejected VEW's suit against Mary J. Blige's company and entered a $105,000 judgment against VEW. Chapter 05
- **2020–2026.** Recorded-instrument citations, not independently retrieved, report judgments of $1,100,534.43, $625,000 and $83,487.37 against Burke and/or VEW Live; balances not public. Chapter 06
- **July 16, 2026.** A $2,089,122.81 foreclosure judgment on the Davie property of a company Burke manages, which had filed two Chapter 11 cases. Chapters 09–10
- **June 13, 2025.** Two investors alleged fraud and racketeering over $298,145.95 paid toward the 2025 BZR Carnival Edition. Allegations; the judgment's terms are not yet available. Chapter 11
- **November 2026.** Burke says Cardi B was paid US$2.5 million in full; she disputes it and threatens a countersuit. Disputed; no court ruling. Chapter 13

Edition of November 11, 2026 · Online edition and redacted filings: ryan-burke-bzr-wknd-vew-live.com

An independent compilation of public court records, government registries and published news reports. Allegations are identified as allegations; court findings are identified as findings. Ryan Burke's stated positions are included. Corrections and replies are published on request. The records reviewed contain one criminal adjudication, a May 13, 2024 order of a Broward County circuit judge holding Ryan Burke in direct and indirect criminal contempt of court for perjury in a civil case, and no criminal charge brought by a prosecutor. Where this record discusses fraud, it reports what courts found, what witnesses swore and what parties alleged, and labels each accordingly.

CONTENTS

00 About this record: sources, methods and disclosure . . . 3

01 Summary: what the public record shows . . . 7

02 Who Ryan Burke is: identification and identity standard . . . 12

03 The companies: VEW, NWE, the LLCs and V12 Group . . . 19

04 The Lady Gaga booking: TV Service ZAO v. NWE Talent . . . 27

05 The Rihanna and Mary J. Blige disputes . . . 38

06 Money judgments and other civil cases, 2010–2026 . . . 45

07 VEWtopia 2020: the Miami festival . . . 56

08 Kameka & Dzotsi v. Burke: service and criminal contempt . . . 63

09 The Davie property: a $962,000 note and a $2.09 million judgment . . . 81

10 Two bankruptcies for 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC . . . 89

11 Echols & Mosley v. Burke: the Sabina Park money . . . 98

12 BZR WKND Jamaica, edition by edition . . . 105

13 The 2026 Cardi B cancellation: both accounts . . . 116

14 Recurring features across the record . . . 129

15 Burke's side: his positions, denials and explanations . . . 134

16 What the record does not yet show . . . 146

17 Master timeline, 2010–2026: dated events . . . 154

A Register of redacted court filings . . . 163

B Source index . . . 165

ABOUT · SOURCES, METHODS AND DISCLOSURE

About this record: sources, methods and disclosure

What this compilation is, where its material comes from, how each statement is labeled, what was redacted and how to ask for a correction or reply.

The Ryan Burke Public Record is an independent compilation of court records, government registries and published news reports concerning Ryan Burke, a Miami-based concert promoter and talent booker, and the companies through which he has done business, chiefly VEW Live, LLC, Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC and, since 2026, V12 Group, LLC, the company behind BZR WKND Jamaica. It covers the years 2010 to November 2026. It is published as a website and as a downloadable PDF edition with the same text.

The record is meant for people who need the documented history in one place: journalists covering the 2026 BZR WKND cancellation, artists and agents asked to accept a booking, ticket buyers, venues, lenders and anyone else weighing a business relationship. It does not tell readers what to conclude. Where a court made a finding, the finding is quoted. Where someone made an accusation, it is reported as an accusation. Where Burke answered, his answer is printed next to it.

Disclosure

Several of the court filings in the document library, among them the 2023 deposition and hearing transcripts, the American Airlines records and the May 13, 2024 contempt order, were provided to this publication from the case file of a party to the Broward County lawsuit *Kameka Management Solutions, Inc. v. 16260 Saddle Club Road, LLC* (No. CACE-22-001852), which is described in Chapter 08. Every one of those documents is a filed court record that any member of the public can obtain from the Broward County Clerk of Courts or, for the bankruptcy filings, from PACER. Readers should weigh that relationship. To make independent checking easy, each statement about that case is tied to a specific filed document and page, and the documents themselves are posted.

The publication is not affiliated with Ryan Burke or his companies, with Cardi B or her representatives, with any Jamaican government agency, or with any news outlet whose reporting is cited.

What the record is built from

The compilation draws on five kinds of material. The first is court filings: orders, judgments, transcripts, motions and exhibits from the Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit in Broward County, Florida; the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Florida; the U.S. District Courts for the Southern District of Florida, the Southern District of New York and the Northern District of Illinois. Federal filings were read through the government's GovInfo service, CourtListener's RECAP archive, Justia and PacerMonitor docket reproductions. The second is re-

corded instruments and docket indexes from the Miami-Dade and Broward County clerks, cited by case number or Official Records book and page so a reader can retrieve the instrument. The third is government and registry records: the Florida Division of Corporations (Sunbiz), Town of Davie meeting minutes, trademark records and published statements of the Government of Jamaica. The fourth is news reporting from Jamaican, Caribbean and U.S. outlets, among them The Gleaner, the Jamaica Observer, The Star, CVM Television, DancehallMag, Billboard, Complex, Courthouse News Service and the Miami New Times. The fifth is public social-media posts by the people involved, including Burke's Instagram account, @vewryan.

Two earlier compilations about Burke circulated privately before this edition. They were used only as leads. Nothing in this record relies on them as a source; any fact they reported is either tied here to the underlying record or labeled as not independently verified.

Every source cited appears in the source index, grouped by type, with a link to the original publisher or custodian.

How each statement is labeled

Key statements carry a label that says what kind of evidence they are.

Label	What it means
COURT FINDING	Something a judge decided or found in a signed order or judgment. Rulings known only from a hearing transcript or a docket entry are labelled "Court order" or "Order", and registry records are labelled "Public record".
SWORN TESTIMONY	Statements made under oath: depositions, affidavits, declarations and hearing testimony. Sworn testimony can be true or false; the label only says it was given under oath.
PARTY ALLEGATION	A claim in a complaint, motion, letter or demand that no court has ruled on. Also used for disputed accounts where two sides contradict each other.
PRESS REPORT	What a news organization published, attributed to that organization.
BURKE'S POSITION	Burke's own statements, denials and explanations, and the arguments his lawyers made for him.

Three distinctions run through the record. A lawsuit is not a judgment; many of the cases described here ended in dismissal, settlement or an unknown result, and each chapter says which. A default judgment is entered because a defendant did not respond, not because a court weighed the evidence. And a company's bankruptcy is not its owner's personal bankruptcy; the two bankruptcy cases in this record were filed by 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC.

On criminal matters the record is specific. The records reviewed contain one criminal adjudication: the May 13, 2024 order of Broward Circuit Judge William Haury Jr. holding Burke in indirect and direct criminal contempt of court for perjury in a civil lawsuit and committing him to three days in the county jail (Chapter 08). Criminal contempt is punished by a judge to protect the court's own process; it is not a prosecution brought by a state attorney. No criminal charge filed by a prosecutor, arrest record or other conviction of this Ryan Burke was found. Where the word "fraud" appears, it is a cause of action that someone pleaded, a word a court or party used, or the phrase "alleged fraud".

Dollar amounts are given as they appear in each document at the time it was signed. They are not added together, because judgments, claims, estimates and payments are different things and current balances are generally not public.

Identity standard

Ryan Burke is a common name. A record is attributed to the Ryan Burke in this compilation only when the record itself ties that person to his known companies, business addresses, roles or events. Examples are a judgment against both “Ryan Burke” and VEW Live, LLC, or a filing that names him as the manager of a company he is documented to control. Index entries that match the name but cannot be tied to him in this way are either left out or listed separately with an explicit identity caution. Criminal-records search results for other people of the same name were excluded. The full rules are set out in Chapter 02.

Redaction policy

The court filings in the document library were redacted before posting. The following were permanently removed: telephone and fax numbers; email addresses; dates of birth; Social Security, tax, driver’s licence, passport and traveler numbers; bank, card, account, policy and loan numbers; airline record locators, ticket and loyalty numbers; all information about airline passengers other than Ryan Burke; residential street addresses of individuals, including the home where Burke was served; handwritten signatures of private individuals and the court reporter; and references that could identify minors or household members who are not parties.

The following were left as they appear in the court file: names of parties, judges, lawyers and witnesses; case numbers; dates; dollar amounts; the text of orders and testimony; the address and legal description of the litigated property in Davie, Florida; the names of the limited liability companies; and business or virtual-office addresses that appear in court orders. Burke’s own flight numbers, dates and boarding status are kept because they are the evidence the court relied on.

The redactions cannot be undone. Every page was re-rendered from the court copy as an image with the black boxes burned into the pixels, so none of the original file’s text or hidden data survives; a searchable text layer was then generated by optical character recognition from the redacted image, and document metadata was stripped. Each page was checked by text extraction and character recognition after redaction. The May 13, 2024 contempt order is posted as a facsimile of the copy filed in the bankruptcy court as Docket Entry 10-1 in case 24-14947-PDR and recorded in the Broward County Official Records as Instrument 119575457. Its distribution block of email addresses is omitted.

Federal filings that are already public on official or archival sites, such as the 2013 Lady Gaga summary-judgment order and the 2025 Illinois complaint, are linked at their source rather than rehosted.

Images

The identification photographs in Chapter 02 are included so that readers can confirm which Ryan Burke is meant. The CVM Television graphic and interview still are reproduced as credited news screenshots for reporting and commentary; CVM Television owns them.

Corrections policy

Errors of fact will be corrected promptly and the correction noted at the foot of the affected chapter with its date. A correction request should identify the statement, explain what is wrong and, where possible, point to a record that shows the correct fact. Requests can be sent to corrections@ryan-burke-bzr-wknd-vew-live.com. If a court later vacates, reverses or modifies an order described here, or a case listed as pending is resolved, the record will be updated to say so.

Right of reply

Ryan Burke, his companies and his lawyers, and anyone else named in this record, may submit a written reply. A reply will be published in full, without editing other than to remove private personal information, alongside the chapter it concerns, and will be linked from Chapter 15. This edition was compiled from the documentary record; Burke's positions in it are taken from his sworn testimony, his lawyers' filings and his public statements to news organizations, and Chapter 15 collects them in one place.

Editions

This is the edition of November 11, 2026. The PDF edition carries the same date on its cover. Later editions will note what changed.

CHAPTER 01 · SUMMARY

Summary: what the public record shows

Fifteen years of court files, registries and news reports about Ryan Burke and his companies, set out by what courts decided, what witnesses swore and what others have alleged.

Ryan Burke is a Miami-based promoter and talent booker who has done business since 2008 through Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC, VEW Live, LLC, NWE Talent Agency and Management, Inc. and, more recently, the companies behind the BZR WKND Jamaica concerts. Between 2011 and November 2026 his name, or the names of those companies, appear in federal and state lawsuits over celebrity bookings, money judgments, a lending dispute that ended in a criminal-contempt order, a $2.09 million foreclosure judgment, two bankruptcy cases filed by a company he manages, a federal fraud and racketeering complaint brought by two investors, and the postponement of an October 2026 concert after its headliner, Cardi B, withdrew.

This chapter summarizes that record. Each statement below is developed, with full citations, in the chapter linked beside it. The summary keeps the same distinctions the chapters do. Court findings come first because they carry the most weight. Allegations are identified as allegations. Burke's positions are collected in Chapter 15.

The record at a glance

Years	Matter	Forum	What the record establishes	Chapter
2011–2013	Lady Gaga booking for a Moscow awards show	U.S. District Court, S.D. Fla., No. 1:12-cv-20317	FINDING Counterclaim by Burke's companies rejected on summary judgment; the court treated as undisputed that they were never Lady Gaga's authorized representatives. ZAO's own fraud claims were left for trial; the case closed in January 2013, and no merits verdict was found in the reviewed sources.	04
2012	Rihanna booking money	Miami-Dade County (as reported)	ALLEGATION A woman and her bankruptcy trustee claimed VEW and Burke took $75,000 on a claimed ability to book Rihanna. Outcome not verified.	05
2013–2014	Mary J. Blige Dallas concert	U.S. District Court, S.D.N.Y., No. 1:13-cv-04215	FINDING VEW sued for the return of a $145,000 advance; the court granted summary judgment to Blige's side and entered a $105,000 judgment against VEW (October 17, 2014).	05
2019–2020	VEWtopia festival, Miami	News reports; Miami-Dade docket	REPORT Festival moved venues, first night disrupted, Cardi B performed on the second night. An index citation, not independently verified, reports that a stadium operator's suit against VEW Live was dismissed for lack of prosecution.	07, 06
2020–2026	Money judgments	N.J. Superior Court; Miami-Dade Circuit Court	RECORD Recorded-instrument citations, not independently retrieved, report $1,100,534.43 (New Jersey, 2023, Burke and VEW Live), $625,000 (Miami-Dade, 2020, Burke and VEW Live) and $83,487.37 (Miami-Dade, 2026, VEW Live only, by default). Current balances not public.	06
2022–2024	Kameka Management Solutions v. Burke	Broward Circuit Court, No. CACE-22-001852	FINDING Judge William W. Haury Jr. found beyond a reasonable doubt that Burke lied under oath about being in Las Vegas when he was served, and adjudged him guilty of indirect and direct criminal contempt (May 13, 2024).	08

Years	Matter	Forum	What the record establishes	Chapter
2021–2026	Davie property foreclosure	Broward Circuit Court, No. CACE-22-016620	JUDGMENT $2,089,122.81 final judgment of foreclosure on a $962,000 note (July 16, 2026); sale ordered for August 20, 2026. Completed sale not established.	09
2024–2026	Two bankruptcies of 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, S.D. Fla.	ORDER First Chapter 11 case dismissed without discharge (July 2024); second converted to Chapter 7 on the U.S. Trustee's motion (September 2025). Company cases, not personal ones.	10
2025–2026	Echols & Mosley v. Burke	U.S. District Court, N.D. Ill., No. 1:25-cv-06604	ALLEGATION Two investors alleged fraud, conversion and civil racketeering over $298,145.95 paid toward the 2025 BZR Carnival Edition. Burke challenged jurisdiction; a judgment entered January 20, 2026, but its terms were not available for review.	11
2023–2026	BZR WKND Jamaica	News reports	REPORT 2023 debut with Chris Brown took place; July 2024 edition postponed; April 2025 Sabina Park show reported cancelled; October 2026 show lost its headliner.	12
2026	Cardi B withdrawal	News reports; public statements	DISPUTED Burke says Cardi B was paid US$2.5 million in full; Cardi B says required payments were not made on time and threatens a countersuit. No lawsuit by either side located as of November 11, 2026.	13

The perjury and criminal-contempt finding

The one criminal adjudication in the record comes from a civil lending case in Broward County. Kameka Management Solutions, Inc. and Eryck Dzotsi obtained a default judgment in 2022 against Burke, VEW Live and two property companies after a process server swore she served Burke in person at his home in Sunrise, Florida, on April 11, 2022. Burke moved to undo the judgment. In a sworn affidavit, at a deposition and on the witness stand he said he had been in Las Vegas from April 1 to April 14, 2022, and so could not have been served. After an evidentiary hearing in August 2023, the judge granted the motion and quashed service.

Records subpoenaed from American Airlines then listed Burke as having flown from Las Vegas to Miami overnight on April 4, 2022, a week before the service date, and the carrier could not locate a manifest for the April 14 return flight he had described. The plaintiffs moved for criminal contempt.

> **COURT FINDING** Order adjudging Ryan Burke in criminal contempt, Broward Cir. Ct. No. CACE-22-001852, May 13, 2024
>
> Judge William W. Haury Jr. found "beyond any reasonable doubt" that Burke lied in his affidavit, his deposition and his testimony in open court, that he did so "knowingly and with the intent to obstruct the administration of justice," and that he relied on a "fake travel document or record locator purportedly issued by American Airlines." The court adjudged him guilty of indirect criminal contempt and direct criminal contempt "due to his perjury" and committed him to three consecutive days in the Broward County jail.[1]

Criminal contempt is imposed by a judge to protect the court's own process. It is not a prosecution by a state attorney, and no criminal charge filed by a prosecutor against this Ryan Burke was found. Whether the jail term was served, modified or appealed is not established by the primary records reviewed; a secondary account reports a May 16, 2025 modification replacing jail with a

$5,000 fine and 30 hours of community service, but this publication has not seen that order. Chapter 08 sets out the case filing by filing, with the redacted transcripts, airline records and order.

Celebrity bookings and the money paid for them, 2011–2014

The earliest detailed record is a federal case in Miami over Lady Gaga. In late 2011 a Russian broadcaster, TV Service ZAO, paid money, partly through an intermediary and partly directly to Burke's company, toward a Lady Gaga appearance at its 2012 Moscow music awards; NWE Talent Agency, which Burke controlled, received $1,500,000 of it. The artist never agreed to the proposals. When ZAO demanded its money back, Burke's companies counterclaimed for breach of contract.

> **COURT FINDING** Order on summary judgment, TV Service ZAO v. NWE Talent Agency, S.D. Fla. No. 1:12-cv-20317, January 9, 2013
>
> The Burke entities, the intermediary and its company "were never authorized representatives of Lady Gaga and had never secured her as a performer on anyone else's behalf." Separately: "The Burke Entities are not licensed talent agencies pursuant to section 468.403 of the Florida Statutes."[2]

The court rejected the counterclaim but did not release the frozen funds to ZAO, which still had to prove its fraud, unjust-enrichment and conversion claims at trial. The case closed later that month. No merits verdict on ZAO's claims was found in the reviewed sources, and the terminating document was not available. The same order describes Burke's mother as a "figurehead" president of NWE and the companies' listed Miami offices as "virtual offices" (Chapter 04).

In December 2012 Courthouse News Service reported an accusation that VEW and Burke had taken $75,000 by claiming they could book Rihanna, who was not a party. No adjudication of that claim was found. In 2013 VEW was itself the plaintiff, suing Mary J. Blige and her production company in New York for the return of a $145,000 advance after a Dallas concert did not go ahead. Blige's side said VEW had not met the deal's travel terms. On October 17, 2014, Judge Analisa Torres granted summary judgment to the Blige defendants and entered a $105,000 judgment for Mary Jane Productions against VEW.[3] Both disputes are in Chapter 05.

Money judgments, 2020–2026

Recorded-instrument citations in the official records index report three money judgments. This publication has not independently retrieved the instruments or the case dockets, and the link between each case and this Ryan Burke is treated as provisional. The citations report a February 2023 New Jersey award of $1,100,534.43 against Burke and VEW Live jointly in favor of VEW Capital Group, later domesticated in Miami-Dade, where a garnishment judgment in the enforcement case was reportedly marked satisfied in June 2024 (which is not the same as satisfaction of the whole award); a February 2020 Miami-Dade judgment of $625,000 plus interest against Burke and

VEW Live for Joe Clark after a settlement agreement was breached; and a May 2026 default judgment of $83,487.37 against VEW Live alone for Bayfront Park Management Trust. Current balances are not public (Chapter 06).

The Davie property and two company bankruptcies, 2021–2026

A property company Burke manages, 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC, owned a parcel in Davie, Florida. It was subject to a senior lien securing a $962,000 promissory note dated July 23, 2021, and was the property against which the Kameka plaintiffs held a $107,212 equitable lien. On July 16, 2026, a senior judge entered a final judgment of foreclosure of $2,089,122.81 on the senior lien and ordered a sale for August 20, 2026 (Chapter 09).

The same company twice filed for Chapter 11 protection. The first case, filed May 21, 2024, was dismissed in July 2024 without a discharge. The second, filed April 21, 2025, was converted to a Chapter 7 liquidation on the U.S. Trustee's motion in September 2025; in it, the Kameka plaintiffs filed a $178,415.77 claim and the company's own summary listed Burke as manager and sole shareholder. In November 2026 the Chapter 7 trustee was authorized to distribute $74.92 to the debtor's representative (Chapter 10).

BZR WKND and the Illinois investors, 2023–2026

BZR WKND Jamaica began with a concert at Kingston's National Stadium scheduled for August 27, 2023, at which Chris Brown performed after midnight, into August 28. The July 2024 edition was postponed, citing Hurricane Beryl, and an April 26, 2025 "Carnival Edition" at Sabina Park with Sexyy Red was later reported cancelled for weather (Chapter 12).

> **PARTY ALLEGATION** Verified complaint, Echols v. Burke, N.D. Ill. No. 1:25-cv-06604, June 13, 2025
>
> Hugh Echols and John Mosley alleged that they paid $298,145.95 in four payments toward the 2025 Carnival Edition, made to VEW Live, Universal Creative Agency and Burke himself, that the money was not used as promised and was not repaid, and that the conduct amounted to fraud, conversion, unjust enrichment and a pattern of racketeering. They sought $5,301,854.05.[4]

Counsel for Burke appeared in October 2025 for "Ryan Matthew Burke, erroneously sued as 'Ryan Burke'" and moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. The docket shows an order on that motion in December 2025 and a judgment on January 20, 2026, but the documents were not available for this edition, so whether the case was dismissed or decided on other grounds is not established (Chapter 11).

The 2026 Cardi B cancellation

Cardi B was announced on August 14, 2026 as the headliner of BZR WKND Jamaica on October 18 at the National Stadium. Her representatives confirmed her withdrawal on October 8; ticket sales were suspended, the concert was moved to December 20 and refunds were promised from October 19. On November 3 the Jamaica Observer reported ticket buyers still waiting for refunds.[5]

> **DISPUTED ACCOUNT** CVM Television, broadcast reported November 9 and article November 10; DancehallMag, November 10; Complex, November 11, 2026
>
> Burke told CVM that Cardi B had been paid US$2.5 million in five transfers, that "she was paid in full," and that he would sue. Cardi B responded publicly that the money was not paid as agreed, that a later $750,000 transfer arrived after she had decided to withdraw and was sent back, and that she would countersue. Jamaica's Ministry of Culture, Gender, Entertainment and Sport said the government made no commitment or payment toward her fee.[6]

Neither account has been tested in court, and no lawsuit by either side had been located as of November 11, 2026. Chapter 13 sets out the chronology and both accounts side by side.

What the record does not show

The record does not contain a criminal charge brought by a prosecutor, an arrest record or a criminal conviction of this Ryan Burke; the May 2024 contempt order is the only criminal adjudication found. Several of the most significant civil matters ended without a public decision on the merits: no merits verdict on ZAO's fraud claims in the Lady Gaga case was found, the Rihanna claim's outcome is unknown, and the content of the Illinois judgment is not yet available. The amounts in this record are not added together: judgments, claims, payments and estimates are different kinds of figures, and current balances are generally not public. Chapter 14 describes features that recur across the cases, and Chapter 16 lists what remains unanswered and which records would answer it.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Order Adjudging Ryan Burke in Indirect Criminal Contempt of Court and Order of Commitment, Kameka Management Solutions, Inc. v. 16260 Saddle Club Road, LLC, Broward Cir. Ct. No. CACE-22-001852 (May 13, 2024) — facsimile of filed copy. See Chapter 08 for page cites.
2. Order on summary judgment, TV Service ZAO v. NWE Talent Agency and Management, Inc., S.D. Fla. No. 1:12-cv-20317, DE 104 (January 9, 2013) — GovInfo PDF. Page cites in Chapter 04.
3. Vision Entertainment Worldwide, LLC v. Mary Jane Productions, Inc., S.D.N.Y. No. 1:13-cv-04215-AT, Memorandum, Order and Judgment, DE 42, pp. 1, 24 (October 17, 2014) — publicly reproduced court PDF, hosted by theJasmineBRAND.
4. Verified complaint, Echols v. Burke, N.D. Ill. No. 1:25-cv-06604, DE 1 (June 13, 2025) — CourtListener docket. Allegations only; see Chapter 11.
5. "BZR WKND ticket buyers still waiting for refund weeks after organisers pledged money back," Jamaica Observer, November 3, 2026 — article.
6. "BZR Weekend sues Cardi B, patrons being reimbursed," CVM Television, November 2026 — article; "Cardi B vows to countersue Jamaican promoter Ryan Burke over canceled BZR WKND show," DancehallMag, November 10, 2026 — article; Complex, November 11, 2026 — article; Ministry statement, CVM Television, November 10, 2026 — article.

CHAPTER 02 · IDENTIFICATION AND ATTRIBUTION

Who Ryan Burke is: identification and identity standard

Court testimony, company records and public interviews identify the VEW and BZR promoter; a shared name alone does not connect a record to him.

Ryan Burke is the entertainment promoter associated with VEW Live, Vision Entertainment Worldwide and BZR WKND Jamaica. That description is supported by his sworn account of his work, Florida company records and interviews in which he speaks for the event. This chapter identifies the subject of the record before addressing what any particular lawsuit establishes. It does not attach every search result for "Ryan Burke" to the promoter.[1] [2] [3]

How Burke describes his work

At his February 23, 2023 deposition in the Broward loan and service-of-process case, Burke was asked what kind of business he conducted. His answer was direct:

> **SWORN TESTIMONY** Deposition, Feb. 23, 2023, PDF p. 6, Tr. 18:13–15
>
> "I manage talent. I'm a booking agent. I'm a promoter. I am a marketing consultant. I'm a producer."[1]

Asked which of those functions he performed during the Las Vegas trip under discussion, he answered, "All of them." The deposition concerns a disputed attempt to serve legal papers, not a review of his artist contracts or professional qualifications. The occupational answer is useful identification evidence because Burke gave it under oath in the same proceeding that names him with VEW Live and the two property LLCs. It does not establish that he held a talent-agency license or represented a particular artist.[1]

His public profiles use similar descriptions. The Instagram account @vewryan displays "RYAN BURKE" and the bio "Record Executive & Producer | Talent Manager | Promoter." When reviewed on November 11, 2026, it also referred to BZR WKND Jamaica and December 19–20 dates. Those are the account's self-published descriptions. The portion of the bio ending "Tickets remain" was truncated in the retrieved page; no missing wording is supplied here.[4]

The LinkedIn profile identifies Burke in Miami as "Founder & Chief Executive Officer" of VEW Live!, VEW Music Group and Vision Entertainment Worldwide. It dates the broader VEW operation to 2003 and VEW Live! to 2005. Those dates are claimed operating-history dates, not the dates of the Florida LLC filings. The companies chapter separates incorporation dates from these descriptions. Promotional claims about market size, attendance and work with named artists are not independently established merely because they appear on the profile.[5]

How news coverage identifies him

The Gleaner's July 16, 2023 report describes Burke as a "record executive, producer, talent manager and promoter." It places him at the launch of the Chris Brown concert and names VEW Live!, Solid Agency, Burke Bodley and Universal Creative Agency among the partners bringing BZR to Jamaica. The article quotes him explaining the choice of headliner and production planning. This supplies a contemporary business connection, not proof that he owned every organization in that partnership.[6]

Billboard's August 14, 2026 announcement describes Ryan Burke and Roy "Gramps" Morgan as "organizers of BZR WKND Jamaica" and attributes a joint statement to them. The article concerns the planned October event. It identifies Burke's role but is not evidence that the subsequently withdrawn Cardi B performance occurred. The distinction between an announcement and a completed engagement is retained in the BZR editions chapter.[7]

CVM Television's November 10, 2026 report identifies its interviewee as "Founder and CEO of BZR Weekend, Ryan Burke." Burke answers questions about the canceled October engagement, refunds and proposed legal action. That interview links the person appearing on screen to the event through his own statements and CVM's identification. It is also a record of his position in the dispute, rather than an adjudication of the payments he describes.[3]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Burke's CVM interview, published Nov. 10, 2026
>
> "Yes, we have receipts. She was paid in full." Asked about recovery, Burke said: "I would hope so. Right now, we are pursuing legal action."[3]

Cardi B disputes full payment and alleges missed production-payment obligations. No independently verified filed complaint in that dispute is identified here. The interview remains identification evidence even though the parties disagree about the transaction. Their competing accounts belong in the Cardi B chapter, not in an implied finding based on Burke's title or photograph.[8]

Photos




Left: still from CVM Television's November 2026 interview (credit: CVM Television). Right: photo of Burke circulated on social media and attributed to his public accounts. Included for identification only.



News screenshot: CVM-TV Entertainment graphic, "BZR organisers to sue Cardi B," November 2026. Credit: CVM Television. Reproduced for reporting and commentary.

The CVM images accompany the identified news interview. The self-portrait's attribution to public accounts is retained as supplied; its original posting date and original post were not independently established. The photographs are not used to match unidentified arrest images or decide whether an unrelated person in a name search is this promoter.[3] [4]

Names, age and location in the records

"Ryan Burke" is the name in the Broward summons, his affidavit and deposition, and the January 2013 federal order involving NWE and Vision. His October 2022 affidavit begins, "My name is Ryan Burke," then identifies his registered-agent roles for VEW Live, 2045 SW 127th Avenue and 16260 Saddle Club Road. That statement provides a stronger link than the name by itself.[9] [10]

A different formulation appears in the Illinois case. The October 23, 2025 docket entry describes counsel's appearance as being for "Putative Defendant Ryan Matthew Burke, erroneously sued as 'Ryan Burke'." The November jurisdiction motion is likewise described as the putative defendant's motion and lists a declaration of Ryan Matthew Burke. This establishes the full name used by the appearing defendant's lawyer and the asserted error. It does not establish why counsel claimed an error, whether a different person was served, or how the court resolved individual identity.[11]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Illinois appearance, docket entry 11, Oct. 23, 2025
>
> Counsel appeared for "Putative Defendant Ryan Matthew Burke, erroneously sued as 'Ryan Burke'." The wording is the defense's position, not a judicial identification finding.[11]

The November 2, 2026 bankruptcy distribution order uses "Ruyan Burke" in its operative paragraph. The case number, debtor and role as debtor representative connect that wording to the otherwise identified Ryan Burke in this company proceeding. It is treated as a spelling discrepancy in the document, not evidence of an alias or another person.[12]

The return reporting the April 11, 2022 service encounter described the man served with the field "Age: 39." It was filed in May and later attached to the motion to quash. The limited statement warranted here is that the April 2022 return described the man served as about 39. This is a process server's description, not verification of a birth date, and no current age is calculated from it.[9]

Burke described his home as being in Sunrise, Florida, and said in February 2023 that he had lived there "Since 2010." Asked where his office was, he answered, "It's in my house." The residential street address and household details are omitted. "Miami" in company and media descriptions therefore should not be substituted for a verified statement that he lived in the City of Miami.[1]

Two business addresses recur. The January 9, 2013 ZAO order describes Vision's 1395 Brickell Avenue, Suite 800, Miami address as a "virtual office" and says no Vision representative worked or had worked at that physical address. It describes NWE's 1680 Michigan Avenue, Suite 700, Miami Beach address as "also a virtual office." These are historical statements in that order. They do not establish the physical occupancy of every company using either address in 2026.[10]

The February 2022 summons for VEW Live names Burke as registered agent at the Brickell business office. Current corporate records also connect him and VEW Live to that office. An office or service listing helps identify a business connection; it is not proof that papers were successfully delivered or that the individual lived there.[2] [13]

Identity standard

For attribution to this promoter, a record must connect the person to VEW Live, Vision Entertainment Worldwide, NWE, 2045 SW 127th Avenue LLC, BZR WKND, or an already established business role or address. A matching office is corroboration, not sufficient proof alone: virtual-office addresses can be shared. A name plus an exact VEW entity in a signed order is materially stronger than a name plus a city in an internet index.[10] [14]

The standard also separates a case about a related company from a case against Burke individually. A lawsuit naming VEW Live alone belongs in the business record, but does not establish personal liability. A company bankruptcy is not a personal bankruptcy. The debtor's 2025 summary identifies Burke and Burke Development Group as managers, which connects him to the filing without changing the debtor's legal identity.[14]

A common lawyer can corroborate a connection already supported by the parties and transaction; it is not an independent identity test. Likewise, a complaint naming Burke with his known businesses establishes whom the plaintiffs intended to accuse. It does not necessarily identify the person actually served, settle a contested appearance, or prove the allegations. Those limits are particularly relevant in Illinois.[11] [15]

How each case was tied to him

Confidence below concerns identity or business linkage, not the truth of an allegation, the merits or a current judgment balance. "Provisional" means a specific underlying locator was supplied but the case-specific record was not independently retrieved for this edition.

Major case or dispute	Connection in the record	Identity confidence and limit
ZAO, 2012	Signed federal order names Burke with NWE and Vision and describes his controlling roles.	High; primary order, pp. 5–6.[10]
Rihanna report, 2012	Courthouse News names Ryan Burke together with Vision in its Miami-Dade allegation brief.	High for the reported business connection; underlying plaintiff, case number and outcome unverified.[16]
Blige, 2013	Named plaintiff is Vision; public docket lists Robert Alan Rosenblatt, also counsel in ZAO.	High company connection; company litigation, not a personal case against Burke.[17]
Joe Clark, 2019	Cited judgment locator names Burke and VEW Live together, Miami-Dade 2019-037826-CA-01.	Provisional; OR 31833/2101–2102 not independently retrieved.[18]
Marlins, 2020	Cited civil index names VEW Live, No. 2020-002259-CA-01.	Provisional company connection; complaint and OR 32708/1760 not independently retrieved.[19]
VEW Capital, 2023	Cited New Jersey judgment names Burke and VEW Live as debtors.	Provisional; OR 34008/758–760 not independently retrieved. VEW Capital is the creditor.[20]
Kameka, 2022	Summons, affidavit and deposition name Burke with VEW Live and both property LLCs; he acknowledges agency roles.	High; supplied primary filings.[1] [9]
Duboff foreclosure	Defense notice identifies counsel for Burke and 2045 LLC; signed 2026 judgment names both.	High; same borrower entity and primary papers.[21]
Bankruptcies, 2024/2025	2045 company is debtor; state attachment links first dismissal; second debtor summary identifies Burke as manager.	High company/representative connection; no personal petition established.[14] [22]
Echols, 2025	Complaint names VEW, Vision and UCA, the two business offices and BZR contracts; appearance disputes the individual designation.	High intended business connection; individual service/identity dispute unresolved.[11] [15]
Bayfront, 2024–26	Cited company judgment names VEW Live, No. 2024-016045-CA-01.	Provisional; OR 35320/4699–4700 not independently retrieved; no personal award established.[23]
Cardi B, 2026	Identified CVM interview and BZR reporting quote Burke speaking for the organizer.	High for public dispute; filed suit not verified.[3] [8]

Exclusions

Criminal-record results for other men named Ryan Burke, including results in Florida jail or arrest databases, are excluded. Name-only matches, differing middle names and an apparent visual resemblance do not meet this standard. The same restraint applies to companies in a statewide officer-name search that lack a VEW, BZR or documented role connection. They are not silently added to his company inventory.

The reviewed record does contain the May 13, 2024 adjudication of direct and indirect criminal contempt in the Broward civil case. The signed order identifies Burke through that case's service testimony and commits him to three consecutive jail days. That is a criminal-contempt adjudication by a civil judge, not a separately verified prosecutor-filed criminal charge or arrest record. Whether the term was served, appealed or later modified is not established by the primary materials reviewed.[24]

What remains unresolved

The Illinois appearance and underlying declaration require further records before any fuller conclusion about the disputed individual designation. Original posting details for the supplied self-portrait remain unverified. The state instruments for Clark, Capital, Marlins and Bayfront remain retrieval leads; they cannot be upgraded to verified identity findings by repetition. The Rihanna complaint's case number and plaintiff remain unresolved. No current talent-agency license or complete career history is established here. These gaps do not affect the direct links in Burke's sworn role descriptions, the identified interviews and the company records, but they limit claims beyond those sources.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Deposition of Ryan Burke, Broward CACE-22-001852 (Feb. 23, 2023), PDF p. 6, Tr. 18:13–20 (occupations and functions); PDF p. 3, Tr. 7:13–18 and 8:5–9 (Sunrise residence and home office) — record.
2. Florida Division of Corporations, VEW Live, LLC, L11000006244, registered-agent, authorized-person and address fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
3. CVM Television, Nov. 10, 2026, opening identification and interview exchanges beginning 'And you can confirm' and 'Are you going to get your money back?' — source.
4. Ryan Burke, @vewryan, displayed name and bio, retrieved Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
5. Ryan Burke, LinkedIn profile, summary and VEW Live!, VEW Music Group and Vision experience entries, retrieved Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
6. Yasmine Peru, The Gleaner (July 16, 2023), professional-description paragraph and paragraph beginning 'Burke is part of a conglomerate' — source.
7. Kyle Denis, Billboard (Aug. 14, 2026), joint statement identifying Burke and Morgan as organizers — source.
8. DancehallMag (Nov. 10, 2026), Cardi B's disputed-payment and production account and statement that filing remained unclear — source.
9. Defendants' motion to quash (Nov. 22, 2022), Broward CACE-22-001852, PDF p. 4 (return describing April 11 service, filed May 5, 'Age: 39'); PDF p. 8, affidavit paragraph 1 (name and registered-agent roles) — record.
10. TV Service ZAO v. NWE, S.D. Fla. 1:12-cv-20317, DE 104 (Jan. 9, 2013), pp. 5–6 and footnote 6 (roles, control and virtual offices) — record.
11. Echols et al. v. Burke et al., N.D. Ill. 1:25-cv-06604, reproduced docket entries 11–12 (Oct. 23, 2025) and 13 (Nov. 13, 2025). Exact appearance wording uses double quotes around Ryan Burke; single quotes above are typographic nesting — record.
12. Bankr. S.D. Fla. 25-14362-SMG, Doc. 123 (Nov. 2, 2026), PDF p. 1, operative paragraph ('Ruyan Burke') — record.
13. Summons to VEW Live, Broward CACE-22-001852 (Feb. 18, 2022), PDF p. 1, registered-agent business address — record.
14. Debtor's case-management summary, Bankr. S.D. Fla. 25-14362-SMG, Doc. 18 (May 2, 2025), PDF pp. 1–2, Burke's stated role and manager signature — record.

15. Echols/Mosley verified complaint, N.D. Ill. 1:25-cv-06604, DE 1 (June 13, 2025), PDF pp. 1–2, paragraphs 3–6 and 9–12, corporate offices and alleged BZR instruments — record.
16. Courthouse News Service, 'Bogus' (2012), Miami brief naming Vision and Ryan Burke; allegations, not findings — source.
17. Vision Entertainment Worldwide v. Mary Jane Productions and Mary Jane Blige, S.D.N.Y. 1:2013cv04215, filed June 18, 2013, party and plaintiff-counsel fields — record.
18. Joe Clark v. Burke and VEW Live, Miami-Dade 2019-037826-CA-01; judgment locator OR Book 31833, pp. 2101–2102, DIN 16 (Feb. 19, 2020). Not independently retrieved by this publication; portal is a retrieval route, not case-specific proof — record.
19. Marlins Stadium Operator v. VEW Live, Miami-Dade 2020-002259-CA-01, reported dismissal locator DIN 13, OR Book 32708, p. 1760 (Aug. 2021). Not independently retrieved by this publication — record.
20. VEW Capital Group v. Burke and VEW Live, N.J. BER-L-321-23 (Feb. 17, 2023), foreign-judgment locator Miami-Dade OR Book 34008, pp. 758–760, case 2023-028109-CA-01. Not independently retrieved by this publication — record.
21. Defense hearing notice, Broward CACE-22-016620 (filed Feb. 6, 2025), PDF p. 2, Mittelberg identified for Burke and 2045 LLC — redacted notice; Final Judgment of Foreclosure (July 16, 2026), PDF p. 1, named defendants — redacted judgment.
22. Bankr. S.D. Fla. 24-14947-PDR dismissal/notice package, order signed July 15, entered July 16, 2024; PDF pp. 1–5, debtor caption and matching case number. Order caption says '2034'; notice identifies 2045, as explained in bankruptcy chapter — record.
23. Bayfront Park Management Trust v. VEW Live, Miami-Dade 2024-016045-CA-01, judgment locator OR Book 35320, pp. 4699–4700, DIN 19 (May 26, 2026). Not independently retrieved by this publication — record.
24. Broward CACE22001852, Order Adjudging Respondent in Indirect Criminal Contempt of Court and Order of Commitment (May 13, 2024), PDF pp. 1–2, findings A–C, direct/indirect adjudications and commitment paragraph — record.

CHAPTER 03 · CORPORATE RECORDS AND BUSINESS ROLES

The companies: VEW, NWE, the LLCs and V12 Group

Florida registrations and court filings distinguish the entertainment companies, property managers and event brands associated with Burke.

The public record contains several legal entities, not a single company called "VEW." Vision Entertainment Worldwide and VEW Live have different Florida document numbers and filing dates. NWE appears as both a corporation and an LLC. The property company that filed two bankruptcies is another entity, managed through Burke Development Group. In 2026, V12 Group appears in Florida's registry and in BZR WKND's own organizer statement. Their relationships are described below only to the extent established by registrations, testimony, court orders or attributed reporting.[1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Company register

The table records the Florida Division of Corporations detail pages as reviewed on November 11, 2026. "Active" and "inactive" are registry status labels, not opinions about solvency, performance or payment of judgments. Filing and effective dates are kept separate where they differ. The roles reproduce the filed titles: MGR is manager, MGRM is managing member, and AMBR is authorized member. Those titles do not disclose ownership percentages or establish every person who exercised practical control.

Brickell refers below to 1395 Brickell Avenue, Suite 800, Miami. Michigan refers to 1680 Michigan Avenue, Suite 700, Miami Beach. The ZAO court described those two offices as virtual in 2013. The descriptions are not extended into a finding about their present occupants. Residential street addresses used in property-company filings are withheld.[6]

Entity or business name	State and verified document number	Filing date	Registry status at review	Burke's role per records	Registered agent / principal address type	Source
Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC	Florida; L08000104363	Nov. 7, 2008	Active; reinstated Feb. 24, 2026	Registered agent and MGRM; 2013 order calls him president and controlling representative	Burke; Brickell business office, described as virtual in 2013	Sunbiz; ZAO order.[1] [6]
VEW Live, LLC	Florida; L11000006244	Jan. 14, 2011	Active; reinstated Feb. 24, 2026	Registered agent and MGRM, alongside VEW Marketing, Inc.	Burke; Brickell business office	Sunbiz.[2]
VEW Music Group, LLC, sometimes shortened to VEW Music	Florida; L12000002589	Jan. 6, 2012; effective Jan. 1	Inactive; annual-report dissolution Sept. 22, 2023	Registered agent; filed authorized-person title "President"	Burke; Brickell business office	Sunbiz.[7]

Entity or business name	State and verified document number	Filing date	Registry status at review	Burke's role per records	Registered agent / principal address type	Source
NWE Talent Agency & Management, Inc.	Florida; P11000004653	Jan. 13, 2011	Inactive; conversion Jan. 31, 2012	Not listed as officer on detail page; order describes designated/ senior booking agent and practical control	President/agent identified in order as his mother; Michigan business office, described as virtual	Sunbiz; ZAO order.[3] [6]
NWE Talent Agency & Management Company LLC	Florida; L12000015455	Jan. 31, 2012; effective Jan. 13, 2011	Inactive; registered-agent dissolution July 22, 2013	Not listed as manager on detail page; exact succession instrument not reviewed	Barry Chase/ Chase Lawyers; legal-office agent address; Michigan principal office	Sunbiz.[8]
16260 Saddle Club Road, LLC	Florida; L21000182654	Apr. 20, 2021; effective Apr. 19	Inactive; annual-report dissolution Sept. 22, 2023	Registered agent and MGR; role discussed at deposition	Burke; Sunrise residential/ home-office listing, street withheld	Sunbiz; deposition.[9] [10]
2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC	Florida; L21000213244	May 6, 2021; effective May 1	Inactive; annual-report dissolution Sept. 26, 2025	Registered agent; Burke Development Group listed as MGR; debtor summary calls Burke manager and sole shareholder	Burke; Sunrise residential/ home-office listing, street withheld	Sunbiz; debtor summary.[4] [11]
Burke Development Group, LLC	Florida; L21000103177	Mar. 3, 2021; effective Mar. 1	Inactive; annual-report dissolution Sept. 25, 2026	Registered agent and MGRM; Burke signs debtor summary as its manager	Burke; Sunrise residential/ home-office listing, street withheld	Sunbiz; debtor summary.[12] [11]
Universal Creative Agency Inc / UCA	Florida; P19000045308; Jamaica event partner in reporting, not a verified Jamaican incorporation	May 23, 2019; effective May 20	Active; reinstated Feb. 24, 2026	Burke not listed as agent or officer; partnership and letterhead links described below	Vanessa Cepeda, registered agent/ president; Michigan business office	Sunbiz; Gleaner; complaint.[13] [14] [15]
V12 Group, LLC	Florida; L26000124570	Mar. 2, 2026	Active; no events or annual reports displayed	AMBR Ryan Burke	Roy Morgan, registered agent; Brickell business office	Sunbiz; BZR statement.[5] [16]

Dates and legal names

Vision's 2008 filing predates the chapter's 2009–2026 reporting window and is included because it identifies the entity later appearing in litigation. Its first annual report is indexed in 2009. LinkedIn dates VEW's operations to 2003 and VEW Live! to 2005. Neither self-description changes the verified November 7, 2008 and January 14, 2011 LLC filing dates. A business may describe a history preceding a particular incorporation, but the profile does not supply formation documents for that earlier history.[1] [2] [17]

The music entity's verified legal name is "VEW Music Group, LLC," not an assumed separate corporation called "VEW Music." The distinction matters when following a court caption or company role. The registry gives Burke the title "President" in an LLC's authorized-person field. This chapter preserves that title rather than changing the company's legal form to match it.[7]

The record for VEW Live also lists VEW Marketing, Inc. as MGRM. There are two verified Florida registrations with that corporate name: P11000004667, filed January 13, 2011 and administratively dissolved September 28, 2012, and P19000038710, filed May 1, 2019 and active after a February 24, 2026 reinstatement. Both identify Burke as president and registered agent at Brickell. VEW Live's displayed manager name does not itself specify which document number it means. The two marketing registrations should not be merged or assigned a succession relationship without the relevant instruments.[2] [24]

NWE: listed officers and the court's account of control

The most specific account of practical corporate control appears in Magistrate Judge John J. O'Sullivan's January 9, 2013 summary-judgment order in *TV Service ZAO v. NWE Talent Agency and Management*. The order identifies Burke as Vision's president and as a "designated agent" and "senior booking agent" for NWE. Its facts section says his mother was listed as NWE's president to create the appearance that NWE and Vision were distinct, calls her a "figurehead," and describes Burke as the controlling member and corporate representative of both. The family member's name is omitted here.[6]

> **COURT FINDING** ZAO order, Jan. 9, 2013, pp. 5–6
>
> The order describes Burke as the controlling member and corporate representative of NWE and Vision. Footnote 6 explains that, unless otherwise noted, the Burke defendants did not dispute the cited facts in ZAO's statement.[6]

The order also describes a cousin as briefly holding NWE's chief operating officer title from January through June 2012, with no earlier entertainment-industry experience. It says the January 10 proposal was signed only by that cousin and not accepted by Lady Gaga or her authorized representatives. No private family name is necessary to report the corporate role or the court's account of authority.[6]

Those findings differ from the Sunbiz officer fields. The corporation page lists the president/agent but not Burke; the LLC page lists the same family member as MGRM and an attorney as agent. The court order supplies the evidence of Burke's practical control that the registry page alone does not. Conversely, the court's collective term "Burke Entities" identifies parties in that particular case. It is not a blanket ruling that every later company in this chapter was his alter ego or responsible for every other company's debts.[3] [8] [6]

NWE Inc.'s last event is a January 31, 2012 conversion. The NWE LLC was filed that day with an effective date matching the corporation's January 13, 2011 effective date. The records are consistent with a conversion, but the actual conversion instrument was not reviewed. The LLC was later administratively dissolved for a registered-agent issue on July 22, 2013; the image index also lists an agent resignation. That is not described as an annual-report dissolution.[3] [8]

Dissolutions and reinstatements

VEW Live's event history records an annual-report administrative dissolution on September 28, 2012 and reinstatement March 21, 2013. It records another annual-report dissolution September 26, 2025 and reinstatement February 24, 2026. Vision's history records dissolution September 24, 2010 and reinstatement January 10, 2011, followed by the same September 2025 and February 2026 pair. The 2025/2026 entries repeat on the displayed histories; repetition is not counted as a second dissolution.[18]

Vision's history also records a January 12, 2012 name change from the misspelled "VISION ENTERTAINMENT WORLWIDE LLC" and an August 10, 2017 amendment. The displayed latest report tables for Vision and VEW Live show 2025 and 2026 reports filed on February 24, 2026. These are registry events. They do not show when every business activity stopped or resumed, establish insolvency, or resolve liability in a lawsuit.[18] [1] [2]

The property entities' displayed dissolution dates differ: Saddle Club in September 2023, the 2045 company in September 2025 and Burke Development Group in September 2026. None of their inspected detail pages shows a later reinstatement. The existence of a bankruptcy proceeding and the state registry's inactive label are separate recorded facts. One should not replace the other in a description of the company's status.[9] [4] [12]

V12's March 2026 page displays "No Annual Reports Filed" and "No Events." That does not prove that an annual report was overdue. UCA's page records reinstatement February 24, 2026. For these entries, this chapter reports the detail page and its last-event field, not an independently reconstructed history of every earlier filing or lapse.[5] [13]

What court records say about the money

The common addresses and roles do not provide a consolidated financial statement. The reviewed court documents describe particular payments and claims. They are kept separate below. No account numbers are reproduced, and no unexplained difference between sums is called a transfer to Burke or another entity without evidence.

ZAO: deposits at NWE

The 2013 order says WMA and NWE entered an August 23, 2011 binder agreement requiring a $150,000 deposit to be placed in NWE's escrow account. It records that NWE received the deposit and that the agreement promised refunds if the artist did not accept or negotiations did not pro-

duce executed contracts. Around December 27, WMA paid NWE another $1,350,000 on ZAO's behalf. Burke's December email, quoted in the order, said the money would go directly to NWE and then to the artist's management or agent.[6]

The court records $1.5 million received by NWE and $1.05 million remaining in its bank account on January 31, 2012. Its footnote identifies the February 1 freezing order. These facts show the recipient, contractual escrow description and reported remaining balance. They do not establish a verified ultimate destination for the difference, a payment to Lady Gaga, or a transfer to each other VEW company.[6]

BURKE'S POSITION Burke defendants' contract position, recorded in the ZAO order

The defendants argued that ZAO breached an exclusivity/no-contact obligation by contacting Lady Gaga's representatives. The court rejected their breach-of-contract counterclaim, but denied immediate release of the frozen funds and said ZAO had to prove its own claims at trial.[6]

The ZAO chapter explains the separate agreements and the limits of that ruling. The order is not a final fraud judgment against Burke on ZAO's pleaded claims.

Kameka: loan and lien figures, not an entity-by-entity bank trail

The July 12, 2022 amended default judgment, attached to the creditors' bankruptcy claim, states $200,000 principal, interest and costs, and a $120,000 payment credit, producing a $107,212 equitable lien. It names the case's defendants, including Burke, VEW Live and the two property LLCs. It does not attach a complete ledger showing which entity first received each loan dollar or where each payment came from.[19]

The May 2025 claim describes its basis as "Money loaned" and claims $178,415.77 after interest and additional fees/costs. It is a creditor submission, not proof of the amount later allowed or paid. Burke's February deposition concerns service and roles, not loan formation or diversion of proceeds. The account therefore does not import the earlier reports' descriptions of separate advances and repayments as sworn admissions.[19] [10]

The debtor's May 2, 2025 summary says the bankruptcy was filed to stop foreclosure, describes real-estate investment and calls its financial figures approximations for background information. It identifies Burke as manager and sole shareholder, while the signature identifies Burke Development Group as manager and Burke as that entity's manager. That is evidence of a management relationship, not proof that all three subjects had interchangeable assets.[11]

PUBLIC RECORD Company bankruptcy records

The debtor in both proceedings was the 2045 property LLC, not Burke personally. The first case was dismissed; the second was converted to Chapter 7. The November 2026 order authorizes $74.92 to the debtor's representative, without establishing receipt or complete creditor distributions.[20]

The loan chapter and bankruptcy chapter address the later service and enforcement issues. These proceedings do not furnish a basis for labeling every VEW receipt as property-company money.

Echols: alleged recipients in a filed complaint

Echols and Mosley's June 2025 Illinois complaint alleges contracts bearing VEW Live, Vision and UCA letterheads. Paragraph 12 alleges $150,000 to UCA, $62,500 to Burke personally, and $15,645.95 and $70,000 to VEW Live. The four figures total $298,145.95. Vision is named on the alleged documents but is not listed as a separate payment recipient in that paragraph.[15]

> **PARTY ALLEGATION** Illinois complaint, paragraph 12
>
> The payment list is the plaintiffs' verified pleading, not independently reconciled bank records or a court finding that the listed transfers settled, were retained or were diverted.[15]

The complaint's letterhead allegations do not establish which company signed each obligation. The appearance and jurisdiction motion also dispute the individual designation, using "Putative Defendant Ryan Matthew Burke, erroneously sued as 'Ryan Burke'." The available docket wording does not resolve that dispute or supply the terms of the later judgment. The Echols chapter preserves both the allegations and that response.[21]

Talent-agency licensing

The ZAO order's facts section states: "The Burke Entities are not licensed talent agencies pursuant to section 468.403 of the Florida Statutes." This is the order's historical finding about the defendants then before it. It is not a current licensing search for every entity formed afterward.[6]

Florida Statutes section 468.401 defines a talent agency as a person who, for compensation, procures or attempts to procure engagements for an artist. Section 468.403 generally requires a license from the Department of Business and Professional Regulation before conducting that occupation in Florida. It exempts acting for oneself, a family member or exclusively one artist, but separately restricts advertising or holding oneself out as a "talent agency" or "talent agent" without the license.[22]

The application requirements include operator experience, fingerprints and photographs, the location, relevant ownership or managing information, and references. Incorporation on Sunbiz is not this professional license. Conversely, the occupation "promoter" is not automatically a judicial finding that a particular transaction falls within the statutory definition.[22]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Licensing argument in the ZAO order, pp. 19–20
>
> The Burke defendants argued that the statute was intended to protect artists, not third parties such as ZAO, and did not void the claimed contract. The court declined to decide that alternative theory because it rejected the counterclaim on contract grounds.[6]

The nonlicensure statement and the decision not to resolve the contract-voidness theory can both be reported. Neither warrants saying that this order imposed a licensing penalty, revoked a license, or adjudicated the legality of all Burke's later bookings.

UCA, V12 and event brands

The Gleaner named UCA as a BZR partner in 2023. The Florida UCA record lists Vanessa Cepeda, not Burke, as president and registered agent. Its Michigan address matches NWE's historical office and the Illinois complaint's UCA listing. That corroborates a business context but does not prove Burke owned UCA, controlled its bank accounts or was entitled to bind it in every event. No separate Jamaican company registration was verified.[14] [13] [15]

V12 has a more direct registry connection: Burke is its listed authorized member at Brickell. The live BZR website's refund/postponement statement is signed "V12 Group and the BZR WKND Jamaica Team." Together these sources connect the Florida entity to the 2026 event's public communications. They do not identify the legal signatory to the Cardi B artist agreement, which was not reviewed.[5] [16]

The verified trademark reproduction is for VEW LIVE!, serial 86785472 and registration 5034854. Justia identifies Ryan Burke as the individual original registrant, a filing on October 12, 2015, registration September 6, 2016 and claimed first use December 1, 2009. Its displayed "Registered" status carries a 2016 status date. Trademarkia records "CANCELLED - SECTION 8" on March 17, 2023. A current primary USPTO status for the correct serial was not independently retrieved; the two mirrors' different update dates are disclosed.[23]

No attributable VEWtopia or BZR trademark serial or registration was verified in the searches reviewed. That is not a finding that neither brand has rights or registrations. An event name, company filing and trademark are different records. OpenCorporates corroborates VEW Live's document number, agent and Brickell address; Bizapedia returned an automated-query restriction rather than company details. Neither source was used to invent missing ownership or financial information.[25]

What remains unresolved

The NWE conversion instrument, the document number intended by VEW Live's VEW Marketing manager entry, beneficial ownership and complete historical filing images remain unverified. UCA's ownership, any Jamaican registration and its authority in the alleged Illinois contracts are unresolved. The artist agreement's contracting party, bank reconciliation and any court ruling on the 2026 payment dispute were unavailable. Current talent-agency licensing, primary current trademark status, and attributable VEWtopia/BZR registrations were not established. The court materials do not supply a complete intercompany money trail; they support only the particular deposits, loan figures, management statements and allegations described above.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Sunbiz, Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC, L08000104363, filing, address, authorized-person, status and document-index fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
2. Sunbiz, VEW Live, LLC, L11000006244, filing, agent, MGRM, report and status fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
3. Sunbiz, NWE Talent Agency & Management, Inc., P11000004653, officer/agent, filing and conversion fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
4. Sunbiz, 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC, L21000213244, filing, agent, manager and last-event fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
5. Sunbiz, V12 Group, LLC, L26000124570, filing, authorized-member, agent and address fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
6. TV Service ZAO v. NWE, S.D. Fla. 1:12-cv-20317, DE 104 (Jan. 9, 2013), pp. 5–6 and footnote 6 (control, offices, licensing); pp. 7–12 and footnotes 7–8 (deposits and bank balance); pp. 10–11 (cousin's role); pp. 13–21 (contract positions, ruling and limits), particularly p. 20 (licensing defense) — record.
7. Sunbiz, VEW Music Group, LLC, L12000002589, legal name, dates, President, registered-agent and dissolution fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
8. Sunbiz, NWE Talent Agency & Management Company LLC, L12000015455, filing/effective dates, manager, agent, last event and document index, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — Sunbiz search by document number, L12000015455.
9. Sunbiz, 16260 Saddle Club Road, LLC, L21000182654, filing, MGR/agent and annual-report dissolution fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
10. Ryan Burke deposition (Feb. 23, 2023), Broward CACE-22-001852, PDF pp. 3–4, Tr. 8:11–19, 10:6–11:4 (entity/agent answers); PDF p. 3, Tr. 8:5–9 (home office). Loan formation and disposition are not subjects established by this transcript — record.
11. Debtor's case-management summary, Bankr. S.D. Fla. 25-14362-SMG, Doc. 18 (May 2, 2025), PDF pp. 1–2, background-approximation warning, filing purpose, Burke's role and Burke Development Group signature — record.
12. Sunbiz, Burke Development Group, LLC, L21000103177, filing/effective dates, MGRM/agent and annual-report dissolution fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
13. Sunbiz, Universal Creative Agency Inc, P19000045308, filing/effective dates, agent/president, Michigan office and reinstatement fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
14. Yasmine Peru, The Gleaner (July 16, 2023), paragraph beginning 'Burke is part of a conglomerate,' naming UCA as a partner — source.
15. Echols/Mosley verified complaint, N.D. Ill. 1:25-cv-06604, DE 1 (June 13, 2025), PDF pp. 1–2, paragraphs 4–6 and 9–12 (addresses, letterheads and alleged payment recipients). External unredacted source, not re-hosted — record.
16. BZR WKND website, live statement ending 'V12 Group and the BZR WKND Jamaica Team,' checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
17. Ryan Burke LinkedIn profile, summary and VEW Live!/Vision experience entries, self-described operating dates, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
18. Sunbiz event histories for VEW Live and Vision, dissolution/reinstatement and name-change fields, previously opened Nov. 11, 2026 in supplied verified research. Duplicate September 2025/February 2026 display entries are not counted twice.
19. Kameka/Dzotsi Claim 4, Bankr. S.D. Fla. 25-14362-SMG (May 21, 2025), PDF pp. 1–3 (creditor claim); attached July 12, 2022 amended default judgment, PDF pp. 4–6, principal, credit, lien and parties. Later service proceedings qualify its procedural history — record.
20. Bankr. S.D. Fla. 24-14947-PDR, dismissal order signed July 15, entered July 16, 2024, PDF pp. 3–5 — redacted copy; 25-14362-SMG conversion order, signed Sept. 9, entered Sept. 10, 2025, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy; distribution order, Nov. 2, 2026, PDF p. 1 — redacted copy.
21. Justia reproduction, Echols et al. v. Burke et al., N.D. Ill. 1:25-cv-06604, entries 11–12 (Oct. 23, 2025) and 13 (Nov. 13, 2025), putative-defendant wording and jurisdiction motion — record.
22. Florida Statutes section 468.401, subsections 1, 5 and 10 (definition and department); section 468.403, subsection 1 (license, exemptions and advertising) and subsections 2–9 (application requirements), 2026 text.
23. Justia trademark reproduction, serial 86785472, filing/registration, registrant and claimed-first-use fields, 2016 status date; Trademarkia history, March 17, 2023 Section 8 cancellation, both checked Nov. 11, 2026. Correct-serial current primary USPTO status not independently retrieved.
24. Sunbiz, VEW Marketing, Inc., P11000004667 and VEW Marketing, Inc., P19000038710, verified filing, officer/agent and last-event fields in supplied Nov. 11, 2026 research. Two document numbers, not one registration.
25. OpenCorporates, VEW Live, LLC, company number, agent and address fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026; Bizapedia access response, same review date, automated-query restriction rather than company details.

CHAPTER 04 · FEDERAL COURT, MIAMI

The Lady Gaga booking: TV Service ZAO v. NWE Talent

A federal order reconstructed the payments and unsigned proposals for a Moscow performance, rejected the Burke entities' counterclaim, and left ZAO's own claims for trial.

In August 2011, TV Service ZAO wanted Lady Gaga to perform at the following year's MUZ-TV Music Awards in Moscow. By January 2012, ZAO was demanding the return of $1,650,000 paid in connection with that booking. NWE Talent Agency and Management, Inc. had received $1,500,000 of ZAO's funds, according to the federal court's later account. The artist had not accepted the proposals. The case that followed produced a detailed summary-judgment order, but not a publicly verified trial verdict on ZAO's claims against Ryan Burke and his companies.[1]

TV SERVICE ZAO V. NWE TALENT AGENCY

Court	U.S. District Court, S.D. Florida (Miami)
Case no.	1:12-cv-20317
Judge	Joan A. Lenard; Magistrate Judge John J. O'Sullivan (by consent)
Filed	January 26, 2012
Status	Terminated January 23, 2013; termination terms not public in the reviewed sources
Parties	TV Service ZAO (plaintiff); NWE Talent Agency and Management, Inc.; Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC; Ryan Burke; George Sergeev; World Media Alliance, Inc.

The distinction between the claims matters. ZAO sued the Burke defendants for fraud, unjust enrichment and conversion. Those were pleaded civil causes of action, not findings that Burke had committed fraud. Burke, NWE and Vision Entertainment Worldwide, LLC (VEW) answered and counterclaimed for breach of contract. On January 9, 2013, Magistrate Judge John J. O'Sullivan rejected that counterclaim on summary judgment. He did not award ZAO the frozen funds. His conclusion expressly required ZAO to prove its own claims at trial before obtaining their release.[2]

What the January 2013 order establishes

The principal source for this chapter is the 21-page order entered as docket entry 104. It identifies Burke, NWE and VEW collectively as the "Burke Entities." That term does not include George Sergeev or his company, World Media Alliance, Inc. (WMA), which had a separate role as the intermediary between ZAO and NWE. The order also records a separate default judgment against Sergeev and WMA. Neither their procedural default nor the ruling on the Burke entities' counterclaim should be described as a trial verdict against Burke.[2]

O'Sullivan acted as a magistrate judge, not the district judge assigned to the case. Footnote 1 explains his authority: the parties consented to magistrate-judge jurisdiction over certain motions, including summary judgment, and District Judge Joan A. Lenard referred pretrial matters and motions to him. The January order was therefore a decision by the judicial officer authorized to dispose of this motion, rather than simply a recommendation awaiting another judge's approval.[3]

The facts section has an equally important qualification. Its source was principally ZAO's statement of undisputed material facts, incorporated into ZAO's motion. The order says the Burke entities did not dispute those facts unless otherwise noted. It also says some facts not pertinent to the motion were omitted. This chapter attributes the factual account to that order and identifies the deposition testimony where the order does so. It does not imply that every quoted statement came from a witness examined at a public trial.[4]

> **COURT FINDING** Order on summary judgment, January 9, 2013, p. 5, footnote 6
>
> "Unless otherwise noted, the Burke Entities do not dispute the facts cited in ZAO's statement of undisputed material facts."[4]

That procedural setting gives the facts more support than an untested complaint alone. At the same time, the subject of the motion was whether ZAO had breached a contract enforceable by the Burke entities. The judge's decision on that question did not automatically resolve ZAO's separate causes of action. The order's facts, its contract analysis and its reservation of ZAO's claims must be read together.[2]

The companies and the artist's representatives

ZAO was a wholly owned subsidiary of UTH Russia Limited. UTH's main assets included MUZ-TV, a Russian music television channel. According to the order, ZAO had presented the nationally televised MUZ-TV Music Awards annually in Moscow since 2003. The June awards show included an appearance by a major international recording artist; previous performers included Christina Aguilera, Jennifer Lopez, Katy Perry and 50 Cent. The proposed Lady Gaga performance was for June 1, 2012, not an unspecified Moscow appearance at any date the parties might later select.[5]

The order describes Burke's roles in both companies involved on his side of the transaction:

> **COURT FINDING** Order on summary judgment, January 9, 2013, pp. 5–6
>
> "Ryan Burke is the president of VEW, a Florida corporation holding itself out as operating a full service entertainment company and talent agency." The order also identifies him as a "designated agent" and "senior booking agent" for NWE.[5]

The facts section states that Burke listed his mother as NWE's president to create the appearance that NWE and VEW were distinct corporate entities. In practice, the order says, she was a "figurehead," while Burke was the controlling member and corporate representative of both NWE and

VEW. Her name is omitted here under this publication's privacy policy. The finding concerns the roles described in this litigation; it is not a claim that all entities using the VEW name were legally interchangeable.[6]

The listed offices were also addressed in the order. VEW gave its principal place of business as 1395 Brickell Avenue, Suite 800, Miami. The judge's account calls that location a "virtual office" and states that no VEW representative worked or had ever worked at that physical address. NWE listed 1680 Michigan Avenue, 700, Miami Beach, which the order also describes as a virtual office. These are the business addresses named in the case, not residential addresses of individuals.[6]

> **COURT FINDING** Order on summary judgment, January 9, 2013, p. 6
>
> "The Burke Entities are not licensed talent agencies pursuant to section 468.403 of the Florida Statutes."[6]

This was an undisputed fact recited in the order. Its legal consequence was a different question, discussed later in the decision. O'Sullivan did not decide ZAO's argument that the absence of a license made the alleged contracts void or required the return of commissions. The fact of nonlicensure and the unresolved statutory argument should not be collapsed into a single holding.[7]

Sergeev was the president of WMA, a Florida corporation holding itself out as a music label. According to the order, neither he and WMA nor the Burke entities had worked with Lady Gaga, been her authorized representatives, or secured her to perform for another customer. The artist's actual representatives were identified separately: Troy Carter had been her exclusive manager since 2007, and William Morris Endeavor Entertainment, LLC was her exclusive booking and talent agent.[6]

> **COURT FINDING** Order on summary judgment, January 9, 2013, p. 6
>
> The Burke entities, Sergeev and WMA "were never authorized representatives of Lady Gaga and had never secured her as a performer on anyone else's behalf."[6]

The order nevertheless records Burke's assertion to Sergeev in mid-August 2011 that he could use his relationship with Carter to obtain Lady Gaga for the awards. That assertion explains how the proposed engagement moved toward payment. It is not proof that Carter had authorized Burke to sign for the artist, nor does the order treat it that way.[8]

August 2011: two binder agreements, different parties

The transaction began through Sergeev. In or around August 2011, ZAO representatives sought Lady Gaga for the June 1 awards. Sergeev said he could arrange the performance. Burke then told Sergeev that he needed a deposit, called a "binder," before beginning negotiations to secure the artist. On August 23, WMA and NWE signed a document titled Binder Agreement/Intent to Engage Talent. The order refers to it as the WMA/NWE Binder Agreement.[8]

Under that agreement, WMA directly engaged NWE to act on WMA's behalf. WMA agreed to pay a $150,000 binder deposit, to be "placed into the Escrow Account at NWE Talent Agency & Management, Inc." NWE received the deposit. The stated total agent, booking and broker fees for NWE were $300,000. These were terms of the WMA-NWE agreement, not evidence of a signed performance contract with Lady Gaga.[8]

The binder contained a refund provision. Funds received in escrow were to be "fully refundable" if the artist, her management or agents did not accept the offer, or if negotiations did not end in fully executed contracts. Both conditions concerned the outcome of the proposed negotiation. Paying the binder did not itself establish artist acceptance.[9]

ZAO was not a party to that August 23 agreement. The order says ZAO had no obligations under it and had not agreed to engage or pay NWE under its terms. At the time WMA and NWE executed it, ZAO had no agreement with Sergeev or WMA, and they had no authority to act on ZAO's behalf for any purpose. This timing became material when the Burke entities later tried to enforce the agreement's exclusivity clause against ZAO.[9]

A second binder agreement followed on August 28. This one was between ZAO and Sergeev/WMA. None of the Burke entities were parties to it. Its purpose was for WMA to obtain a $300,000 binder from ZAO before entering negotiations with Lady Gaga or her authorized representatives for the June 1, 2012 Moscow awards. The compensation that WMA could offer the artist was described as "$1,500,000.00 USD Plus All Expenses."[9]

The second binder also addressed refunds, but with its own language. It said funds held in escrow at WMA were fully refundable if the artist or her representatives did not accept the offer by October 30, 2011, or if negotiations did not end in fully executed contracts or negotiations toward a formal agreement memorializing the engagement. The court later treated this document as a ZAO-WMA agreement, not an agreement naming NWE or VEW as contracting parties.[10]

The two binders therefore cannot be read as one document. WMA stood between ZAO and NWE, signing separately with each. One binder contemplated $150,000 going to NWE; the other contemplated $300,000 going from ZAO to WMA. The January order's accounting explains that $150,000 of ZAO's $300,000 payment to WMA was passed along under the WMA/NWE binder. That helps reconcile the later figures without attributing all of ZAO's payments directly to Burke or NWE.[11]

December 2011: a proposal and a payment deadline

During the proposed booking, the Burke entities supplied Sergeev/WMA and ZAO with different artist-engagement proposals. The order says their concepts and material terms varied. They were prepared for submission to Lady Gaga's authorized representatives for review and possible approval. Specific acceptance by the artist or an authorized representative, such as Carter or William Morris, was required.[10]

One version was dated December 16, 2011. The court calls it the "12/16 Proposal." In the facts section, it is described as not an operative agreement: it could not become operative until Lady Gaga or one of her authorized representatives signed the line designated for an authorized signatory.

No such signature was obtained. Later, when analyzing the documents, the judge noted that its only signature was Sergeev's, under "WORLD MEDIA ALLIANCE/George Sergeev on behalf of MUZ-TV."[12]

Burke's December 23 email to ZAO then set an immediate deadline for money. The order reproduces his wording and notes the original capitalization:

> **PUBLIC RECORD** Email reproduced in the January 9, 2013 order, p. 10
>
> "the funds MUST be in escrow no later than end of business on Tuesday, December 27, 2011"[13]

The same email specified the recipient and the proposed next transfer:

> **PUBLIC RECORD** Email reproduced in the January 9, 2013 order, p. 10
>
> "the funds were going DIRECTLY to NWE Talent who would then forward to her [Lady Gaga's] Management/Agent a deposit, that way they would know that it's real people they are dealing with."[13]

The email is evidence of what Burke told ZAO about the payment path. It does not by itself establish that the stated onward transfer to the artist's management or agent occurred. The order's account of receipt is narrower: on or about December 27, WMA, acting on behalf of ZAO, paid NWE $1,350,000 to secure the June 1 performance. The judge cited an acknowledgment of receipt submitted with ZAO's motion.[13]

This was separate from the earlier binder. Adding the $1,350,000 to the $150,000 already received by NWE gives the $1,500,000 the order attributes to NWE. ZAO's total outlay in connection with the engagement was larger, because its original binder payment to WMA had been $300,000, not $150,000. The court's footnote, rather than a press headline, provides the basis for keeping those sums distinct.[11]

The order also records Burke's evidence about the return he expected from the December proposal:

> **SWORN TESTIMONY** Burke deposition as recited in the January 9, 2013 order, p. 12
>
> Burke would have made a profit of "on or around $300,000.00" if the December 16 proposal had been fulfilled.[14]

That is a statement about expected profit in the contemplated transaction. It is not a finding that Burke actually earned or retained $300,000, and it should not be used to explain every dollar absent from NWE's account by the end of January. The order cites Burke's deposition at DE 98-2, page 26, for the estimate.[14]

January 2012: the date changed, and ZAO asked for a refund

On January 10, NWE sent Sergeev/WMA another proposed artist-engagement agreement. This "1/10 Proposal" changed the performance date to October 9, 2012, after the June awards, and proposed compensation of $3.5 million. It was not merely a revised spelling or administrative correction. The date and price differed from the original award-show booking described in the binders.[15]

The only signature was from NWE's chief operating officer: a cousin of Burke's who, according to the order, had not previously worked in the entertainment industry. The order says she briefly held that title from January through June 2012. Her name is not reproduced here. Neither she nor anyone at NWE or the other Burke entities was authorized to enter an agreement on Lady Gaga's behalf.[15]

The order is explicit about acceptance on both sides. Neither Carter nor Lady Gaga accepted the prior proposals, including the October-performance proposal. No ZAO representative signed or accepted the January 10 document, and ZAO did not agree to its terms. The court later found the document was not a valid contract because its sole signatory was not an authorized artist representative.[15]

Sergeev's response, quoted in the order, was direct: "Date MUZ TV need June 1, all deal is impossible and unacceptable." On January 20, a ZAO representative emailed Burke demanding the immediate return of $1,650,000 paid in connection with the engagement. The demand included the $300,000 original ZAO-WMA binder and the $1,350,000 December payment.[11]

The chronology and the amounts can be summarized without treating a demand as a judgment:

Date	Event recorded in the January 2013 order	Amount or term
August 23, 2011	WMA-NWE binder agreement; NWE received the binder	$150,000; stated NWE fees of $300,000
August 28, 2011	ZAO-WMA binder agreement	$300,000 binder; proposed artist compensation of $1.5 million plus expenses
December 23, 2011	Burke's email required funds in escrow by December 27	Funds to go directly to NWE
About December 27, 2011	WMA paid NWE on ZAO's behalf	$1,350,000
January 10, 2012	NWE sent revised, unaccepted proposal	October 9 date; $3.5 million compensation
January 20, 2012	ZAO demanded an immediate refund	$1,650,000
January 31, 2012	Balance stated for NWE's account	$1,050,000 remained of $1.5 million received
February 1, 2012	Court froze funds in the account	DE 6, joint motion granted

The entries come from pages 7–12 and footnotes 7–8 of the order.[16] The difference between the $1,500,000 received by NWE and the $1,050,000 remaining was $450,000. The January decision does not provide a complete tracing of that difference or decide its ultimate legal treatment. It is accurate to report the amounts; it would go beyond this order to assign every missing dollar to a particular recipient or use.[14]

The lawsuit and the intermediary's default

PacerMonitor's public case page lists the filing date as January 26, 2012. On February 1, the court granted a joint motion to freeze funds in the escrow account, DE 6. On February 9, ZAO filed the amended complaint later described in the summary-judgment order. It alleged fraud, unjust enrichment and conversion against the Burke entities. It also brought claims against Sergeev and WMA, including aiding and abetting fraud and breach of agreement.[17]

> **PARTY ALLEGATION** Amended complaint described in the January 9, 2013 order, p. 2
>
> ZAO asserted civil claims against the Burke entities arising from the failed booking and retention of its money. The January order did not enter judgment on those affirmative claims.[2]

Burke, NWE and VEW answered on March 12 and filed a breach-of-contract counterclaim that day. The record therefore contains an affirmative defense-side account, not just ZAO's allegations. The order lists the answer as DE 35 and the counterclaim as DE 36. ZAO moved for summary judgment on the counterclaim on November 28; the Burke entities responded on December 18; ZAO replied on December 31.[2]

Sergeev and WMA followed a different procedural course. The January order records a clerk's default against them on March 12, DE 34. An official April 16 order, DE 48, shows that ZAO had moved for default judgment and no response had been received. O'Sullivan gave the defendants until April 30 to respond and warned that failure could result in a recommendation to grant the motion in full. That April order was a response deadline, not yet the final default judgment.[18]

> **JUDGMENT** Default judgment identified in the January 9, 2013 order, p. 2, footnote 2
>
> A final default judgment was entered against George Sergeev and World Media Alliance, Inc. on June 14, 2012, DE 63.[19]

RAPSI reported on June 20 that the award against those two defendants was $1.65 million. The January order verifies the entry and its defendants, but does not reproduce the award amount. The amount is therefore attributed here to RAPSI's reporting, rather than represented as a figure independently read in DE 63. A default judgment against Sergeev and WMA does not establish an equivalent judgment against Burke, NWE or VEW, and an award does not establish payment or collection.[20]

The Burke entities' position

The counterclaim's central contention was that ZAO had violated exclusivity obligations by approaching Lady Gaga's agents and others directly. The Burke entities relied on the separate binders and the subsequent proposals. They alleged that the original June date conflicted with the artist's schedule and that they had performed their obligations by securing an October 9 appearance in Moscow.[21]

BURKE'S POSITION Counterclaim summarized in the January 9, 2013 order, pp. 12–14

The Burke entities argued that the engagement date could change with artist availability, that they had secured an October performance, and that ZAO breached its agreement by contacting the artist's representatives directly rather than negotiating exclusively through WMA, NWE and VEW.[21]

There was textual support for part of their account. The ZAO-WMA binder said, "Engagement date(s) subject to change according to ARTIST availability." Both binder agreements also contained exclusivity or no-contact provisions. The court did not resolve the counterclaim by pretending those clauses were absent. It examined which parties each agreement bound and whether a document containing the alleged prohibition could be enforced by the Burke entities against ZAO.[21]

The defense also qualified its reliance on the January 10 proposal. As quoted by the court, the Burke entities said it was merely a document reporting a January 10 meeting with the artist's management and confirming a conditional October performance. They said they attached it to put the dealings in context. The judge noted that they appeared to acknowledge it was not a valid contract and independently found it invalid.[22]

BURKE'S POSITION Defense argument quoted in the January 9, 2013 order, p. 14

The Burke entities described the January proposal as "merely a document from NWE" about a meeting with management and a conditional performance, included "to put the dealings between the parties and third parties in context."[22]

Their stated position must be distinguished from the undisputed absence of artist acceptance. An alleged meeting or conditional prospect of a future appearance did not supply the authorized signature missing from the proposal. Nor did the asserted scheduling conflict decide whether ZAO owed duties enforceable by these defendants. Those were the contract questions O'Sullivan addressed.[22]

Why the counterclaim failed

The court applied Florida contract law. It identified the required elements as a valid contract, a material breach and damages. ZAO argued that the four documents relied on by the Burke entities were either agreements between different parties or proposals that had not become operative contracts. The judge then considered the agreements separately.[23]

The first was the August 23 WMA-NWE binder. It required WMA and specified related persons and clients to work exclusively with NWE and not contact other agents without NWE's authorization. But ZAO was not a party. The document did not mention ZAO, and there was no indication that WMA had entered it as ZAO's representative. O'Sullivan held that the Burke entities could not enforce its exclusivity or no-contact provision against ZAO.[24]

The second was the August 28 ZAO-WMA binder. This did bind ZAO to exclusivity with WMA or its assigns, but the Burke entities were not parties and were not mentioned. The court considered the possible exception for an intended third-party beneficiary, a nonparty whom both contracting parties meant primarily and directly to benefit. It found no such intent in the agreement. An incidental benefit from WMA's later arrangement with NWE was insufficient.[25]

The third document was the December 16 proposal. The judge tested it on assumptions favorable to the counterclaim: even if it were a valid, enforceable contract, and even if Sergeev had authority to bind ZAO by signing, it did not contain the exclusivity or no-contact clause that ZAO allegedly breached. It also described itself as the sole, complete and binding agreement between its parties, rather than incorporating earlier agreements. Direct contact with the artist's representatives therefore did not breach a term of this proposal.[26]

This reasoning did not declare that the December document had in fact become a valid artist contract. "Assuming" validity for the sake of analysis is not a finding of validity. The judge showed that even on that assumption the pleaded breach failed. The January proposal, the fourth document, had already been rejected as a valid contract because its only signer lacked authority to act for Lady Gaga.[26]

> **COURT FINDING** Order on summary judgment, January 9, 2013, pp. 17–18
>
> ZAO was entitled to judgment on the counterclaim because "the Burke Entities have failed to show that ZAO breached the terms of a valid contract."[26]

Liquidated damages and the licensing argument

The Burke entities' claim for $1,350,000 in liquidated damages also failed. Liquidated damages are an amount specified in advance in the contract for a breach. ZAO argued this sum would be an unenforceable and unreasonable penalty. O'Sullivan did not need to decide that broader argument. Of the documents he considered for this purpose, only the December proposal contained a liquidated-damages provision, and the counterclaim did not allege a breach of a term in that document.[27]

The proposal also said it superseded prior written or oral agreements concerning the same subject. Its terms did not import the earlier binder's exclusivity clause. With no pleaded breach of the December proposal's terms, the Burke entities could not obtain liquidated damages under it. The order therefore granted summary judgment on any liquidated-damages claim without deciding whether those provisions would otherwise have been enforceable under Florida law.[27]

The talent-agency licensing argument was left undecided for a similar reason. ZAO contended that the Burke entities' unlicensed activity voided benefits obtained from the transaction and defeated any claim to commissions or profits. The defense disputed that consequence, even though the facts section recorded nonlicensure.[7]

BURKE'S POSITION Defense response quoted in the January 9, 2013 order, p. 20

The Burke entities argued that the statute did not void ZAO's contract with NWE because it was "designed and intended for the protection of the ARTIST not third parties like [ZAO]."[7]

O'Sullivan said he had not found case law discussing section 468.403 or the statute's intent. He expressly declined to decide the issue because the counterclaim already failed on the contract grounds. The order should not be cited as either accepting or rejecting the defense's interpretation of the licensing statute.[7]

The funds remained frozen; the case later terminated

The concluding paragraph put a limit on ZAO's victory. Summary judgment on the counterclaim did not entitle it to immediate release of the escrowed funds. The judge denied that request:

COURT ORDER Order on summary judgment, January 9, 2013, pp. 20–21

"ZAO will need to prove its claims at trial before it is entitled to an Order releasing the funds held in escrow" under the February 1 freeze order.[28]

Contemporary press coverage described different stages of the case. The Australian's January 29, 2012 NewsCore report, drawing on TMZ's account of court papers, described ZAO's allegation that NWE had taken $1.5 million for the performance and refused a refund. It also reported an allegation about a $300,000 brokerage fee. Those were allegations in early reporting, not a later tracing of the account. The article said TMZ reported that NWE had not responded to requests for comment.[29]

RAPSI's February 10 report covered the expanded defendant list and ZAO's allegations about negotiations and payments. Its June report addressed the intermediary default. Courthouse News's January 16, 2013 report covered the ruling on the counterclaim and the refusal to release escrow. These reports help establish what was publicly said at each point; where their shorthand differs from the signed order, this chapter follows the order. In particular, the order calls the addresses "virtual offices," not the "bogus" addresses described by Courthouse News.[20][30]

PacerMonitor lists the case as terminated on January 23, 2013, fourteen days after the summary-judgment order. Its free page does not provide the termination document or any settlement terms. The reviewed sources establish no public trial verdict on ZAO's claims against the Burke entities. Termination cannot be converted into a finding that ZAO recovered all its money, that the Burke entities were cleared of the allegations, or that they admitted them.[17]

What remains unresolved

The terms on which the case ended are not public in the sources reviewed. The disposition of the frozen funds, any further payments to ZAO, and collection of the separate default award against Sergeev and WMA are not verified. The January order does not supply a full accounting for the

difference between NWE's receipts and its January 31 balance. It also did not decide the legal consequence of the Burke entities' lack of talent-agency licenses. What is established is narrower: the stated undisputed facts, the rejected contract and liquidated-damages counterclaim, the separate intermediary default, and the judge's requirement that ZAO prove its own claims before obtaining release of escrow.[14171928]

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. TV Service ZAO v. NWE Talent Agency and Management, Inc., S.D. Fla. No. 1:12-cv-20317, order on summary judgment, DE 104, pp. 7–12, 20–21 (January 9, 2013) — official PDF.
2. Order, DE 104, pp. 2–3, 20–21, including amended complaint DE 10, answer DE 35 and counterclaim DE 36 — official PDF.
3. Order, DE 104, p. 1, footnote 1, citing consent DE 49 and referral DE 52 — official PDF.
4. Order, DE 104, p. 5, footnote 6, describing the undisputed-fact statement in DE 84 — official PDF.
5. Order, DE 104, pp. 5–7, MUZ-TV background and Burke's roles — official PDF.
6. Order, DE 104, pp. 5–7, NWE presidency, control, licensing, virtual offices and authorized artist representatives; private family member's name omitted — official PDF.
7. Order, DE 104, pp. 19–20, licensing argument and response, citing DE 101 at 17 — official PDF.
8. Order, DE 104, pp. 7–8, August 23 WMA/NWE binder and representations preceding it — official PDF.
9. Order, DE 104, p. 8, refund terms, ZAO's nonparty status and August 28 ZAO/WMA binder — official PDF.
10. Order, DE 104, pp. 8–9, ZAO/WMA compensation and refund terms; proposed engagement documents — official PDF.
11. Order, DE 104, p. 11 and footnote 7, demand and accounting of the $1,650,000 — official PDF.
12. Order, DE 104, pp. 9–10, 14, December proposal and signature — official PDF.
13. Order, DE 104, p. 10, quoting December 23 email, DE 84-9, and citing acknowledgment DE 84-10 — official PDF.
14. Order, DE 104, pp. 11–12, account balance and Burke deposition estimate, DE 98-2 at 26 — official PDF.
15. Order, DE 104, pp. 10–11, 14, January proposal, sole signatory and nonacceptance; private family member's name omitted — official PDF.
16. Order, DE 104, pp. 7–12 and footnotes 7–8, chronology and freeze order DE 6 — official PDF.
17. PacerMonitor case page, case-information fields, filed January 26, 2012; terminated January 23, 2013; free page inspected November 11, 2026. For amended claims and freeze: DE 104, p. 2 and p. 12, footnote 8 — official PDF.
18. Order requiring response to motion for default judgment, DE 48, pp. 1–2 (April 16, 2012), motion DE 42 and April 30 response deadline — official PDF.
19. Order, DE 104, p. 2, footnote 2, identifying clerk's default DE 34 and final default judgment DE 63 (June 14, 2012) against Sergeev/WMA — official PDF.
20. RAPSI, "MUZ-TV gets $1.65 mln over failed Lady Gaga performance" (June 20, 2012), paragraphs identifying default award and two defaulting defendants. Award amount not independently checked against DE 63. RAPSI, "Russian TV channel extends defendants list in case over failed Lady Gaga's performance" (February 10, 2012), allegations and payments.
21. Order, DE 104, pp. 12–14, counterclaim DE 36, paragraphs 9–15, and date-change clause in ZAO/WMA binder — official PDF.
22. Order, DE 104, p. 14, defense characterization and court's determination on January proposal — official PDF.
23. Order, DE 104, p. 13, Florida-law elements and ZAO's contract argument — official PDF.
24. Order, DE 104, pp. 14–15, WMA/NWE exclusivity provision and ZAO's nonparty status — official PDF.
25. Order, DE 104, pp. 16–17, WMA/ZAO agreement and intended-third-party-beneficiary analysis — official PDF.
26. Order, DE 104, pp. 17–18 and footnote 10, December proposal analysis and counterclaim holding — official PDF.
27. Order, DE 104, pp. 18–19, liquidated damages and superseding-agreement provision — official PDF.
28. Order, DE 104, pp. 20–21, conclusion denying release of escrow and reserving ZAO's claims for trial — official PDF.
29. NewsCore, "Russian TV company sues US firm over Lady Gaga performance, report says", The Australian (January 29, 2012), court-paper allegations and reported absence of NWE comment.
30. DeShayla Strachan, "Trial Needed to Sort Out Botched Lady Gaga Deal", Courthouse News Service (January 16, 2013), ruling coverage. The signed order identifies O'Sullivan as a magistrate judge; PacerMonitor's filing date is used rather than the article's January 27 date.

CHAPTER 05 · CIVIL BOOKING DISPUTES

The Rihanna and Mary J. Blige disputes

A reported Rihanna booking allegation remains unresolved; a separate dispute brought by VEW over Mary J. Blige's canceled Dallas show ended in a judgment for her production company.

Two disputes involving Vision Entertainment Worldwide, LLC (VEW) entered the public record in 2012–2013, but the company's role differed in each. A short Courthouse News report described a woman and her bankruptcy trustee accusing VEW and Ryan Burke over a claimed ability to book Rihanna. In the Mary J. Blige case, VEW was the plaintiff, seeking the return of a $145,000 advance for a Dallas concert. The Blige defendants denied breach and counterclaimed. A court order retrieved for this chapter verifies a later $105,000 judgment for Mary Jane Productions, Inc. against VEW.[1][2]

Rihanna: a reported $75,000 allegation

Courthouse News reported in December 2012 that a woman and her bankruptcy trustee claimed in Miami-Dade County Court that Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Ryan Burke had taken $75,000 by claiming they could book Rihanna for a concert. The item expressly identifies Rihanna as a nonparty. It does not name the woman or trustee in its accessible text, supply a case number, or describe an adjudication.[1]

RIHANNA BOOKING ALLEGATION; CASE IDENTITY UNVERIFIED

Court	Miami-Dade County Court, as described by Courthouse News
Case no.	Not verified; 2012-046329-CA-01 is an unverified possible match
Judge	Not verified
Filed	Not verified; news report identified as December 2012
Status	Not verified
Parties	Courthouse News describes a woman and her bankruptcy trustee as claimants; Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Ryan Burke as defendants; Rihanna is a nonparty

PARTY ALLEGATION Courthouse News Service, December 2012 report

The woman and her bankruptcy trustee alleged that VEW and Burke took $75,000 by claiming they could book Rihanna. The report's use of the word "defrauded" describes their allegation, not a court finding.[1]

The amount and the claimed booking representation can be reported with that attribution. The accessible item does not establish the proposed concert's date or venue, the terms of an agreement, the identity of any artist representative contacted, or the recipient account for the money. It also does not establish whether VEW denied the allegation, offered a refund, or supplied evidence of booking negotiations.[1]

BURKE'S POSITION No defense account in the accessible Rihanna report

The one-sentence Courthouse News item contains no response from Burke or VEW. No answer, motion or sworn defense statement in the identified Rihanna dispute was obtained for this chapter.[1]

A possible docket match supplied as a research lead is *Youngman et al. v. Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Burke*, Miami-Dade No. 2012-046329-CA-01. The lead also describes a dismissal for lack of prosecution. Neither the match nor that reported dismissal was independently verified. Searches did not produce a case-specific docket or complaint linking that number to the Rihanna allegation, and the clerk's civil portal did not yield a usable case result during this review.[3]

The possible match is retained here so the gap is explicit, not to treat it as a confirmed identity. Without the underlying filing, the names in that lead cannot safely be substituted for the unnamed claimants in Courthouse News. Nor can a claimed procedural dismissal establish what happened to the $75,000. The verified public account remains the outlet's short description of an allegation against VEW and Burke, with Rihanna outside the litigation.[13]

Mary J. Blige: VEW brought the case

VEW filed its federal action against Mary Jane Productions, Inc. (MJP) and Mary Jane Blige on June 18, 2013. The case was assigned to Judge Analisa Torres in the Southern District of New York. Justia's public docket summary identifies it as a contract action under diversity jurisdiction, lists a jury demand by the plaintiff, and names Robert Alan Rosenblatt as VEW's attorney. Burke was not individually listed as a plaintiff in that case summary.[4]

VISION ENTERTAINMENT WORLDWIDE V. MARY JANE PRODUCTIONS

Court	U.S. District Court, S.D. New York
Case no.	1:13-cv-04215-AT
Judge	Analisa Torres
Filed	June 18, 2013
Status	Summary judgment and $105,000 judgment for MJP, October 17, 2014; later fees, payment and appeal status not verified
Parties	Vision Entertainment Worldwide, LLC (plaintiff); Mary Jane Productions, Inc. and Mary Jane Blige (defendants); MJP (counterclaimant)
Counsel	Robert Alan Rosenblatt for VEW, according to Justia

Pollstar reported on June 20 that VEW alleged Blige retained a $145,000 deposit after canceling a December 9, 2012 Dallas show shortly before its scheduled date. It also reported VEW's asserted explanation: she had chosen to perform with the Rolling Stones at Barclays Center in Brooklyn on December 8 instead. Pollstar attributed its account to court documents obtained by TMZ and noted that a representative for Blige denied the charges.[5]

BURKE'S POSITION VEW's claim as reported by Pollstar, June 20, 2013

VEW said Blige had canceled the Dallas engagement, had not returned the $145,000 deposit, and had instead taken an opportunity to perform with the Rolling Stones. These were VEW's allegations, not the later court's explanation of liability.[5]

TMZ's original June 18 report included a specific artist-side response. Publicist Karynne Tencer told the outlet: "Mary J did not breach any contract for a Dallas concert last December. Any claim to the contrary is false." That denial was public when the suit was first reported, before the subsequent dispute over travel obligations appeared in countersuit coverage.[6]

By September 30, TMZ reported that Blige's side had counterclaimed, alleging VEW failed to provide first-class air travel for her and her crew. The report said she intended to retain the $145,000 and sought another $105,000 as the balance of the deal. CNN's October 1 broadcast similarly reported a countersuit based on VEW's asserted breach of its air-travel obligation. These were accounts of the defendants' position at that stage, not yet a judgment.[7]

DISPUTED ACCOUNT Blige's side, as reported by TMZ and CNN in September–October 2013

The defendants' position was that VEW, not the artist's production company, failed to perform the agreement by not providing the contracted travel. They disputed VEW's right to recover the advance and sought the unpaid balance.[7]

The travel provision was not merely a preference invented in press coverage. The later court order quotes a written agreement requiring first-class travel and accommodations. CNN's segment also contained a joke about green M&Ms that the anchor immediately said he had made up. It supplies no evidence of a candy requirement and is not treated as a term of the contract here.[8]

The written agreement and the December emails

The signed October 17, 2014 decision, DE 42, is titled *Memorandum, Order and Judgment*. A public copy was linked by theJasmineBRAND's October 23 outcome report. It carries the case number, docket-entry header, page numbering and Torres's signature. The copy is hosted by that outlet and bears its watermark; it is not an official court-hosted download. Its text nevertheless permits the ruling to be read directly rather than inferred from a news headline.[2]

The order describes a dispute between two contracting entities: VEW, an event promoter, and MJP, the company furnishing Blige's entertainment services. The amended Live Performance Agreement was dated as of October 1, 2012, for a December 9 concert at the American Airlines Center in Dallas. It required VEW to provide, at its own cost, first-class air and ground transportation and first-class hotel accommodations for Blige and her entourage before the concert. VEW also had to furnish the facilities and services for the performance.[8]

The court identifies Burke as VEW's owner and president. On December 6, the travel agent received three wires from VEW totaling $19,800. Burke knew the total travel cost exceeded that sum, according to the order's account of the parties' factual statements. Shortly after 8 p.m., a travel-agency employee asked him whether he intended to wire the remaining balance so the arrangements could proceed.[9]

About fifteen minutes later, an assistant to Blige's manager emailed Burke: "This date is cancelled. Nothing to discuss." Burke replied: "You sure boss?" The assistant's later reply said not all the money had been sent and also demanded proof of escrow for the remaining performance fee. The court treated the first cancellation email as an anticipatory repudiation, a declaration before performance was due that contractual obligations would not be performed.[9][10]

That finding gives VEW's position concrete support. Its account of an artist-side cancellation was not wholly rejected as imaginary. The legal question was what followed: whether an authorized and timely retraction restored the obligations, and whether VEW had already elected to terminate or materially changed its position before that retraction.[10]

At 1:50 p.m. on December 7, MJP's lawyer emailed Burke that the client was "ready, willing and able" to perform, but needed VEW to fulfill its obligations. The lawyer asked when the travel agency and client could expect the funds. Nearly two hours later, VEW informed the American Airlines Center that the concert was canceled. The court's chronology places the lawyer's statement of readiness before the venue cancellation.[9]

The venue and VEW then took steps to stop ticket sales, arrange refunds and suspend marketing. VEW did not pay the remaining travel funds, and Blige did not perform at the venue on December 9. Those facts alone did not determine which party breached; the judge analyzed them against the agreement and the timing of the communications.[9]

VEW's arguments and the court's response

VEW argued that it reasonably relied on the assistant's apparent authority to cancel. The defendants disputed his authority to bind MJP. Torres discussed the evidence of that authority but did not need to resolve the dispute in VEW's favor or against it: even assuming a factual issue about apparent authority, MJP was entitled to judgment for the reasons that followed.[10]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** VEW's arguments described in DE 42, pp. 7–17
>
> VEW maintained that it could rely on the cancellation email, that Burke tried to persuade MJP to proceed, and that VEW had acted to mitigate its losses. It argued it had changed its position before the lawyer's December 7 email.[11]

The judge held that the lawyer's 1:50 p.m. email retracted the earlier repudiation. Burke's initial reply had encouraged performance rather than immediately electing to treat the agreement as terminated. The court considered VEW's later arguments about withholding money and can-

celing the venue, but found they did not establish termination or a material change of position before the retraction. Emails obtained from the venue showed that it was notified later that afternoon.[11]

The agreement did not specify a calendar deadline for furnishing travel funds. The judge applied a reasonable-time obligation and rejected the contention that VEW's nonpayment had already terminated the deal before the 1:50 p.m. email. After the retraction, VEW remained obligated to provide sufficient funds for the travel. Its failure to do so meant it could not maintain its own breach-of-contract claim against MJP.[12]

There were other limits on VEW's claims. The order records that VEW dropped its unjust-enrichment claim and demand for punitive damages in its opposition to summary judgment. It also did not oppose Blige's individual argument that no contractual relationship existed between VEW and her personally. The court granted judgment dismissing the contract claim against her on that ground. The surviving contract analysis concerned VEW and MJP, not a finding that Blige personally owed VEW the deposit.[13]

MJP's counterclaim required the court to consider notice and an opportunity to cure. The agreement ordinarily required written notice describing a breach. The defendants acknowledged their emails did not comply with its prescribed notice method, but argued formal notice would have been futile. Torres found VEW had abandoned the agreement by directing the venue to cancel after MJP said it was ready to perform. Under those circumstances, the absence of formal notice did not defeat MJP's claim.[14]

The verified judgment was for MJP, not Burke

The agreement set a $250,000 performance fee: $145,000 initially and a $105,000 balance. MJP had received the first payment. The contract allowed MJP to retain payments and required VEW to pay the remaining fee if VEW failed to comply with its requirements. VEW argued that provision was unconscionable because the parties had unequal bargaining power and the terms were imposed on it.[15]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** VEW's damages argument described in DE 42, p. 22
>
> VEW contended it had been forced to accept overbearing and one-sided terms and challenged MJP's entitlement to retain the advance and recover the balance. Torres found VEW had not met its burden of showing that the damages provision was unconscionable.[15]

The result was a judgment in the opposite direction from VEW's original demand:

> **JUDGMENT** Memorandum, Order and Judgment, October 17, 2014, p. 24
>
> "Judgment on MJP's counterclaim for breach of contract is entered in favor of MJP in the amount of $105,000.00."[16]

The judgment was against VEW and in favor of Mary Jane Productions, Inc. It was not a $105,000 judgment against Burke individually, and the court's recipient was the production company rather than Blige personally. Nor was the awarded balance the same as VEW's original $145,000 refund demand. The order granted the defendants' summary-judgment motion, rejected VEW's claims and awarded MJP the remaining contractual fee.[1316]

The court also directed MJP to submit an application for reasonable attorney's fees by November 21, 2014, after construing the agreement's indemnification clause. That direction does not establish a later fee award or its amount. The reviewed order establishes the $105,000 judgment at entry; it does not establish its current balance, collection, satisfaction or any subsequent appellate disposition.[16]

TheJasmineBRAND reported that the case closed the same day and described the result as an award to Blige. The directly read order supports the contractual outcome and amount, but this chapter uses its precise entity-level description. The free Justia case summary did not contain the decision, so that summary's lack of an outcome should not be mistaken for an absence of a ruling.[24]

What remains unresolved

The Rihanna complaint, verified case identity, defense account and disposition remain unavailable. The suggested Youngman docket match and reported dismissal for lack of prosecution are unverified, as is any recovery of the alleged $75,000. In the Blige case, the October 17, 2014 judgment is now verified from a publicly reproduced signed order, but subsequent fee orders, appeal history and payment are not. The two disputes should not be given a common outcome: one is a short reported allegation with an unverified docket lead; the other is a contract suit brought by VEW that ended at summary judgment in a $105,000 award for MJP.[1316]

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Courthouse News Service, "Bogus!", identified in the supplied research as December 2012; complete accessible one-sentence report, fetched November 11, 2026. The retrieved page does not display an exact publication day or identify the claimants by name. Its wording expressly attributes the accusation to the woman and bankruptcy trustee and identifies Rihanna as a nonparty.
2. Vision Entertainment Worldwide, LLC v. Mary Jane Productions, Inc. and Mary Jane Blige, S.D.N.Y. No. 1:13-cv-04215-AT, Memorandum, Order and Judgment, DE 42, pp. 1, 24 (October 17, 2014) — publicly reproduced court PDF, linked by Kellie Williams's October 23, 2014 report, page 2. PDF hosted by theJasmineBRAND, not the court; signed order inspected directly.
3. Possible-match research lead supplied for checking: Youngman et al. v. Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Burke, No. 2012-046329-CA-01; identity and reported lack-of-prosecution dismissal not independently verified. The Miami-Dade Clerk civil portal was accessed November 11, 2026, but no case-specific result was obtained. The portal is a search resource, not corroboration of the lead or the dismissal.
4. Justia public case summary, fields for parties, filed date, court, judge, nature of suit, jury demand and VEW counsel (June 18, 2013 filing; inspected November 11, 2026).
5. Pollstar Staff, "Blige Sued Over Canceled Concert" (June 20, 2013), VEW allegations concerning Dallas, deposit and Rolling Stones appearance; concluding artist-side denial.
6. TMZ Staff, "Mary J. Blige Sued Over Canceled Concert – Mick Jagger Stole Her!!!" (June 18, 2013), VEW's allegations and concluding quotation from publicist Karynne Tencer.
7. TMZ Staff, "Mary J. Blige Lawsuit – I'm A First Class Star – So Treat Me Like One" (September 30, 2013), countersuit, travel and $105,000 demand; CNN, Early Start, October 1, 2013, 05:30 ET transcript, final entertainment segment before the handoff to New Day, discussing $145,000 and first-class travel.
8. DE 42, pp. 1, 13, written travel and accommodation requirements — public court-order copy. CNN transcript cited in footnote 7 expressly retracts the green-M&M joke.

9. DE 42, pp. 1–3, Burke's role, $19,800 travel wires and December 6–7 email chronology — public court-order copy.
10. DE 42, pp. 4–9, anticipatory repudiation, apparent authority and legal options following repudiation — public court-order copy.
11. DE 42, pp. 7, 10–17, VEW's positions, timely retraction and venue emails — public court-order copy.
12. DE 42, pp. 12–18, reasonable-time analysis, travel-funding failure and dismissal of VEW's contract claim against MJP — public court-order copy.
13. DE 42, pp. 4, 18, 23–24, abandoned unjust-enrichment/punitive claims, lack of privity with Blige, and disposition — public court-order copy.
14. DE 42, pp. 19–21, contract notice requirement, admitted email noncompliance, futility and abandonment — public court-order copy.
15. DE 42, pp. 21–23, fee installments, default remedy and VEW's unconscionability argument — public court-order copy.
16. DE 42, pp. 23–24, attorney-fee application and signed $105,000 judgment for MJP — public court-order copy.

CHAPTER 06 · CIVIL COURTS AND RECORDED JUDGMENTS

Money judgments and other civil cases, 2010–2026

Recorded-instrument citations identify three money awards, while other case entries require care over later dispositions and individual identity.

Three recorded-instrument citations identify money judgments involving Ryan Burke or VEW Live: a New Jersey award to VEW Capital Group, a Miami-Dade award to Joe Clark, and a Miami-Dade award to Bayfront Park Management Trust. Their reported amounts are amounts at entry, not verified balances today. A fourth case, brought by Marlins Stadium Operator against VEW Live, is reported as dismissed for lack of prosecution, with no final money award established by the cited index history.[1] [2] [3] [4]

These records need to be read separately. Burke and a company are reported as joint judgment debtors in the Capital and Clark matters; VEW Live alone is the reported judgment debtor in Bayfront. Other entries identify different VEW companies, or individuals whose connection to this promoter remains provisional. The chapter does not combine their amounts into a "total debt," attribute a company-only award to Burke personally, or treat a case filing as proof that its allegations were sustained.

> **EDITOR'S NOTE** Verification status for this edition
>
> The publication could open the Miami-Dade and Broward search interfaces, but did not retrieve the case-specific state dockets or the recorded instruments discussed below. Exact case-number and party searches did not produce usable independent copies. The locators are retained as leads to the named underlying records, not represented as documents newly inspected for this edition. The separately discussed federal Blige judgment and bankruptcy notice certificate were inspected.[5] [6] [7]

VEW Capital Group: New Jersey judgment and Florida enforcement

The citation for *VEW Capital Group v. Ryan Burke and VEW Live LLC* identifies a February 17, 2023 judgment by Judge David V. Nasta in the Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Bergen County. It gives an award of $1,100,534.43 against Burke and VEW Live jointly and severally. The corresponding Florida enforcement case is Miami-Dade No. 2023-028109-CA-01. Neither the New Jersey case file nor the complete Florida enforcement file was independently retrieved for this edition.[1] [8]

VEW CAPITAL GROUP V. BURKE AND VEW LIVE

Court	Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Bergen County; Florida enforcement in Miami-Dade Circuit Court
Case no.	BER-L-321-23; Florida 2023-028109-CA-01
Judge	David V. Nasta, New Jersey judgment
Judgment date	February 17, 2023, as identified in recorded-instrument citation
Parties	VEW Capital Group, creditor; Ryan Burke and VEW Live LLC, reported judgment debtors
Amount at entry	$1,100,534.43, reportedly jointly and severally
Status	Florida garnishment judgment reportedly satisfied June 2024; underlying judgment balance not verified
Verification	Instrument and case-specific dockets not re-retrieved for this edition

PUBLIC RECORD Miami-Dade OR Book 34008, Pages 758–760

The cited instrument is CFN **2023 R 895299**. The signed New Jersey judgment is identified at instrument p. 3, corresponding to OR Book 34008, Page 760. This publication relied on the recorded-instrument citation; the instrument was not re-retrieved for this edition.[1]

The citation describes the judgment as resting on a 2017 affidavit for confession of judgment and a 2017 promissory note that reaffirmed or modified an August 2016 agreement. It reports $564,704.56 in outstanding debt, $535,744.87 in interest and $85 in court costs. It also attributes to the judgment a recital that no payments had been made under the note or agreement. These details describe the cited instrument's account at judgment entry. Without the instrument and supporting papers, this publication cannot independently assess the agreement, the interest calculation, or the procedural basis on which the confession was accepted.[1]

The exact creditor's name matters. VEW Capital Group is identified here as the party obtaining the award, not as a judgment debtor. Its use of "VEW" in its name does not establish its ownership, management or relationship to Burke's entertainment businesses. The record citation alone supplies no basis for treating all entities with those letters as one company. The judgment reportedly names two debtors; it does not supply two separate awards of $1,100,534.43.

The garnishment satisfaction is not an established satisfaction of the original award

The Florida docket citation places the foreign judgment's filing in December 2023. It identifies a May 2024 judgment against a garnishee at docket index number 19, recorded at OR Book 34221, Page 515, and a June 2024 satisfaction at docket index number 24. The available citation does not give a CFN for either the garnishment judgment or its satisfaction. Those identifiers should not be guessed or borrowed from the original foreign-judgment recording.[8]

PUBLIC RECORD Florida case 2023-028109-CA-01, DIN 19 and DIN 24

The reported June 2024 satisfaction concerns the May 2024 garnishment judgment. Satisfaction of the underlying New Jersey award is not verified. For the garnishment instrument at OR Book 34221, Page 515: This publication relied on the recorded-instrument citation; the instrument was not re-retrieved for this edition.[8]

The distinction affects any description of the outcome. A reader encountering the word "satisfaction" in the Florida index should inspect the document to see which judgment it identifies, who signed it and what amount it covers. The citation supplied here describes a garnishment-specific satisfaction. It does not support either saying the whole New Jersey award was paid or saying the whole original amount remains unpaid.

The record needed to establish a present balance would include the full enforcement history and any credits, releases, later orders or satisfaction of the original judgment. None was available for this edition. The same limitation applies to possible appeals or challenges in New Jersey: no decision on such a challenge was retrieved, and no assertion that there was none is made. Burke's or VEW Live's position on the underlying note and the Florida collection proceedings is not available in the materials inspected for this chapter. Silence in this account is an evidentiary gap, not a concession by either debtor.

Joe Clark: a judgment following a reported settlement breach

The citation for *Joe Clark v. Ryan Burke and VEW Live* identifies a final judgment for damages signed by Judge Beatrice Butchko on February 19, 2020, in Miami-Dade Circuit Court No. 2019-037826-CA-01. It reports $625,000 plus statutory interest against Burke and VEW Live jointly and severally, after breach of a January settlement agreement. The settlement and judgment images were not re-retrieved for this edition.[2]

JOE CLARK V. BURKE AND VEW LIVE

Court	Circuit Court, Miami-Dade County, Florida
Case no.	2019-037826-CA-01
Judge	Beatrice Butchko, cited final judgment
Judgment date	February 19, 2020
Parties	Joe Clark, plaintiff; Ryan Burke and VEW Live, reported judgment debtors
Amount at entry	$625,000 plus statutory interest, reportedly jointly and severally
Status	March 30, 2020 motion to vacate reported; ruling and current balance not verified
Verification	Judgment, settlement and case-specific docket not re-retrieved

PUBLIC RECORD Miami-Dade OR Book 31833, Pages 2101–2102

The judgment locator is CFN **20200130597**, e-filing **103560400**, DIN **16**. The award is identified on instrument p. 1. This publication relied on the recorded-instrument citation; the instrument was not re-retrieved for this edition.[2]

The stated reason for the award is narrower than a general finding about Burke's business conduct. The citation attributes the judgment to breach of a settlement agreed in January, not to a contested trial of every allegation that may have appeared in the original complaint. Because the operative agreement is unavailable, this publication cannot describe its payment schedule, deadlines, release terms, enforcement clause or any condition that led to the specified award. It also cannot reconstruct the earlier transaction from the dollar figure alone.

The distinction between an original dispute and an agreement resolving it is relevant here. The reported judgment is an enforcement event following an agreement. It should not be rewritten as a finding that Clark proved a particular artist-booking allegation unless the actual judgment or other deciding order says that. No such artist-specific finding was verified in this chapter. The case number and parties provide the route to the file; they do not provide the missing underlying facts.

A motion to vacate was reported, but its result is unknown

The civil docket citation identifies a March 30, 2020 motion to vacate at DIN 26. A copy of the motion, its supporting evidence and an order resolving it were not available. The report of that filing is retained because it is part of the procedural account, rather than presenting the February judgment without the subsequent challenge.[9]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Reported motion to vacate, March 30, 2020
>
> The cited docket lists a request to vacate the judgment. The grounds, moving party's full argument and ruling were not independently verified; the filing is not described here as a successful vacatur.[9]

A request to undo a judgment and a judicial order undoing it are different records. This chapter cannot assume that the motion was granted merely because it was filed. Nor can the absence of a retrieved granting order establish that it was denied or that the judgment remained unchanged through November 2026. The most accurate status is a reported judgment followed by a reported challenge whose result is not verified.

The wording "plus statutory interest" likewise does not supply a current payoff figure. The cited $625,000 is the judgment's reported principal award at entry. The relevant interest terms and any later payments or credits would have to be read in the actual record before a balance could be stated. No calculation of accumulated interest is made here. Joint-and-several wording is preserved as reported, but the award is not counted once against Burke and again against the company.

No reviewed document for this case contains a substantive denial or explanation from Burke that can be fairly summarized beyond the reported effort to vacate. It would be inaccurate to describe him as having offered no defense at all. It would be equally inaccurate to supply a defense from his arguments in an unrelated case. Clark's award, the settlement terms and the later motion must be checked in this case's own file.

Bayfront Park Management Trust: company-only default judgment

The citation for *Bayfront Park Management Trust v. VEW Live LLC*, Miami-Dade No. 2024-016045-CA-01, identifies a default final judgment signed by Judge Robert T. Watson on May 26, 2026. The reported award is $83,487.37 plus statutory interest. The reported judgment debtor is VEW Live LLC, not Burke individually.[3]

BAYFRONT PARK MANAGEMENT TRUST V. VEW LIVE LLC

Court	Circuit Court, Miami-Dade County, Florida
Case no.	2024-016045-CA-01
Judge	Robert T. Watson, cited default final judgment
Parties	Bayfront Park Management Trust, plaintiff; VEW Live LLC, defendant
Clerk default	December 30, 2024, as reported in cited docket history
Judgment date	May 26, 2026
Amount at entry	$83,487.37 plus statutory interest
Status	Current balance and subsequent relief not verified
Verification	Judgment and case-specific docket not re-retrieved

PUBLIC RECORD Miami-Dade OR Book 35320, Pages 4699–4700

The judgment locator is CFN **20260360056**, e-filing **248964897**, DIN **19**. The award is identified on instrument p. 2. This publication relied on the recorded-instrument citation; the instrument was not re-retrieved for this edition.[3]

The associated docket account reports a clerk default on December 30, 2024, preceding the May 2026 final judgment. The chronology identifies two different procedural events. It does not authorize substituting the earlier default date for the judgment date or treating the earlier entry as the final damages award. Both dates remain subject to inspection of the underlying docket and orders.[3]

The complaint, contract and evidence supporting the claimed amount were unavailable. The plaintiff's name suggests a venue-related business dispute, but the record citation does not establish the event, rental arrangement, invoice or performance obligation involved. This publication therefore does not assign the award to VEWtopia, BZR WKND or any other named festival. A common promoter or a venue-related plaintiff is not enough to identify the underlying engagement.

The company-only designation is retained throughout this account. Burke's association with VEW Live does not turn this cited judgment into an individual award against him. No order imposing personal liability in this case was retrieved. No collection result, satisfaction, amended judgment or later vacatur was verified either. The reported amount should consequently be read as a historical company award, with its present enforceability and balance unresolved.

The default description also needs to stay visible. It is not a report of a contested trial at which both sides presented evidence on the merits. The available citation contains no defense position or explanation for the default that can be attributed to Burke or VEW Live. This account does not infer one, and does not infer deliberate nonparticipation from the default entry alone.

Marlins Stadium Operator: requests for relief, then reported dismissal

Marlins Stadium Operator v. VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2020-002259-CA-01, is a separate civil index entry. The cited history reports motions for default and a request for prejudgment garnishment, followed by dismissal for lack of prosecution in August 2021. It establishes no verified final money award for this publication.[4]

MARLINS STADIUM OPERATOR V. VEW LIVE

Court	Circuit Court, Miami-Dade County, Florida
Case no.	2020-002259-CA-01
Parties	Marlins Stadium Operator, plaintiff; VEW Live, defendant, as reported in index citation
Judge	Not verified
Proceedings	Default motions and prejudgment-garnishment request reported
Status	Dismissal for lack of prosecution reported August 2021
Recorded locator	DIN 13; OR Book 32708, Page 1760; CFN not available in supplied citation
Verification	Complaint, motions, dismissal instrument and case-specific docket not re-retrieved

PUBLIC RECORD Miami-Dade OR Book 32708, Page 1760

DIN 13 is the cited locator for the recorded dismissal. No CFN was available in the citation supplied for this edition. This publication relied on the recorded-instrument citation; the instrument was not re-retrieved for this edition.[4]

The requested remedies should not be mistaken for remedies awarded. A default motion is a party's request; the prejudgment-garnishment request is also a request. Neither, without a deciding order, supplies a finding that the company owed a stated sum or that funds were actually collected. The limited procedural account contains no award amount that can responsibly be stated as a judgment.

The reported dismissal qualifies the earlier requests. The chapter records the lack-of-prosecution disposition rather than leaving the reader with the impression that the requests culminated in a final money judgment. Because the actual dismissal was not inspected, its precise terms, any later reopening and any related settlement remain unverified. There is no basis here to characterize the dismissal as an adjudication that the plaintiff's underlying claim was false, or as proof of payment.

The timing and parties make the case relevant to the VEWtopia chapter, but do not establish what the lawsuit concerned. VEWtopia was originally advertised for Marlins Park and then moved to Miami Gardens shortly before its January 31–February 1, 2020 staging. Those facts are supported by contemporary news and the original release. The unavailable stadium complaint is needed before this publication can say that the case arose from that move, an unpaid festival invoice or any specific contractual breach.[10]

No substantive defense statement from VEW Live in this case was retrieved. The festival's public explanation of a "production issue" was about the venue change, not an inspected answer to this lawsuit. It cannot be imported into the docket as the company's litigation position. The case and the festival account are cross-referenced for readers without presenting an unproved causal link.

Other civil index entries and identity cautions

The following table preserves the other case locators and their reported dispositions. "Parties as indexed" means the party description supplied with the index lead, not a newly certified or complete party list. Where aliases or additional co-parties were not available, the table says so rather

than inventing them. Every state entry remains unverified for this edition. The specific VEW names make some leads more closely connected to the entertainment businesses than name-only collection cases; they do not eliminate the need to retrieve the file.[11] [12]

Case	Court / number	Parties as indexed in supplied citation	Reported disposition	Identity confidence	Verification status
Miles Entertainment	Broward Circuit; CACE10007738	Miles Entertainment LLC v. Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Ryan Burke	Judgment Aug. 12, 2010; new trial granted and judgment set aside Jan. 6, 2011; dismissed without prejudice Oct. 27, 2011	Stronger lead because Vision and Burke appear together; not independently confirmed	Not verified; disposition entries not retrieved.[11]
Spotlite Images	Broward Circuit; CACE22018263	Patrick St Fleur d/b/a Spotlite Images v. Davie property LLC, Burke and VEW Live; complete caption not rechecked	Bankruptcy suggestion June 2024; disposition and closure entries July 2024; no award established by supplied account	Stronger party cluster; bankruptcy notice independently confirms St Fleur/Spotlite involvement, not this case number	State history not verified; instrument 119688902 not retrieved.[13]
Christian Santiago	Broward Circuit; CACE14022119	Christian Santiago v. VEW Live	Contract litigation; mediation report; April 2019 disposition; no monetary award established	Company-level connection; no personal award against Burke identified	Not verified; instrument 115734710 not retrieved.[14]
Regions Bank	Broward Circuit; CACE19021242	Regions Bank v. Arellano-Valle and VEW Music Group; Burke not listed individually in supplied account	March 2020 default judgment; Feb. 2021 stipulation order; Feb. 2024 voluntary dismissal with prejudice	Company-level lead; judgment coverage unresolved	Not verified; instruments 116412280, 117033174 and 119378078 not retrieved.[15]
Kemar Bramwell	Miami-Dade Circuit; 2022-011979-CA-01	Kemar Bramwell v. VEW Live and We Do Eventz	Negligent-security action; dismissed for lack of prosecution Jan. 2024	Specific VEW company; individual Burke liability not established	Not verified; DIN 30, OR 34054/107 not retrieved.[16]
Puntropolis	Miami-Dade Circuit; 2020-010605-CA-01	Puntropolis Inc. v. VEW Music Group	Oct. 2020 default entry; March 2022 dismissal and voluntary dismissal; no final money award established	Company-level lead, not individual liability	Not verified; DIN 25, OR 33052/3509 and DIN 27, OR 33053/2570 not retrieved.[17]
Wells Fargo, first case	Broward Circuit; CACE15000510	Wells Fargo; Burke full-name aliases reported; full party list and aliases unavailable	Feb. 2016 judgment reportedly vacated; action dismissed March 2016	Provisional: reported full-name aliases, overlapping counsel and parties	Not verified; instruments 113509761 and 113588217 not retrieved.[18]
Wells Fargo, second case	Broward Circuit; CACE17004624	Wells Fargo; Burke name match and association parties reported; complete list unavailable	July 2018 foreclosure judgment; sale vacatur; June 18, 2019 order reportedly vacated judgment and dismissed action	Provisional: reported same full name, counsel and association parties as first case	Not verified; instrument 115216627 and June 2019 order not retrieved.[19]

Case	Court / number	Parties as indexed in supplied citation	Reported disposition	Identity confidence	Verification status
Nationstar Mortgage	Broward Circuit; CACE26001527	Nationstar Mortgage; Burke full-name and overlapping-party match reported; complete caption unavailable	Filed Jan. 2026; default entry Nov. 2, 2026; final foreclosure judgment not established	Provisional: reported name and association/ creditor overlap	Not verified; case-specific docket not retrieved.[20]
Jermaine McLean	Broward County Court; COWE13008216	Jermaine McLean; Burke match reported; complete caption unavailable	Nov. 2013 judgment; recorded satisfaction July 2022	Provisional: reported overlap with a party in first Wells Fargo case	Not verified; instruments 111909199 and 118285704 not retrieved.[21]
Prestige Motor Car Imports	Broward County Court; COCE25008319	Prestige Motor Car Imports; Burke full-name variant reported; exact variant unavailable	May 2025 default final judgment entry; amount unavailable	Low/provisional: no complaint or service image to corroborate identity	Not verified; instrument 120222521 not retrieved.[22]
Mercedes-Benz Financial Services	Broward County Court; COSO19013400	Mercedes-Benz Financial Services; Burke middle-initial match reported; exact indexed name unavailable	May 2020 final judgment and later collection entries; amount/balance unavailable	Low/provisional: middle initial alone insufficient; judgment image unavailable	Not verified; instrument 116503060 not retrieved.[23]
Erena Nemzer	Miami-Dade Circuit; 2022-019906-CA-01	Erena Nemzer; matching Burke name and counsel reported; no VEW entity in caption	Jan. 2025 dismissal and settlement entries; terms unavailable	Provisional: name/ counsel match, no company identifier	Not verified; DIN 52, OR 34565/4734 not retrieved.[24]

Later entries belong beside the earlier judgments

Several leads report an early judgment followed by relief that changes its interpretation. Miles Entertainment is reported as having obtained a judgment later set aside before dismissal without prejudice. Both Wells Fargo leads report vacatur and dismissal after earlier judgments. Jermaine McLean's lead includes a recorded satisfaction. Omitting those later events would give an incomplete account even if the earlier judgment entries were confirmed. Since the documents remain unavailable, neither the early action nor the later action is upgraded here into a newly verified finding.[11] [18] [19] [21]

Other entries require a different caution. The Regions Bank account reports both a default judgment and a later dismissal with prejudice, but the operative documents are needed to identify whom the judgment covered and how the stipulation and dismissal affected it. Christian Santiago's entry reports a disposition without a verified award. Puntropolis's default entry is not itself a verified final money judgment. Nationstar's reported default entry is not a retrieved final foreclosure judgment.[14] [15] [17] [20]

The provisional individual matches are retained as verification leads, not adverse findings about this promoter. The supplied descriptions refer to aliases, counsel and overlapping parties without providing all the underlying identifiers. This publication cannot independently reproduce the

matching exercise. In particular, a full-name variant or middle initial is not enough on its own to resolve whether a county-court defendant is the person associated with VEW. The identification chapter addresses that issue across the dossier.

Spotlite Images appears in the company bankruptcy record

One connection has direct documentary support. The notice certificate filed July 18, 2024, as Doc. 40 in Bankruptcy S.D. Florida No. 24-14947-PDR lists "Patrick St Fleur, DBA Spotlite Images" through counsel Geoffrey D. Ittleman among recipients of notice concerning dismissal. The certificate is part of the supplied primary packet and was inspected for this edition.[7]

> **PUBLIC RECORD** Bankruptcy 24-14947-PDR, Doc. 40, PDF p. 1
>
> Patrick St Fleur d/b/a Spotlite Images appears on the notice-recipient list. The certificate does not state an adjudicated claim amount, establish payment, or identify Broward case CACE22018263.[7]

This supports describing St Fleur/Spotlite as a creditor or notice participant in the company bankruptcy context, with the narrower verified fact being his presence on the notice list. It does not independently establish the state action's outcome. The debtor was the property company, 2045 SW 127 Avenue, LLC, not Burke personally. The dismissal order expressly discharges no debts and terminates the automatic stay; it does not decide each listed recipient's underlying claim. The separate bankruptcy chapter gives the fuller history.[7]

Mary Jane Productions: verified federal judgment for $105,000

A federal award belongs in this account even though it is discussed more fully in the Rihanna and Mary J. Blige chapter. On October 17, 2014, Judge Analisa Torres granted the defendants' summary-judgment motion in *Vision Entertainment Worldwide, LLC v. Mary Jane Productions, Inc. and Mary Jane Blige*, S.D.N.Y. No. 1:13-cv-04215-AT. She entered judgment on Mary Jane Productions' breach-of-contract counterclaim for $105,000.[6]

> **JUDGMENT** Memorandum, Order and Judgment, Oct. 17, 2014, p. 24
>
> "Judgment on MJP's counterclaim for breach of contract is entered in favor of MJP in the amount of $105,000.00." The judgment is against Vision Entertainment Worldwide, not a personal judgment against Burke and not an award directly to Blige.[6]

The reviewed order calculates the remaining balance of a $250,000 performance fee after $145,000 had been paid. It rejects Vision's position and permits Mary Jane Productions to apply for reasonable attorney fees. The $105,000 should not be replaced with the earlier $145,000 deposit that was the subject of Vision's suit. Any subsequent fee award, appeal, payment or satisfaction remains unverified.[6]

The primary copy used here is a news-hosted, watermarked reproduction of docket entry 42 published by theJasmineBRAND, not a newly downloaded certified court copy. Its court header, signed disposition and decisive page were inspected. That provenance is disclosed so readers can distinguish the actual deciding text from a news headline about the outcome.

What remains unresolved

The principal open questions are the complete state dockets and instrument images; the New Jersey confession-of-judgment papers; the scope of the Florida garnishment satisfaction; the result of Clark's motion to vacate; and any subsequent relief, payment or satisfaction in Bayfront. Marlins' complaint and dismissal terms are needed before linking its lawsuit to VEWtopia. Its CFN, and the CFNs for the Capital garnishment and satisfaction, were not available.

Every additional state index entry remains unverified, including its complete party list, reported later disposition and any amount not given above. The provisional individual matches require documentary identity confirmation. Spotlite's bankruptcy notice status is verified, but its state judgment or allowed claim is not. The Blige award is verified; later fees and collection are not. None of these gaps supports stating a present aggregate debt or assuming an unresolved obligation is either fully paid or wholly unpaid.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Final judgment, VEW Capital Group v. Ryan Burke and VEW Live LLC, N.J. Super. Ct., Law Div., Bergen County, BER-L-321-23 (Feb. 17, 2023), identified in Miami-Dade OR Book 34008, pp. 758–760, CFN 2023 R 895299; signed judgment identified at instrument p. 3 / OR p. 760. Official Records search. Citation retained; instrument not independently re-retrieved for this edition.
2. Final Judgment for Damages, Joe Clark v. Burke and VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2019-037826-CA-01 (Feb. 19, 2020), DIN 16, e-filing 103560400, OR Book 31833, pp. 2101–2102, CFN 20200130597, award identified at instrument p. 1. Official Records search. Citation retained; judgment and settlement not independently re-retrieved.
3. Default Final Judgment, Bayfront Park Management Trust v. VEW Live LLC, Miami-Dade No. 2024-016045-CA-01 (May 26, 2026), DIN 19, e-filing 248964897, OR Book 35320, pp. 4699–4700, CFN 20260360056, award identified at instrument p. 2; clerk default reported Dec. 30, 2024. Official Records search. Instrument and docket not independently re-retrieved.
4. Marlins Stadium Operator v. VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2020-002259-CA-01, reported dismissal Aug. 2021, DIN 13, OR Book 32708, p. 1760; CFN unavailable. Civil docket search and Official Records search. Reported motions and dismissal not independently verified.
5. Miami-Dade Clerk, Official Records online system and Civil, Family and Probate Courts online system; Broward Clerk, Public Case Search, accessed Nov. 11, 2026. Search interfaces opened, not case-specific verification. Miami-Dade interfaces describe Clerk's File Number and Recording Book/Page search options and anti-bot verification.
6. Memorandum, Order and Judgment, Vision Entertainment Worldwide, LLC v. Mary Jane Productions, Inc. and Mary Jane Blige, S.D.N.Y. No. 1:13-cv-04215-AT, DE 42 (Oct. 17, 2014), pp. 21–24; award and fee-application direction at p. 24. News-hosted reproduction of signed order, watermarked by theJasmineBRAND. Primary deciding text inspected; later fee amount and satisfaction not verified.
7. Bankruptcy Noticing Center, Certificate of Notice, Bankr. S.D. Fla. No. 24-14947-PDR, Doc. 40 (July 18, 2024), PDF p. 1, notice recipient Patrick St Fleur d/b/a Spotlite Images; attached dismissal signed July 15, entered July 16, PDF pp. 3–5, especially p. 4, paragraphs 2–3. Redacted copy. The certificate names the 2045 company; attached order caption says "2034," a discrepancy preserved in the bankruptcy chapter.
8. VEW Capital Group v. Burke and VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2023-028109-CA-01, foreign-judgment filing reported Dec. 2023; garnishment judgment DIN 19 (May 2024), OR Book 34221, p. 515; satisfaction DIN 24 (June 2024). Civil docket search and Official Records search. CFNs unavailable for these enforcement entries; scope and amounts not independently verified.
9. Joe Clark v. Burke and VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2019-037826-CA-01, reported motion to vacate March 30, 2020, DIN 26. Civil docket search. Motion text, grounds and ruling not independently verified.
10. "Vewtopia Music Festival announces full lineup and special $99 two-day pass," MLB.com, Jan. 7, 2020, release, opening and ticket paragraphs; Madeleine Marr, "What is the deal with Vewtopia? The music fest changed venues and folks are confused," Miami Herald, Jan. 29, updated Feb. 1, 2020, article, venue-change and spokesperson paragraphs. Neither establishes the stadium lawsuit's underlying claim.
11. Broward Clerk, Miles Entertainment LLC v. Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Burke, CACE10007738, reported disposition entries Aug. 12, 2010, Jan. 6 and Oct. 27, 2011. Public case search. Case history and party list not independently verified.

12. Broward County, Official Records instrument-number search, retrieval portal named in supplied record citations. Instruments in this table were not independently retrieved. Portal links are locators, not case-specific evidence.
13. Broward Clerk, Patrick St Fleur d/b/a Spotlite Images v. Davie property LLC, Burke and VEW Live, CACE22018263, reported June–July 2024 entries, instrument 119688902. Public case search. State caption, disposition and instrument not independently verified; separate bankruptcy notice at footnote 7 inspected.
14. Broward Clerk, Christian Santiago v. VEW Live, CACE14022119, reported mediation/disposition April 2019, instrument 115734710. Public case search. Not independently verified.
15. Broward Clerk, Regions Bank v. Arellano-Valle and VEW Music Group, CACE19021242, reported March 2020 default judgment, Feb. 2021 stipulation order and Feb. 2024 voluntary dismissal with prejudice; instruments 116412280, 117033174 and 119378078. Public case search. Coverage and later effect not independently verified.
16. Miami-Dade Clerk, Kemar Bramwell v. VEW Live and We Do Eventz, 2022-011979-CA-01, reported Jan. 2024 dismissal for lack of prosecution, DIN 30, OR Book 34054, p. 107. Official Records search. Not independently verified.
17. Miami-Dade Clerk, Puntropolis Inc. v. VEW Music Group, 2020-010605-CA-01, reported Oct. 2020 default and March 2022 dismissal entries; DIN 25, OR Book 33052, p. 3509; DIN 27, OR Book 33053, p. 2570. Official Records search. Not independently verified.
18. Broward Clerk, Wells Fargo, CACE15000510, reported Feb.–March 2016 judgment/vacatur/dismissal entries, instruments 113509761 and 113588217. Public case search. Disposition and promoter identity not independently verified.
19. Broward Clerk, Wells Fargo, CACE17004624, reported July 2018 judgment, sale vacatur and June 18, 2019 vacatur/dismissal order, instrument 115216627. Public case search. Disposition and promoter identity not independently verified.
20. Broward Clerk, Nationstar Mortgage, CACE26001527, reported Jan. 2026 filing and Nov. 2, 2026 default entry. Public case search. Entries and promoter identity not independently verified.
21. Broward Clerk, Jermaine McLean, COWE13008216, reported Nov. 2013 judgment and July 2022 satisfaction, instruments 111909199 and 118285704. Public case search. Entries and promoter identity not independently verified.
22. Broward Clerk, Prestige Motor Car Imports, COCE25008319, reported May 2025 default final judgment, instrument 120222521. Public case search. Amount and promoter identity not verified.
23. Broward Clerk, Mercedes-Benz Financial Services, COSO19013400, reported May 2020 judgment and subsequent collection, instrument 116503060. Public case search. Amount, balance and promoter identity not verified.
24. Miami-Dade Clerk, Erena Nemzer, 2022-019906-CA-01, reported Jan. 2025 dismissal/settlement, DIN 52, OR Book 34565, p. 4734. Official Records search. Terms and promoter identity not independently verified.

CHAPTER 07 · MIAMI AND MIAMI GARDENS

VEWtopia 2020: the Miami festival

A festival announced for Marlins Park moved to Miami Gardens, suffered first-night disruptions and closed its second night with Cardi B onstage.

VEWtopia was announced in December 2019 for January 31 and February 1, 2020. It was not a festival held in December 2019. Cardi B was the first announced headliner, and Marlins Park was the original venue. By late January, the festival had moved to Miami Gardens and joined SuperFest Miami Live. Contemporary reporting describes a disrupted first night, followed by performances from DaBaby, Migos and Cardi B on the second.[1] [2] [3] [4]

The record supports both parts of that account. The first night's advertised headliners did not appear as expected, and the event ended early amid a lightning advisory. Cardi B nevertheless performed on Saturday, February 1. Her appearance is documented in an eyewitness review, not merely inferred from the earlier lineup announcement. The sources do not provide an audited attendance figure, artist-payment records or a complete reconciliation of ticket refunds.[4]

December announcement and the Marlins Park plan

The Hype Magazine published the first-headliner announcement on December 7, 2019. It identified VEW Live! as the announcing company and promised two days of performances and interactive experiences before the Super Bowl. Additional artists were to be revealed later. Early-bird tickets were scheduled to go on sale December 9 through the Marlins ticketing link.[1]

> **PRESS REPORT** The Hype Magazine, Dec. 7, 2019
>
> The announcement named Cardi B as the first headliner for a festival "taking place on January 31st and February 1st 2020." It said tickets would cover both festival dates and that single-day tickets would not be available.[1]

This was announcement material, not a post-event assessment. Its description of VEW Live's prior work and size was promotional company copy. The announcement is useful for establishing what was offered and when, but does not independently verify every claimed earlier production or the delivery of the proposed festival program.

A fuller release appeared on MLB.com on January 7, 2020. It named Marlins Park as the venue and advertised a limited-time $99 two-day pass. Cardi B, Chris Brown, Migos, DaBaby and Nicky Jam led the announced lineup. Other advertised performers included DJ Khaled, Gunna, Megan Thee Stallion, Burna Boy, Rema, Jeremih, Ty Dolla $ign, Koffee and Shenseea.[2]

PUBLIC RECORD MLB.com-hosted VEW Live announcement, Jan. 7, 2020

The release advertised Marlins Park for January 31–February 1 and stated: "All tickets available for purchase will be for both festival dates; no single-day tickets will be available." The release establishes the announced venue and ticket offer, not that every advertised artist performed.[2]

The two-day ticket restriction appeared in both the December announcement and the January release. It gives a specific point of comparison with later reporting: the Miami Gardens review described single-day tickets being sold at the door. That was a later observed sales arrangement, not what the original Marlins Park release had offered. The sources do not establish whether an identical ticketing contract governed both versions of the event.[1] [2] [4]

The January release also announced plans to donate festival proceeds to local charitable organizations. No receipts or post-event accounting were available to confirm the donations. Likewise, the announced fourteen hours of performances should remain an advertised plan rather than a verified measure of delivered stage time. The first night's early ending and the second night's performances are documented separately in the review.[2] [4]

Move to Miami Gardens

The Miami Herald's January 29 article, updated February 1, reported that organizers had changed venues because of "a production issue." The event joined SuperFest Miami Live and the City of Miami Gardens in a temporary festival space on Northwest 27th Avenue. The Herald said the lineup would remain the same. That statement recorded the organizers' plan before the reviewed cancellations and disruptions, not a confirmation that everyone appeared.[3]

The move also changed the ticket arrangement. According to the Herald, original ticket holders were to receive refunds and repurchase tickets for the replacement event. The article listed two-day passes starting at $149, compared with the special $99 offer in the earlier MLB-hosted release. Those were different advertised offers at different stages, not an independently measured price increase paid by every customer.[2] [3]

BURKE'S POSITION Ryan Burke, quoted by the Miami Herald

"Amazing things don't just belong on South Beach," VEWtopia cofounder Ryan Burke said. The paper also quoted him saying the organizers were honored to bring the event to Miami Gardens.[3]

Burke's statement expressed support for the new location. It did not provide the technical details of the "production issue," identify a dispute with Marlins Park or explain the financial arrangements behind the move. The record reviewed for this chapter contains no production memorandum or venue contract that resolves those questions.

A January 29 Miami New Times preview provided more detail about the partnership. It identified Burke, associated with VEW Live!, and Marco Mall, owner of Florida Film House, as VEWtopia's founders. It described SuperFest as a longer-running community, music and sports festival organized by Ted Lucas and Melvin Bratton in cooperation with Miami Gardens, on a 34-acre site near Hard Rock Stadium.[5]

That preview distinguished free public areas from paid activities. SuperFest included a carnival, food offerings and a gaming area, while VEWtopia was a ticketed concert component on January 31 and February 1. This matters when describing admission: the presence of free SuperFest attractions does not establish that the advertised VEWtopia concerts were free. The preview's ticket listing also started at $149.[5]

Mall told Miami New Times that the multicultural lineup was intended to reflect Miami. Those comments explain the organizers' stated program, including its mix of hip-hop, Latin music and reggae. They do not supply artist contracts or prove that the advertised lineup was delivered. The subsequent review, by the same reporter, records which performances she observed and the problems she encountered.[5] [4]

What the refund statement establishes

The Herald attributed a refund-completion statement to a VEWtopia spokeswoman: original ticket holders had already been refunded. The same article also instructed people who had not yet received a refund to contact customer service through the festival website. Both parts belong in the account.[3]

> **PRESS REPORT** Miami Herald, Jan. 29, updated Feb. 1, 2020
>
> A festival spokeswoman said ticket holders had been refunded following the venue change. The article also gave customer-service instructions for purchasers who had yet to receive a refund. No transaction-level audit was available to establish that every refund reached its recipient.[3]

The spokeswoman's statement is evidence of the festival's published position. It is not equivalent to payment records for each purchaser. The customer-service instruction leaves room for refunds still awaiting resolution or receipt; the story does not determine the number of affected patrons or the cause of any delay. This chapter therefore does not say that all refunds failed, or that every purchaser was made whole.

The statement concerned tickets for the original venue arrangement. It should not be assumed to cover every possible complaint arising from the first night's shortened program at the replacement venue. The reviewed story did not provide a separate refund policy for missing performers, late entry or weather disruption. Establishing that policy would require the replacement ticket terms and any later organizer notice.

Friday, January 31: delayed entry and missing headliners

Aaliyah Pasols' February 3 Miami New Times review describes the first night from arrival through shutdown. According to her account, the gates were expected to open at 3 p.m., but patrons were not admitted until around 4:15 p.m. She also reported that artist set times had not been publicly released. The Herald's advance account had listed a 3:30 p.m. gate time; the sources differ on the advertised opening, but both place it before the review's reported actual admission time.[3] [4]

The reviewer described short performances by mostly local artists and large empty spaces around the stage. She interpreted the scene as suggesting weak ticket sales. No numerical attendance or ticket-sales count appears in the reviewed account, so this publication does not convert that observation into a specific crowd estimate. Pasols reported single-day tickets at $50 at the door.[4]

The expected first-night acts included Gunna, Ty Dolla $ign, Fabolous, Megan Thee Stallion and Chris Brown. The review says patrons did not see those advertised acts that night. By about 8:15 p.m., Pasols wrote, it was apparent that Brown and Megan would not appear. She attributed a statement about Brown's absence to his manager and reported that Megan's publicist had informed another journalist onsite that she would not perform.[4]

> **PRESS REPORT** Miami New Times, Feb. 3, 2020
>
> The review attributed Brown's withdrawal to his manager's statement that he was "not being able to come to an agreement with promoters." That is an attributed account of a disagreement, not verified proof that Brown was unpaid.[4]

The manager's post was described by the reviewer as deleted. This publication relies on the contemporaneous report of its wording, not a newly inspected original post. Megan's publicist's explanation was also reported indirectly through another journalist. The review does not set out the contracts, payment schedules or correspondence needed to decide either artist's contractual position.

Pasols reported that DJs continued asking the crowd whether they were ready for Chris Brown after the cancellations had become apparent. Around 10 p.m., rain began and patrons chanted for Megan. At approximately 10:40, an announcement said a lightning advisory would cut the night short and encouraged people to go to an onsite nightclub for remaining performances. A further announcement around 11 p.m. said there would be no more performances that night.[4]

The review also recorded a festival Instagram statement attributing the disrupted concert experience to a lightning advisory issued by Dade County and circumstances outside the organizers' control. The statement then promoted Saturday's lineup. It is the organizers' explanation as reproduced in the review; the underlying advisory and original post were not independently retrieved.[4]

BURKE'S POSITION Organizer statement reproduced by Miami New Times

"Due to unforeseen circumstances outside of our control, a lightning advisory issued by Dade County impacted our ability to deliver the amazing concert experience we planned." The reported statement addresses the weather interruption, but does not resolve the earlier artist-agreement dispute or delayed entry.[4]

Saturday, February 1: Cardi B performed

The review describes visible changes on the second day: more staff and security, and a bright screen displaying performance times at the entrance. The schedule still slipped. Pasols reported that Aaron Bodden, listed for 5:15 p.m., did not take the stage until about 8:50. Those observations support an improved but still delayed operation rather than either an entirely unchanged event or a fully on-time program.[4]

The second night included observed performances by Alex Sensation, DaBaby and Migos. The review describes DaBaby's arrival with the Jabbawockeez dancers and a crowd movement over barriers separating general admission from VIP. Security checked the situation before the set continued. Migos appeared at nearly 11 p.m. These are the reviewer's reported events; no independent incident report was obtained.[4]

PRESS REPORT Eyewitness review, Miami New Times, Feb. 3, 2020

Cardi B appeared after the crowd began chanting for her around 11:20 p.m. The reviewer described an approximately hour-long set, an appearance by Offset, and a closing performance of "Bodak Yellow" with pyrotechnics.[4]

The performance detail establishes more than a name on an advance poster. Pasols described Cardi B's opening songs, dancers, costume and stage props, along with "Taki Taki," "I Like It" and "Clout." The review's conclusion was favorable to the second night, especially the closing set. This chapter retains that outcome alongside the first-night problems rather than portraying the entire festival as an event at which none of the announced stars appeared.[4]

The observed performances do not verify every act in the original lineup. Nor does an artist's appearance establish the amount or timing of payment, satisfaction of every contractual term or agreement with the promoter's account of a different engagement. The evidence here supports the limited conclusion that Cardi B performed at the 2020 festival on its second night.

The stadium case and the later Jamaica booking

The civil judgments chapter includes *Marlins Stadium Operator v. VEW Live*, Miami-Dade No. 2020-002259-CA-01. Its supplied docket citation reports default motions, a request for prejudgment garnishment and dismissal for lack of prosecution in August 2021. The recorded dismissal locator is DIN 13, OR Book 32708, Page 1760. The complaint, deciding instruments and case-specific docket were not re-retrieved for this edition.[6]

> **PUBLIC RECORD** Miami-Dade case 2020-002259-CA-01
>
> The stadium case is a reported civil index entry, not an established judgment for unpaid VEWtopia expenses. This publication relied on the recorded-instrument citation; the instrument was not re-retrieved for this edition.[6]

Marlins Park's original role in the festival announcement makes the entry relevant to readers, but the available records do not establish that the lawsuit arose from VEWtopia, its relocation or an unpaid festival invoice. The chronology alone cannot decide that. The lawsuit's reported dismissal also must not disappear from an account that mentions its earlier requests for relief.

Cardi B was later booked for BZR WKND Jamaica in 2026. Government launch coverage on August 27 announced an October 18 performance at Kingston's National Stadium during the October 16–19 festival. The Cardi B 2026 chapter addresses her later withdrawal and the competing payment accounts. That booking is a separate transaction: her verified Miami performance in 2020 neither resolves nor disproves either side's claims concerning Jamaica.[7]

What remains unresolved

The records reviewed do not establish the technical or contractual cause of the move from Marlins Park, completion of every original-ticket refund, or the refund terms for the shortened first night at the replacement venue. Artist agreements and payment records were unavailable, including those that could explain Chris Brown's and Megan Thee Stallion's absence. Exact attendance, final ticket revenue and the announced charitable donations are not verified.

The first-night weather explanation is preserved as an organizer statement; the underlying advisory was not retrieved. Cardi B's second-night performance is verified by contemporary eyewitness reporting, but no artist-payment audit follows from it. The Marlins complaint and dismissal instrument remain needed to determine that lawsuit's subject and exact terms. No reviewed primary record establishes a venue-case connection to VEWtopia or a final festival-specific unpaid-vendor award.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Dr. Jerry Doby, "Cardi B Announced as 1st Headliner for VEWTOPIA Music Festival 2020 in Miami," The Hype Magazine, Dec. 7, 2019, announcement, opening, early-bird and ticket paragraphs. Promotional material establishes what VEW Live announced, not all delivered performances or company-history claims.
2. "Vewtopia Music Festival announces full lineup and special $99 two-day pass," MLB.com, Jan. 7, 2020, release, opening, ticket and charitable-proceeds paragraphs. Announcement, not an audit of performances or donations.

3. Madeleine Marr, “What is the deal with Vewtopia? The music fest changed venues and folks are confused,” Miami Herald, originally Jan. 29, updated Feb. 1, 2020, article, venue-change, repurchase, Burke quotation, refund-contact and gate/ticket paragraphs. Refund-completion statement attributed to spokeswoman, not independently reconciled transactions.

4. Aaliyah Pasols, “With the Help of Cardi B, Vewtopia Music Festival Found Its Footing After a Shaky Start,” Miami New Times, Feb. 3, 2020, review, first-night entry/cancellations/weather paragraphs, reproduced organizer statement, and second-night performance descriptions through Cardi B’s closing set. Eyewitness account; reported deleted manager/promoter posts not independently retrieved.

5. Aaliyah Pasols, “SuperFest and Vewtopia Stage a Super Bowl Gathering for Locals,” Miami New Times, Jan. 29, 2020, preview, partnership, founders, free/ticketed areas, Mall quotation and event-listing paragraphs.

6. Marlins Stadium Operator v. VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2020-002259-CA-01, reported Aug. 2021 lack-of-prosecution dismissal, DIN 13, OR Book 32708, p. 1760; CFN unavailable in supplied citation. Civil docket search and Official Records search. Case-specific history and instrument not independently verified; portal links are retrieval locators, not proof of underlying claims.

7. Ainsworth Morris, “Thousands of Patrons Expected at BZR Weekend in October,” Jamaica Information Service, Aug. 27, 2026, launch report, opening paragraphs identifying October 16–19 dates and scheduled Cardi B performance Oct. 18. Announcement and projections, not proof of a completed performance.

CHAPTER 08 · BROWARD CIRCUIT COURT

Kameka & Dzotsi v. Burke: service and criminal contempt

A lending action became a dispute over service, travel records and sworn testimony, followed by a signed criminal-contempt order.

Kameka Management Solutions, Inc. and Eryck Dzotsi's case against Ryan Burke and three companies produced two different rulings that must be read in sequence. In August 2023, Judge William W. Haury Jr. granted the defendants' motion to quash service after hearing conflicting testimony about an encounter at Burke's home in Sunrise, Florida. On May 13, 2024, the same judge signed an order finding beyond any reasonable doubt that Burke had lied about being in Las Vegas on the disputed service date. The order adjudged him guilty of indirect criminal contempt for his affidavit and deposition testimony, and direct criminal contempt for his testimony in open court "due to his perjury."[1]

KAMEKA MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS, INC. & ERYCK DZOTSI V. BURKE ET AL.

Court	Circuit Court, Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County, Florida
Case no.	CACE-22-001852
Judge	William W. Haury Jr., Division 04
Filed	February 3, 2022, according to the later defense dismissal motion
Status	May 13, 2024 criminal-contempt adjudication; complete current civil disposition not established by the records reviewed
Parties	Kameka Management Solutions, Inc.; Eryck Dzotsi (plaintiffs); Ryan Burke; VEW Live LLC; 16260 Saddle Club Road LLC; 2045 SW 127th Avenue LLC (defendants)

The complaint is not in the supplied packet. The underlying 2021 lending can be described only at the level established by the July 12, 2022 amended default judgment: $200,000 principal, $120,000 credited as payments tendered, a $107,212 equitable lien on the Davie parcel, and $4,080 fees separately addressed. The records do not establish separate advances, repayment installments, collateral promises or precise causes of action.[2]

Raymond Carrero represented the plaintiffs in 2022 and examined Burke at his February 2023 deposition. Danielle Cohen and Keith R. Gaudioso of Cohen Law represented plaintiffs at the August hearing and in the November contempt motion. Robert A. Rosenblatt of The Rosenblatt Law Firm represented all four defendants throughout the service challenge. Defense papers sometimes call Carrero "Carrera"; his own appearance blocks use Carrero. Counsel's roles here differ from their roles in the separate foreclosure.[3]

Summonses, disputed service and the default judgment

The summonses directed to Burke and VEW Live LLC were e-filed on February 18, 2022. Burke's summons directed service at his home in Sunrise, Florida. VEW Live's separate summons named Burke as its registered agent and supplied a business-office service address. Both forms warned

that a lawsuit had been filed and required a written response. Neither form, standing alone, proves that the summons and complaint were delivered. The complaint referenced in the summonses is not attached.[4]

The contested service records describe April 11, 2022, at approximately 8 a.m. Process server Shirley Lowe's narrative says she saw a man approaching the front door, called out "Ryan," and received an affirmative response. She said she identified herself, explained the case and the three corporations, and was asked to mail the documents or give them to his attorney. According to the return, she offered to leave the documents at the door and the man agreed. Burke later denied both the encounter and his presence in Florida that day.[5]

DISPUTED ACCOUNT Service returns and Burke's later affidavit

Lowe's return describes an encounter with Burke at his home in Sunrise, Florida on April 11, 2022. Burke's affidavit says: "I was never served with any summons on April 11, 2022." These were competing sworn accounts, not an undisputed delivery record.[5]

The 2045 SW 127th Avenue LLC return states April 4, 2022 in its operative service line but April 11 in its narrative. The returns carry May 5 e-filing stamps. At the August hearing, plaintiffs' counsel also acknowledged that the filed VEW Live return was not the correct one.[6]

The July 12 amended final default judgment declared service "duly and regularly obtained" and granted judgment on all counts. Its title identifies a scrivener-error correction concerning property information. This was a default judgment, not a contested merits trial. The earlier default and original judgment are not supplied.[7]

Item in the July 12, 2022 judgment	Amount at entry
Principal	$200,000.00
Accrued interest, stated at 15% per annum	$7,500.00
Default interest, stated at 18% per annum	$17,500.00
Litigation costs	$2,212.00
Payments tendered	($120,000.00)
Equitable-lien total	$107,212.00
Attorney fees, separately addressed	$4,080.00

JUDGMENT Amended final default judgment, July 12, 2022

"The Plaintiff's Verified Motion for Judgment after Default is GRANTED on all counts as to all defendants." The judgment established that Kameka and Dzotsi "hereby jointly hold an equitable lien" for the specified total on the Davie parcel. Its attorney-fee paragraph separately stated that "a fee of $4,080.00 is appropriate."[7]

The judgment provided for interest and a conditional August 24, 2022 public sale if unpaid. Its $107,212 lien total is historical, not a current balance; fees were separately addressed. The later service ruling means uninterrupted enforceability cannot be assumed.[7]

The October 25, 2022 filing attached a sale notice published October 18 and 25. It referenced an October 4 order setting an online sale for November 9. Neither that standalone order nor completion records are supplied; the notice establishes no purchaser, sale price or title transfer. The original uploaded filename incorrectly identified the year as 2023.[8]

The November challenge and the January hearing

On November 22, 2022, all four defendants moved to quash service, set aside the default and set aside the sale order. Their motion presented a legal objection and a factual denial. Rosenblatt argued that merely leaving a summons and complaint at a door did not meet the statutory requirements for service on Burke or the companies. He also argued that Burke could not have been the person encountered because he was in Las Vegas from April 1 through April 14.[9]

The supporting affidavit was executed October 17, 2022. Burke identified himself as the registered agent for the three defendant LLCs, denied being at his residence on April 11, and denied receiving any summons that day. He also said he had not been notified of the plaintiffs' motion for default. That last statement is a separate notice objection; it should not be merged with the question of whether original service occurred.[10]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Burke's affidavit, executed Oct. 17, 2022
>
> "I was present in Las Vegas, NV on business from April 1, 2022 until my return to my residence on April 14, 2022."
>
> "I was never served with any summons on April 11, 2022."[10]

The affidavit said attached travel documents reflected his absence April 1–14. The supplied motion ends with an April 1 outbound confirmation, without the purported April 14 return page later attached to the contempt motion. That exhibit limitation does not negate the later court finding about a fake document or record locator.[10]

On January 26, 2023, defendants cited Vives, Murphy, Robles-Martinez and Carus concerning facial defects, identification and the burden of proving service. One parenthetical stated: "Plaintiff bears ultimate burden of proving valid service of process." These precedents were not additional Burke cases or findings about his whereabouts.[11]

The January 30 hearing was an argument over how to resolve the service dispute. No witness gave substantive sworn testimony at that hearing. Carrero argued that a screenshot of a ticket purchase did not establish boarding. Rosenblatt maintained that Burke was in Las Vegas and that the service returns were deficient. Judge Haury allowed a deposition and said an evidentiary hearing would follow if the dispute remained.[12]

> **COURT ORDER** Judge Haury at the Jan. 30, 2023 hearing
>
> "If you're still contesting or disagreeing, let me know and I'll get you an evidentiary hearing."
>
> "Okay. I will cancel the sale."
>
> "Let's do it within the next 30 days."[12]

Haury canceled the noticed February 8, 2023 sale, not a proved November auction. He separately raised default-proceeding notice under Rule 1.500(b). Discussing a receipt card, he said, "No. I don't think it's an answer to the complaint." The service facts and document authenticity remained unresolved.[12]

Burke's February 23, 2023 deposition

Carrero questioned Burke by videoconference on February 23, 2023, from 1:07 to 1:45 p.m., with Rosenblatt representing the defendants. Burke was sworn remotely. The questioning concerned service, his registered-agent roles and the asserted Las Vegas trip, not the formation or performance of the underlying loans. The supplied mini-transcript identifies exhibits retained by counsel rather than appending a complete exhibit bundle.[13]

Residence and company roles

Burke testified that he had lived at his home in Sunrise, Florida since 2010 without interruption and had an office inside the house. He said his spouse lived there, no other adults lived there, and he sometimes had guests for more than seven days. Those answers gave context for questions about who might have encountered the process server. They did not identify another person who actually did so.[14]

His answers about registered-agent status were less definite than the affidavit. Asked about 16260 Saddle Club Road LLC, he initially said, "Yes. I believe so." After seeing a registry printout, he said that if it stated he was the agent, "it means I'm the registered agent." He acknowledged the same role for 2045 SW 127th Avenue LLC. As to VEW Live, he said he knew he was a member but was not sure about the agent. That difference is part of the testimony; it does not, without more, prove a registry change or intentional falsehood about his corporate position.[15]

Purpose, duration and work

Asked where he was on April 11, 2022, Burke answered, "Las Vegas." He identified the trip's purpose as "Grammys ceremony," described it as business rather than vacation and said its duration was "From the 1st to the 14th." These answers repeated the central factual proposition in his affidavit.[16]

SWORN TESTIMONY Burke deposition, Feb. 23, 2023, Tr. 18

"I manage talent. I'm a booking agent. I'm a promoter. I am a marketing consultant. I'm a producer."

Asked which of those functions he performed in Las Vegas, Burke answered: "All of them."[16]

Shown an event flyer, Burke first said it was one of the events he was promoting, then corrected himself: "Well, that was the event. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. That was the event." Asked about events after April 1, he said they were not events he was promoting but events to which he had been invited. He later said he was not paid for the April 1 event, had no contract with the client and had not reserved the venue. These answers describe the business explanation he gave for travel, not findings about any separate concert engagement.[17]

Airline confirmation and missing boarding passes

Burke identified a trip confirmation as his and agreed that it showed an April 1 Miami–Las Vegas flight and an April 14 Las Vegas–Miami return. He said he believed $817.20 accurately reflected the ticket cost and said he boarded the outbound flight. On how he reached the airport, he did not recall. He was not sure whether the boarding pass was digital or paper, though he said he had one.[18]

BURKE'S POSITION Burke's explanation for missing boarding passes

"I wouldn't have a copy because the pass expired. It goes to your – when – in the past when it's been a digital boarding pass, it goes to your Apple Wallet; and once you've used it, it – it expires, and it goes away."[18]

Burke did not recall whether the return pass was digital and had no physical copy. He could not recall how he got home from Miami and did not believe he left his car at the airport. Missing copies do not alone prove no pass existed.[19]

Hotel reservations and the gap between stays

Burke confirmed that the hotel documents presented to him showed reservations for April 1–3 and April 9–13. He denied writing the annotations on the printout, saying the page "came as is." Asked about the gap between April 3 and April 9, he said he stayed with an artist who was a cousin. The cousin's identity is not needed to report the explanation.[20]

BURKE'S POSITION Burke's explanation for the hotel gap

"Because I was staying with – with one of the – the talent, one of the artists." Asked the relationship, Burke answered: "It's my cousin."[20]

Burke did not recall obtaining final folios or incidental-charge ledgers for either stay. He said he ate with many people and did not recall paying meal bills. His cousin explanation accounted for why hotel reservations would not cover the asserted full stay.[20]

Bank entries, transportation and posting dates

Carrero asked about an Uber charge posted April 4. Burke said he had multiple accounts and that not every ride had to appear on the account produced. He said the detail showed an April 1 ride from the Las Vegas airport even though it posted April 4. He had no additional Uber records with him at the deposition.[21]

Questions about Florida restaurant and fuel entries required the same distinction. Carrero referred to transactions associated with locations in Lauderhill, Pompano Beach and Fort Lauderdale. Burke said he could see the entries, but did not remember the purchases. He disputed the inference that a posting date fixed the date of his physical presence in Florida.[21]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Burke on bank posting dates, deposition Tr. 27
>
> "I – I – again, I see the transactions; but I – I'd like you to also realize that this says, 'Posting date'; and you can see the dates of the actual transaction, that they're all March 31, 2022."[21]

A posting date alone does not establish the cardholder's location that day. The later airline manifest records flight status, not a bank-date inference.[21]

Access to the house and the unanswered settlement question

Near the end of the deposition, Burke said family members probably had access to the house but he did not know where they were. He could not identify any guest or housesitter who might have been there. Asked why another person would answer to "Ryan" at his home, he said, "I have no idea." He did not offer a specific alternative identification for the man Lowe described.[22]

Rosenblatt instructed Burke not to answer whether he received Carrero's written settlement proposal, arguing it was outside the deposition's scope. Carrero said actual notice was relevant and certified the question. No judicial resolution is supplied; the nonanswer is not an admission of receipt.[23]

The June special appearance and alleged agreement

The defendants' special appearance was e-filed June 6, 2023, with a June 2 service certificate. A second supplied copy has the same substantive response and no independent e-filing header. The two copies are not evidence of two separate appearances or rulings. The response maintained that the service motion had to be decided before judgment or enforcement proceedings.[24]

Rosenblatt described an alleged March agreement with Carrero. According to the defense, former plaintiffs' counsel offered to vacate the default and grant the motion to quash if Rosenblatt would accept service for the defendants. The response said the defense agreed, then plaintiffs replaced Carrero. It also said the defense chose not to seek enforcement of that agreement because doing so would cause more delay and raise a dispute over Carrero's authority.[24]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Defendants' special appearance, June 2023
>
> "Plaintiff's prior counsel, Ray Carrera, accepted our offer that the undersigned would accept service for the Defendants conditioned on the order of default was vacated."
>
> On pursuing enforcement of that alleged agreement: "We chose not to go down this road."[24]

The exhibit compilation's March cancellation message does not set out the full alleged agreement. Some May correspondence is displayed as Outlook drafts, not proof of sent messages. The packet does not independently establish a binding agreement or breach.[25]

The defense called its April 26 magistrate-referral objection timely and "self-executing." It accused plaintiffs' counsel of misrepresenting consent to magistrate hearings and sought sanctions and fees. These were unsworn party arguments; no order granting sanctions is supplied.[26]

The August 21 evidentiary hearing

Haury held the evidentiary hearing on August 21, 2023. Burke and Lowe testified under oath; Cohen and Gaudioso appeared for the plaintiffs, and Rosenblatt for the defendants. No airline custodian or hotel witness testified. The standalone transcript contains no appended documentary exhibits. The airline material later attached to the contempt motion was obtained after this hearing.[27]

Burke's account

Burke repeated that he returned from Las Vegas on April 14, was in Las Vegas on April 11 and had not been served in this case. He identified booking and account material but did not produce boarding passes, final hotel folios, photographs from the later part of the asserted trip or additional transportation records. His answers repeated both the travel claim and the explanations for limited records.[28]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Burke's sworn hearing testimony, Aug. 21, 2023
>
> "My boarding passes are electronic. They're digital. They go to my Apple Wallet. When they expire, I delete them."
>
> "No, I was in Vegas. I also use cash as well, so not everything is on a bank statement."[28]

He described multiple accounts, cash and rides or meals from friends or family. He also denied the certified-mail signature: "That is not my signature." The card dispute did not resolve Lowe's separate personal-service account.[28]

Lowe's account and the disputed returns

Lowe testified that she received the process on February 23, 2022 and served it April 11 at approximately 8 a.m. She described calling to Burke as he approached the house. Her account was not merely that papers had been left unattended without any contact.[29]

SWORN TESTIMONY Shirley Lowe, hearing Tr. 29–31

"I got out of my car, and I said, 'Hi, Ryan.'"

"He did. He turned around, and he said, 'Yes.'"

Lowe said she identified herself and the documents. When she offered to leave them at the door, she testified that Burke replied: "That's fine."[29]

Lowe identified Burke in court and answered "No doubt" when asked about his identity. Those are her sworn assertions about the encounter, not admissions made by Burke in the hearing. Rosenblatt challenged how she could identify someone she had not previously met, her failure to request identification and the lack of a photograph. He also questioned omissions from the return and inconsistencies concerning her camera or phone and contemporaneous observations. Lowe maintained her account.[30]

Asked about entering the house, a detail not stated in the return, Lowe responded: "It doesn't need – need to be in my notes in order to say that I served him." That testimony and the cross-examination must be reported together. Counsel's contentious exchanges are not independent evidence that a witness was dishonest.[30]

The return for VEW Live received separate attention. Haury observed that one of the four returns was a no-service return for the company. Gaudioso acknowledged that the return filed with the court was not the correct return and proposed a correction. Rosenblatt did not object, and the composite was admitted. Admission of the composite did not amount to a final ruling that every attempted corporate service was sufficient.[31]

Arguments and the ruling

Rosenblatt criticized Lowe's credibility, describing her as "extremely argumentative" and saying she "wasn't candid with the Court." Gaudioso argued that confirmations showed bookings rather than actual travel or hotel occupancy and that Burke's evidence did not meet the clear-and-convincing standard plaintiffs said applied. Those credibility arguments belong to the lawyers. The judge did not adopt them all in his ruling.[32]

COURT ORDER Judge Haury's bench ruling, Aug. 21, 2023

"Okay. Thank you. Certainly, folks, there is a conflict in the evidence."

"Nonetheless, I will grant the Motion to Quash so Mr. Gaudioso can establish that the evidence proffered today is fraudulent. I will be happy to consider either direct or indirect criminal contempt in the future."[33]

The transcript says "so"; plaintiffs' later motion inserted "[if]." Despite that ambiguity, the operative ruling granted quashing. Future contempt was left open, not adjudicated that day. Haury did not expressly find Lowe incredible, Burke guilty of perjury or the travel document fabricated.[33]

Afterward, Gaudioso asked whether Rosenblatt would accept service. Rosenblatt declined and returned to the alleged prior agreement, including vacatur and mediation. Gaudioso disputed its terms. The transcript ended with defense counsel proposing to prepare an order. The plaintiffs' later motion describes an August 23 written order quashing service and vacating the judgment, but that operative order is not supplied.[34]

On August 24, the defendants moved to dismiss under Rule 1.070(j), arguing that service had not been obtained within 120 days and plaintiffs had not shown good cause or requested an extension. That motion supplies the packet's assertion that the complaint was filed February 3, 2022. A notice e-filed November 2, with an October 20 service certificate, withdrew the dismissal motion scheduled for November 9. It gave no reason. Withdrawal did not itself concede valid service or establish any contempt allegation; no order granting dismissal is supplied.[35]

American Airlines subpoenas and records

The plaintiffs pursued nonparty production from American Airlines concerning the asserted travel. An October 10, 2023 notice attached requests concerning April 1 flight AA462 from Miami to Las Vegas, April 4 flight AA2742 from Las Vegas to Miami and a passenger manifest. It allowed other passengers' names to be redacted. Its attached deadline was September 21, before the notice's October filing date. That internal problem means the notice should not be treated as proof of an orderly completed production on the stated deadline.[36]

The responses themselves are attached to the November contempt motion. An October 5 letter said the carrier was "unable to locate a passenger manifest for April 14, 2022, Flight AA 1524." The first group of records included an April 1 AA462 manifest identifying Burke as "Successfully flown." A further letter dated October 30 accompanied records identifying him as "Successfully flown" on April 4 AA2742 from Las Vegas to Miami.[37]

The April 4 record describes an overnight flight. It lists scheduled departure at 23:27, actual departure at 23:50, scheduled arrival at 07:08 and actual arrival at 07:11. It is not an 11:50 a.m. departure. The itinerary history also identifies an earlier booking on AA1524 for April 4, not April 14. Passenger contact information, ticket identifiers and other passengers are not reproduced here.[37]

What the airline records show and what they do not show

Record	What it shows	What it does not establish by itself
April 1, 2022 AA462, Miami–Las Vegas	A carrier manifest lists Burke as "Successfully flown," consistent with his claimed outbound trip.	His full movements or continuous presence in Las Vegas afterward.
April 4, 2022 AA2742, Las Vegas–Miami	A carrier manifest lists Burke as "Successfully flown" on an overnight return, actual departure 23:50.	That he remained in Florida every day afterward or was at his home on April 11.
October 5 letter about April 14 AA1524	The carrier could not locate the specified passenger manifest.	That Burke took no April 14 flight on any carrier, route or flight number.
Itinerary/history entries	An earlier AA1524 booking is dated April 4; records provide booking and flight-status context.	A complete independent account of every later trip or a forensic examination of the document offered by Burke.

The April 4 record substantially conflicts with the claimed continuous April 1–14 stay. It does not alone establish Burke's location April 11. Lowe supplied a separate eyewitness account, disputed by Burke. The later finding belongs to the court, not an independent reconstruction of every movement by this publication.[37]

The November 21 verified contempt motion

On November 21, 2023, Kameka and Dzotsi filed a verified motion for an order to show cause and to vacate the order granting the motion to quash. The actual movants were the plaintiffs, despite "Defendants" appearing in the original file name and later hearing-notice matter line. Gaudioso verified the motion's facts. Verification made it a sworn party submission; it did not turn its conclusions into court findings.[38]

The motion alleged perjury in the October affidavit, February deposition and August hearing. It also alleged that Burke submitted a "forged or altered" confirmation to obtain the service ruling and judgment vacatur. Its exhibits collected the affidavit, deposition and hearing, a purported $817.20 itinerary showing April 1 AA462 outbound and April 14 AA1524 return, subpoenas, carrier responses and flight records.[38]

> **PARTY ALLEGATION** Plaintiffs' verified motion, Nov. 21, 2023
>
> "As established herein beyond a reasonable doubt, BURKE committed perjury and submitted a forged document into evidence."
>
> The motion sought punishment "for submitting into evidence the forged or altered printout." These were the plaintiffs' allegations and asserted standard of proof, not yet the court's determination.[38]

Plaintiffs sought a show-cause order, direct and/or indirect contempt with incarceration, a fine or other punishment, vacatur of quashing, reinstatement of the July 12 judgment nunc pro tunc (with retroactive effect), and fees. Neither the request nor the later contempt order proves reinstatement.[39]

The motion's narrative contains date and time errors. Some flight references say 2023 although the carrier records say 2022. It misdates the February deposition as 2022 rather than February 23, 2023. It calls the April 4 flight's actual departure 11:50 a.m. instead of the manifest's 23:50. It describes the further response as November 2 although the attached letter is dated October 30. Those errors do not erase the exhibits, but the chronology must be taken from the underlying documents rather than copied uncritically from the motion.[40]

A hearing notice filed November 22 scheduled an evidentiary hearing for November 30 before Haury. The notice establishes scheduling, not that the hearing occurred or what happened there. It erroneously called the plaintiffs' motion "Defendants'" and misspelled Burke's name. The signed May order supplies the later show-cause and hearing chronology.[41]

The May 13, 2024 criminal-contempt order

The signed two-page order is titled "Order Adjudging Respondent in Indirect Criminal Contempt of Court and Order of Commitment." It was e-filed May 13, 2024 as Filing #198218543, recorded May 15 as Broward instrument 119575457, and filed May 24 in company bankruptcy case 24-14947-PDR as Doc. 10-1. Although its title refers to indirect contempt, its operative paragraph also adjudges direct criminal contempt.[42]

CRIMINAL CONTEMPT WITHIN THE LENDING ACTION

Court	Broward Circuit Court, civil Division 04
Case no.	CACE-22-001852
Judge	William W. Haury Jr.
Order	Signed and e-filed May 13, 2024; recorded May 15, 2024, instrument 119575457
Respondent	Ryan Burke
Disposition	Indirect criminal contempt for affidavit and deposition; direct criminal contempt for open-court testimony; three consecutive days in county jail ordered
Compliance	Service of the sentence, appeal and later modification not established by primary records reviewed

The order recites that an order to show cause was issued December 2, 2023 and served that same day under Rule of General Practice and Judicial Administration 2.516. It describes the charged conduct as perjury in Burke's efforts to quash service, occurring through the affidavit filed November 22, 2022, deposition testimony February 23, 2023 and court testimony August 21, 2023. The separate show-cause order and service proof are not supplied. The December dates are recitals in the signed May order; inspection of the facsimile resolves misread superscripts in the OCR. [42]

The order says the contempt hearing was held April 8, 2024 at 9:30 a.m. It refers to deliberation, advice of counsel and evaluation of the evidence presented. The April hearing transcript is not supplied, so the complete testimony, objections and defense argument at that hearing cannot be reconstructed. The court's findings, however, are expressly stated in the signed order.[43]

> **COURT FINDING** May 13, 2024 contempt order, PDF p. 1
>
> "A hearing was held on this matter on the 8th day of April, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.. Upon due deliberation, advice of counsel, and evaluation of the evidence presented, this court FINDS, beyond any reasonable doubt, that Mr. Burke lied in his affidavit, his deposition testimony and in open court."[43]

Unlike plaintiffs' November assertion of proof beyond reasonable doubt, this is the court's stated finding after the contempt hearing.[43]

COURT FINDING May 13, 2024 contempt order, finding A

"Mr. Burke, knowingly and with the intent to obstruct the administration of justice, provided false testimony that he was physically in Las Vegas, Nevada on April 11, 2022. This false testimony is contained in his Affidavit executed on October 17, 2022 which was filed with his Motion to Quash Service of Process filed on November 22, 2022. The Affidavit also included a fake travel document or record locator purportedly issued by American Airlines. The false testimony was repeated in his deposition on February 23, 2023, and again in open court August 21, 2023 at the hearing on his Motion to Quash Service of Process."[44]

The finding identifies intent and each repetition of the travel claim. The publication has not independently determined who created or altered the document. The order gives no technical account of alteration, but expressly finds the document or locator fake.[44]

COURT FINDING May 13, 2024 contempt order, findings B and C

"Mr. Burke's false testimony was directly pertinent to the issue at hand, to wit: whether Mr. Burke was personally served with process on April 11, 2022."

"Mr. Burke's false testimony had an obstructive effect and resulted in an order quashing service of process."[45]

The obstruction finding concerns the administration of this civil case. It does not resolve every lending claim, later service on each company or current judgment enforceability.[45]

COURT FINDING May 13, 2024 contempt order, adjudication

"It is therefore ORDERED and ADJUDGED that Ryan Burke is guilty of indirect criminal contempt of this Court with regard to his Affidavit and deposition testimony and is guilty of direct criminal contempt with regard to his testimony in open court due to his perjury."[46]

The affidavit and deposition are the indirect-contempt acts; open-court testimony is the direct-contempt act. This is the only criminal-law adjudication established in the reviewed record, entered by a civil judge in a civil case. No separate prosecutor-filed perjury charge, arrest record or other criminal conviction was found.[46]

The sentence, reduction and appeal bond

COURT FINDING May 13, 2024 contempt order, commitment paragraph

"For such contempt the Respondent is committed to the Sheriff of Broward County to the county jail for three consecutive days to be served between May 15, 2024 and July 15, 2024, commencing on Friday at 5:00 p.m. through Monday at 4:00 p.m. After being confined for such period, Mr. Burke shall be duly discharged from imprisonment according to law. This is a reduction from the sentence pronounced in open court due to BSO's inability to provide incarnation for multiple weekends."[47]

The order uses “incarnation” [sic] in the final sentence. It states three consecutive days with the Friday-to-Monday reporting window and a May 15–July 15 period for service. It expressly says the written sentence was reduced from the sentence pronounced in open court because of the Broward Sheriff’s Office’s inability to accommodate multiple weekends. The reviewed primary records do not establish the precise original oral sentence, so its number of weekends should not be inferred from that phrase.[47]

The order required a $500 bail bond if Burke appealed and said the court would entertain a further contempt motion if he neither reported nor appealed. It proves no appeal, bond posting, failure to report or completed confinement.[47]

Direct and indirect criminal contempt

Florida Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.830 addresses direct criminal contempt. It permits summary punishment only when the court saw or heard the conduct in its actual presence. The rule requires notice of the accusation before adjudication, an opportunity to present excusing or mitigating evidence, a factual recital in the judgment, a signed and entered judgment, and sentence pronounced in open court. “Direct” describes the relationship of the conduct to the court’s presence, not a separate lending offense.[48]

Rule 3.840 provides the procedure for indirect criminal contempt. It calls for a show-cause order stating the essential facts and allowing reasonable preparation time after service. The respondent may seek dismissal, particulars or answer with an explanation or defense; failure to answer is not an admission of guilt. The rule provides for a hearing, representation by counsel, compulsory process for witnesses, a written judgment and an opportunity to present mitigating evidence before sentencing.[48]

Those rules explain the categories used by Haury: a filed affidavit and deposition were treated as indirect contempt, while testimony given in open court was treated as direct contempt. The absence of the April hearing transcript and any appellate disposition prevents an independent assessment here of every procedural step or potential challenge to the order. The publication reports the signed adjudication without substituting its own ruling on compliance with the rules.[48]

What happened next

The next supplied records connect the civil action to the bankruptcy of 2045 SW 127th Avenue LLC. On July 17, 2024, the plaintiffs filed a notice in the state case attaching the order dismissing the company’s first Chapter 11 case, 24-14947-PDR. Judge Peter D. Russin signed the bankruptcy order July 15; it was entered July 16. July 17 was the state notice date, not the dismissal date.[49]

> **COURT ORDER** Company Chapter 11 dismissal order, entered July 16, 2024
>
> “This case is DISMISSED effective immediately upon entry of the order.”
>
> “No debts, liabilities, or obligations are discharged.”
>
> “The automatic stay, if any, is terminated.”[49]

The dismissal package identifies the debtor as the 2045 company, although the order's caption says "2034 SW 127 Avenue, L.L.C." The matching case number and notice connect it to the company's proceeding; the discrepancy remains unexplained. This was not Burke's personal bankruptcy. The dismissal order addresses bankruptcy and the stay, not whether he completed the contempt sentence. The two company proceedings are covered in the bankruptcy chapter.[49]

In the company's second bankruptcy, 25-14362-SMG, Kameka and Dzotsi filed joint Claim 4 on May 21, 2025 through Gaudioso. It sought $178,415.77 for "Money loaned": $131,104.73 claimed secured by a recorded judgment lien and $47,311.04 claimed unsecured. It attached the July 2022 amended judgment, an interest statement, a fee motion, a declaration and billing records. Filing a proof of claim did not establish allowance or payment of the entire amount.[50]

The attached fee motion supplies an account of later state proceedings not otherwise reproduced in full. It says a March 20, 2024 order determined that plaintiffs were entitled to reasonable fees and costs associated with the show-cause and vacatur motion and deferred the show-cause ruling. It recounts the April 8 hearing and May 13 indirect-contempt order. The May adjudication can now be checked against the signed order; the separate March fee-entitlement order is not attached.[51]

> **PARTY ALLEGATION** Plaintiffs' fee motion attached to Claim 4
>
> "On December 20, 2024, the Court ruled on Plaintiffs' Second Motion for Contempt awarding Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees and costs through December 20, 2024."[51]

Counsel's account does not establish a new jail sentence, the acts adjudicated or whether the second motion concerned failure to report. The fee motion requested $42,835 fees and $4,476.04 costs, totaling $47,311.04. Its expense sheet totals $4,118.04, an unexplained $358 difference. These are claimed figures, not a verified present balance or final fee judgment.[52]

Secondary material reports a 2025 sentence modification replacing jail weekends with a $5,000 fine and 30 hours of community service. It attributes that account to a May 16, 2025 modification and the creditors' later conversion motion, ECF 36, in bankruptcy case 25-14362-SMG. Neither the modification order nor that motion has been seen by this publication. The supplied conversion order references ECF 36 but does not reproduce that account. The reported modification, payment of any fine and completion of any community service remain not independently verified.[53]

The second company case was converted to Chapter 7 by an order signed September 9 and entered September 10, 2025. That order granted the U.S. Trustee's motion and deemed Kameka and Dzotsi's separate conversion motion moot. It does not amend the state contempt sentence. Likewise, the later senior-lender foreclosure concerns the Davie property and competing lien interests, not an adjudication that the contempt commitment was served. The complete civil enforcement sequence, including any reinstatement of the 2022 judgment, is not established by the records supplied.[53]

Chronology, 2022–2025

Date	Event and evidence status
February 3, 2022	Complaint filing date asserted in the later, withdrawn defense dismissal motion; complaint absent.[35]
February 18, 2022	Summonses to Burke and VEW Live e-filed; issuance does not establish service.[4]
April 1, 2022	AA462 Miami–Las Vegas manifest lists Burke as "Successfully flown."[37]
April 4, 2022	AA2742 Las Vegas–Miami manifest lists Burke as "Successfully flown," with overnight departure at 23:50.[37]
April 11, 2022	Lowe's asserted service encounter; Burke denied being present. One corporate return conflicts internally between April 4 and April 11.[56]
May 5, 2022	Service returns e-filed, as shown by the attached stamps.[6]
July 12, 2022	Amended default judgment establishes the $107,212 equitable lien and separately addresses $4,080 fees.[7]
October 17, 2022	Burke executes affidavit claiming Las Vegas presence April 1–14.[10]
October 18 and 25, 2022	Newspaper publication dates for the November 9 sale notice.[8]
October 25, 2022	Notice of filing sale notice; completion of November 9 sale not established.[8]
November 22, 2022	Defense moves to quash service and set aside default and sale order.[9]
January 26, 2023	Defense files supplemental service authorities.[11]
January 30, 2023	Haury directs deposition, offers evidentiary hearing and cancels the noticed February 8 sale.[12]
February 23, 2023	Burke repeats the Las Vegas account in sworn deposition.[16]
June 6, 2023	Special appearance filed, with June 2 service certificate; alleged agreement and sanctions request are defense positions.[24][26]
August 21, 2023	Burke and Lowe testify; Haury grants quashing and leaves future criminal contempt open.[33]
August 23, 2023	Written quashing and vacatur order described by plaintiffs; operative copy absent.[34]
August 24, 2023	Defendants move to dismiss for untimely service.[35]
October 5 and 30, 2023	Carrier response letters supply travel records and report inability to locate the specified April 14 manifest.[37]
October 10, 2023	Standalone nonparty-production notice filed, with an earlier attached deadline.[36]
November 2, 2023	Defense withdrawal of dismissal motion e-filed; certificate dated October 20.[35]
November 21, 2023	Plaintiffs file verified contempt and vacatur motion alleging perjury and a forged or altered confirmation.[38]
December 2, 2023	Show-cause order issued and served, according to the May 13 signed order.[42]
March 20, 2024	Fee-entitlement order recounted in plaintiffs' later fee motion; operative copy absent.[51]
April 8, 2024	Contempt hearing, according to the signed May order; transcript absent.[43]
May 13, 2024	Signed order adjudges indirect and direct criminal contempt and orders three consecutive jail days.[46][47]
May 15–July 15, 2024	Period specified for serving the Friday-to-Monday sentence; compliance not established.[47]
July 15–17, 2024	First company bankruptcy dismissal signed July 15, entered July 16, filed in state action July 17.[49]
December 20, 2024	Second-contempt fee ruling recounted by plaintiffs; operative copy absent.[51]
May 16, 2025	Sentence modification reported in secondary material; underlying order not independently verified.[53]
May 21, 2025	Kameka and Dzotsi file Claim 4 for $178,415.77 in second company bankruptcy.[50]
September 9–10, 2025	Chapter 7 conversion order signed and entered; it does not modify the state contempt sentence.[53]

Burke's position

Burke's defense was that he was not served because he was away on business in Las Vegas. He put that position in an affidavit, repeated it under oath in deposition and again testified to it at the August hearing. His lawyer separately argued that the delivery method described in the returns was legally insufficient for him and the companies. Those were distinct grounds: the first denied the encounter; the second challenged the legal sufficiency of the asserted service even on the process server's account.[910]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Burke's service and travel defense
>
> Burke maintained that he was in Las Vegas on April 11 and remained there from April 1 to April 14. He offered travel confirmations, hotel-booking material and account entries, explaining missing records by digital boarding-pass expiry, use of multiple accounts and cash, lodging with a cousin, rides or meals supplied by others, and imperfect recollection.[1618202128]

The bank-date explanation deserves its full context: he distinguished posting from transaction dates rather than simply denying every Florida merchant entry. The hotel explanation likewise supplied a reason for the reservation gap rather than asserting uninterrupted paid hotel occupancy. He denied the certified-mail signature and could not identify another person who might have answered Lowe. Counsel instructed him not to answer the settlement-proposal question; that instruction did not establish the answer.[2021222328]

Rosenblatt also challenged Lowe's identification and documentation, complained of inadequate default notice, described an alleged agreement to accept service in exchange for vacatur, and sought sanctions over magistrate scheduling. The defense obtained a favorable bench ruling on quashing in August 2023. That result must remain in the account even though the court later found the testimony used to obtain it false.[1224263033]

The reviewed packet does not contain Burke's full response at the April 2024 contempt hearing, a separate response to the carrier's April 4 successfully-flown record, or an appellate decision on the May order. His earlier explanations should not be invented into a later defense that the records do not show. They also cannot be presented as leaving the judicial finding unresolved: Haury expressly rejected the material Las Vegas account in the signed contempt order. The unresolved issues concern the missing later record, not whether that order was entered.[434446]

What remains unresolved

The original complaint, lending instruments, earlier default orders, written August 2023 quashing and vacatur order, and any later reinstatement order are not supplied. Their absence prevents a complete account of the lending allegations and current judgment status. The separate December show-cause order, April 2024 contempt transcript, March fee-entitlement order and December ruling on the second contempt motion are also absent; where later filings describe them, this chapter attributes the account to those filings.[234424351]

No primary record reviewed establishes whether Burke reported to jail, served the written sentence, appealed, posted the $500 bond, or obtained a later sentencing modification. The reported $5,000 fine and 30 hours of community service remain unverified without the underlying modification and compliance records. The proof of claim does not establish an allowed or paid claim, a current balance, or a complete resolution of the $358 costs discrepancy. The signed May 13, 2024 criminal-contempt adjudication is established; its execution and the complete subsequent civil disposition are not.[47505253]

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Aug. 21, 2023 hearing, Broward Cir. Ct., CACE-22-001852, PDF pp. 70–71, Tr. 70:24–71:5 — redacted copy; Order Adjudging Respondent in Indirect Criminal Contempt of Court and Order of Commitment, May 13, 2024, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy.
2. Amended Final Default Judgment Establishing and Foreclosing Equitable Lien, July 12, 2022, ¶¶ 1–3, 5, 11, attached to Claim 4, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, May 21, 2025, PDF pp. 4–6 — redacted copy. The complaint and loan instruments are not in the reviewed packet.
3. Sale-notice filing, Oct. 25, 2022, PDF p. 1 — redacted copy; Burke deposition, Feb. 23, 2023, PDF p. 2, Tr. 2:2–17 — redacted copy; Aug. 21 hearing, PDF p. 2, Tr. 2:2–18 — redacted copy; plaintiffs' Nov. 21, 2023 motion, PDF p. 10 — redacted copy.
4. Summons directed to Ryan Burke, Feb. 18, 2022, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy; summons directed to VEW Live LLC, same date, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy.
5. Motion to Quash Service of Process, Nov. 22, 2022, attached return and affidavit, PDF pp. 4, 8 — redacted copy.
6. Motion to quash, attached returns, PDF pp. 4–7, especially p. 5 — redacted copy; Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 27–28, Tr. 27:17–28:15 — redacted copy.
7. July 12, 2022 amended default judgment, ¶¶ 1–6, 11, in Claim 4, PDF pp. 4–6 — redacted copy.
8. Notice of Filing Notice of Sale and publication affidavit, Oct. 25, 2022, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy.
9. Defendants' motion to quash, Nov. 22, 2022, PDF pp. 1–3 — redacted copy.
10. Burke affidavit and travel-confirmation attachment, executed Oct. 17, 2022, in motion to quash, PDF pp. 8–10, affidavit ¶¶ 1–6 — redacted copy; later itinerary attachment, plaintiffs' contempt motion, PDF pp. 77–78 — redacted copy.
11. Defendants' Notice of Filing Supplemental Authority, Jan. 26, 2023, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy.
12. Jan. 30, 2023 hearing transcript in defense exhibit compilation, PDF pp. 5–16 (Tr. 4–15), especially PDF pp. 12–15, Tr. 11:9–11, 12:13–19, 14:4–5 — redacted copy.
13. Burke deposition, Feb. 23, 2023, PDF pp. 1–2, 10–11, Tr. 1–5, 37–39; exhibit index Tr. 3 — redacted copy.
14. Burke deposition, PDF p. 3, Tr. 7:13–8:9 — redacted copy.
15. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 3–4, Tr. 8:11–19, 10:6–10, 11:1–4 — redacted copy; affidavit ¶ 1, motion to quash, PDF p. 8 — redacted copy.
16. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 5–6, Tr. 17:21–24, 18:3–20 — redacted copy.
17. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 6, 8–9, Tr. 20:3–17, 29:20–30:3 — redacted copy.
18. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 6–7, Tr. 21:3–24, 22:1–18 — redacted copy.
19. Burke deposition, PDF p. 9, Tr. 30:4–22 — redacted copy.
20. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 7–8, Tr. 25:3–26:21, 29:7–19 — redacted copy.
21. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 7–8, Tr. 23:5–24:18, 27:1–29:4, quotation Tr. 27:19–22 — redacted copy.
22. Burke deposition, PDF p. 10, Tr. 35:2–16, 36:2–8 — redacted copy. Household details not necessary to the service dispute are omitted.
23. Burke deposition, PDF p. 9, Tr. 31:9–33:18 — redacted copy.
24. Defendants' Special Appearance in Response to Request for a CMC, filed June 6, 2023, PDF pp. 1–2, 5 — redacted copy; duplicate service-dated copy, June 2, PDF pp. 1–5 — redacted copy.
25. Defense exhibit compilation, PDF pp. 25–31, 33–35, especially March message p. 25 and draft screenshots pp. 27–31 — redacted copy.
26. Defendants' special appearance, PDF pp. 3–5, ¶¶ 7–11 and objection/conclusion — redacted copy; reproduced April 26 objection and counsel correspondence, exhibit compilation, PDF pp. 32–35 — redacted copy.
27. Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 1–5, 24, 73, oaths Tr. 5:14–16, 24:8–11 — redacted copy.
28. Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 11, 15–22, Tr. 11:1–11, 18:18–20, 21:3–4, 22:9 — redacted copy.
29. Lowe testimony, Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 26, 29–31, Tr. 26:9–24, 29:9–30:4, 31:3–15 — redacted copy.
30. Lowe cross-examination, Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 32–33, 38–49, especially Tr. 32:11–33:2, 42:19–20, 43:5–12 — redacted copy.
31. Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 27–28, Tr. 27:17–28:15 — redacted copy.
32. Counsel arguments, Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 65–70, especially Tr. 65:18, 66:21, 67:22–70:22 — redacted copy.

33. Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 70–71, Tr. 70:24–71:5 — redacted copy; plaintiffs' later reproduction with bracketed insertion, contempt motion, PDF p. 5 — redacted copy.
34. Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 71–72, Tr. 71:6–72:16 — redacted copy; plaintiffs' description of Aug. 23 order, contempt motion, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy.
35. Defendants' Rule 1.070(j) dismissal motion, Aug. 24, 2023, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy; withdrawal, e-filed Nov. 2, 2023, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy.
36. Nonparty-production notice and American Airlines subpoena, filed Oct. 10, 2023, PDF pp. 1, 3–4 — redacted copy.
37. American Airlines exhibits F and H, attached to plaintiffs' Nov. 21 contempt motion, PDF pp. 82–88, 92–98; October letters pp. 82, 92; outbound manifest p. 88; April 4 manifest p. 93; booking histories pp. 86, 97 — redacted copy.
38. Plaintiffs' Verified Motion for an Order to Show Cause and Motion to Vacate Order Granting Motion to Quash, Nov. 21, 2023, PDF pp. 1–12, quotations pp. 2, 7; verification p. 11; itinerary exhibit pp. 77–78 — redacted copy.
39. Plaintiffs' contempt motion, requested relief, PDF pp. 9–10 — redacted copy; May 13 order, operative disposition, PDF p. 2 — redacted copy.
40. Plaintiffs' contempt motion, PDF pp. 5–7, contrasted with deposition date and carrier exhibits pp. 92–93 — redacted copy; deposition cover, PDF p. 1 — redacted copy.
41. Evidentiary-hearing notice, e-filed Nov. 22, 2023, scheduling Nov. 30, PDF p. 1 — redacted copy.
42. May 13, 2024 contempt order, PDF pp. 1–2, filing/recording stamps and opening recitals — redacted copy. December dates read from the signed facsimile; the separate show-cause order is not supplied.
43. May 13 contempt order, PDF p. 1, hearing and beyond-reasonable-doubt paragraph — redacted copy.
44. May 13 contempt order, PDF p. 1, finding A — redacted copy.
45. May 13 contempt order, PDF pp. 1–2, findings B–C — redacted copy.
46. May 13 contempt order, PDF p. 2, adjudication paragraph — redacted copy. No separate prosecutor-filed charge or other criminal disposition is established in the reviewed record.
47. May 13 contempt order, PDF p. 2, commitment, reduction, appeal-bond and further-contempt paragraphs — redacted copy. Execution and any subsequent amendment are not established by the supplied primary records.
48. Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rules 3.830(a)–(e) and 3.840(a)–(g), current official compilation, printed pp. 331–334, updated Oct. 1, 2026 — The Florida Bar. Cited for the procedural distinction, not as an appellate review of this order.
49. Plaintiffs' notice filing bankruptcy dismissal, July 17, 2024, PDF pp. 1, 3–5 — redacted copy; dismissal order and notice certificate, 24-14947-PDR, Doc. 39 signed July 15/entered July 16, reproduced with Doc. 40 certificate, PDF pp. 1–5, quotations p. 4 — redacted copy.
50. Joint Claim 4, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, May 21, 2025, PDF pp. 1–8, basis and components p. 2 — redacted copy.
51. Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs Through December 20, 2024, attached to Claim 4, certificate dated May 6, 2025, PDF pp. 9–11, ¶¶ 1–3 — redacted copy. March and December underlying rulings are not attached.
52. Claim 4, fee motion ¶ 5, declaration and expense sheet, PDF pp. 10, 12–13, 19 — redacted copy. The declared/requested $4,476.04 costs and sheet's $4,118.04 differ by $358; no reconciliation is supplied.
53. Reported May 16, 2025 state sentencing modification and creditors' conversion motion, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, ECF 36: underlying records not seen by this publication, reported modification not independently verified. The supplied conversion order, signed Sept. 9/entered Sept. 10, 2025, PDF pp. 1–2, references ECF 36 and deems that motion moot but contains no sentencing amendment — redacted copy.

CHAPTER 09 · BROWARD CIRCUIT COURT

The Davie property: a $962,000 note and a $2.09 million judgment

A senior mortgage foreclosure produced a July 2026 judgment against the property company and other defendants, but the reviewed records do not establish a completed sale.

The final judgment in Broward case CACE-22-016620 identifies a $962,000 promissory note dated July 23, 2021. Five years later, on July 16, 2026, Senior Judge Christopher William Pole signed a foreclosure judgment stating a grand total of $2,089,122.81 and directing a conditional sale of 2045 SW 127th Avenue, Davie, Florida 33325. The judgment is a court decision about the lien and foreclosure. It is not a certificate showing that the property was sold, and it is not a later deficiency judgment establishing an unpaid balance after a sale.[1]

THE SENIOR-LENDER FORECLOSURE OF THE DAVIE PROPERTY

Court	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County, Florida
Case no.	CACE-22-016620
Judge	Gary Farmer named for February 2025 hearing; Carlos Augusto Rodriguez in July 2026 header; final judgment signed by Senior Judge Christopher William Pole
Filed	Original complaint date not established in the records reviewed
Status	Final foreclosure judgment July 16, 2026; August 20, 2026 sale ordered and noticed; completed sale not established
Parties	Kenneth Duboff and other lenders; Genuine Investments Land Trust; E&Y Assets, LLC, as trustee; 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC; Ryan Burke; Kameka Management Solutions, Inc.; Eryck Dzotsi; other named defendants

The case concerns the same parcel that Kameka Management Solutions, Inc. and Eryck Dzotsi claimed as security in a separate equitable-lien action. Their role changes between the two cases: they are plaintiffs in CACE-22-001852, but defendants asserting an interest in the property in the senior foreclosure. Keeping those proceedings separate is necessary to understand both the amounts and the court's priority ruling.[2][4]

The note and the property

The July 2026 judgment calls its first financial entry "Principal on the July 23, 2021 Promissory Note" and gives $962,000. It then lists default interest at 25% for two periods beginning September 1, 2021. Those are amounts and terms stated in the signed judgment. The original note and the original foreclosure complaint are not among the filings reviewed for this chapter, so the judgment is the primary source here for the note's date, principal and default-interest treatment.[1]

JUDGMENT Final judgment, July 16, 2026, PDF pp. 1–2

The court granted the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and stated a $2,089,122.81 grand total secured by a lien on the Davie parcel.[1]

The property is identified by more than its street address. The judgment gives parcel number 5040 14 01 0490 and describes Tract 177, less the north 25 feet for right-of-way, of Flamingo Groves Unit E, recorded in Plat Book 15, page 5. The Kameka/Dzotsi judgment attached to their bankruptcy claim uses the same legal description. That agreement between the descriptions establishes the shared collateral in these records; it does not mean the lenders made the same loan.[14]

The borrower company also used the property as the explanation for its bankruptcy filing. In its May 2025 case-management summary, 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC described its business as real-estate investment and stated that it owned this Davie property. The company identified Burke as its manager and sole shareholder. Its signature block named Burke Development Group, LLC as manager, with Burke signing as that company's manager. These are the debtor's descriptions, not separate judicial findings about every ownership or management relationship.[7]

No record reviewed here establishes that this property was concert-event collateral, that the senior note financed a particular performance, or that the judgment concerned ticket revenue. The foreclosure papers identify a promissory note, a property lien and defendants. The property's appearance in a dossier about an entertainment promoter does not change the transaction described by those papers.[17]

The lender names in successive filings

The February 2025 hearing notice uses the abbreviated caption "Kenneth Duboff, et al." against "Ryan Burke, et al." The April 2026 deposition notice gives a longer plaintiff list and identifies Genuine Investments Land Trust "as Successor in Interest to Kenneth Duboff." The July judgment identifies the lienholder as E&Y Assets, LLC, as trustee of Genuine Investments Land Trust. These are successive descriptions in the same numbered foreclosure case.[321]

The April caption also names Steven H. Selznick in a custodial capacity, 153412 Canada Inc., AFE III Front Porch Investments, LLC, AFE III Rottweiler Growth Holdings, LLC, and other individual lenders. Their individual shares of the note or judgment are not quantified in that notice. It would therefore be inaccurate to allocate the $962,000 or the judgment total among them from the caption alone.[2]

The defendant list also needs care. The April notice includes the property company, Burke, Kameka, Dzotsi, VEW Live, LLC, 16260 Saddle Club Road, LLC and unknown tenants. The operative opening paragraph of the July judgment expressly grants relief against the property company, Burke, Kameka, Dzotsi and an identified tenant. It does not expressly include VEW Live or 16260 Saddle Club Road in that list. The later sale notice again lists those companies and contains an extra zero in the Saddle Club company's name. The supplied filings do not explain the difference, so the judgment's express list controls this chapter's description of the relief granted.[218]

Burke's February 2025 request to stop a sale

A notice e-filed February 6, 2025 scheduled a hearing for February 18 at 9:15 a.m. before Judge Gary Farmer. The stated matter was the "Defendant's Emergency Motion to Cancel/Vacate Sale date Scheduled for February 20, 2025." Barry S. Mittelberg signed the notice as attorney for Burke and 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC. The notice thus establishes both a scheduled sale date and a defense request to cancel or vacate it.[3]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Defense hearing notice, filed February 6, 2025, PDF pp. 1–2
>
> Through Mittelberg, Burke and the property company sought emergency consideration of a request to cancel or vacate the sale scheduled for February 20, 2025.[3]

The actual emergency motion is not supplied. Neither is an order deciding it or a transcript of the scheduled hearing. The notice does not state the legal or factual grounds for cancellation. It cannot support a claim that Burke denied the note, disputed a particular interest charge, offered refinancing, or obtained a cancellation. Those would require the motion or a later ruling.[3]

There is also a date distinction within the document's description. February 18 is the scheduled hearing date, not the filing date shown by its e-filing stamp. February 20 is the sale date that counsel sought to change. Treating any of those dates as interchangeable would obscure the sequence. The available record shows that counsel asked for a hearing before the scheduled sale; it stops short of showing what happened next.[3]

A later July 2026 judgment does not, by itself, explain the fate of the February 2025 auction. The records reviewed do not include the intervening orders needed to establish whether that sale was canceled, postponed, otherwise stopped or replaced. This chapter therefore reports the February event as an emergency request concerning a noticed sale, not as a completed sale or a proven successful defense.[31]

The debtor's May 2025 financial picture

The company filed a second Chapter 11 case on April 21, 2025. Its May 2 case-management summary gave its reason as "Stop Foreclosure sale of 2045 SW 127th Avenue, Davie, FL 33325." That statement is the debtor's own account of its purpose. It does not specify the date of the sale it intended to stop. The February notice identifies February 20, a date already before this bankruptcy filing; it does not establish an April sale date.[73]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Debtor's case-management summary, May 2, 2025, PDF pp. 1–2
>
> The company said it filed to stop the property's foreclosure sale. It estimated assets at $2.9 million, Kenneth Duboff and other lenders' debt at $962,000, Kameka's debt at $107,212, and a Keys Funding LLC tax-certificate obligation at $93,965.58.[7]

The summary expressly warns that its figures are “approximations for background information only” and may be the debtor’s best estimates. It lists Keys Funding as the holder of a 2023 tax certificate under priority obligations. It lists Kameka and the Duboff group under secured claims, and says there are no unsecured claims. Its reported income is $21,000 for 2024 and $28,000 for 2025 in response to a question about prior-year and year-to-date gross income. None of these entries is a court-approved valuation or an allowed-claim determination.[7]

Those qualifications matter when comparing the $962,000 entry with the later foreclosure judgment. The debtor’s estimate matches the principal identified in that judgment, but the judgment also contains years of default interest and fees, followed by credits. The $962,000 estimate is not evidence that all charges had been adjudicated at that figure, and it cannot be used as the July 2026 balance.[71]

The estimated $2.9 million asset value is not an auction price. Nor does subtracting estimated obligations from that figure establish money available to Burke or to a subordinate creditor. The documents contain different dates, categories of debt and accrued charges. The senior court also reserved further decisions about subordinate lienholders and any remaining sale proceeds. The companion bankruptcy chapter addresses the company’s filings and conversion without treating them as personal bankruptcies by Burke.[71]

Kameka and Dzotsi’s separate lien claim

The historical amended default judgment in CACE-22-001852, dated July 12, 2022, established a $107,212 equitable lien for Kameka and Dzotsi against this parcel. Its calculation used $200,000 principal, $7,500 accrued interest, $17,500 default interest and $2,212 litigation costs, less $120,000 tendered. A separate paragraph addressed $4,080 in attorney fees. Those figures belong to the equitable-lien action, not to the $962,000 senior note.[4]

The default judgment’s procedural history is not a straight line. At the August 21, 2023 service hearing, Judge William W. Haury, Jr. granted the defendants’ motion to quash. The plaintiffs’ later verified motion describes a written order vacating the judgment. Their 2025 bankruptcy claim nevertheless relies on the historical judgment and recounts subsequent proceedings. The written orders needed to reconcile its complete enforceability history are not all in the records reviewed. The Kameka/Dzotsi chapter examines that dispute, Burke’s service defense and the later contempt order.[564]

On May 21, 2025, Kameka and Dzotsi filed joint Claim 4 in the company’s second bankruptcy. They claimed $178,415.77, divided into $131,104.73 secured and $47,311.04 unsecured. The secured part combined the $107,212 historical judgment with claimed interest; the unsecured part reflected additional claimed fees and costs. Filing that claim does not establish that the bankruptcy court allowed its full amount or classification.[4]

The July 2026 senior judgment resolves a different question: it declares the plaintiff’s lien superior to the defendants’ claims or estates, subject to specified statutory assessment exceptions. Kameka and Dzotsi are expressly among the defendants against whom summary judgment was granted.

The same judgment reserves jurisdiction to determine amounts owed to subordinate lienholders. Priority and amount are therefore distinct in the order: the senior lien's superiority is decided, while further subordinate-lien determinations are contemplated.[1]

The April 2026 deposition notice

On April 1, 2026, Kameka and Dzotsi, acting as defendants in the senior foreclosure, filed a notice to take Eli Hen's deposition on April 14 at 10 a.m. Danielle Cohen and Keith R. Gaudioso of Kelley Kronenberg appear as their lawyers. The notice says the deposition was for discovery, trial use or both. It was served on senior-lender counsel and Mittelberg.[2]

> **PUBLIC RECORD** Deposition notice, April 1, 2026, PDF pp. 1–3
>
> Kameka and Dzotsi noticed Eli Hen's deposition in CACE-22-016620. No transcript or other record establishing that Hen testified is included in the materials reviewed.[2]

The notice is evidence of a procedural step taken by the subordinate claimants. It is not sworn testimony from Hen, an admission by Burke or a judicial finding about either lender's accounting. Its broad statement of purpose does not identify the questions counsel planned to ask. No conclusions about Hen's role, knowledge or answers can be drawn from the notice alone.[2]

The July 16, 2026 judgment

The final judgment records a July 15, 2026 hearing on the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment of foreclosure. Its header names Carlos Augusto Rodriguez as the assigned judge in Division 11, but the electronic signature belongs to Senior Judge Christopher William Pole. Judge Farmer's name appeared on the February 2025 hearing notice. Neither earlier name should replace Pole's as the signer of this judgment.[13]

The monetary entries below reproduce the judgment's displayed amounts. Credits are shown in parentheses. The per diem is separately stated rather than added as a single fixed fee. The table preserves the court's stated subtotal and grand total; the arithmetic observation that follows does not amend them.[1]

Component stated in the judgment	Amount
Principal on July 23, 2021 promissory note	$962,000.00
Default interest at 25%, September 1, 2021 through December 1, 2023	$561,166.48
Default interest at 25%, December 1, 2023 through July 15, 2026	$630,567.30
Separately stated per diem interest at 25%, December 1, 2023 to judgment	$658.90/day
Title search expenses	$275.00
Attorney fees	$32,817.50
Filing fee	$1,916.00
Summons fee	$65.00

Component stated in the judgment	Amount
Service of process	$270.00
First notice of sale	$72.45
Expert fee for reasonableness affidavit	$450.00
Stated subtotal	$2,192,667.58
Less payments received from borrower	($101,410.80)
Less escrow balance	($2,133.97)
Stated grand total	$2,089,122.81

For attorney fees, the court found 82.85 hours reasonable and hourly rates between $185 and $595 appropriate. These findings support the $32,817.50 fee entry. The borrower-payment and escrow entries are credits, not additional sums awarded to the plaintiff. The judgment expressly recognizes them in arriving at its stated grand total.[1]

The $658.90 per diem appears with the pre-judgment default-interest entries. A separate interest paragraph directs interest from the judgment date forward at the statutory rate under Florida Statutes section 55.03. For that reason, this chapter does not project the judgment forward at $658.90 a day or publish an estimated current balance. The amount reported is the amount at entry, and the current balance is unknown.[1]

A reproducible arithmetic observation

Adding the displayed principal, both displayed default-interest amounts and all displayed fixed fees and costs produces $2,189,599.73. That is $3,067.85 below the judgment's stated $2,192,667.58 subtotal. This calculation does not separately accumulate the per diem. The stated subtotal, less the two displayed credits, does equal the stated grand total of $2,089,122.81.[9]

> **EDITOR'S NOTE** Publication's arithmetic check of judgment entries, PDF pp. 1–2
>
> The displayed fixed components add to $3,067.85 less than the stated subtotal. The reviewed filings do not explain the difference. This is an arithmetic observation, not an accusation or a replacement legal balance.[9]

The judgment describes its grand total as together with additional accrued interest as of judgment. Without a supporting calculation or explanatory filing, this publication cannot determine how the difference arose. It does not call the judgment invalid, attribute the difference to intentional conduct or substitute its own sum for the court's award. Readers can examine the redacted judgment and distinguish the printed entries from the publication's limited addition of them.[19]

The sale ordered for August 20

The judgment directs the clerk to sell the property electronically on August 20, 2026 at 10 a.m. if the total sum, applicable interest and subsequent costs are not paid. It requires a court order to postpone or cancel the sale. It also states that failures to pay sale and clerk fees or timely file proof of publication will stop the sale. These conditions are part of the order; the scheduled date alone does not establish that every condition was met.[1]

On July 22, Kenneth M. Rehns of Lippes Mathias signed and filed a Chapter 45 sale notice for E&Y Assets as trustee of Genuine Investments Land Trust. It cites the July 16 judgment, repeats the parcel and legal description, and gives August 20 as the electronic auction date. The notice confirms scheduling under that judgment. It supplies no purchaser, successful bid or certificate of sale.[8]

> **COURT ORDER** Final judgment and Chapter 45 notice, July 2026
>
> An August 20, 2026 sale was ordered and noticed. No certificate of sale, certificate of title, sale-disbursement record or later deficiency judgment appears in the records reviewed.[18]

The judgment makes later consequences depend on later filings. Its distribution paragraph begins with filing the certificate of title and directs payment of specified costs and sums due to the plaintiff, with remaining money retained pending further order. Its possession provisions also refer to certificates of sale and title. The court reserves jurisdiction for writs of possession, deficiency judgments and subordinate-lien determinations. Reservation of authority to enter those orders is not evidence that they were entered.[1]

A deficiency would concern a remaining obligation after applying sale proceeds; the reviewed judgment reserves that issue rather than fixing a post-sale amount. This publication therefore does not describe $2,089,122.81 as a proven personal deficiency owed by Burke, or report that he was evicted from the parcel. The necessary later records are absent.[1]

Davie code compliance: recorded as corrected

A separate local-government record concerns Town of Davie code-compliance case 24-085078. The July 10, 2025 Special Magistrate minutes name 2045 SW 127TH AVENUE LLC and the same folio, 5040 14 01 0490. They list Town Code section 12-544, “Permits,” and section 12-33(S)(2), “Landscape Maintenance,” and show that the matter had been continued from April 10, 2025.[10]

> **PUBLIC RECORD** Town of Davie Special Magistrate minutes, July 10, 2025, p. 2
>
> “Canceled/Corrected as owner comply before hearing day.”[10]

The minutes record correction before the hearing. They do not assess a fine, quantify a code lien or make a contempt finding personally against Burke in this matter. Their mention of permits and landscaping should not be converted into a claim that an unpaid municipal penalty added to the foreclosure judgment. Nothing in these minutes supplies such an amount, and the foreclosure components do not identify one.[101]

What remains unresolved

The records reviewed do not establish the outcome of the February 2025 emergency motion, whether Eli Hen's noticed deposition occurred, or the calculation accounting for the $3,067.85 difference between displayed fixed components and the stated foreclosure subtotal. They do not establish a completed August 20, 2026 sale, a purchaser or price, transfer of title, possession proceedings, a deficiency judgment or the current balance. The full enforceability history and eventual recovery on Kameka and Dzotsi's separate lien also remain unresolved. These missing records do not undo the signed July 16 judgment; they limit what can be said about events after it. [32914]

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Final Judgment, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, July 16, 2026, PDF p. 1 (summary judgment, parties, note, interest and fees), p. 2 (credits, total, statutory interest, property and sale), p. 3 (distribution, possession and reserved jurisdiction), p. 4 (Senior Judge Christopher William Pole's signature) — redacted copy.
2. Defendants Kameka Management Solutions, Inc. and Eryck Dzotsi's Notice of Taking Deposition, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, April 1, 2026, PDF p. 1 (caption and April 14 date), p. 2 (time, purpose and counsel), p. 3 (service) — redacted copy.
3. Notice of Hearing on Defendant's Emergency Motion to Cancel/Vacate Sale Date Scheduled for February 20, 2025, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, e-filed February 6, 2025, PDF p. 1 (filing stamp, matter, judge and February 18 hearing), p. 2 (Mittelberg's representation of Burke and the LLC) — redacted copy.
4. Joint Proof of Claim 4, Kameka Management Solutions, Inc. and Eryck Dzotsi, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, May 21, 2025, PDF pp. 1–3 (claim and classification), pp. 4–6 (attached July 12, 2022 amended default judgment), pp. 7–10 (claimed interest and additional-fee account) — redacted copy.
5. Transcript of August 21, 2023 Evidentiary Hearing, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-001852, PDF/Tr. 70:24–71:5 (granting motion to quash), 71:6–72:16 (subsequent service discussion) — redacted copy.
6. Plaintiffs' Verified Motion for an Order to Show Cause and to Vacate Order Granting Motion to Quash, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-001852, November 21, 2023, PDF pp. 1–2 (party account of written vacatur and requested reinstatement) — redacted copy.
7. Debtor's Chapter 11 Case Management Summary, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, Doc. 18, May 2, 2025, PDF p. 1 (estimate qualification, April 21 filing, business, property, reason, Burke's role, income and tax certificate), p. 2 (secured and unsecured entries, asset estimate and manager signature) — redacted copy.
8. Notice of Sale Pursuant to Chapter 45, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, July 22, 2026, PDF p. 1 (judgment reference, defendants, parcel and August 20 sale), p. 2 (Rehns's signature) — redacted copy.
9. Publication's addition of the fixed entries printed in Final Judgment, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, July 16, 2026, PDF pp. 1–2: principal plus both displayed default-interest amounts plus title search, attorney fees, filing, summons, service, first notice and expert fees equals $2,189,599.73; the stated subtotal is $2,192,667.58. No separate per-diem accumulation is included. The stated subtotal minus $101,410.80 and $2,133.97 equals $2,089,122.81 — redacted copy.
10. Town of Davie, Special Magistrate Minutes, July 10, 2025, p. 2, case 24-085078 (company, folio, provisions, prior continuance and "Canceled/Corrected" disposition) — official minutes.

CHAPTER 10 · U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT, FORT LAUDERDALE

Two bankruptcies for 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC

The property's company filed Chapter 11 in 2024 and again in 2025; the first case was dismissed without discharge and the second was converted to Chapter 7.

2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC, the company associated with the litigated Davie property, was the debtor in two bankruptcy cases in the Southern District of Florida. The first, 24-14947-PDR, was dismissed in July 2024 without discharging any debts. The second, 25-14362-SMG, began in April 2025 under Chapter 11 and was converted to Chapter 7 that September. These are company bankruptcies, not petitions filed by Ryan Burke personally.[1][2][3][4]

The first case: May to July 2024

The public docket reproduction for 24-14947-PDR gives May 21, 2024 as the filing date and identifies a voluntary Chapter 11 case before Judge Peter D. Russin in the Fort Lauderdale Division. It names Barry S. Mittelberg as debtor counsel. The reproduced caption is "2045 SW 127 Avenue, LLC," without "th." The supplied dismissal and notice package uses that company name in its notice certificate and the same case number throughout.[1][2]

IN RE 2045 SW 127 AVENUE, LLC

Court	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida, Fort Lauderdale Division
Case no.	24-14947-PDR
Judge	Peter D. Russin
Filed	May 21, 2024, according to the public docket reproduction
Status	Chapter 11 dismissed by order signed July 15 and entered July 16, 2024; docket reproduction records closure August 22, 2024
Parties	2045 SW 127 Avenue, LLC, debtor; Office of the U.S. Trustee; creditors and notice recipients identified in the dismissal package

The petition itself is not among the supplied primary filings. The public reproduction establishes the filing date and docket activity, but it does not reveal the petition's company signatory or the complete schedules of assets and liabilities. A June 26 entry referring to "Schedules and Statements Filed" establishes that such documents were docketed; it is not evidence of their financial totals. This chapter does not import the second case's later estimates into the first case.[1]

The U.S. Trustee filed an expedited motion to convert the case to Chapter 7 or appoint a Chapter 11 trustee, identified in the dismissal order as D.E. 10. Judge Russin heard the matter July 11, 2024. According to the signed order, the debtor had no objection to dismissal and the U.S. Trustee did not oppose that relief. The court reviewed the record, motion and hearing statements and determined that dismissal was in the best interests of creditors and the estate.[2]

BURKE'S POSITION Dismissal order's account of July 11, 2024 hearing, PDF p. 3

The debtor did not object to dismissal. The U.S. Trustee did not oppose dismissal, although its motion had requested conversion or appointment of a trustee.[2]

The underlying motion and July 11 hearing transcript are not supplied. The dismissal order proves the motion's existence, requested alternatives and disposition. It does not set out the motion's complete allegations. It would be inaccurate to describe the order as a finding that Burke personally committed bankruptcy fraud, or to attribute a particular statutory ground for dismissal beyond what the order states.[2]

The contempt order filed as an attachment

The bankruptcy file contains a copy of the May 13, 2024 state-court contempt order in Kameka and Dzotsi's separate Broward case, CACE-22-001852. Its federal filing header identifies it as Doc. 10-1 in 24-14947-PDR, filed May 24, 2024. The state order preceded the company's May 21 bankruptcy filing; its inclusion in the bankruptcy docket followed that filing. Those dates establish a sequence, not the company's motive for its first petition.[51]

Judge William Haury Jr.'s signed order found that Burke lied in his affidavit, deposition and open-court testimony concerning his claimed presence in Las Vegas on April 11, 2022. It adjudged indirect criminal contempt for the affidavit and deposition and direct criminal contempt for his in-court testimony "due to his perjury." It ordered three consecutive days in the Broward County jail, to be served between May 15 and July 15, 2024. That adjudication was made by a civil judge in the state civil case, not by the bankruptcy court.[5]

COURT FINDING State contempt order, May 13, 2024; filed federally May 24, 2024

The order is an actual state-court contempt adjudication. Its filing as bankruptcy Doc. 10-1 does not make it a bankruptcy judgment or establish additional findings by Judge Russin.[5]

Burke's earlier position was that he had been in Las Vegas and had not been served on April 11. The state court later rejected that account in the contempt order. The underlying service litigation and his explanations are addressed in the Kameka/Dzotsi chapter. The records reviewed do not establish whether the jail term was served, appealed or later modified. Nothing in the company's bankruptcy-dismissal order resolves those questions.[562]

Dismissal was entered July 16, not July 17

Judge Russin signed the dismissal order July 15, 2024. The docket reproduction records its entry on July 16 as Doc. 39. Kameka and Dzotsi filed a notice attaching that order in their state action on July 17. The federal certificate of notice, Doc. 40, was filed July 18 and reproduces the same dismissal order. July 17 is therefore the state notice date, not the date the federal court dismissed the company case.[217]

COURT ORDER Dismissal order, signed July 15 and entered July 16, 2024, PDF p. 4

"This case is DISMISSED effective immediately upon entry of the order." The order also states: "No debts, liabilities, or obligations are discharged. The automatic stay, if any, is terminated."[2]

The order denied unresolved motions as moot and canceled remaining meetings, hearings or scheduling conferences. It required outstanding operating reports and assessed fees within 21 days of entry. It required professional compensation applications within 14 days and permitted the clerk to close the case after the relevant application period or adjudication. These were continuing administrative requirements after dismissal, not a confirmed repayment plan or a discharge.[2]

The public docket reproduction records "Bankruptcy Case Closed" on August 22, 2024, Doc. 43. That later closure is distinct from dismissal on July 16. The supplied signed order authorizes eventual closure; the reproduction supplies the closing entry. Neither event shows that creditors were paid, and the dismissal order expressly says obligations were not discharged.[12]

There is a caption discrepancy in the package. The notice certificate names the 2045 company, but the attached dismissal order says "2034 SW 127 Avenue, L.L.C." The matching case number, certificate and state attachment link the package to the 2045 company. This chapter treats "2034" as the caption typo apparent in that package while preserving the discrepancy. No explanatory correction order was reviewed.[27]

Creditors and notice recipients

The dismissal certificate includes both identified creditors and recipients of bankruptcy notices. Its CM/ECF list expressly describes Gaudioso as counsel for creditors Kameka and Dzotsi, Rachamin Cohen as counsel for creditor Genuine Investments Land Trust, and Scott Andron as counsel for creditor Broward County. Mittelberg is identified for the debtor, while J. Steven Wilkes and Martin P. Ochs appear for the Office of the U.S. Trustee.[2]

Person or entity	What the dismissal package establishes
Kameka Management Solutions, Inc.; Eryck Dzotsi	Identified creditors, with Keith Richard Gaudioso as counsel
Genuine Investments Land Trust	Identified creditor, with Rachamin Cohen as counsel
Broward County	Identified creditor, with Scott Andron as counsel; county tax and treasury recipients also listed
Patrick St Fleur d/b/a Spotlite Images	Listed notice recipient through Geoffrey D. Ittleman; no adjudicated amount or separate lawsuit number stated
Internal Revenue Service	Notice recipient; the certificate does not establish an allowed tax claim or unpaid amount
Florida Department of Revenue	Notice recipient; the certificate does not establish an allowed tax claim or unpaid amount
Office of the U.S. Trustee	Participant seeking case-administration relief, not an ordinary lender identified by the certificate

The distinction is consequential. Notice to the IRS or Florida Department of Revenue is not proof of a tax judgment against Burke or the company. The Spotlite Images entry does not prove a judgment for unpaid photography services, identify the underlying transaction or state an amount. Those propositions would require a proof of claim, complaint, judgment or another transaction-specific record.[2]

The certificate also records duplicate and undeliverable-address notations. Those are administrative descriptions of notice processing. They are not findings of evasion, refusal to accept service or misconduct by the named creditor or debtor. No personal addresses or contact details from the certificate are reproduced here.[2]

The second case: April 21, 2025

The company's May 2, 2025 Chapter 11 case-management summary states that the second voluntary filing occurred April 21, 2025. The public docket reproduction agrees with that date and identifies Judge Scott M. Grossman. The company again described its business as real-estate investment and identified ownership of 2045 SW 127th Avenue, Davie, Florida 33325 as its operations.[38]

IN RE 2045 SW 127TH AVENUE, LLC

Court	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida, Fort Lauderdale Division
Case no.	25-14362-SMG
Judge	Scott M. Grossman
Filed	April 21, 2025
Status	Chapter 11 converted to Chapter 7 by order signed September 9 and entered September 10, 2025; November 2, 2026 distribution authorized; later closure not established
Parties	2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC, debtor; Office of the U.S. Trustee; Kameka Management Solutions, Inc.; Eryck Dzotsi; other creditors; Kenneth A. Welt, Chapter 7 trustee

The summary identifies "Ryan Burke, Manager and sole shareholder." Its signature is for the debtor through Burke Development Group, LLC as manager, with Burke described as manager of Burke Development Group. Mark S. Roher appears as proposed debtor counsel. Those statements explain Burke's representative role in this filing. They do not convert the LLC's petition into his individual bankruptcy or make every company claim his personal debt.[3]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Debtor's case-management summary, May 2, 2025, PDF p. 1
>
> The company's stated reason for Chapter 11 was to "Stop Foreclosure sale of 2045 SW 127th Avenue, Davie, FL 33325."[3]

The summary qualifies its information as "approximations for background information only" and possible best estimates. It is a signed debtor submission, not sworn deposition testimony or a court valuation. Its purpose and financial entries are accordingly reported as the debtor's position.[3]

Income, assets and debts in the May 2 summary

The summary's income question asks for year-to-date gross income and gross income for the preceding year. The answers are "Income for 2024 - $21,000.00" and "Income for 2025 - $28,000.00." The document does not describe the 2025 amount as a monthly rate or a completed full-year result. This chapter reports the figures with their stated years and does not annualize them or attribute them to Burke's personal earnings.[3]

Debtor's reported item	May 2, 2025 estimate or statement
Gross income identified for 2024	$21,000.00
Gross income identified for 2025	$28,000.00
General approximate asset value	$2,900,000.00
Kenneth Duboff et al., listed under secured claims	$962,000.00
Kameka Management Solutions, Inc., listed under secured claims	$107,212.00
Keys Funding LLC, 2023 tax-certificate holder, listed under priority obligations	$93,965.58
Unsecured claims	None reported

The company also reported no employees or wages owed and no anticipated emergency relief within 14 days. The summary attached an Evanston general-liability insurance binder, but the binder expressly describes temporary coverage for twelve days subject to application and payment requirements. Its attachment is not proof that insurance remained in force throughout the listed June 2024–June 2025 period. No lapse or resulting sanction is established merely by that limitation.[3]

The $2.9 million estimate is not a later foreclosure-sale price. The $962,000 lender entry matches the note principal identified in the July 2026 state judgment, not the judgment's larger total after interest, fees and credits. The company summary and the state judgment address different dates and different measures. The foreclosure chapter sets out the judgment's components and the limits on any claim about present balances.[39]

Claim 4 by Kameka and Dzotsi

Kameka and Dzotsi filed joint Proof of Claim 4 on May 21, 2025, asserting $178,415.77 for "Money loaned." They divided it into $131,104.73 secured by a recorded judgment lien and $47,311.04 unsecured. Their claim also listed a $2.9 million property value. The claim is signed under penalty of perjury, but it remains the creditors' claim, not a supplied order allowing the full amount.[10]

> **PARTY ALLEGATION** Kameka/Dzotsi Proof of Claim 4, May 21, 2025, PDF pp. 1–3
>
> The creditors asserted a $178,415.77 claim, including a secured judgment-and-interest component and an unsecured fees-and-costs component.[10]

The secured figure is the $107,212 historical equitable-lien judgment plus $23,892.73 in claimed interest. The unsecured figure is $42,835 in additional fees plus $4,476.04 in claimed costs. The package attaches the July 12, 2022 amended default judgment, interest entries, an additional-fee motion, counsel's declaration and billing materials. The judgment is a court record within the attachment; the request for additional compensation remains a party submission.[10]

These entries differ from the debtor's earlier $107,212 Kameka estimate and statement that unsecured claims were "none." Claimed accrued interest and additional fees explain part of the difference in what the parties reported. The reviewed materials contain no Claim 4 allowance order resolving the entire amount or classification. They also do not provide the complete written orders reconciling the historical state judgment with the later service and contempt proceedings.[310]

One arithmetic detail remains unexplained: the attached expense sheet totals $4,118.04, while the declaration and request state $4,476.04 in costs, a $358 difference. This is a comparison of printed amounts, not a finding of improper billing or a correction to an allowed claim. The claim package does not explain it.[10]

Conversion in September 2025

Judge Grossman heard two motions September 3, 2025: the U.S. Trustee's motion to convert or dismiss, ECF 38, and Kameka and Dzotsi's motion to convert, ECF 36. He signed the conversion order September 9; it was entered September 10 as Doc. 47. The public reproduction's conversion-date field uses September 9. Reporting both signature and entry dates avoids treating that field as a different ruling.[48]

> **COURT ORDER** Conversion order, signed September 9 and entered September 10, 2025, PDF p. 2
>
> The U.S. Trustee's motion was granted and the Chapter 11 case converted to Chapter 7. Kameka and Dzotsi's separate conversion motion was deemed moot.[4]

The court determined conversion appropriate under 11 U.S.C. section 1112(b) "for the reasons stated on the record" at the September 3 hearing. Neither the hearing transcript nor the two motions is supplied. The order does not itself set out findings of fraud, a contempt sentence or a fine. The fact of conversion should not be expanded into an unsupported account of why the court chose it.[4]

The order required the debtor to turn over estate records and property to the Chapter 7 trustee. It also required an accounting of receipts and distributions within 30 days and schedules of unpaid post-petition debts and other required information within 14 days. Professional compensation applications and creditor notices were addressed as well. These are affirmative administration duties, not evidence that all transfers or filings were completed.[4]

What dismissal and conversion mean here

The U.S. Courts' Bankruptcy Basics guide explains that Chapter 11 generally provides for reorganization. A debtor ordinarily keeps control of its assets as a "debtor in possession" unless a trustee is appointed. The automatic stay generally suspends pre-petition collection and foreclosure actions against the debtor, subject to exceptions and court-ordered relief. Filing therefore can affect a property foreclosure without deciding the lender's ultimate entitlement or paying the debt.[11]

The same guide explains that a party may seek dismissal or conversion for cause, with the choice generally governed by creditors' and the estate's best interests. Dismissal ends the bankruptcy proceeding rather than changing it into Chapter 7 administration. In the first company case, the operative consequences were explicit: no discharge and termination of any automatic stay. That order did not cancel the underlying state claims.[112]

Conversion changes the existing case to another chapter. Chapter 7 provides for liquidation and distribution under a trustee's administration, rather than continuing with the debtor in possession as under ordinary Chapter 11. The U.S. Courts guide also states that Chapter 7 discharge is available only to individuals, not corporations or partnerships. The second company's conversion was not a personal "fresh start" for Burke, and no reviewed order grants him a discharge.[124]

Three different trustee descriptions appear across these records. The Office of the U.S. Trustee sought dismissal or conversion as part of bankruptcy oversight. Kenneth A. Welt later acted as the Chapter 7 estate trustee. E&Y Assets acted as trustee of Genuine Investments Land Trust, the senior property-lien claimant. Those are different roles; the lender trust's trustee is not the bankruptcy estate's trustee.[24139]

The November 2, 2026 distribution order

The latest supplied bankruptcy order is Doc. 123, signed November 2, 2026 by Grossman as Chief Judge. It grants Welt's request and permits the trustee to distribute $74.92 to the debtor's representative. The operative paragraph spells that representative's name "Ruyan Burke." That spelling is preserved here rather than silently rewritten in a quotation.[13]

> **COURT ORDER** Distribution order, November 2, 2026, PDF p. 1
>
> "The Motion is GRANTED, and the Trustee may distribute the amount of $74.92 to Mr. Ruyan Burke as representative of the Debtor."[13]

Permission to distribute is not evidence that the representative received the payment. The order does not disclose a foreclosure price, explain the source of the small residue or provide the history of payments to creditors. It cannot be used to infer that the property's total value was $74.92 or that this was all money administered in the case.[13]

The public docket reproduction describes the preceding November 1 motion as seeking distribution of minimal funds "So Case Can Be Closed." It shows the November 2 order but no later closing entry in the excerpt reviewed. An objective of closing the case is not a completed closure. The supplied order itself authorizes payment, not closure or discharge.[813]

Combined timeline and foreclosure timing

The records establish specific foreclosure sale dates in February 2025 and August 2026. They do not identify a scheduled sale date corresponding to the first petition on May 21, 2024. The second company's stated purpose was to stop a sale, but its May 2 summary does not give that sale's date. This chapter therefore does not describe either bankruptcy as filed "the day before" a foreclosure sale.[14913]

Date	Record and event
May 13, 2024	State court signed the contempt order later attached in the first bankruptcy.[5]
May 21, 2024	First company Chapter 11 filed, according to docket reproduction.[1]
May 24, 2024	State contempt order filed in 24-14947-PDR as Doc. 10-1.[5]
July 11, 2024	First-case hearing on the U.S. Trustee's motion; debtor did not object to dismissal.[2]
July 15–16, 2024	Dismissal signed July 15 and entered July 16; no discharge; stay terminated.[21]
July 17–18, 2024	State notice filed July 17; federal notice certificate filed July 18.[72]
August 22, 2024	First-case closure recorded in public docket reproduction.[1]
February 18–20, 2025	Defense hearing scheduled February 18 on request to cancel February 20 foreclosure sale; outcome not supplied.[14]
April 21–May 2, 2025	Second petition filed April 21; debtor summary filed May 2 stated a sale-stopping purpose without a sale date.[3]
May 21, 2025	Kameka and Dzotsi filed Claim 4 for $178,415.77.[10]
September 3–10, 2025	Conversion hearing September 3; order signed September 9 and entered September 10.[4]
July 16–August 20, 2026	State foreclosure judgment signed July 16; August 20 sale ordered and noticed, completion not established.[915]
November 2, 2026	Chapter 7 trustee authorized to distribute $74.92 to debtor representative; payment and later closure not established.[138]

What remains unresolved

The reviewed records do not disclose the full first petition or schedules, its company signatory, the complete grounds in either U.S. Trustee motion, or the hearing reasons incorporated into the conversion order. They do not establish a sale date immediately following either petition, full allowance or recovery on Claim 4, the property's eventual sale price, all creditor distributions, receipt of the authorized $74.92 or closure of the second case. The "2034" caption and "Ruyan" spelling have no supplied explanatory correction. Whether the jail term was served, appealed or later modified is also not established. None of these gaps supports treating the two company cases as Burke's personal bankruptcies.[1243109135]

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. BKalerts, public docket reproduction for Bankr. S.D. Fla., 24-14947-PDR, undated, checked November 11, 2026, case header (May 21 filing, Chapter 11, Judge Russin and counsel), Doc. 34 (June 26 schedules reference), Doc. 39 (July 16 dismissal entry), Doc. 43 (August 22 closure) — docket reproduction. Underlying petition and schedules were not reviewed.
2. Order Dismissing Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Case Resolving the Motion to Convert Case to Chapter 7 or Appoint a Trustee as Filed by United States Trustee, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 24-14947-PDR, Doc. 39, signed July 15 and entered July 16, 2024; reproduced with certificate of notice, Doc. 40, filed July 18. PDF pp. 1–2 (recipients and attorney roles), p. 3 (signature, caption, July 11 hearing and debtor position), p. 4 (dismissal, no discharge, stay termination, reports and fees), p. 5 (professional applications and eventual closure) — redacted copy.
3. Debtor's Chapter 11 Case Management Summary, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, Doc. 18, May 2, 2025, PDF p. 1 (qualifications, filing date, business, property, purpose, Burke's role, income and tax certificate), p. 2 (secured debt, no unsecured claims, assets, employees and signature), pp. 3–5 (insurance attachment and temporary-binder terms) — redacted copy.
4. Order Converting Chapter 11 Case to Chapter 7, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, Doc. 47, signed September 9 and entered September 10, 2025, PDF p. 1 (signature, hearing and motions), p. 2 (conversion, creditors' motion moot and turnover), pp. 2–3 (accounting, schedules, notices and professional applications), p. 4 (U.S. Trustee submission) — redacted copy.
5. Order Adjudging Respondent in Indirect Criminal Contempt of Court and Order of Commitment, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-001852, signed and e-filed May 13, 2024, recorded May 15 as Instrument 119575457; filed in Bankr. S.D. Fla., 24-14947-PDR, Doc. 10-1, May 24, 2024. PDF p. 1 (federal header and findings), p. 2 (direct/indirect contempt, jail term, appeal provision and signature) — redacted copy.
6. Defendants' Motion to Quash Service, Set Aside Default and Order of Sale, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-001852, November 22, 2022, PDF pp. 8–9 (Burke's October 17 affidavit denying April 11 service and claiming April 1–14 Las Vegas stay) — redacted copy.
7. Plaintiffs' Notice of Filing Order Dismissing Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Case, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-001852, July 17, 2024, PDF p. 1 (state filing and notice), pp. 3–5 (attached federal dismissal order, including "2034" caption) — redacted copy.
8. Inforuptcy, public docket reproduction for Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, undated, checked November 11, 2026, case header (April 21 filing, judge, chapters, September 9 conversion date and Welt), Doc. 122 (November 1, 2026 motion description), Doc. 123 (November 2 order) — docket reproduction. The reviewed excerpt does not establish later closure.
9. Final Judgment, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, July 16, 2026, PDF p. 1 (note principal and charges), p. 2 (grand total, parcel and August 20 sale), p. 3 (reserved jurisdiction and proceeds), p. 4 (Pole's signature) — redacted copy.
10. Kameka Management Solutions, Inc. and Eryck Dzotsi, Joint Proof of Claim 4, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, May 21, 2025, PDF pp. 1–3 (amount, security, value and declaration), pp. 4–6 (attached historical state judgment), pp. 7–8 (interest), pp. 9–13 (additional-fee motion and declaration), pp. 14–19 (billing and expenses). PDF p. 19 gives $4,118.04 expenses; pp. 10 and 13 state $4,476.04 in claimed costs — redacted copy.
11. Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Chapter 11 – Bankruptcy Basics, undated, accessed November 11, 2026, sections on the debtor in possession, "The Automatic Stay" and "Conversion or Dismissal" — official guide. General explanations are not findings about either company case.
12. Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Chapter 7 – Bankruptcy Basics, undated, accessed November 11, 2026, introduction, "Background," "Chapter 7 Eligibility" and discussion of the Chapter 7 trustee — official guide.
13. Order Granting Trustee's Motion Requesting the Entry of an Order Allowing Chapter 7 Trustee to Distribute $74.92 to the Representative of the Debtor, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, Doc. 123, November 2, 2026, PDF p. 1 (Chief Judge Grossman's signature and "Ruyan Burke" authorization), p. 2 (Kenneth A. Welt as trustee) — redacted copy.
14. Notice of Hearing on Defendant's Emergency Motion to Cancel/Vacate Sale Date Scheduled for February 20, 2025, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, filed February 6, 2025, PDF pp. 1–2 (February 18 hearing, February 20 sale and defense counsel) — redacted copy.
15. Notice of Sale Pursuant to Chapter 45, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, July 22, 2026, PDF p. 1 (August 20 auction scheduled under July 16 judgment) — redacted copy.

CHAPTER 11 · FEDERAL COURT, ILLINOIS

Echols & Mosley v. Burke: the Sabina Park money

Two Illinois plaintiffs alleged payments for the 2025 BZR Carnival Edition; the public docket records a jurisdiction challenge and a later judgment whose terms were not available for review.

Hugh Echols and John Mosley filed a verified civil complaint in the Northern District of Illinois on June 13, 2025, over money they said they paid toward BZR WKND Jamaica Carnival Edition 2025. They named Ryan Burke, VEW Live LLC, Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC and Universal Creative Agency Inc. The five-page complaint alleges four payments totaling $298,145.95 and asks for substantially more in damages and equitable relief. Those are the plaintiffs' allegations and requests, not an award.[1]

ECHOLS ET AL. V. BURKE ET AL.

Court	U.S. District Court, N.D. Illinois, Eastern Division
Case no.	1:25-cv-06604
Judge	Jeffrey I. Cummings; designated Magistrate Judge Jeffrey T. Gilbert
Filed	June 13, 2025
Status	Judgment entered January 20, 2026; later orders entered September 16, 2026; operative terms not verified
Parties	Hugh Echols and John Mosley; Ryan Burke; VEW Live LLC; Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC; Universal Creative Agency Inc

The complaint concerns the edition advertised for April 26, 2025, at Sabina Park in Kingston, with Sexyy Red, Shenseea and Dexta Daps. A later Billboard account says that edition was canceled because of inclement weather. The complaint, however, describes disputed contracts, payment handling and a repayment promise before the advertised concert date. It should not be reduced to a claim that bad weather alone caused the financial dispute. The event's publicity and cancellation history are set out in BZR WKND, edition by edition.[2]

What the plaintiffs filed

Echols and Mosley filed without counsel. In paragraphs 1 and 2, they describe themselves as domiciled in Illinois. Paragraph 3 describes the individual defendant as a Florida resident; paragraphs 4–6 identify the three corporate defendants and their business offices. The complaint's jurisdiction section asserts federal jurisdiction and says a substantial part of the events and injuries occurred in the Northern District of Illinois. These statements explain where the plaintiffs chose to sue. They do not establish that the Illinois court had jurisdiction over every named defendant.[3]

The filing carries a jury demand. On page 4, the plaintiffs affirm that the allegations are true and correct to the best of their knowledge. That verification makes their account a verified pleading, but it does not mean a judge accepted it as true. The complaint contains no judicial findings about the transaction, and the free docket material reviewed does not supply a later merits decision adopting its allegations.[1]

> **PARTY ALLEGATION** Verified complaint, June 13, 2025, paragraph 10
>
> The plaintiffs allege that Burke presented contracts and agreements bearing the letterheads of VEW Live LLC, Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC and Universal Creative Agency Inc as formal instruments of BZR WKND Jamaica Carnival Edition 2025.[4]

Paragraph 9 says the plaintiffs transferred funds in reliance on written and oral representations by Burke and the named entities. Paragraph 10 identifies the company letterheads. Paragraph 11 then draws a distinction between those documents and the payment instructions: it alleges that accompanying invoices for performer payments and disbursements were directed to Burke personally and to VEW Live, with "no payment structure or escrow for independent verification." The plaintiffs thus challenge both what they were told about the project and how they were instructed to pay for it.[4]

The names on the alleged letterheads matter because the plaintiffs sued three separate entities, not just an event brand. The five-page main complaint does not itself reproduce the contracts or invoices it describes. The docket lists an attachment titled "Notice of Filing of Complaint and Supporting Exhibits," but that attachment was not available as a free RECAP download on the page reviewed. The description confirms that an attachment was docketed; it does not independently authenticate each alleged agreement or show which entity signed which obligation.[5]

Universal Creative Agency was not first linked publicly to BZR by this complaint. In a July 16, 2023 interview, The Gleaner named UCA among the partners bringing BZR to Jamaica, alongside VEW Live, Solid Agency and Burke Bodley. That contemporary report supports the limited proposition that UCA was publicly identified with the earlier event. It does not establish UCA's liability for the 2025 payments or prove that all partners had the same role across editions.[6]

Four alleged payments

Paragraph 12 supplies the dates, sums and identified recipients of four payments. Presented chronologically, rather than in the complaint's original order, the list is as follows. No account identifiers are reproduced.[7]

Date in 2025	Alleged payment	Recipient identified in paragraph 12
February 14	$15,645.95	VEW Live
March 15	$150,000.00	Universal Creative Agency
March 24	$62,500.00	Ryan Burke
April 4	$70,000.00	VEW Live

Date in 2025	Alleged payment	Recipient identified in paragraph 12
Total of the four listed payments	$298,145.95	Arithmetic verified; transfers alleged

The total is an arithmetic check of the amounts in the pleading. It is not a bank reconciliation. The plaintiffs say they paid directly from personal funds, but the freely available main complaint does not provide bank statements establishing settlement, receipt or later disposition of each transfer. Nor does paragraph 12 allocate a particular artist fee, venue bill or production invoice to each sum. It identifies the alleged recipients and dates without providing that fuller accounting.[7]

The March 15 payment is attributed to UCA; the March 24 payment to Burke; and the two other payments to VEW Live. Vision Entertainment Worldwide is named as a defendant and in the letterhead allegation, but paragraph 12 does not list a separate payment to Vision. That difference should not disappear in a summary that describes the whole sum as paid to one person or one company. Whether a recipient acted for another defendant is not established by the list alone.[4] [7]

The amount sought in damages is also not the sum of these four payments. The complaint claims additional losses, expenses and recoverable disbursements elsewhere, without a detailed itemization in the five-page main document. The $298,145.95 figure is therefore the checked total of the four expressly listed transactions, not an independently established measure of all losses or the amount of a judgment.[8]

The venue claim, cease-and-desist and repayment promise

Paragraph 13 alleges that the defendants claimed to have wired money to Sabina Park Cricket Stadium but provided no receipt or confirmation that the venue received it. This is an allegation about an asserted transfer and the documentation supplied to the plaintiffs. It does not establish that Sabina Park denied receiving funds, and no venue account statement or direct venue response was available in the free material reviewed.[9]

Paragraph 14 alleges that, despite promising to execute the project, the defendants sent a cease-and-desist email “falsely asserting fraud” and claiming control of the project while retaining the plaintiffs’ money. The quoted characterization is the plaintiffs’ account of the communication. The email itself is not reproduced in the freely available main complaint, so its complete wording, asserted grounds and any response cannot be checked there.[9]

> **PARTY ALLEGATION** Verified complaint, June 13, 2025, paragraphs 13–15
>
> The plaintiffs allege an undocumented venue wire, a cease-and-desist communication asserting control of the project, and a verbal promise to return their money on April 8, 2025.[9]

Paragraph 15 says Burke verbally stated that he would pay back all the money on April 8, 2025, while in Jamaica. The sentence gives a repayment date and location but no written undertaking or recording. It does not say in the main pleading when the conversation occurred. The chapter therefore records the alleged promise without assigning a date to the conversation or treating the promise as an admission proved by an independent document.[9]

Paragraph 16 concludes that the plaintiffs later discovered misrepresented or incomplete artist agreements, invoices, venue statements and financial communications, and that the defendants failed to meet contractual or fiduciary obligations. It does not identify an artist's own statement disputing a booking or attach a venue cancellation notice within the main complaint. The allegations are broader than a simple unpaid invoice, but their factual basis would require the agreements, communications and payment records referred to in the filing.[9]

The counts and requested relief

The complaint pleads four civil counts: unjust enrichment; fraud and misrepresentation; conversion; and civil RICO, invoking section 1962(c), the federal provision in 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c). Under unjust enrichment, the plaintiffs allege retention of their funds without the promised services. Under fraud and misrepresentation, they allege misstatements about artist participation, payment handling, venue arrangements and authority to bind parties. The conversion count alleges diversion and retention of personal funds without lawful justification.[8]

The civil RICO count alleges an association-in-fact enterprise and a pattern of racketeering involving wire and bank fraud and misuse of interstate commerce. That language belongs to the civil pleading. The docket's "Racketeer/Corrupt Organization" classification similarly identifies a category assigned to the action; it is not a criminal charge, a prosecutor's finding or proof of racketeering. The free records reviewed establish that the count was pleaded, not that its legal or factual requirements were met.[8] [10]

The plaintiffs ask jointly for $1,767,284.68 in compensatory damages and $3,534,569.37 in punitive damages, a total of $5,301,854.05. The addition is correct. The complaint describes the punitive component as "triple damages authorized under RICO, fraud, and equitable relief doctrines." This chapter reports the plaintiffs' formulation without endorsing the asserted entitlement or supplying a calculation that the pleading does not explain.[8]

They also request a constructive trust over traceable funds and property, an equitable lien, and an injunction against transfers or dissipation of assets. Page 4 asks for a declaratory judgment concerning fraud, conversion and racketeering, along with interest, fees and costs. These requests are part of the prayer for relief. Nothing in the freely accessible material establishes that the court granted a lien, imposed a trust, restrained assets or awarded the requested damages.[8]

Status reports and attempted service

Judge Jeffrey I. Cummings was assigned on June 16, 2025. A July 1 minute entry, docket entry 7, instructed the parties to file an initial joint status report by July 30. It set a tracking date and said no appearance was required. That order called for case-management information; it did not adjudicate the complaint.[11]

On August 25, entry 8 said no report had been filed. The court extended the deadline to September 5 and instructed the plaintiffs to report on service if the defendants had not been served. It warned that failure to comply could result in dismissal for want of prosecution. The warning was conditional. The entry does not say the case was dismissed that day.[11]

The September 18 entry, number 9, again noted missing reports, but also recorded a notice problem: the plaintiffs' email addresses were not on file and they apparently had not consented to electronic notice. The court ordered a status report on service by October 3, repeated the dismissal warning and directed the clerk to mail the order to the plaintiffs. Omitting this notice issue would give an incomplete account of the court's response to the missed deadlines.[11]

On October 3, Echols and Mosley filed a status report on service, entry 10. The reproduction confirms the filing and date but does not display the report itself. It therefore cannot be used to say which defendants were successfully served, how service was attempted or whether the court accepted the plaintiffs' position on service.[11]

The appearance and jurisdiction defense

On October 23, 2025, lawyer Saurish Appleby-Bhattacharjee entered an appearance described as being on behalf of "Putative Defendant Ryan Matthew Burke, erroneously sued as 'Ryan Burke'." On the same date, he filed a status report on attempted service of that putative defendant. Both descriptions appear in Justia's docket reproduction.[12]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Defense appearance and motion, docket entries 11–13
>
> Counsel appeared for "Putative Defendant Ryan Matthew Burke, erroneously sued as 'Ryan Burke'" and later moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. The asserted error is the defense's position; the available docket descriptions do not resolve it.[12]

The wording must be kept intact. It establishes the full name used by the lawyer and the contention that his client was erroneously sued. It does not, without the underlying filing, establish that a different individual was served or explain precisely what counsel meant by the error. This publication does not infer identity from the name alone or treat the defense description as a court finding.[12]

On November 13, counsel filed entry 13, a motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. Justia lists a supporting memorandum, a declaration of Ryan Matthew Burke, a declaration of counsel and exhibits among the attachments. The declarations' existence is verified by the docket; their substantive testimony was not available as free text or PDFs in the sources reviewed. No particular statement about Illinois contacts, contracts, residence or responsibility for payments can safely be attributed to the declarant on that basis.[12]

No independently verified public statement by the promoter addressing the Echols and Mosley allegations was found. Statements Burke made about other BZR editions do not answer this complaint. The documented response here is the appearance and jurisdiction motion, subject to the limits of the available docket descriptions.[12]

The judgment and later orders

CourtListener's docket, last updated September 16, 2026, extends beyond Justia's November 2025 extract. It lists entry 15 on December 18, 2025, as an "Order on Motion to Dismiss/Lack of Jurisdiction." On January 20, 2026, it lists entry 18, "Order," and entry 19, "Judgment - AO450." The presence of a judgment is verified. Its beneficiary, grounds and effect on particular defendants are not.[13]

Date	Entry	What the free docket establishes
November 13, 2025	13	Jurisdiction-dismissal motion filed
December 18, 2025	15	Order on that motion entered
January 20, 2026	18 and 19	Order and AO450 judgment entered
February 17, 2026	24	Motion for miscellaneous relief filed
September 16, 2026	29 and 30	Order on miscellaneous-relief motion and a further order entered

The February 17 motion's purpose and the September orders' results are not disclosed by their generic docket labels. The free page supplies PACER purchase links for these documents, not their text. On the reviewed page, the complaint is the only document with a free RECAP PDF download. The supporting exhibits, defense declarations, December order, January judgment and later orders were not available there as free copies.[5] [13]

> **EDITOR'S NOTE** Limits of the public docket reproduction
>
> A judgment entry is not proof that the plaintiffs won $5,301,854.05. Nor does the label "Order on Motion to Dismiss/Lack of Jurisdiction" show that the motion was granted or denied. The operative documents must be read before stating either result.[13]

What remains unresolved

The missing orders and judgment are the principal procedural gap: whether dismissal occurred, its grounds, its scope and the effect of the later motions remain unverified. The underlying contracts, invoices, exhibits, bank reconciliation, venue receipt and cease-and-desist email were also unavailable for independent verification. The April 8 repayment promise remains an allegation. The complaint is linked at its original archival source but is not re-hosted here because it contains private residential and financial data; this chapter omits those details.[1] [5] [13]

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Verified complaint, Echols et al. v. Burke et al., N.D. Ill. No. 1:25-cv-06604, docket entry 1, PDF pp. 1–5 (June 13, 2025), especially verification, p. 4 — original RECAP PDF. External, unredacted document; not re-hosted.
2. Akeeile Harris, "Rap Sensation Sexyy Red Set to Headline BZR Weekend at Sabina Park," Kaboom Magazine (Mar. 30, 2025), lineup and date — article; Kyle Denis, "Cardi B Will Headline a Caribbean Stadium for the First Time at BZR WKND Jamaica 2026," Billboard (Aug. 14, 2026), paragraph on the 2025 cancellation — article.
3. Verified complaint, docket entry 1, PDF pp. 1–2, paragraphs 1–8 — original RECAP PDF.
4. Verified complaint, docket entry 1, PDF p. 2, paragraphs 9–11 — original RECAP PDF.

5. CourtListener, Echols v. Burke, entry 1 and attachment 1, “Notice of Filing of Complaint and Supporting Exhibits”; free-download availability checked Nov. 11, 2026 — docket.
6. Yasmine Peru, “Chris Brown ‘super excited’ to perform in Jamaica at Bizarre Weekend,” The Gleaner (July 16, 2023), paragraph beginning “Burke is part of a conglomerate” — article.
7. Verified complaint, docket entry 1, PDF p. 2, paragraph 12 — original RECAP PDF. Total independently added from the four alleged sums.
8. Verified complaint, docket entry 1, PDF pp. 3–4, counts I–IV, damages, equitable relief and prayer — original RECAP PDF.
9. Verified complaint, docket entry 1, PDF p. 2, paragraphs 13–16 — original RECAP PDF.
10. Justia, Echols et al. v. Burke et al., case classification and complaint entry — docket reproduction.
11. Justia docket reproduction, entries 7 (July 1), 8 (Aug. 25), 9 (Sept. 18) and 10 (Oct. 3, 2025), including the September order’s notice and mailing instructions — docket.
12. Justia docket reproduction, entries 11–12 (Oct. 23, 2025) and 13 (Nov. 13, 2025), appearance language, attempted-service report and motion attachments — docket.
13. CourtListener, Echols v. Burke, entries 13, 15, 18–19, 24 and 29–30; last updated Sept. 16, 2026; checked Nov. 11, 2026 — docket. Docket labels verified; underlying orders and judgment not available as free RECAP downloads on the reviewed page.

CHAPTER 12 · CONCERTS, JAMAICA

BZR WKND Jamaica, edition by edition

Contemporary reports confirm the Chris Brown debut, record later postponements and cancellation, and name different partners across the advertised editions.

BZR WKND's first Jamaican edition ended with Chris Brown performing at the National Stadium on the night of August 27, 2023. That completed concert is documented by contemporary reporting, not merely by an announcement. The later editions have a less complete record: a July 2024 postponement citing Hurricane Beryl, an advertised April 2025 Carnival show later reported canceled for weather, and an October 2026 concert postponed after Cardi B withdrew. The same event name does not make their lineups, partners or outcomes interchangeable.[1] [2] [3]

The editions at a glance

The table separates scheduled dates from verified performances. For 2024, a later Billboard account refers to a staging with Spice, Masicka and SQUASH, but the contemporary postponement report and a March 2025 account do not establish when such a replacement event occurred. That inconsistency remains unresolved rather than being converted into a confirmed concert date.[2] [3] [4]

Edition	Announced dates	Main venue	Named headline or leading acts	Recorded outcome and sources
2023 debut	August 25–27; main concert August 27	National Stadium, Kingston; parties at other venues	Chris Brown & Friends; advertised supporting acts included Sean Kingston, Teejay and Ding Dong	Main concert held; Brown performed after midnight into August 28. Contemporary Observer review; Gleaner launch interview.[1] [5]
2024 return	July 26–28; finale planned July 28	National Stadium in the announcement	International headliner not named in the reviewed April announcement; Billboard later names Spice, Masicka and SQUASH	Postponed after Beryl, with an autumn date promised. Later staging not independently verified; reports conflict.[2] [3] [6]
2025 Carnival Edition	April 26	Sabina Park, Kingston	Sexyy Red, Shenseea, Dexta Daps; additional soca acts announced	Billboard retrospectively reports cancellation for inclement weather. A separate Illinois civil complaint concerns alleged project payments. [3] [4] [7]
2026	October 16–19; main concert October 18; replacement concert announced for December 20	National Stadium for the original concert; replacement booking not established here	Cardi B & Friends; later additions included Keyshia Cole and Jamaican acts	Cardi B withdrew October 8; main concert postponed. Live event site advertises December 19–20 with updated lineup to be announced. See the 2026 chapter.[8] [9] [10]

2023: the Jamaican debut

The July launch described BZR as a Miami-origin weekend being brought to Jamaica for the first time. In The Gleaner's July 16 interview, Ryan Burke was described as a record executive, producer, talent manager and promoter. He said the choice of Chris Brown followed conversations with

promoters and consumers about whom they wanted to see. Burke told the paper that Brown was excited about the show and that the organizers were working with their own production team and Brown's team on the experience.[5]

The advertised finale was "Chris Brown and Friends," a stop on the Under the Influence tour at the National Stadium on Sunday, August 27. The initial advertised friends included Sean Kingston, Teejay, Ding Dong, Byron Messia and Davo, with surprise guests left unnamed. Radio Jamaica later reported that Aidonia and Byron Messia had been added to the lineup. These are accounts of the advertised program, not proof that every announced performer completed a set.[5] [11]

The weekend itself was wider than the stadium show. The Gleaner's launch account listed five events across August 25–27: an invitation event at the AC Hotel, Memba Dis at Hope Gardens, a Port Royal brunch, Indigo at Hope Gardens and the National Stadium concert. Later publicity described the brunch as Rise & Toast, with Jada Kingdom, and Indigo with Walshy Fire. These accompanying events help explain why organizers' audience projections were sometimes expressed for the whole weekend rather than for a single concert.[5] [12]

The Gleaner named VEW Live, Solid Agency, Burke Bodley and UCA, expanded as Universal Creative Agency, among the partners. The Observer's July 14 launch report and its August 29 review used a somewhat different list: Solid Agency, Burke Bodley, VEW Live LLC + PLXYBOY, and Jay Upscale. The lists overlap but are not identical. Neither article supplies a signed partnership agreement, revenue allocation or statement that Ryan Burke personally owned each named business.[1] [5] [13]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Ryan Burke, reported by The Gleaner, July 16, 2023
>
> Burke said the organizers were working closely with their production team and Chris Brown's production team. Asked about ticket prices, he gave tiers of "US$45, $75, $175, $275, $400 all the way up" and promised "there is no bad seat in the house."[5]

Ticket prices and the suite debate

The starting price was consistently reported as US$45 for the bleachers. The highest published figure was less consistent. The Observer's launch story described early-bird prices extending to US$15,000 for limited Sky VEW suites; The Star's July 17 article gave a range up to US$10,000. Later coverage described suites costing approximately J$1.5 million. These reports should not be treated as a single, audited ticket-price schedule.[13] [14] [12]

The expensive offer was a group package, not simply one ordinary admission seat. Caribbean National Weekly described a Skyview suite package with 12 all-inclusive Ultra VIP concert tickets and 12 VIP passes to the accompanying parties. It also described parking passes, express entry, a hostess, private security, bottles and food and bathroom access. That context matters when comparing the suite price with the US$45 bleacher admission. The sources do not establish the final price paid by every suite purchaser.[15]

On August 3, DancehallMag reported that all 12 Sky VEW suites had sold, citing a release from Solid Agency. The same report said tier-two tickets and cabanas were still available. A sold-out suite category is not itself evidence that every section of the stadium was sold out at that point. Billboard would later describe the debut as sold out, but no box-office ledger or stadium turnstile count was supplied in these reports.[12] [3]

The suite prices generated social-media ridicule and an unusual accompanying news story: concert loans. The Star reported that E-Loan Microfinancing was offering J$100,000 loans with 12 months to repay and J$1.5 million loans with four years to repay. Its managing director described the offer as a response to demand for leisure borrowing. This was a lender's business offer associated with the concert, not evidence that the BZR organizers themselves extended credit or required buyers to borrow.[14]

Caribbean National Weekly's later account likewise discussed the loan offer and the online price debate. Neither that report nor The Star's article provides a verified number of people who actually borrowed for BZR, their final borrowing costs or the proportion of concert tickets financed that way. The loan coverage documents the public reaction to premium pricing without establishing those wider financial effects.[14] [15]

Projections and the crowd actually reported

The launch coverage carried different projections. The Observer said 45,000 patrons were expected. The Gleaner quoted a projection of more than 47,000 over 48 hours. By August, a release reported by DancehallMag projected more than 50,000 across five events over 72 hours. The figures come from different dates and descriptions of the event period; they are not three independent counts of the stadium audience.[13] [5] [12]

Radio Jamaica's August 2 story repeated an expectation of more than 45,000 patrons. Its wording, like the launch reports, was prospective. The Observer's post-show review said "thousands" filed into the National Stadium and described occupied bleachers, grandstands, VIP and VVIP sections. Billboard's 2026 retrospective called the 2023 debut sold out. Those accounts support a large, completed event, but do not verify an exact attendance number or the economic projections made beforehand.[11] [1] [3]

> **PRESS REPORT** Jamaica Observer, August 29, 2023
>
> Chris Brown performed for just under two hours at the National Stadium. He appeared minutes after midnight, and the show ended minutes after 2 a.m. on Monday.[1]

The contemporary review gives the clearest performance record. It describes Brown's harness-assisted entrance, choreography, graphics and songs from different periods of his career. It also reports a surprise appearance by Valiant during Brown's set. Its account of the music and the audience was favorable, and patrons interviewed afterward praised the performance. A dossier of disputes should retain that reporting rather than imply that the inaugural headliner failed to appear. [1]

Admission delays and vendor complaints

There was also a documented problem before the performance. In an August 27 post, The Gleaner reported that early patrons were denied access ahead of the concert and that vendors complained of missed sales opportunities as police tried to control the crowd. The post credited video reporting to Nathaniel Stewart. It does not state a verified duration for the delay or provide an organizer's explanation for it.[16]

The Gleaner's launch story had advertised the stadium event from 4 p.m. to midnight. The Observer's review places Brown's own entrance after midnight and the conclusion after 2 a.m. Those are different kinds of times: the advertised event window and the observed headliner's set. They establish that the finale ran beyond the published window. They do not establish a promised individual set time, an intentional delay or the cause of the earlier admission problem.[5] [1]

Pre-event security arrangements were separately reported. Radio Jamaica described an Instagram notice from the Jamaica Constabulary Force telling licensed firearm holders that storage would be available at the Firearm Licensing Authority, not at the stadium. That was a security instruction for the concert. It is not evidence that a weapons incident occurred at BZR and should not be used to suggest one.[17]

The admission complaint and favorable performance review address different parts of the night. Both can be accurate. The available sources do not quantify the vendors' lost sales, identify a compensation agreement for them or establish a court finding over the entry arrangements. No verified 2023 patron-refund accounting was found in the sources reviewed.[16]

A supplier claim reported in 2024 concerned the 2023 show

A supplier dispute became public the following year, but it related to supplies for the August 2023 Chris Brown concert. On September 7, 2024, The Gleaner reported that Hardware and Lumber had filed a Supreme Court claim on August 2 against Sharon Burke and Solid View Limited. The supplier alleged an unpaid balance of J$5,687,827.82 and administrative or recovery charges of J$1,137,585.56, as well as interest. These were amounts claimed, not a verified judgment.[18]

The reported particulars alleged that Sharon Burke identified herself as the customer for Solid View, sought urgent delivery of supplies shortly before the concert and personally guaranteed payment. The supplier said the transaction was supposed to be cash-on-delivery and that goods were supplied without complete payment. The Gleaner described a later formal demand and unsuccessful efforts to settle the matter.[18]

> **PARTY ALLEGATION** Hardware and Lumber's claim, reported by The Gleaner, September 7, 2024
>
> The supplier alleged unpaid charges for materials used for the Chris Brown and Friends concert. The defendants identified by the report were Sharon Burke and Solid View Limited, not Ryan Burke or VEW Live.[18]

The distinction between the two promoters is essential. Sharon Burke appeared in the earlier event reporting in connection with Solid Agency. The supplier article named her and Solid View as the defendants. It does not permit this publication to add Ryan Burke as a debtor, assign him the claimed balance or describe the lawsuit as a judgment against his companies.[13] [18]

On September 10, The Gleaner published Sharon Burke's denial. She said the goods were purchased by Solid View, that she was a director but not the owner, and that the company had been formed for the event. Her statement said the transaction was between two companies. Her lawyer, Isat Buchanan, questioned why she was named personally and said she had not yet been personally served.[19]

> **DISPUTED ACCOUNT** Sharon Burke's response, reported by The Gleaner, September 10, 2024
>
> Sharon Burke denied personal responsibility for the supplier transaction and said Solid View was the purchaser. Her lawyer said proof would be required and disputed the allegation of a personal payment by her.[19]

No signed claim, case number, judgment or settlement in that Jamaican supplier matter was independently retrieved for this chapter. The reporting supports an attributed dispute and a reported filing. It does not establish the current debt or final liability of either reported defendant. Its appearance in September 2024 must not be mistaken for a vendor dispute arising from a completed 2024 BZR edition.[18] [19]

2024: a return announced, then postponed

The Observer's April 27, 2024 announcement said VEW Live would bring BZR back from July 26–28 at the National Stadium. It described two premium party events on Friday and Saturday, followed by a concert finale on Sunday, July 28. The article quoted VEW Live and the TGE Consulting team and directed readers to BZR's Instagram for further details. It did not identify the promised international headliner.[6]

A joint Instagram post by Buzzz Caribbean Lifestyle and BZR, dated April 24, provided more partner names. Its caption described VEW Live and PLXYBOY as organizers partnering with Eyes Above Water, associated there with Sean Kingston, UCA and TGE Consulting Ltd. It identified Ryan Burke as BZR's president and producer. This is a published promotional description; it does not establish the contractual allocation of production costs or the legal obligations of each partner.[20]

The partner list differs from the 2023 reporting. Solid Agency, Burke Bodley and Jay Upscale were named in the debut reports, while the retrieved 2024 caption highlighted Eyes Above Water and TGE. That change is a fact about the publicity. Without agreements or a statement explaining the transition, it would be speculation to describe why partners changed or to assume that every earlier partner remained responsible for the new edition.[13] [20]

On July 19, The Star reported that organizers had announced a postponement the previous day because of Hurricane Beryl's damage in Jamaica. Their statement said they were directing attention to relief efforts and would reschedule BZR to "a later date this autumn." It also said the decision was intended to protect attendees, staff and the local community.[2]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Organizer release reported by Jamaica Star, July 19, 2024
>
> "After witnessing the aftermath of Hurricane Beryl, which devastated several parts of Jamaica, we have decided to direct our focus on relief efforts. Thus, we are rescheduling BZR WKND Jamaica 2024 to a later date this autumn."[2]

The release promised cooperation with local organizations and authorities, including resources, manpower and financial support for recovery. It also promised additions to the future festival experience. The report verifies those announcements. It does not contain receipts for relief spending, identify completed restoration work or establish that the replacement production was mounted.[2]

Refunds and the missing replacement date

Organizers said purchased tickets would remain valid for the new date. Patrons unable to attend were directed to their ticket vendors for a full refund. The Star said further details of the new date and additions would be announced later. It gave neither a fixed replacement date nor a deadline by which each refund would be paid.[2]

This distinction leaves two separate gaps. One is what happened to the event: no independently verified autumn date or post-show account was located in the reviewed sources. The other is what happened to ticket payments: the refund offer is documented, but records showing how many refunds were requested, paid or still outstanding were not found. The absence of that accounting does not establish that no one was refunded.[2]

Billboard's August 2026 preview creates an unresolved complication. It states that Spice, Masicka and SQUASH "anchored the fest's 2024 staging." That is a published retrospective assertion, but the article gives no date or venue for the staging it describes. By contrast, Kaboom Magazine's March 30, 2025 Carnival announcement says BZR's last Jamaican staging took place in 2023. Neither article explains the discrepancy.[3] [4]

> **DISPUTED ACCOUNT** Billboard, August 14, 2026; Kaboom Magazine, March 30, 2025
>
> Billboard refers to a 2024 staging led by Spice, Masicka and SQUASH. Kaboom says the last staging before the announced 2025 event was in 2023. A dated replacement-event record has not been verified.[3] [4]

Accordingly, this chapter records the July postponement as confirmed by contemporary reporting and the later lineup description as Billboard's account. It does not claim that the original July 26–28 program occurred, nor that a later edition definitely did not occur. A dated program, venue confirmation or contemporaneous review would be needed to settle the chronology.

No independently verified 2024 artist-payment dispute or vendor lawsuit was located that could be attributed to that edition. A Prism Marketing Consultants item sometimes described as "threatened BZR litigation" is a November 2026 report of the organizers' intended action against Cardi B. It is not a report that Prism threatened to sue BZR over 2024 services. It is kept with the later dispute rather than converted into an earlier adverse claim.[21]

2025: the Carnival Edition at Sabina Park

On March 30, 2025, Kaboom Magazine reported the organizers' announcement of a Carnival Saturday show at Sabina Park on April 26. Sexyy Red was the advertised headliner, with Shenseea and Dexta Daps. The announced lineup also included Trinidadian soca performers Nailah Blackman, Yung Bredda and Lady Lava. The venue and Carnival branding distinguished the proposed event from the National Stadium summer weekend advertised in 2024.[4]

The announcement described Sexyy Red's appearance as a Jamaican debut. It also recalled the 2023 Chris Brown event, rather than providing a record of a 2024 replacement show. Its lineup is evidence of what organizers said they intended to present. It is not a performance review, artist contract or confirmation that each fee had been received.[4]

Billboard later reported that BZR WKND 2025 was "ultimately canceled due to inclement weather" and named Sexyy Red, Shenseea and Dexta Daps as its intended leading acts. That supplies an attributed cancellation explanation, but it is retrospective reporting from August 2026. No contemporaneous cancellation notice, venue weather report or detailed refund reconciliation was independently retrieved for this chapter.[3]

> **PRESS REPORT** Billboard, August 14, 2026
>
> The 2025 edition was reported canceled for inclement weather. The article identifies the proposed lineup but does not set out ticket-refund totals or the payments disputed in the Illinois lawsuit.[3]

A separate set of financial allegations appears in Hugh Echols and John Mosley's June 13, 2025 verified complaint in Illinois. The plaintiffs allege that contracts for "BZR WKND Jamaica Carnival Edition 2025" bore the letterheads of VEW Live, Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Universal Creative Agency. They list payments of $15,645.95 on February 14, $150,000 on March 15, $62,500 on March 24 and $70,000 on April 4. The four amounts add to $298,145.95.[7]

The plaintiffs also allege an undocumented wire to Sabina Park, a cease-and-desist communication and a promise to return their money on April 8. These alleged events precede the advertised April 26 show. The complaint is therefore not a documented ticket-refund claim by ordinary patrons after a weather cancellation. It concerns their asserted project contributions, contractual representations and handling of payments.[7]

The difference matters for both chronology and amounts. Billboard's weather explanation does not answer the complaint's earlier allegations. Conversely, a filed civil complaint does not establish that the weather explanation was false. No judicial finding in the freely available materials resolves the relationship between the financial dispute and the ultimate cancellation.[3] [7]

The Illinois docket records an October 2025 appearance for "Putative Defendant Ryan Matthew Burke, erroneously sued as 'Ryan Burke'," followed by a jurisdiction-dismissal motion. It later records a January 20, 2026 judgment and September 2026 orders, but their operative terms were not freely available for review. Those facts, the plaintiffs' four counts and their damages request are covered in Echols & Mosley v. Burke. This edition history does not describe the plaintiffs as having won their claim.[22]

No independent 2025 ticket-refund accounting was verified. The complaint's alleged project payments should not be added to an assumed ticket-refund balance, and the remedies requested there should not be treated as compensation already recovered. Ticketing records, a cancellation release and the operative court documents remain necessary to complete the financial record of the Carnival Edition.[7] [22]

Companies and partners named across the editions

The source descriptions below preserve the distinction between a news report's partner list, a pleading's named defendants and a company registry. Being named in publicity does not establish liability for another partner's debts. Nor does a recurring brand name prove that a new edition used the same contracting entity.

Edition	Companies or partners named	What the source actually establishes
2023	VEW Live; Solid Agency; Burke Bodley; UCA; PLXYBOY; Jay Upscale	Overlapping partner and organizer lists in Gleaner and Observer coverage. A later supplier report separately names Solid View Limited.[5] [13] [18]
2024	VEW Live; PLXYBOY; Eyes Above Water; UCA; TGE Consulting Ltd	Names in the promotional caption and Observer announcement; no reviewed partnership contract.[20] [6]
2025	VEW Live LLC; Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC; Universal Creative Agency Inc; Ryan Burke	Entities and individual named in the Illinois complaint; alleged letterheads and payment recipients, not an adjudicated ownership structure.[7]
2026	Ryan Burke and Gramps Morgan as organizers; Konnect Media at the launch; V12 Group in the event site's statement	Public descriptions and a self-published statement. Florida's V12 record separately lists Ryan Burke as an authorized member and Roy Morgan as registered agent.[3] [23] [10] [24]

V12 Group LLC was filed in Florida on March 2, 2026, under document number L26000124570. The reviewed record shows active status, Roy Morgan as registered agent and Ryan Burke with the title AMBR. Its formation date falls after the earlier editions. Nothing in that record makes it the contracting party for the 2023, 2024 or 2025 events. The public company record and BZR's 2026 statement establish a present connection, not retroactive responsibility.[24] [10]

The event's 2026 refund statement is signed "V12 Group and the BZR WKND Jamaica Team." Its footer also uses the company name with a typographical error. The signed statement is the clearer public connection between the event branding and V12. Full contracts would still be needed to identify which legal entity undertook each artist, venue, ticketing and supplier obligation. Further corporate records are discussed in the companies chapter.[10]

2026 in brief: announcement, withdrawal and postponement

Billboard announced Cardi B on August 14 for an October 18 National Stadium concert within an October 16–19 weekend. Government officials spoke at the August 26 launch: Jamaica Information Service reported remarks by Olivia Grange and Delano Seiveright and a projection of more than 50,000 patrons across four days. Those were promotional expectations, not achieved attendance or proof of a public payment guarantee.[3] [8]

Government attendance is documented, but the Ministry of Culture later denied any commitment or payment toward appearance or other fees and described the concert as a private commercial engagement. A specific Jamaica Tourist Board financing agreement or artist-fee undertaking was not verified. The official launch coverage should not be erased by the later denial, and it should not be inflated into financial sponsorship.[8] [25]

Cardi B's team announced her withdrawal on October 8. Organizers moved the concert to December 20 and offered refunds or continued ticket validity. DancehallMag and Caribbean National Weekly reported those terms; BZR's live site now advertises December 19–20 and says an updated lineup will be announced. It does not confirm Cardi B as the replacement headliner.[9] [26] [10]

On November 3, the Observer reported patrons still waiting for refunds and said its efforts to contact organizers were unsuccessful. On November 4, organizers apologized and said all outstanding refunds had been processed and issued, while allowing further bank-processing time. This verifies the complaint and subsequent response, not receipt by every purchaser.[27]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Ryan Burke, CVM interview reported November 10, 2026
>
> Burke apologized to patrons and said Cardi B had been paid in full. Cardi B disputed his payment account and alleged missed production obligations in an Instagram Live response reported by DancehallMag. Neither account is treated here as a judicial determination.[28]

The fee dispute, artist response, refund chronology and litigation threats are examined in the Cardi B cancellation chapter. TVJ's Entertainment Report also distinguished the older team from the new staging, reporting that Sharon Burke had publicly said she was not involved in 2026. The debut's partner list should therefore not be carried forward wholesale.[29]

What remains unresolved

Exact 2023 attendance and vendor-loss totals are not verified. The supplier suit reported in 2024 lacks an independently retrieved case number and disposition. The 2024 replacement date and staging remain unresolved because the reports conflict; full refund and relief-spending accounts were not found. For 2025, the contemporaneous cancellation notice, ticket-refund record and disputed project-payment documentation are missing. Across editions, the contracts allocating responsibilities among partners were unavailable. A verified JTB funding undertaking, complete 2026 refund reconciliation and confirmed replacement lineup or venue booking have not been established here. The 2026 artist dispute remains separately attributed in Chapter 13.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Kediesha Perry, “Chris Brown delivers on his influence,” Jamaica Observer (Aug. 29, 2023), entrance time, set duration, conclusion and organizer list — review.
2. “BZR WKND postponed,” Jamaica Star (July 19, 2024), organizer release, original dates, autumn promise and refund instructions — article.
3. Kyle Denis, “Cardi B Will Headline a Caribbean Stadium for the First Time at BZR WKND Jamaica 2026,” Billboard (Aug. 14, 2026), announcement, organizer statement and retrospective paragraph on 2023–2025 — article.
4. Akeeile Harris, “Rap Sensation Sexyy Red Set to Headline BZR Weekend at Sabina Park,” Kaboom Magazine (Mar. 30, 2025), April 26 venue and lineup; final paragraph says last staging was in 2023 — article.
5. Yasmine Peru, “Chris Brown ‘super excited’ to perform in Jamaica at Bizarre Weekend,” The Gleaner (July 16, 2023), Burke interview, event program, ticket tiers, partners and projection — article.
6. “BZR WKND is back!,” Jamaica Observer (Apr. 27, 2024), July dates, National Stadium, party/finale program and VEW Live/TGE statement — article.
7. Verified complaint, Echols et al. v. Burke et al., N.D. Ill. No. 1:25-cv-06604, docket entry 1 (June 13, 2025), PDF p. 2, paragraphs 9–16; pp. 3–4, relief requested — original RECAP PDF. External unredacted filing; not re-hosted because it contains private data. Allegations only.
8. Ainsworth Morris, “Thousands of Patrons Expected at BZR Weekend in October,” Jamaica Information Service (Aug. 27, 2026), August 26 launch, officials’ remarks and four-day projection — official report.
9. Claude Mills, “BZR WKND moves to December after Cardi B withdrawal,” DancehallMag (Oct. 13, 2026), postponement statement and absence of a confirmed replacement Cardi B appearance — article.
10. BZR WKND event website, visible postponement, lineup and refund statement, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — promoter site. December dates and lineup TBA are visible; older title/metadata still use Cardi B and a July date and are not treated as current confirmation.
11. “Byron Messia, Aidonia added to Chris Brown and Friends concert,” Radio Jamaica News (Aug. 2, 2023), lineup and expected crowd — report.
12. Dani Mallick, “J$1.5 Million ‘Sky VEW’ Suites For Jamaican Chris Brown Concert Sold Out, Aidonia And Byron Messia Added To Lineup,” DancehallMag (Aug. 3, 2023), Solid Agency release, suite count, other availability and weekend projection — article.
13. Kediesha Perry, “Chris Brown’s ‘Influence’ booked,” Jamaica Observer (July 14, 2023), ticket range, partner names, Burke’s production statement and 45,000 projection — article.
14. Yasmine Peru, “Big loans for Chris Brown concert,” Jamaica Star (July 17, 2023), ticket range and E-Loan offers — article.
15. Nicanor Gordon, “Fans take out loans to afford tickets to Chris Brown’s concert in Jamaica,” Caribbean National Weekly (Aug. 14, 2023), sections on suite inclusions, ticket prices and lending — article. Cited for concert-package and loan reporting only.
16. The Gleaner, public X post (Aug. 27, 2023), “Early patrons were denied access,” video credited to Nathaniel Stewart — post.
17. Prince Moore, “No weapons allowed at Chris Brown concert,” Radio Jamaica News (Aug. 24, 2023), reporting JCF’s Instagram security notice — article.
18. Tanesha Mundle, “Promoter Sharon Burke sued for $6m,” The Gleaner (Sept. 7, 2024), reported August 2 Supreme Court filing, named defendants and claimed sums for 2023 concert supplies — article. Underlying filing and disposition not independently retrieved; Ryan Burke is not named as a defendant in this report.
19. Tanesha Mundle, “Sharon Burke denies doing business with H&L,” The Gleaner (Sept. 10, 2024), her statement and Isat Buchanan’s response — article.
20. Buzzz Caribbean Lifestyle and BZR WKND, joint Instagram post (Apr. 24, 2024), caption naming 2024 organizers and partners and describing Ryan Burke as president and producer — post. Retrieved caption; promotional statement, not a contract.
21. Shadow, “Millions at Stake! BZR WKND to Sue Cardi B After Paying Rapper in Full for Cancelled Jamaican Concert,” Prism Marketing Consultants (Nov. 9, 2026), reported organizer’s legal threat — article. The speaker is the organizer; Prism is the publisher, not a verified claimant against BZR.
22. Justia, Echols et al. v. Burke et al., entries 11–13 (Oct. 23 and Nov. 13, 2025) — docket; CourtListener, entries 18–19 and 29–30 (Jan. 20 and Sept. 16, 2026) — later docket. Underlying judgment and later orders not freely available on the reviewed page.

23. Shereita Grizzle, “From Chris Brown to Cardi B: BZR bets big on Kingston,” Jamaica Observer (Aug. 27, 2026), launch remarks, Gramps Morgan and Konnect Media’s Kaylia Williams — article.

24. Florida Division of Corporations, V12 Group LLC, document L26000124570, formation Mar. 2, 2026, active status and authorized-person/agent fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — entity record.

25. “No Gov’t involvement in BZR concert, says Grange,” The Gleaner (Nov. 10, 2026), Ministry denial of commitment or payments toward fees — article.

26. Joanne Clark, “BZR WKND postponed to December as organizers offer refunds, free tickets,” Caribbean National Weekly (Oct. 14, 2026), October 8 withdrawal and refund/continued-ticket terms — article.

27. “BZR WKND ticket buyers still waiting on refund weeks after organisers pledged money back,” Jamaica Observer (Nov. 3, 2026), patrons’ complaints and unsuccessful comment request — article; “All BZR WKND refunds now issued, organisers say” (Nov. 4, 2026), social-media response and banking qualification — article.

28. “BZR Weekend Sues Cardi B; Patrons Being Reimbursed,” CVM Television (Nov. 10, 2026), Burke interview — report; “Cardi B Dares BZR Promoter Ryan Burke to Sue, Disputes $2.5 Million Payment Claim,” DancehallMag (Nov. 11, 2026), reported Instagram Live response — article. Litigation intent, not a verified filed case.

29. Television Jamaica, “Cardi B Cancels…BZR Weekend In Doubt | Entertainment Report” (2026), transcript section discussing Sharon Burke’s statement of noninvolvement in the new staging — broadcast video. Exact upload date not independently verified; transcript retrieved Nov. 11, 2026.

CHAPTER 13 · JAMAICA, DISPUTED CONCERT BOOKING

The 2026 Cardi B cancellation: both accounts

A stadium booking became a dispute over payments, production deadlines and refunds, with both sides threatening legal action.

Cardi B was announced on August 14, 2026 as the October 18 headliner of BZR WKND Jamaica at Kingston's National Stadium. Her representatives confirmed her withdrawal on October 8. By November 11, promoter Ryan Burke said she had been paid US$2.5 million in full and that he intended to recover the money through litigation. Cardi B disputed that amount, alleged missed production-payment deadlines and threatened to sue in response. Ticket buyers had a separate question: whether the refunds promised after the postponement had reached their accounts. These are disputed public accounts, not findings in a Cardi B–BZR court case.[1] [2] [3] [4]

> **DISPUTED ACCOUNT** Burke's CVM interview and Cardi B's reported responses, November 9–11, 2026
>
> Burke said, "She was paid in full." Cardi B said, "You never sent me US$2.5 million." Neither account has been tested in a court proceeding located by this publication as of November 11, 2026.[3] [5]

What was announced in August

Billboard's August 14 announcement described "Cardi B & Friends" as the marquee event of a four-day programme running October 16–19. Early-bird tickets were scheduled to go on sale August 21. The proposed sequence was a welcome party, a beach party, Cardi B's headlining performance and a farewell celebration. The announcement identified Burke and Roy "Gramps" Morgan as organisers and quoted their ambition to build on BZR's inaugural event. It was a public announcement of a forthcoming appearance, not publication of the artist contract or payment schedule.[1]

Burke and Morgan's joint statement said: "Following the incredible success of our inaugural event, we knew BZR WKND had to return even bigger." Billboard also reported that the 2023 debut, headlined by Chris Brown, had sold out. The earlier BZR editions are addressed in the BZR WKND chapter. For the 2026 dispute, the relevant point is the advertised October programme and its named headliner, not whether the earlier events proved that every contractual requirement for this one had been met.[1]

A media launch followed at the AC Hotel Kingston on August 26. A Jamaica Information Service report published August 27 described attendance by Culture Minister Olivia Grange and Minister of State Delano Seiveright. Grange projected more than 50,000 patrons across the four days. JIS reported that tier-one tickets had sold out and tier-two sales were due to begin August 28. Those were launch-period statements and projections, not an independently audited count of tickets sold or people who eventually attended.[6]

The launch also produced artist-side public support. In its subsequent withdrawal report, the Gleaner recalled manager Kelvin Santiago saying: “She’s very excited. It’s her first stadium show that she’s ever done and her first show here. So, we’re excited. Can’t wait.” This is evidence of what was said at the launch. It does not resolve which payments were due, which were received, or whether the parties later complied with the agreement.[7]

On September 28, Billboard reported a fuller lineup: Spice as host, with Keyshia Cole, Malie Donn, Ding Dong, Stalk Ashley, Shaneil Muir and DJ MAC also expected to appear. It linked ticket information to Tikkets. This multi-artist advertising matters because Cardi B later said the booking had been presented to her as a festival but was subsequently treated, for production purposes, as her own concert. The published lineup confirms the event’s public presentation; it does not establish the private allocation of production expenses.[8] [4]

Dated chronology: August 14 to November 11

The chronology below separates an event’s reported date from the date an article appeared. It records dated developments established in the sources, rather than inventing entries for days on which no specific development was verified. The September 17 deadline belongs to Cardi B’s account; the October 19 date was the organisers’ promised start of refunds. Neither is an independently verified bank-processing event.[4] [9]

Date in 2026	Development and source status
August 14	Billboard announced Cardi B for October 18 at the National Stadium, within an October 16–19 BZR programme. Early-bird sales were announced for August 21.[1]
August 21	Announced opening date for early-bird sales. The August 14 article establishes the planned date, not a transaction-by-transaction sales record.[1]
August 26	AC Hotel Kingston launch, attended by Grange and Seiveright, according to the next day’s JIS report.[6]
August 27	JIS published the launch report, including a projection of more than 50,000 patrons across four days and a report that tier-one tickets were sold out.[6]
August 28	JIS gave this as the intended start of tier-two sales. It is an announced sales date.[6]
September 17	Cardi B later identified this as the deadline for a further payment needed for production. She alleged it was missed; no executed payment schedule was reviewed.[4] [10]
September 28	Billboard published the expanded lineup and linked Tikkets purchasing information.[8]
October 8	Cardi B’s representatives told Billboard she would not perform on October 18. Their statement directed event and ticket questions to organisers and gave no reason for withdrawal.[2] [7]
October 9	Cardi B apologised to Jamaican fans in a video and said she had waited for arrangements to be put in place. Organisers asked patrons for patience while they worked through developments.[11]
October 10	DancehallMag reported ticket sales suspended until further notice, quoting a notice on the event website. Its report did not yet contain a refund arrangement.[12]
October 12	National Stadium booking cancelled, according to Independence Park Limited officials cited by World Music Views in its October 13 report.[13]
October 13	Organisers announced the marquee concert’s postponement to December 20, continued validity of existing tickets and a refund-request route. Cardi B was not confirmed for the replacement date.[14]
October 14	Caribbean National Weekly published the refund instructions and a complimentary-ticket offer for qualifying patrons with documented travel or accommodation bookings.[15]

Date in 2026	Development and source status
October 16–19	Originally advertised festival dates. Cardi B's October 18 performance did not take place; the marquee event had already been postponed.[1] [14]
October 19	Promised date for initiating refunds, with funds expected to reflect within three to seven business days depending on the financial institution. This records the promise, not proof all refunds began that day.[9]
November 3	The Observer reported patrons still awaiting money or acknowledgement. An attorney announced intended chargeback and regulatory complaints. The newspaper said its efforts to obtain organiser comment were unsuccessful.[16]
November 4	Organisers said all outstanding refunds had been "processed and issued," while allowing additional bank-processing time.[17]
November 9	The Star and World Music Views reported Burke's CVM lawsuit threat and Cardi B's response. Complex later specifically dated both the CVM broadcast and her Instagram Live response to Monday, November 9.[18] [10] [4]
November 10	CVM published its interview article, including the five-transfer claim. The Ministry denied any government commitment or payment. Cardi B's agent and a further livestream response were reported as occurring Tuesday night.[3] [19] [20]
November 11	The Star published BZR's independent-funding statement. The Gleaner and Caribbean National Weekly reported the agent's denial, Cardi B's government apology and her refusal to return the deposit. No identifiable Cardi B–BZR complaint or docket was located in the limited checks described below.[5] [20] [21]

Two corrections prevent the dates from being collapsed. October 8 is the withdrawal date, even though the Gleaner's URL contains October 9: the page displays October 8 and an October 9 update. Similarly, the CVM article is dated November 10, but the Star's contemporaneous report and Complex's November 11 article place the interview on November 9. This chapter uses November 9 for the reported broadcast and November 10 for CVM's written publication.[7] [18] [4]

Withdrawal, ticket suspension and the stadium

The October 8 representatives' statement was definite about the performance: "Cardi B will not be performing at BZR WKND Jamaica on October 18, 2026." It thanked Jamaican fans, referred ticketing and event-status inquiries to organisers and said future performance information would come exclusively through Cardi B's official channels. Billboard said organisers had not returned its request for comment at publication. The statement did not identify a production deadline, explain payments or announce a replacement appearance.[2]

Cardi B supplied a limited explanation the following morning. The Observer quoted her saying she had "waited and I waited and I waited for things to get in place and together, but it didn't." DancehallMag reported her saying she could not discuss details because of contracts and that "it wasn't me." She also rejected speculation about low sales, saying she had heard more than 18,000 tickets were sold. That number remains her reported understanding, not a box-office total independently verified here.[11] [12]

The organisers' October 9 social-media statement acknowledged that fans and ticket holders wanted clarity. It said the team was "actively working through the latest developments" and would update the public when details were confirmed. That response should not be replaced with a claim that the organisers said nothing throughout the entire period. It was a response, though it did not settle whether the original concert would proceed or specify the eventual refund terms.[11]

DancehallMag's October 10 report then quoted the website suspension notice: "Due to circumstances beyond our control, we regret to inform you that ticket sales have been suspended until further notice." The article said there was no refund information in that notice. World Music Views subsequently reported that sales advertising had resumed by October 13, with packages still bearing Cardi-related labels. Its reporter described prices from US$79.99 to US$649.99. The later advertising is a dated observation by that publication, not proof that a particular patron made a purchase after withdrawal.[12] [13]

World Music Views also reported a separate operational development. Independence Park Limited officials told it the stadium booking had been cancelled Monday, October 12. The report did not reproduce a cancellation document, name the official giving the information or publish the booking contract. The date is therefore an attributed press report. It cannot establish why the venue arrangement ended, how much was paid for it, or whether a replacement venue had been secured.[13]

On October 13, organisers moved the concert to December 20. Their statement declared: "One thing is certain: We will not let you down. A show will happen!" Existing tickets were to remain valid and customers preferring a refund could request one. DancehallMag expressly noted that the statement did not confirm Cardi B's participation on the new date. The distinction is straightforward: the promoter announced a future show, not an artist-confirmed December Cardi B booking.[14]

The postponement statement also offered condolences following a death in Cardi B's family. DancehallMag said it did not explicitly connect that bereavement to her withdrawal. In November, Cardi B accused organisers of portraying her grandfather's death as the reason she cancelled and rejected that explanation. Her objection is part of the dispute. It should not alter the recorded wording of the October statement or become this publication's conclusion about what caused the withdrawal.[14] [4]

The published refund route and the patrons' accounts

Ticket sales were directed through Tikkets. Its refund-policy page identifies Kanoo Pays Jamaica as the service facilitating customers' ordering, payment and electronic receipt of tickets. It distinguishes that function from the merchant's responsibility for organising and hosting BZR. The event website likewise linked to the Tikkets event page and said tickets were available exclusively online through Tikkets. These are published descriptions of the transaction route, not findings about which entity ultimately bears any particular customer's legal claim.[22] [9]

There was a difference between the platform's standing policy and the later event-specific announcement. The Tikkets policy said ticket and merchandise sales were final, that transaction charges were non-refundable, and that no ticket refund would follow specified force-majeure events. The organisers subsequently offered refunds to people unable or unwilling to attend the December date. Both texts were accessible on November 11. No ruling was found deciding their interaction, whether processing fees were included in the offer or which terms governed an individual purchase.[22] [14]

The October instructions directed patrons to a designated Events Team Jamaica refund email channel at Kanoo Pays. DancehallMag and Caribbean National Weekly reproduced the address and said requests should include the purchaser's full name, purchase confirmation, order or transaction reference and the email used for the purchase. The public address is available in the linked reports and organiser notice; it is not reproduced here under this dossier's email-privacy rule. This identifies the published email route without exposing a ticket buyer's correspondence or private transaction reference.[14] [15] [9]

The organisers' notice promised refunds would be initiated beginning October 19 and should appear within three to seven business days, depending on the customer's financial institution. It also described a remedy for people who had booked travel or accommodation specifically to attend: a refund and a complimentary BZR ticket of equal or lesser value than the original ticket, on submission of valid ticket and travel or accommodation proof. The wording did not provide a clear schedule reimbursing airfare or hotel costs themselves. Caribbean National Weekly described the travel-proof benefit as eligibility for a complimentary ticket.[9] [15]

The difference matters for the practical record. A ticket refund, a free ticket to a future event and reimbursement of a hotel or flight are different remedies. The materials reviewed establish the first two as announced offers. They do not establish the amount of any travel-cost payment, the number of complimentary tickets actually delivered or a completed accounting for patrons who travelled. Nothing in the reports supplies a verified total of refund requests, refunds refused or funds still pending.[9] [15] [16]

> **PRESS REPORT** Jamaica Observer, November 3, 2026
>
> A patron who said she requested a refund on October 13 told the newspaper: "To date, I have not received any refund and no one has even acknowledged receipt of my email and sent any communication to me regarding this." Her name is withheld here.[16]

The Observer's November 3 report was not a claim that no one had received money. It said a few patrons reported refunds while others said they had neither been reimbursed nor told when processing would occur. One anonymous patron said: "I have not gotten my refund. I feel like I am being scammed and given the run and round with no actual solution in place to remedy the incident." That is the patron's account of the experience and suspicion, not a finding that a crime or deceptive practice occurred.[16]

An attorney who was herself seeking a refund said her initial request and follow-up had gone unanswered. She announced that she intended to initiate a bank chargeback, lodge complaints with the Consumer Affairs Commission and the Fair Trading Commission, and consider other legal remedies. The article reported intended steps. No filed regulatory complaint, bank decision, regulator's finding or resulting ticket-buyer lawsuit was independently verified by November 11.[16]

The attorney also questioned whether Cardi B had ever genuinely been secured. That question was an expression of her concern, not documentary proof that the booking was false. The August announcement, launch remarks and October withdrawal by the artist's representatives belong in the record alongside it. None publishes the executed contract, but the attorney's question cannot substitute for evidence about what the organisers and artist actually agreed.[16] [1] [7] [2]

The Observer said its efforts to reach the organisers for comment on November 3 "proved futile." Their response appeared the next day. In a social-media statement reported November 4, organisers apologised for the delay and attributed the backlog to unusually high refund-request and inquiry volumes at the ticketing platform. They said: "as of today, all outstanding refunds have been processed and issued," adding that financial institutions might take a few additional business days to show the funds.[16] [17]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Organisers' refund statement, reported November 4, 2026
>
> The organisers said all outstanding refunds had been processed and issued, apologised for the extended processing period and allowed additional time for banks to reflect the credits. This is their stated position, not an independent audit of each patron's receipt.[17]

Later reporting of Burke's interview said refunds had started and that everyone would be reimbursed, with the volume making the process lengthy. That language differs from the November 4 announcement that all outstanding refunds had already been issued. The reports do not explain whether Burke was describing an earlier stage, new requests or continuing processing. Without a request register and corresponding settlement records, the statements cannot be reconciled into a verified completion date.[5] [17]

Burke's account in the CVM interview

CVM's November 10 article opened with Burke's claim that more than US$2.5 million had been paid for Cardi B's appearance. It then said CVM News had been given copies of five transfers totalling US$2.5 million, which Burke said were sent directly to her. The article's introductory "more than" wording and its stated transfer total are not identical. The reported five-transfer total is US$2.5 million; no larger verified total can be extracted from the article.[3]

The interviewer asked whether Cardi B still had the money, whether it was sent directly to her and whether Burke could confirm receipt. Burke answered affirmatively and said: "Yes, we have receipts. She was paid in full." When asked whether he would get the money back, he answered: "I would hope so. Right now, we are pursuing legal action." CVM described a multimillion-dollar lawsuit intended to recover the money and said the cancellation had damaged the brand.[3]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Ryan Burke, CVM interview, written report November 10, 2026
>
> "We were hoping that Cardi B would have fulfilled her obligations and showed up for the country on October 18. After speaking with her team, they stated that they wanted to come to the make-up date, which was scheduled for December 20, but unfortunately that did not happen either."[3]

Burke's account also concerned notice. CVM reported that he learned the news "straight from a billboard," like everyone else. Its text uses the lower-case word; this chapter retains that wording rather than turning it into a claim about a particular physical advertisement. Cardi B later said lawyers had communicated daily and sent a withdrawal letter. No correspondence record was reviewed that would determine precisely when either side received notice or what it said.[3] [10]

Burke apologised publicly: "I want to apologise sincerely that things unfolded the way they did. We will come back bigger and better." He apologised to fans, sponsors and government, and to local performers including Spice and Ding Dong. CVM said he pointed to Cardi B's late-September break with her management team as a possible factor. That is his proposed explanation, not a verified cause of the cancellation.[3]

He also said Keyshia Cole had remained ready to perform on October 18 after Cardi B withdrew and was still willing to appear at the replacement show. He described talks with other major artists and proposed incentives for patrons and sponsors. The Star subsequently quoted him saying the event was "not off" but that the organisers were "back at the drawing board." These statements record his effort to continue BZR; they do not verify signed replacement bookings or a completed December production.[3] [5]

Cardi B's account and her legal threat

Complex's November 11 report identified Cardi B's first detailed response as a Monday-night Instagram Live session on November 9. She said she had received approximately US$900,000 of a US$1 million advance, which the article described as half her overall fee. World Music Views quoted her saying the deposit had arrived in instalments and correcting her initial reference to US$1 million to US$900,000. She did not deny receiving a substantial deposit; she denied Burke's full-payment figure.[4] [10]

Her account centred on timing and production responsibilities. She said another payment needed for production was due September 17 and had not arrived by the agreed deadline. DancehallMag quoted her: "You was trying to make me pay for the production with my deposit money." World Music Views reported her description of screens, lighting, dancers and a large travelling team. These are her descriptions of the requirements, not contract terms independently established by the publication.[2] [3] [10]

Cardi B said a US$750,000 payment arrived only after she said she was cancelling, and that she sent it back. Complex reported her explanation that there was then too little time to transport equipment from Florida and secure flights and hotels at acceptable cost. DancehallMag described

the money as arriving eight or nine days before the show. No precise transfer or return date was established from bank records reviewed here. The reports agree on her asserted late arrival and return, not an independently verified payment trail.[4] [23]

The public accounts also use different descriptions of the overall money required. Complex described the US$1 million advance as half the overall fee, while the Star and DancehallMag reported discussion of US$2.5 million and production money. Without the agreement and its production rider, those references cannot safely be combined into a reconstructed contract price. It remains unclear from the published extracts which amounts were performance compensation, production funding or other costs.[4] [18] [23]

On notice, she contradicted the implication that Burke learned only through a public announcement. World Music Views quoted her saying he knew because her side had sent a letter and that their lawyers had been communicating every day. The Star reported her claim to possess emails and bank statements supporting her account. No full set of those documents was reproduced in the articles examined, so their existence, completeness and legal effect remain assertions by her.[10] [18]

She also disputed how the show was described to her. Complex quoted her saying a festival with multiple artists was different from a Cardi B concert, and asking why she was expected to pay for production of the entire show. Her argument was about responsibility for expenses, not simply the number of names on the public bill. The September lineup supports the existence of multi-artist promotion but does not decide the allocation of those expenses under the private agreement.[4] [8]

> **PARTY ALLEGATION** Cardi B's reported Instagram Live response, November 9, 2026
>
> "Take me there because now you're lying on me, which is defamation of character, and I'm going to sue you right the fuck back," Complex quoted her saying. This is a threatened legal claim, not a court finding of defamation or a verified filed counterclaim.[4]

DancehallMag separately quoted: "I'm going to countersue you," followed by her claim to have "every, every single evidence." She said her grievance was with the promoter rather than Jamaica or its fans and expressed willingness to perform there if booked by someone else. Her confidence about winning does not establish either party's legal position. No court has been located evaluating the contract, the alleged missed deadline or her entitlement to keep the deposit.[23] [4]

Burke's account vs Cardi B's account

Every account in this table is disputed unless the final column identifies a separately recorded public development. Sources establish that the statements were made, not that the underlying claims are true. Neither side's payment and breach account has been tested in court in a proceeding located for this chapter.

Issue	Burke's account	Cardi B's account	Evidence and unresolved point
Amount received	US$2.5 million sent directly to her; "She was paid in full."[3]	Approximately US$900,000 received as a deposit; denied receiving US$2.5 million in full.[4] [10]	CVM reported seeing five transfer copies. No complete, independently examined bank reconciliation is published in the articles reviewed.
Production deadline	Maintained organisers fulfilled obligations; said money had been paid.[3] [5]	Production money due September 17 was late or missing when required.[4]	Executed agreement, rider and any revised deadlines were not reviewed.
Later US$750,000	Five-transfer total asserted; no itemised response in the cited interview to her returned-payment account.[3]	Late money arrived after she said she was cancelling and was returned.[4] [23]	Transfer dates, purposes, beneficiary and return records remain unverified.
Notice of withdrawal	Learned "straight from a billboard," according to CVM.[3]	Lawyers communicated repeatedly and sent notice before the public announcement.[10]	October 8 public withdrawal is documented. Private delivery and receipt of notice are disputed.
Production responsibility	Said organisers had fulfilled financial and contractual obligations.[15] [5]	Said a festival was treated as her standalone concert and she was expected to fund production from the deposit.[4]	Public multi-artist promotion exists; private cost allocation is not established.
December appearance	Said her team expressed interest in December 20 but it did not proceed.[3]	Rejected working with Burke again and said another promoter could book her.[5] [4]	Postponement did not confirm her participation; live site listed the updated lineup as forthcoming.[14] [9]
Legal action and deposit	Announced counsel and intended proceedings to recover payments and damages.[5]	Threatened a countersuit/defamation claim and later refused to return the deposit, alleging breach.[4] [20]	No identifiable complaint, docket number or filed counterclaim located as of November 11.
Government funding	BZR denied government assistance, payment or any promised funding.[5]	Initially claimed government offered to cover outstanding costs; later apologised and said she had been misled.[23] [21]	The Ministry denied commitment or payment. The underlying communications alleged by Cardi B were not reviewed.[19]

The government statement and the November 11 update

Cardi B's initial livestream account added a government-related claim. DancehallMag reported her saying Jamaican officials had offered to cover the remaining money in an effort to save the show, and that she still declined. The Gleaner quoted her saying they "were willing to pay the rest." This was her account of an offer. It did not establish a disbursement, a written government guarantee or the identity and authority of whoever supposedly made it.[23] [24]

The Ministry of Culture, Gender, Entertainment and Sport rejected the financial claim in a Tuesday, November 10 statement. CVM reported that government had made "no commitment or payment toward appearance fees, or any fees" for the proposed concert. The Gleaner quoted Minister Grange describing it as "a private commercial engagement in which the Government was not involved." The statement also said current event expenditure was constrained by recovery and reconstruction priorities following Hurricane Melissa.[19] [24]

That denial concerns financial commitment and the commercial engagement. It does not erase official attendance at the August launch or the promotional statements recorded by JIS. Conversely, attendance at a launch does not establish that government agreed to pay an artist's balance. The two kinds of participation should be kept separate: documented public promotion and a denied financial undertaking.[6] [19]

The Star's November 11 report reproduced BZR's own social-media statement. Organisers said the event had been independently organised and funded, that the full payment to Cardi B was made directly from independent funding, and that government or ministry assistance had neither been received nor promised. They asked the public to "allow the appropriate legal process to take its course" and said no further statements would be made at that time. The Star noted that the release did not address her other detailed allegations.[5]

There was a further artist-side response before this chapter's cutoff. Caribbean National Weekly's November 11 report said Cardi B had returned to Instagram Live Tuesday night, apologised to the Jamaican government and said she had been misled about its involvement. She maintained that Burke had misrepresented the situation and said texts and an email supported her account. Those messages were not independently reviewed here. Her apology must be included alongside, rather than omitted from, the record of the original government-offer claim.[21]

The Gleaner also reported a Tuesday-night X statement by Mike "Mike G" Guirguis, identified as Cardi B's agent and a United Talent Agency partner: "@iamcardib never received her full fee for the Jamaica show, and the promoter failed to meet multiple obligations under the agreement. Any claim that she was paid in full is false." This is the agent's direct denial, as reported by the newspaper, not independent proof of contractual breach.[20]

In the second livestream, Cardi B said she would not return the deposit. The Gleaner quoted: "I'm not giving back the deposit money." She characterised the issue as a breach of contract by organisers. Her analogy to a non-refundable appointment deposit expresses her position; it does not determine what this performance agreement requires. The Gleaner page was accessible November 11 and displayed that date, although its URL contains November 12. This discrepancy is retained in the source note.[20]

Has a lawsuit actually been filed?

No lawsuit between Cardi B and Burke or BZR over the 2026 show was located as of November 11, 2026. The reporting reviewed identified legal threats and retained counsel, not a complaint, court, case number or filing receipt. CVM's headline used "Sues," but its article described a battle "looming," a lawsuit being launched and Burke saying legal action was being pursued. DancehallMag expressly said it was unclear whether he had filed anything. A headline is not a substitute for a docket.[3] [23]

The federal checks included public CourtListener/RECAP searches for the exact phrases "Cardi B" and "Ryan Burke," and for "Belcalis" with "Ryan Burke." Both precise searches returned no results. A search for "BZR WKND" returned the earlier Echols case about the 2025 edition, not a Cardi B action. Broader name searches produced unrelated matches and were not treated as this dispute. CourtListener itself warns that its RECAP archive does not contain every PACER case.[25] [26] [27]

The PACER Case Locator was also checked, but only its public entry page was accessible without an authenticated account. It states that registration is required to search federal records and that newly filed cases generally appear within 24 hours. No completed nationwide authenticated PACER search is claimed. That limitation is material when the latest lawsuit statements were only days old and no proposed filing court had been named in the reports reviewed.[28]

New York's eCourts civil-index entry point was accessed by extraction, but the browser returned "Your request was blocked," preventing a completed party lookup. Florida checks reached the Broward and Miami-Dade civil-index interfaces. A Broward search entered Burke as surname and Ryan as first name, then returned an error rather than a result. Miami-Dade's public page disclosed anti-bot restrictions; no usable case-specific result was obtained. These are access failures or incomplete checks, not certificates that no case exists in those jurisdictions.[29] [30] [31]

The Jamaican Supreme Court's news-room page and public judgment-index page were reviewed, along with searches for a reported Cardi B–Burke filing. No identified proceeding appeared in the material retrieved. Those pages are not a complete register of newly issued civil claims. A fresh claim could exist without a judgment, news item or readily indexed report. The accurate status is therefore "none located," not "no lawsuit could have been filed."[32] [33]

As of the same cutoff, the live BZR website still advertised postponement to December 19–20 and said an updated lineup would be announced. Burke's public Instagram profile likewise named December 19–20. The website's older page metadata still referred to July 25 and Cardi B, contrary to its visible updated announcement. The current visible text, not that stale metadata, is used here. Neither the website nor the profile established a confirmed December appearance by Cardi B.[9] [34]

Context from the earlier record

Earlier chapters document separate payment and booking disputes: the Lady Gaga/ZAO litigation, the Rihanna allegations and Mary J. Blige case, the Echols–Mosley 2025 BZR allegations and the Kameka–Dzotsi dispute. In the Blige case, the October 17, 2014 ruling entered a US$105,000 judgment for Mary Jane Productions against Vision Entertainment Worldwide, not against Burke personally. The amount is at entry; its current balance is unknown.[35] Those earlier records have different parties, contracts and procedural outcomes. Their inclusion provides factual context, not a finding of a pattern or evidence deciding which account of the 2026 cancellation is correct.

What remains unresolved

The central missing records are the executed Cardi B agreement and production rider, the five transfers described by CVM, any return of US$750,000, and the lawyers' deadline and cancellation correspondence. Without them, the amount retained, compliance with payment terms, notice and entitlement to the deposit remain disputed. The alleged government communications were not reviewed. A complete patron-refund accounting, actual travel-cost reimbursements, filed regulatory complaints and confirmed December replacement bookings were not verified. No identifi-

able lawsuit or countersuit was located by November 11, subject to the court-access limitations above. Neither party's accusation, apology or promise resolves those questions, and this chapter reaches no conclusion about who is telling the truth.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Kyle Denis, "Cardi B Will Headline a Caribbean Stadium for the First Time at BZR WKND Jamaica 2026," Billboard, August 14, 2026, announcement, early-bird sales and organisers' statement — article.
2. Kyle Denis, "Cardi B Cancels BZR WKND Jamaica Headlining Set," Billboard, October 8, 2026, representatives' statement and request for organiser comment — article.
3. "BZR Weekend Sues Cardi B; Patrons Being Reimbursed," CVM Television, November 10, 2026, interview account, five-transfer description and Lewis–Burke exchange — article.
4. Alex Ocho, "Cardi B Dares Jamaican Concert Promoter To Sue Her, Accuses Him Of Lying About $2.5 Million Payment," Complex, November 11, 2026, November 9 broadcast/livestream dates, deposit, production and threatened countersuit — article.
5. "BZR confirms no Gov't funding Mum on other Cardi B claims," Jamaica Star, November 11, 2026, organiser release, payment assertions, refunds and December planning — article.
6. Ainsworth Morris, "Thousands of Patrons Expected at BZR Weekend in October," Jamaica Information Service, August 27, 2026, launch on August 26, tiered sales and attendance projection; page displayed last update August 28 when checked November 11 — report.
7. "No Cardi B for BZR WKND," Jamaica Gleaner, displayed October 8, 2026, updated October 9, withdrawal and Santiago launch remarks; URL contains October 9 — article.
8. Kyle Denis, "Keyshia Cole, Spice & Malie Donn Set to Join Cardi B at BZR WKND Jamaica 2026," Billboard, September 28, 2026, lineup and Tikkets link — article.
9. BZR WKND Jamaica, live event website, undated, checked November 11, 2026, visible postponement, refund announcement, Tikkets links and updated-lineup notice — organiser website. Metadata retained an older date/headliner; current visible text is used.
10. "Cardi B fires back at BZR WKND promoter Ryan Burke over lawsuit threat, reveals she was paid US$900,000," World Music Views, November 9, 2026, reported deposit, production requirements, lawyers' communications and letter — article.
11. "BZR WKND organisers urge patience among patrons amid Cardi B cancellation," Jamaica Observer, October 9, 2026, organiser social-media statement and Cardi B apology video — article.
12. "BZR WKND Jamaica Suspends Ticket Sales After Cardi B Withdrawal," DancehallMag, October 10, 2026, website suspension notice and reported ticket-sales/video remarks — article.
13. "BZR WKND National Stadium Booking Cancelled Following Cardi B Withdrawal," World Music Views, October 13, 2026, officials' attributed October 12 cancellation and ticket advertising observed October 13 — article.
14. Claude Mills, "BZR WKND moves to December after Cardi B withdrawal," DancehallMag, October 13, 2026, postponement, condolences and refund instructions — article.
15. Joanne Clark, "BZR WKND postponed to December as organizers offer refunds, free tickets," Caribbean National Weekly, October 14, 2026, Tuesday announcement and documentary requirements for refunds/complimentary tickets — article.
16. "BZR WKND ticket buyers still waiting on refund weeks after organisers pledged money back," Jamaica Observer, November 3, 2026, patron statements, attorney's intended complaints, October 19 promise and failed request for comment — article. Private patrons are not named here.
17. "All BZR WKND refunds now issued, organisers say," Jamaica Observer, November 4, 2026, social-media statement about backlog, processing and bank credit time — article.
18. Antwaine Campbell, "'Take me to court!' – Cardi B challenges BZR promoter after lawsuit threat," Jamaica Star, November 9, 2026, Monday-night interview and artist allegations — article.
19. "Gov't Says It Made No Commitment to Pay Fees for Proposed Cardi B Concert in Jamaica," CVM Television, November 10, 2026, Ministry statement — article.
20. "Cardi B's agent says she wasn't paid in full," Jamaica Gleaner, displayed November 11, 2026, Guirguis Tuesday-night X statement and Cardi B's second livestream/deposit position — article. URL contains November 12; displayed date and access on November 11 are retained.
21. Jovani Davis, "Cardi B apologizes to Jamaican government amid ongoing BZR Weekend dispute," Caribbean National Weekly, November 11, 2026, Tuesday-night apology, alleged misleading communications, agent response and organiser denial — article.
22. "Refund Policy," Tikkets / Kanoo Pays Jamaica, undated, checked November 11, 2026, merchant/facilitator responsibilities, final-sale terms, transaction fees and force-majeure clauses — policy.
23. "Cardi B Vows to Countersue Jamaican Promoter Ryan Burke Over Canceled BZR WKND Show," DancehallMag, November 10, 2026, reported livestream production/payment claims, government-offer claim and unclear lawsuit filing — article.
24. "No Gov't involvement in BZR concert, says Grange," Jamaica Gleaner, November 10, 2026, ministerial release and Cardi B's government-offer allegation — article.
25. CourtListener/RECAP, public search for exact "Cardi B" AND "Ryan Burke," checked November 11, 2026, returned no results and displayed archive-coverage warning — search.

26. CourtListener/RECAP, public search for Belcalis AND exact “Ryan Burke,” checked November 11, 2026, returned no results — search.
27. CourtListener/RECAP, exact “BZR WKND” search, checked November 11, 2026, returned Echols v. Burke, No. 1:25-cv-06604, and its 2025 complaint excerpt — search.
28. PACER Case Locator, public entry page, checked November 11, 2026, registration/login requirement and case-currency notice; authenticated search not completed — page.
29. New York Unified Court System, eCourts entry page, checked November 11, 2026; extraction retrieved service descriptions, browser request blocked, no completed party search — index.
30. Broward County Clerk of Courts, public case search, checked November 11, 2026; Burke/Ryan party-name submission returned processing error, not a no-record result — index.
31. Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts, Civil, Family and Probate Courts Online System, checked November 11, 2026, public index access attempted, anti-bot restriction disclosed and no usable case result obtained — index.
32. Supreme Court of Jamaica, news-room entry page, checked November 11, 2026, no identified Cardi B–BZR proceeding in material retrieved; not a complete filing index — page.
33. Supreme Court of Jamaica, public judgment-index page, checked November 11, 2026; limited review, not a newly filed-claims register — index.
34. Ryan Burke, public @vewryan Instagram profile, undated live profile checked November 11, 2026, self-description and December 19–20 BZR date; truncated bio and automated post descriptions not treated as contract evidence — profile.
35. Memorandum, Order and Judgment, Vision Entertainment Worldwide, LLC v. Mary Jane Productions, Inc. and Mary Jane Blige, S.D.N.Y. No. 1:13-cv-04215-AT, DE 42, October 17, 2014, PDF p. 24, judgment for Mary Jane Productions of US$105,000 — news-hosted copy of court ruling. External reproduction bears theJasmineBRAND watermark; it is not a personal judgment against Burke.

CHAPTER 14 · ANALYSIS

Recurring features across the record

Six features appear in more than one matter. This chapter lists them, the records behind each, and the cases that do not fit.

The earlier chapters treat each matter separately, which is how courts treat them. Read together, the files show several features that appear more than once. This chapter sets them out. It is a description of what recurs in the documents, not a finding that any dispute was decided against Burke where no court decided it. A feature that recurs in allegations is still an allegation each time. Where a matter cuts the other way, it is listed as well.

At a glance

Feature	Matters in which it appears	Strongest record type	Chapters
Large advance payments for artist bookings, followed by a dispute over who should hold the money	Lady Gaga (2011–13), Rihanna (2012), Mary J. Blige (2012–14), Echols & Mosley (2025), Cardi B (2026)	FINDING in two matters; allegations or public statements in three	04, 05, 11, 13
Questions about artist authorization or acceptance	Lady Gaga, Rihanna	FINDING (2013)	04, 05
Several related companies with overlapping names and roles	ZAO order (2013), Echols complaint (2025), bankruptcies (2024–25), BZR 2026	FINDING (2013); registry records	03, 04, 10
Defaults, service and jurisdiction fights	Joe Clark (2020), Kameka (2022–24), Bayfront (2026), Echols (2025)	FINDING (2024 contempt order)	06, 08, 11
Company bankruptcy petitions while foreclosure was pending	2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC (2024, 2025)	Debtor's own filing; court orders	09, 10
Events postponed, cancelled or changed, with refund questions	Blige Dallas (2012), VEWtopia (2020), BZR 2024, BZR 2025, BZR 2026	REPORT; court order (Blige)	05, 07, 12, 13

1. Advance payments and disputes over who keeps them

Most of the larger disputes in this record turn on an advance: money paid before a performance to secure an artist, a venue or a share in an event. The direction of the payment differs from case to case, and that difference matters.

In the Lady Gaga matter, money flowed *to* Burke's company. The federal court's account is that NWE Talent Agency received $1,500,000 of the Russian broadcaster's funds toward a performance that the artist had not accepted, and that ZAO demanded its return. The court rejected the Burke entities' counterclaim to keep the money; no merits verdict on ZAO's own fraud and conversion claims was found in the reviewed sources (Chapter 04). The 2012 Rihanna report describes a claim that $75,000 was paid to VEW and Burke on the basis of a booking ability that the claimants said did not exist; no decision on it was found (Chapter 05). In 2025, two Illinois investors alleged four payments totaling $298,145.95 toward the BZR Carnival Edition, made to VEW Live, Universal Creative Agency and Burke personally, and alleged that the money was not repaid (Chapter 11).

In the Mary J. Blige and Cardi B matters, money flowed *from* Burke's side to the artist, and Burke's position is that the artist should give it back or should have performed. In the Blige case a federal court decided that dispute against VEW, rejecting VEW's claim for return of the $145,000 advance and entering a further $105,000 judgment for the artist's company.

> **COURT FINDING** Memorandum, Order and Judgment, Vision Entertainment Worldwide v. Mary Jane Productions, S.D.N.Y. No. 1:13-cv-04215, October 17, 2014
>
> Summary judgment for the Blige defendants and a $105,000 judgment for Mary Jane Productions against VEW on its counterclaim.[1]

In the Cardi B matter the two sides' accounts of the US$2.5 million conflict and no court has ruled (Chapter 13). The common feature is the structure of the dispute, not its outcome: in each matter the documents show a large sum paid in advance under terms that were later contested.

2. Whether the artist had agreed

The 2013 Lady Gaga order is the only judicial finding on this point, and it is specific.

> **COURT FINDING** Order on summary judgment, TV Service ZAO v. NWE Talent, S.D. Fla. No. 1:12-cv-20317, January 9, 2013
>
> The Burke entities "were never authorized representatives of Lady Gaga and had never secured her as a performer on anyone else's behalf." The December 16, 2011 proposal was never signed by the artist or an authorized representative.[2]

The Rihanna claim, as reported, raised the same question and was not adjudicated. The Cardi B dispute is different in kind: the artist's booking was publicly confirmed by both sides, and the disagreement is over payment terms and deadlines, not over whether she had agreed to perform, so it is not counted under this feature.

3. Related companies and how the courts described them

Burke has done business through a number of companies with similar names: Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC, VEW Live, LLC, NWE Talent Agency and Management, Inc. (and an LLC of the same name), property companies managed through Burke Development Group, LLC, and, in 2026, V12 Group. Universal Creative Agency appears as a partner in the BZR WKND years (Chapter 03). Using several companies is common and lawful. The record matters here because the 2013 ZAO order describes how the companies were presented; later pleadings and debtor filings describe additional company roles.

COURT FINDING Order on summary judgment, TV Service ZAO v. NWE Talent, January 9, 2013

Burke listed his mother as NWE's president so that NWE and VEW would appear to be separate; she was a "figurehead," and Burke was the controlling member and corporate representative of both. The companies' listed Miami addresses were "virtual offices." Separately, "The Burke Entities are not licensed talent agencies pursuant to section 468.403 of the Florida Statutes."[2]

The licensing finding describes the law and the companies as they stood in 2013. It is not a statement about any company's current status. In 2025, the Echols plaintiffs alleged four payments for the same event, made variously to VEW Live, Universal Creative Agency and Burke himself, and the property company's bankruptcy filings identified Burke as acting through Burke Development Group as manager (Chapter 10).

4. Defaults, service and jurisdiction

Several cases were decided, or nearly decided, on procedure rather than merits. According to recorded-instrument citations that were not independently retrieved, the Joe Clark judgment followed a breach of a settlement agreement, and the Bayfront Park Management Trust judgment against VEW Live was entered by default (Chapter 06). In the Illinois case, counsel appeared for "Ryan Matthew Burke, erroneously sued as 'Ryan Burke'" and moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction (Chapter 11). Challenging service and jurisdiction is a defendant's right, and such motions are often granted.

The Kameka case is where this feature produced the record's most serious finding. Burke's challenge to service rested on sworn statements that he was in Las Vegas on the day he was served. The judge first granted the challenge, then, after airline records were subpoenaed, found the statements false.

COURT FINDING Order adjudging Ryan Burke in criminal contempt, Broward Cir. Ct. No. CACE-22-001852, May 13, 2024

The court found "beyond any reasonable doubt" that Burke lied in his affidavit, deposition and testimony "knowingly and with the intent to obstruct the administration of justice," and adjudged him guilty of indirect and direct criminal contempt.[3]

That is one finding, in one case. No other court in this record has found that Burke gave false testimony.

5. Bankruptcy petitions while foreclosure was pending

The Davie property company filed for Chapter 11 twice in eleven months. The first petition, filed May 21, 2024, was dismissed in July 2024 without a discharge. Ahead of a foreclosure sale scheduled for February 20, 2025, the defense asked the state court to cancel the sale; the second petition followed on April 21, 2025. In its own case summary the company stated its purpose plainly.

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Chapter 11 case management summary, 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC, Bankr. S.D. Fla. No. 25-14362-SMG, May 2, 2025
>
> The company's stated reason for filing was to "Stop Foreclosure sale of 2045 SW 127th Avenue, Davie, FL 33325."[4]

Filing under Chapter 11 to stop a foreclosure sale is lawful, and the automatic stay exists for that purpose. The record shows what followed: the second case was converted to Chapter 7 on the U.S. Trustee's motion in September 2025, and in July 2026 the state court entered a $2,089,122.81 foreclosure judgment and set a new sale date. The records do not show a sale date immediately before the first petition, and this publication does not describe either filing as timed to the day (Chapter 10).

6. Postponements, cancellations and refunds

Five events promoted by Burke's companies did not go ahead as advertised. The Mary J. Blige concert in Dallas, set for December 9, 2012, did not take place; VEW said she pulled out, her side said VEW had not met the travel terms, and the New York court later ruled for her company. VEWtopia moved from Marlins Park to Miami Gardens in January 2020 and its first night was disrupted (Chapter 07). The July 2024 BZR WKND edition was postponed, citing Hurricane Beryl. The April 2025 Carnival Edition at Sabina Park was later reported cancelled for weather. The October 2026 edition lost Cardi B ten days before the show and was moved to December 20 (Chapter 12).

Weather and an artist's withdrawal are not the promoter's doing by default, and the stated reasons should be taken into account. What recurs in the reporting is the question that follows each change: whether ticket buyers were repaid, and when. In November 2026 the Jamaica Observer reported buyers still waiting weeks after refunds were promised; the organisers said on November 4 that outstanding refunds had been "processed and issued."[5]

What does not fit the pattern

The record also contains counter-examples.

- The first BZR WKND edition took place: Chris Brown performed at the National Stadium after midnight at the concert scheduled for August 27, 2023. Cardi B performed on VEWtopia's second night in 2020.
- An index citation, not independently verified, reports that a stadium operator's 2020 suit against VEW Live was dismissed for lack of prosecution; no money award was verified.
- No merits decision on ZAO's fraud claims in the Lady Gaga case was found; the January 2013 order left them for trial, and the terminating document was not available. The Rihanna claim has no recorded outcome.
- The Illinois case may have been dismissed on jurisdictional grounds; until the January 2026 judgment is read, its result is unknown.

- In 2023 a judge accepted Burke's service challenge after a full evidentiary hearing. The later contempt finding rested on records that were not before the court at that hearing.
- No prosecutor has charged this Ryan Burke with a crime in any record found, and the money disputes in this chapter are civil.

Burke's own explanations for each matter are collected in Chapter 15. The questions that the records leave open are listed in Chapter 16.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Vision Entertainment Worldwide, LLC v. Mary Jane Productions, Inc., S.D.N.Y. No. 1:13-cv-04215-AT, Memorandum, Order and Judgment, DE 42, pp. 1, 24 (October 17, 2014) — publicly reproduced court PDF.
2. Order on summary judgment, TV Service ZAO v. NWE Talent Agency and Management, Inc., S.D. Fla. No. 1:12-cv-20317, DE 104 (January 9, 2013) — GovInfo PDF. Page cites in Chapter 04.
3. Order Adjudging Ryan Burke in Indirect Criminal Contempt of Court and Order of Commitment, Broward Cir. Ct. No. CACE-22-001852 (May 13, 2024) — facsimile of filed copy.
4. Chapter 11 Case Management Summary, In re 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC, Bankr. S.D. Fla. No. 25-14362-SMG, DE 18 (May 2, 2025) — redacted copy.
5. "BZR WKND ticket buyers still waiting for refund weeks after organisers pledged money back," Jamaica Observer, November 3, 2026 — article. The November 4 organiser statement is cited in Chapter 13.

CHAPTER 15 · RIGHT OF REPLY

Burke's side: his positions, denials and explanations

Burke's sworn accounts, his lawyers' arguments and his companies' public explanations, collected with the responses and rulings that qualify them.

This chapter exists so readers can see Burke's account in one place, rather than reconstruct it from separate cases. It collects the positions recorded elsewhere in this publication, including sworn statements, company claims and lawyers' arguments. Burke, his companies and his lawyers may submit a written reply under the right-of-reply policy; this is an invitation to reply, not a claim that anyone was contacted. A response label identifies whose position is being reported. It does not establish that the position is correct, and the absence of an available response is not an admission.

Business descriptions and the early booking record

See identification and companies for the distinction between personal descriptions, company registrations and authority to represent an artist.

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Burke's public profiles, reviewed Nov. 11, 2026
>
> Instagram describes him as a record executive, producer, talent manager and promoter. LinkedIn identifies him as founder and chief executive of VEW businesses, dating the broader operation to 2003 and VEW Live! to 2005.[1] [2]

These are self-descriptions, not incorporation dates or independently verified career histories. The company register gives separate filing dates, and the 2013 ZAO order found the defendants then before it were not licensed talent agencies.[3]

Lady Gaga and TV Service ZAO, 2011–2013

Chapter 04 separates the binders, unsigned artist proposals and ZAO's claims from the defendants' counterclaim.

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Representations recorded in DE 104, pp. 7–8
>
> In mid-August 2011, Burke told intermediary George Sergeev he could use his relationship with Lady Gaga's manager Troy Carter to obtain the awards performance. He said a binder deposit was needed before negotiations began.[4]

The court's account nevertheless says the Burke entities had never been authorized representatives of Lady Gaga. The binder was an agreement to pursue a booking, not the artist's acceptance.[5]

BURKE'S POSITION Burke email, Dec. 23, 2011

Burke required funds in escrow by December 27 and said they were going directly to NWE, which would forward a deposit to the artist's management or agent so they knew they were dealing with real people.[6]

The order records NWE's receipt of $1,350,000 around December 27. It does not verify the proposed onward transfer to the artist's representatives.[6]

BURKE'S POSITION Burke deposition recited in the January 2013 order

Burke estimated he would have made a profit of "on or around $300,000.00" if the December proposal had been fulfilled.[7]

That was an expected profit, not a finding that he earned or retained that amount. The order does not fully trace the difference between NWE's receipts and its January 31 balance.

BURKE'S POSITION Counterclaim and summary-judgment arguments

The defendants said the June date conflicted with artist availability, the engagement date could change, and they had secured an October 9 performance. They alleged ZAO breached exclusivity and no-contact obligations by approaching the artist's representatives directly, and sought $1,350,000 in liquidated damages.[8] [9]

COURT FINDING Summary-judgment order, Jan. 9, 2013

The court held that the defendants failed to show ZAO breached a valid contract enforceable by them. It rejected the counterclaim and liquidated-damages claim, but required ZAO to prove its own claims before obtaining release of the frozen funds.[10] [9] [11]

BURKE'S POSITION Defense characterization of the January proposal

The defendants described the January 10 proposal as "merely a document from NWE" reporting a management meeting and conditional performance, submitted to put the dealings in context.[12]

COURT FINDING DE 104, p. 14

The judge found the January proposal was not a valid contract because its only signer lacked authority to act for Lady Gaga.[12]

BURKE'S POSITION Defense licensing argument

The defendants argued that the talent-agency statute protected artists, not third parties such as ZAO, and did not void the claimed contract.[13]

The judge expressly declined to decide that alternative theory. The case's termination terms and ultimate disposition of the funds remain unverified.[14]

Rihanna and Mary J. Blige, 2012–2014

Chapter 05 treats the Rihanna allegation and VEW's Blige lawsuit as separate matters.

BURKE'S POSITION Limits of the accessible Rihanna account

The short Courthouse News report contains no response from Burke or Vision. No answer, motion or sworn defense statement in the identified Rihanna dispute was obtained.[15]

That is a limitation of the documentary account, not proof that no defense existed. The possible case match and reported dismissal are unverified.[16]

BURKE'S POSITION VEW's Blige claim, reported June 20, 2013

VEW said Blige canceled the December 9 Dallas engagement, retained its $145,000 deposit and instead took an opportunity to perform with the Rolling Stones.[17]

Blige's representative denied breach. The later court order treated the first cancellation email as anticipatory repudiation but found it was timely retracted.[18] [19] [20]

BURKE'S POSITION VEW's arguments described in DE 42

VEW argued it reasonably relied on the assistant's apparent authority to cancel, that Burke tried to persuade MJP to perform, and that it mitigated losses and materially changed position before the lawyer's December 7 email.[19] [20]

COURT FINDING Memorandum, Order and Judgment, Oct. 17, 2014

The judge found the lawyer's 1:50 p.m. email retracted the cancellation before VEW terminated or materially changed position. VEW remained obligated to fund travel and could not maintain its contract claim after failing to do so.[20] [21]

BURKE'S POSITION VEW's position on remaining claims and damages

VEW dropped unjust enrichment and punitive damages, did not oppose Blige's no-contract defense individually, and challenged the fee-remedy provision as overbearing, one-sided and unconscionable because of unequal bargaining power.[22] [23]

COURT FINDING DE 42, pp. 21–24

The court rejected the unconscionability challenge and entered $105,000 for Mary Jane Productions against Vision, not Burke individually. Later fees, appeal and payment are not verified.[23] [24]

Clark and VEWtopia, 2019–2020

The judgments chapter records a limited procedural response in Clark; Chapter 07 contains the festival's public explanations.

BURKE'S POSITION Reported Clark motion, March 30, 2020

The cited docket lists a request to vacate the February 19 judgment. The motion's text, grounds and result were not independently verified.[25]

A motion is not a vacatur. No fuller substantive defense can be attributed from the available lead.

BURKE'S POSITION VEW Live festival announcements, Dec. 2019–Jan. 2020

The announcements promised two-day admission without single-day tickets, a Marlins Park lineup and a later limited-time $99 pass; the January release also announced charitable use of festival proceeds.[26] [27]

Those were advertised terms and plans. Later reporting observed single-day door sales, and no donation accounting was verified.

BURKE'S POSITION Venue move and refunds, Miami Herald

Organizers attributed the relocation to a "production issue." Burke said, "Amazing things don't just belong on South Beach," and welcomed Miami Gardens; a spokeswoman said original ticket holders had been refunded.[28]

The same article gave instructions for purchasers still awaiting refunds. It did not identify the technical cause of the move or reconcile every payment.

BURKE'S POSITION Organizer Instagram statement reproduced in the review

Organizers attributed the interrupted first night to circumstances outside their control and a Dade County lightning advisory, then promoted Saturday's lineup.[29]

The review separately reported delayed admission and missing acts before the weather shutdown, including Chris Brown's manager's account of an agreement dispute. It also documented Cardi B's completed second-night set; the weather statement did not resolve every earlier problem.

Kameka and Dzotsi: service and travel, 2022–2024

Chapter 08 gives the full sequence, including the initially favorable service ruling and later contempt adjudication.

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Affidavit executed Oct. 17; motion filed Nov. 22, 2022
>
> Burke said he was in Las Vegas on business from April 1 until April 14, was not at his home on April 11, never received a summons that day and had not been notified of the default motion. His lawyer separately argued that leaving papers at the door was legally insufficient for him and the companies.[30] [31]

The process server described a face-to-face encounter and consent to leaving the papers. The travel denial and legal objection were different grounds for challenging service.[32]

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Supplemental authorities and Jan. 30, 2023 argument
>
> Counsel challenged facial defects and identification, emphasized plaintiffs' burden to prove service, and maintained Burke was in Las Vegas. He also raised default-notice objections.[33] [34]

The judge canceled the noticed February sale, allowed a deposition and offered an evidentiary hearing. That hearing did not resolve document authenticity.

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Burke deposition, Feb. 23, 2023
>
> Burke said he had lived in Sunrise since 2010 and worked from home. He acknowledged the property-company agent roles with qualifications, but was unsure of VEW Live's agent designation while knowing he was a member.[35] [36]

The affidavit had stated all three registered-agent roles more definitely. The difference does not itself prove a registry change or intentional falsehood.

> **BURKE'S POSITION** Deposition account of the Las Vegas business trip
>
> Burke identified the Grammys as the purpose, described himself as talent manager, booking agent, promoter, consultant and producer, and said he performed all those functions. He corrected his description of the event flyer, said later events were invitations, and said he was unpaid for the April 1 event, without a client contract or venue reservation.[37] [38]

This was testimony about the asserted trip, not an adjudication of separate artist engagements. The deposition did not establish the underlying loan's formation or use of proceeds.

BURKE'S POSITION Deposition explanations for limited travel records

Burke identified the flight confirmation, believed the $817.20 cost was accurate and said he boarded outbound. He explained missing boarding passes by digital expiry, the hotel gap by staying with a cousin, and missing transportation or meal records by multiple accounts, rides or meals supplied by others and imperfect recollection.[39] [40] [41] [42]

Missing records alone did not prove the trip false. Later carrier records listed a successfully flown April 4 return, conflicting with the continuous stay he asserted.[43]

BURKE'S POSITION Bank entries and access to the house

Burke distinguished posting dates from transaction dates, saying the questioned Florida entries reflected March 31 purchases. He could not identify another person who might have answered to “Ryan”; counsel instructed him not to answer the settlement-proposal question as outside scope.[42] [44] [45]

A posting date does not itself establish location, and the instructed nonanswer was not an admission. No judicial resolution of the certified question is supplied.

BURKE'S POSITION Special appearance, June 2023

Counsel said a March agreement contemplated accepting service in exchange for vacatur, but chose not to seek enforcement because of delay and authority disputes. He insisted service be resolved first, called the magistrate objection timely and self-executing, and sought sanctions and fees for alleged misrepresentations about consent.[46] [47]

The exhibits do not independently establish the full agreement. No sanctions award is supplied.

BURKE'S POSITION August 21 hearing testimony and defense argument

Burke repeated the Las Vegas account, said he deleted expired digital passes, used cash and multiple accounts, and denied the certified-mail signature. Counsel challenged Lowe’s identification and documentation, called her argumentative and not candid, and afterward declined to accept service while invoking the alleged earlier agreement.[48] [49] [50] [51]

COURT ORDER August 21, 2023 hearing transcript

The transcript records Haury granting the motion to quash service.[52]

COURT FINDING Order adjudging criminal contempt, May 13, 2024

Haury found beyond any reasonable doubt that Burke lied about being in Las Vegas on April 11, knowingly obstructed justice and supplied a fake travel document or locator; he adjudged indirect and direct criminal contempt.[53] [54]

BURKE'S POSITION Untimely-service motion, Aug. 24, 2023

Defendants argued service was not obtained within 120 days and plaintiffs had not shown good cause or requested an extension. They later withdrew the motion without stating a reason.[55]

Withdrawal did not establish valid service or concede contempt. The packet contains no full defense account from the April 2024 contempt hearing or verified appellate disposition.

BZR's debut and 2024 postponement

See Chapter 12 for the event record and differing partner lists.

BURKE'S POSITION Burke's July 2023 launch interview

Burke said Chris Brown was selected after conversations with promoters and consumers, was excited to perform, and that both production teams were working closely. He gave ticket tiers starting at US$45 and promised "there is no bad seat in the house."[56]

Contemporary reporting confirms Brown performed after midnight into August 28. It does not verify exact attendance, every advertised price or vendor-loss totals.[57]

BURKE'S POSITION 2024 promotion and postponement release

Promotion identified Burke as president and producer and advertised a July return. Organizers later cited Hurricane Beryl, promised relief assistance and an autumn rescheduling, and said tickets would remain valid or be fully refundable through vendors.[58] [59] [60]

No complete refund or relief-spending accounting was verified. Billboard's later reference to a 2024 staging conflicts with Kaboom's statement that the last staging before 2025 was in 2023.[61] [62]

Company bankruptcy and foreclosure positions, 2024–2025

These positions concern the company debtor, not personal bankruptcy. See Chapter 10 and Chapter 09.

BURKE'S POSITION First-company-case hearing, July 11, 2024

The debtor did not object to dismissal.[63]

COURT FINDING Dismissal entered July 16, 2024

The court dismissed the case without discharging debts and terminated any automatic stay.[63]

That order did not decide service of Burke's contempt sentence.

BURKE'S POSITION Foreclosure defense notice, filed Feb. 6, 2025

Burke and the property company sought emergency cancellation or vacatur of the February 20 sale through counsel Barry Mittelberg.[64]

The motion's grounds and ruling are absent. The notice proves a request, not success.

BURKE'S POSITION Debtor summary, May 2, 2025

The company said it filed to stop foreclosure, described Burke as manager and sole shareholder, and qualified its financial figures as background approximations. It reported $2.9 million assets, $21,000 income for 2024, $28,000 for 2025, secured debts of $962,000 and $107,212, a $93,965.58 tax-certificate obligation, no unsecured claims, employees or wages owed, and no anticipated emergency relief within 14 days.[65]

Creditors later claimed additional interest, fees and costs. The summary was not a valuation or allowance order, and conversion to Chapter 7 did not make it one.

Echols and Mosley, 2025–2026

Chapter 11 distinguishes docket descriptions from unavailable declarations and deciding orders.

BURKE'S POSITION Defense appearance and jurisdiction motion

Counsel appeared October 23, 2025 for "Putative Defendant Ryan Matthew Burke, erroneously sued as 'Ryan Burke'," filed an attempted-service report and moved November 13 to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. The docket lists declarations by the putative defendant and counsel.[66]

PARTY ALLEGATION Project statements alleged by the Illinois plaintiffs

The complaint alleges the defendants claimed a Sabina Park wire, asserted project control and alleged fraud in a cease-and-desist email; it also alleges Burke promised full repayment on April 8, 2025.[67]

Those communications were not independently reproduced or authenticated in the main complaint. Their characterization remains the plaintiffs' account.

The declarations' substantive contents were unavailable, so no further jurisdiction or identity explanation is supplied. The later judgment and orders are docketed, but their operative terms remain unverified.[68]

Cardi B, BZR and V12 Group, 2026

Chapter 13 sets out the competing payment accounts and ticketing chronology.

BURKE'S POSITION August announcement and October notices

Burke and Gramps Morgan promised a larger return; after withdrawal, organizers asked for patience, suspended sales citing circumstances beyond their control, then announced December 20, continued ticket validity, refunds and complimentary tickets for qualifying travel-booked patrons. They declared a show would happen and maintained they fulfilled financial and contractual obligations.[69] [70] [71] [72] [73]

The postponement did not confirm Cardi B for December. The live site, signed by V12 Group and the team, advertised December 19–20 with lineup forthcoming.[74]

BURKE'S POSITION Refund statement, Nov. 4, 2026

Organizers apologized, attributed the backlog to high platform request volumes and said all outstanding refunds were processed and issued, subject to additional bank time. Later Burke reporting said refunds had started and everyone would be reimbursed.[75] [76]

These formulations do not establish one reconciled completion date. Patrons had reported both receipts and continuing delays.[77]

BURKE'S POSITION CVM interview, broadcast reported Nov. 9; article Nov. 10

Burke said US$2.5 million had been sent directly to Cardi B, he had receipts and she was paid in full. He hoped to recover it through legal action, said he learned withdrawal “straight from a billboard,” and said her team wanted December 20 but that did not proceed.[78] [79]

Cardi B disputed full payment and notice, alleged missed production obligations and said a late US$750,000 was returned. Her agent also denied full payment; no independently verified filed action decides those points.[79] [80]

BURKE'S POSITION Burke’s continuation plans and BZR funding statement

Burke apologized to fans, sponsors, government and local artists, suggested her management change as a possible factor, said Keyshia Cole remained willing, and described replacement talks and incentives. BZR said funding was independent, no government money was received or promised, and asked for the legal process to proceed without further statements.[78] [76]

The Ministry separately denied a financial undertaking. Those statements do not verify replacement contracts, settle production responsibilities or authenticate the disputed transfers.[81]

What remains unresolved

Missing defense papers are not replaced with arguments from other cases. The full contempt-hearing defense, Clark vacatur grounds, Illinois declarations and 2026 agreement remain unavailable. Future replies submitted under the published policy will be linked here and alongside the affected chapter.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. Ryan Burke, @vewryan, displayed name and bio, retrieved Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
2. Ryan Burke, LinkedIn profile, summary and VEW Live!, VEW Music Group and Vision experience entries, retrieved Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
3. TV Service ZAO v. NWE, S.D. Fla. 1:12-cv-20317, DE 104 (Jan. 9, 2013), pp. 5–6 and footnote 6 (control, offices, licensing); pp. 7–12 and footnotes 7–8 (deposits and bank balance); pp. 10–11 (cousin's role); pp. 13–21 (contract positions, ruling and limits), particularly p. 20 (licensing defense) — record.
4. Order, DE 104, pp. 7–8, August 23 WMA/NWE binder and representations preceding it — official PDF.
5. Order, DE 104, pp. 5–7, NWE presidency, control, licensing, virtual offices and authorized artist representatives; private family member's name omitted — official PDF.
6. Order, DE 104, p. 10, quoting December 23 email, DE 84-9, and citing acknowledgment DE 84-10 — official PDF.
7. Order, DE 104, pp. 11–12, account balance and Burke deposition estimate, DE 98-2 at 26 — official PDF.
8. Order, DE 104, pp. 12–14, counterclaim DE 36, paragraphs 9–15, and date-change clause in ZAO/WMA binder — official PDF.
9. Order, DE 104, pp. 18–19, liquidated damages and superseding-agreement provision — official PDF.
10. Order, DE 104, pp. 17–18 and footnote 10, December proposal analysis and counterclaim holding — official PDF.
11. Order, DE 104, pp. 20–21, conclusion denying release of escrow and reserving ZAO's claims for trial — official PDF.
12. Order, DE 104, p. 14, defense characterization and court's determination on January proposal — official PDF.
13. Order, DE 104, pp. 19–20, licensing argument and response, citing DE 101 at 17 — official PDF.
14. PacerMonitor case page, case-information fields, filed January 26, 2012; terminated January 23, 2013; free page inspected November 11, 2026. For amended claims and freeze: DE 104, p. 2 and p. 12, footnote 8 — official PDF.
15. Courthouse News Service, "Bogus!", identified in the supplied research as December 2012; complete accessible one-sentence report, fetched November 11, 2026. The retrieved page does not display an exact publication day or identify the claimants by name. Its wording expressly attributes the accusation to the woman and bankruptcy trustee and identifies Rihanna as a nonparty.
16. Possible-match research lead supplied for checking: Youngman et al. v. Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Burke, No. 2012-046329-CA-01; identity and reported lack-of-prosecution dismissal not independently verified. The Miami-Dade Clerk civil portal was accessed November 11, 2026, but no case-specific result was obtained. The portal is a search resource, not corroboration of the lead or the dismissal.
17. Pollstar Staff, "Blige Sued Over Canceled Concert" (June 20, 2013), VEW allegations concerning Dallas, deposit and Rolling Stones appearance; concluding artist-side denial.
18. TMZ Staff, "Mary J. Blige Sued Over Canceled Concert – Mick Jagger Stole Her!!!" (June 18, 2013), VEW's allegations and concluding quotation from publicist Karynne Tencer.
19. DE 42, pp. 4–9, anticipatory repudiation, apparent authority and legal options following repudiation — public court-order copy.
20. DE 42, pp. 7, 10–17, VEW's positions, timely retraction and venue emails — public court-order copy.
21. DE 42, pp. 12–18, reasonable-time analysis, travel-funding failure and dismissal of VEW's contract claim against MJP — public court-order copy.
22. DE 42, pp. 4, 18, 23–24, abandoned unjust-enrichment/punitive claims, lack of privity with Blige, and disposition — public court-order copy.
23. DE 42, pp. 21–23, fee installments, default remedy and VEW's unconscionability argument — public court-order copy.
24. DE 42, pp. 23–24, attorney-fee application and signed $105,000 judgment for MJP — public court-order copy.
25. Joe Clark v. Burke and VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2019-037826-CA-01, reported motion to vacate March 30, 2020, DIN 26. Civil docket search. Motion text, grounds and ruling not independently verified.
26. Dr. Jerry Doby, "Cardi B Announced as 1st Headliner for VEWTOPIA Music Festival 2020 in Miami," The Hype Magazine, Dec. 7, 2019, announcement, opening, early-bird and ticket paragraphs. Promotional material establishes what VEW Live announced, not all delivered performances or company-history claims.
27. "Vewtopia Music Festival announces full lineup and special $99 two-day pass," MLB.com, Jan. 7, 2020, release, opening, ticket and charitable-proceeds paragraphs. Announcement, not an audit of performances or donations.
28. Madeleine Marr, "What is the deal with Vewtopia? The music fest changed venues and folks are confused," Miami Herald, originally Jan. 29, updated Feb. 1, 2020, article, venue-change, repurchase, Burke quotation, refund-contact and gate/ticket paragraphs. Refund-completion statement attributed to spokeswoman, not independently reconciled transactions.

29. Aaliyah Pasols, “With the Help of Cardi B, Vewtopia Music Festival Found Its Footing After a Shaky Start,” Miami New Times, Feb. 3, 2020, review, first-night entry/cancellations/weather paragraphs, reproduced organizer statement, and second-night performance descriptions through Cardi B’s closing set. Eyewitness account; reported deleted manager/promoter posts not independently retrieved.
30. Defendants’ motion to quash, Nov. 22, 2022, PDF pp. 1–3 — redacted copy.
31. Burke affidavit and travel-confirmation attachment, executed Oct. 17, 2022, in motion to quash, PDF pp. 8–10, affidavit ¶¶ 1–6 — redacted copy; later itinerary attachment, plaintiffs’ contempt motion, PDF pp. 77–78 — redacted copy.
32. Motion to Quash Service of Process, Nov. 22, 2022, attached return and affidavit, PDF pp. 4, 8 — redacted copy.
33. Defendants’ Notice of Filing Supplemental Authority, Jan. 26, 2023, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy.
34. Jan. 30, 2023 hearing transcript in defense exhibit compilation, PDF pp. 5–16 (Tr. 4–15), especially PDF pp. 12–15, Tr. 11:9–11, 12:13–19, 14:4–5 — redacted copy.
35. Burke deposition, PDF p. 3, Tr. 7:13–8:9 — redacted copy.
36. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 3–4, Tr. 8:11–19, 10:6–10, 11:1–4 — redacted copy; affidavit ¶ 1, motion to quash, PDF p. 8 — redacted copy.
37. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 5–6, Tr. 17:21–24, 18:3–20 — redacted copy.
38. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 6, 8–9, Tr. 20:3–17, 29:20–30:3 — redacted copy.
39. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 6–7, Tr. 21:3–24, 22:1–18 — redacted copy.
40. Burke deposition, PDF p. 9, Tr. 30:4–22 — redacted copy.
41. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 7–8, Tr. 25:3–26:21, 29:7–19 — redacted copy.
42. Burke deposition, PDF pp. 7–8, Tr. 23:5–24:18, 27:1–29:4, quotation Tr. 27:19–22 — redacted copy.
43. American Airlines exhibits F and H, attached to plaintiffs’ Nov. 21 contempt motion, PDF pp. 82–88, 92–98; October letters pp. 82, 92; outbound manifest p. 88; April 4 manifest p. 93; booking histories pp. 86, 97 — redacted copy.
44. Burke deposition, PDF p. 10, Tr. 35:2–16, 36:2–8 — redacted copy. Household details not necessary to the service dispute are omitted.
45. Burke deposition, PDF p. 9, Tr. 31:9–33:18 — redacted copy.
46. Defendants’ Special Appearance in Response to Request for a CMC, filed June 6, 2023, PDF pp. 1–2, 5 — redacted copy; duplicate service-dated copy, June 2, PDF pp. 1–5 — redacted copy.
47. Defendants’ special appearance, PDF pp. 3–5, ¶¶ 7–11 and objection/conclusion — redacted copy; reproduced April 26 objection and counsel correspondence, exhibit compilation, PDF pp. 32–35 — redacted copy.
48. Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 11, 15–22, Tr. 11:1–11, 18:18–20, 21:3–4, 22:9 — redacted copy.
49. Lowe cross-examination, Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 32–33, 38–49, especially Tr. 32:11–33:2, 42:19–20, 43:5–12 — redacted copy.
50. Counsel arguments, Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 65–70, especially Tr. 65:18, 66:21, 67:22–70:22 — redacted copy.
51. Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 71–72, Tr. 71:6–72:16 — redacted copy; plaintiffs’ description of Aug. 23 order, contempt motion, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy.
52. Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 70–71, Tr. 70:24–71:5 — redacted copy; plaintiffs’ later reproduction with bracketed insertion, contempt motion, PDF p. 5 — redacted copy.
53. May 13 contempt order, PDF p. 1, finding A — redacted copy.
54. May 13 contempt order, PDF p. 2, adjudication paragraph — redacted copy. No separate prosecutor-filed charge or other criminal disposition is established in the reviewed record.
55. Defendants’ Rule 1.070(j) dismissal motion, Aug. 24, 2023, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy; withdrawal, e-filed Nov. 2, 2023, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy.
56. Yasmine Peru, “Chris Brown ‘super excited’ to perform in Jamaica at Bizarre Weekend,” The Gleaner (July 16, 2023), Burke interview, event program, ticket tiers, partners and projection — article.
57. Kediesha Perry, “Chris Brown delivers on his influence,” Jamaica Observer (Aug. 29, 2023), entrance time, set duration, conclusion and organizer list — review.
58. “BZR WKND is back!,” Jamaica Observer (Apr. 27, 2024), July dates, National Stadium, party/finale program and VEW Live/TGE statement — article.
59. Buzzz Caribbean Lifestyle and BZR WKND, joint Instagram post (Apr. 24, 2024), caption naming 2024 organizers and partners and describing Ryan Burke as president and producer — post. Retrieved caption; promotional statement, not a contract.
60. “BZR WKND postponed,” Jamaica Star (July 19, 2024), organizer release, original dates, autumn promise and refund instructions — article.
61. Kyle Denis, “Cardi B Will Headline a Caribbean Stadium for the First Time at BZR WKND Jamaica 2026,” Billboard (Aug. 14, 2026), announcement, organizer statement and retrospective paragraph on 2023–2025 — article.
62. Akeeile Harris, “Rap Sensation Sexyy Red Set to Headline BZR Weekend at Sabina Park,” Kaboom Magazine (Mar. 30, 2025), April 26 venue and lineup; final paragraph says last staging was in 2023 — article.
63. Order Dismissing Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Case Resolving the Motion to Convert Case to Chapter 7 or Appoint a Trustee as Filed by United States Trustee, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 24-14947-PDR, Doc. 39, signed July 15 and entered July 16, 2024; reproduced with certificate of notice, Doc. 40, filed July 18. PDF pp. 1–2 (recipients and attorney roles), p. 3 (signature, caption, July 11 hearing and debtor position), p. 4 (dismissal, no discharge, stay termination, reports and fees), p. 5 (professional applications and eventual closure) — redacted copy.

64. Notice of Hearing on Defendant's Emergency Motion to Cancel/Vacate Sale Date Scheduled for February 20, 2025, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, e-filed February 6, 2025, PDF p. 1 (filing stamp, matter, judge and February 18 hearing), p. 2 (Mittelberg's representation of Burke and the LLC) — redacted copy.
65. Debtor's Chapter 11 Case Management Summary, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, Doc. 18, May 2, 2025, PDF p. 1 (qualifications, filing date, business, property, purpose, Burke's role, income and tax certificate), p. 2 (secured debt, no unsecured claims, assets, employees and signature), pp. 3–5 (insurance attachment and temporary-binder terms) — redacted copy.
66. Justia docket reproduction, entries 11–12 (Oct. 23, 2025) and 13 (Nov. 13, 2025), appearance language, attempted-service report and motion attachments — docket.
67. Verified complaint, docket entry 1, PDF p. 2, paragraphs 13–16 — original RECAP PDF.
68. CourtListener, Echols v. Burke, entries 13, 15, 18–19, 24 and 29–30; last updated Sept. 16, 2026; checked Nov. 11, 2026 — docket. Docket labels verified; underlying orders and judgment not available as free RECAP downloads on the reviewed page.
69. Kyle Denis, "Cardi B Will Headline a Caribbean Stadium for the First Time at BZR WKND Jamaica 2026," Billboard, August 14, 2026, announcement, early-bird sales and organisers' statement — article.
70. "BZR WKND organisers urge patience among patrons amid Cardi B cancellation," Jamaica Observer, October 9, 2026, organiser social-media statement and Cardi B apology video — article.
71. "BZR WKND Jamaica Suspends Ticket Sales After Cardi B Withdrawal," DancehallMag, October 10, 2026, website suspension notice and reported ticket-sales/video remarks — article.
72. Claude Mills, "BZR WKND moves to December after Cardi B withdrawal," DancehallMag, October 13, 2026, postponement, condolences and refund instructions — article.
73. Joanne Clark, "BZR WKND postponed to December as organizers offer refunds, free tickets," Caribbean National Weekly, October 14, 2026, Tuesday announcement and documentary requirements for refunds/complimentary tickets — article.
74. BZR WKND event website, visible postponement, lineup and refund statement, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — promoter site. December dates and lineup TBA are visible; older title/metadata still use Cardi B and a July date and are not treated as current confirmation.
75. "All BZR WKND refunds now issued, organisers say," Jamaica Observer, November 4, 2026, social-media statement about backlog, processing and bank credit time — article.
76. "BZR confirms no Gov't funding Mum on other Cardi B claims," Jamaica Star, November 11, 2026, organiser release, payment assertions, refunds and December planning — article.
77. "BZR WKND ticket buyers still waiting on refund weeks after organisers pledged money back," Jamaica Observer, November 3, 2026, patron statements, attorney's intended complaints, October 19 promise and failed request for comment — article. Private patrons are not named here.
78. "BZR Weekend Sues Cardi B; Patrons Being Reimbursed," CVM Television, November 10, 2026, interview account, five-transfer description and Lewis–Burke exchange — article.
79. Alex Ocho, "Cardi B Dares Jamaican Concert Promoter To Sue Her, Accuses Him Of Lying About $2.5 Million Payment," Complex, November 11, 2026, November 9 broadcast/livestream dates, deposit, production and threatened countersuit — article.
80. "Cardi B's agent says she wasn't paid in full," Jamaica Gleaner, displayed November 11, 2026, Guirguis Tuesday-night X statement and Cardi B's second livestream/deposit position — article. URL contains November 12; displayed date and access on November 11 are retained.
81. "Gov't Says It Made No Commitment to Pay Fees for Proposed Cardi B Concert in Jamaica," CVM Television, November 10, 2026, Ministry statement — article.

CHAPTER 16 · OPEN QUESTIONS

What the record does not yet show

The missing orders, agreements and payment records that would answer the questions left open in the case chapters.

The chapters distinguish a missing record from an unresolved dispute. Some outcomes may already be recorded in a clerk's file but were not retrieved for this edition; other questions concern private contracts or payment records that may never become public. This chapter groups those gaps by theme and identifies the documents that could answer them. It does not infer wrongdoing, payment or exoneration from an unavailable document. Retrieval routes below are routes to check, not assurances that a document is online or freely accessible. The methods chapter explains the November 11, 2026 edition and correction policy.

Court outcomes and deciding documents not located

The early artist-booking cases

For TV Service ZAO, the January 9, 2013 order rejects the defendants' counterclaim but leaves ZAO's affirmative claims and the frozen funds unresolved. The case page lists termination January 23. The terminating order, any stipulation, trial disposition and escrow-release order would establish how the litigation ended. The Southern District of Florida clerk and PACER, case 1:12-cv-20317, are the places to seek those filings. A sealed settlement might not disclose its financial terms even if a public dismissal is available.[1] [2]

For the Rihanna allegation, the first task is identifying the case. The complaint and docket would establish the claimants, transaction and response; a dismissal or judgment would establish the outcome. Miami-Dade's civil index can be checked for Vision and Burke, including the expressly unverified possible match 2012-046329-CA-01. The reported lack-of-prosecution dismissal is not verified. No date, party identity or result should be supplied from that lead alone.[3] [4]

The Mary Jane Productions judgment is verified at $105,000 against Vision. What is missing is later fee relief, appellate history and satisfaction. PACER and the Southern District of New York clerk, 1:13-cv-04215-AT, would supply subsequent orders and filings; a relevant appellate docket would establish any appeal. The direction to apply for fees is not itself a fee award.[5]

State judgments and later relief

The judgments chapter retains recorded-instrument locators that were not independently retrieved. The Clark judgment and January settlement, the March 30, 2020 motion to vacate and its deciding order are needed in Miami-Dade 2019-037826-CA-01. The reported judgment is at OR Book 31833, pages 2101–2102, DIN 16; the motion is DIN 26. These records would establish the original terms and whether later relief changed the award.[6] [7]

For Capital, the New Jersey note, confession affidavit, judgment and subsequent docket would explain the judgment's basis and any challenge in BER-L-321-23. Miami-Dade 2023-028109-CA-01 and OR Book 34008, pages 758–760, identify the Florida enforcement route. DIN 19 and DIN 24 are needed to determine the amount and scope of the reported garnishment judgment and satisfaction. They cannot establish full satisfaction of the New Jersey award without their actual text.[8] [9]

For Bayfront, the complaint, default, May 26, 2026 judgment and later docket are needed in 2024-016045-CA-01, including OR Book 35320, pages 4699–4700. They would identify the transaction and any later relief. For Marlins, the complaint and dismissal in 2020-002259-CA-01, including OR Book 32708, page 1760, would establish what the case concerned and the dismissal terms. Neither the plaintiff's name nor the venue chronology proves a VEWtopia connection.[10] [11]

Every additional state lead in Chapter 06 requires the complete file, including later orders. That includes Miles, Spotlite, Santiago, Regions, Bramwell, Puntropolis and the provisionally identified individual cases. Broward's civil search and Official Records instrument search, or Miami-Dade's civil and recording systems, are the relevant custodians. An initial judgment must be checked alongside reported vacatur, dismissal or satisfaction. Missing CFNs for Marlins and the Capital collection entries should be obtained rather than guessed.[12] [13]

Service, foreclosure and company-case administration

For Kameka and Dzotsi, the original complaint, lending instruments, earlier defaults, August 23, 2023 written quashing/vacatur order and any reinstatement order would reconcile the civil judgment's history. The March 2024 fee-entitlement order and December 2024 second-contempt ruling would establish what further relief was actually ordered. The Broward clerk's file, CACE-22-001852, is the retrieval route; later motions describing orders are not substitutes for the orders.[14] [15] [16]

In the senior foreclosure, CACE-22-016620, the February 2025 emergency motion and hearing order would answer whether the sale was canceled or postponed. Eli Hen's transcript or a cancellation notice would establish whether the noticed April 14, 2026 deposition occurred. For the August 20 sale, certificates of sale and title, auction results, disbursement orders and later deficiency or possession orders would establish completion and consequences. A scheduled auction and reserved jurisdiction establish none of those later events.[17] [18] [19] [20]

For the company bankruptcies, PACER and the bankruptcy clerk can supply the first petition and schedules in 24-14947-PDR, including its signatory. Both U.S. Trustee motions and the July 11, 2024 and September 3, 2025 hearing records would explain the administration grounds. In 25-14362-SMG, the Chapter 7 trustee's reports, payment record for the authorized $74.92 and closing entry would answer later administration questions. Neither case is Burke's personal petition.[21] [22] [23] [24]

For Echols and Mosley, the December 18, 2025 jurisdiction order, January 20, 2026 order and AO450 judgment, February 17 motion and September 16 orders are essential. PACER or the Northern District of Illinois clerk, 1:25-cv-06604, would establish beneficiaries, grounds, scope and later effect. Free docket labels do not establish which party won or any damages amount.[25]

Money paid, refunded or recovered

The record gives historical receipts, awards, claims and estimates, not a present aggregate debt. A current balance generally requires a transaction ledger and supporting payments or credits, as well as any amended judgment, release or satisfaction. A public docket may reveal some but not all of that information.

In ZAO, account statements and escrow administration records would trace the $1.5 million received by NWE, the $1.05 million remaining January 31, 2012 and the ultimate disposition of the difference. A release order, refund documentation or settlement payment record would establish recovery. Collection records for the separate Sergeev/WMA default would answer a different question, not Burke's personal payment history.[26] [27]

For Clark, Capital, Bayfront and Blige, satisfaction instruments, garnishment distributions and creditor accountings would establish later credits or payment. The historical amounts cannot establish either full nonpayment or full repayment. Clerk records are the public starting point; a party's ledger may be necessary where payments were not separately docketed.[6] [9] [10] [5]

For Kameka/Dzotsi Claim 4, an allowance or objection order and trustee distributions would establish what was allowed and recovered. The $178,415.77 proof of claim is not proof of payment. Billing reconciliation could explain why claimed costs of $4,476.04 differ from the attached $4,118.04 expense sheet. In the foreclosure, an interest calculation or explanatory order could account for the $3,067.85 gap between displayed fixed components and the stated subtotal; sale distributions would establish application of proceeds.[28] [29]

For VEWtopia, artist agreements, venue invoices, ticket reports and payment receipts would answer the production and artist-payment questions. A box-office statement could establish attendance and revenue; charity receipts could establish the announced donations. The underlying weather advisory would verify the cited shutdown instruction. No court or press observation substitutes for those records.[30] [31]

For the BZR editions, venue and ticketing reports would establish exact 2023 attendance and vendor-loss documentation could quantify claimed losses. The reported supplier action concerns Sharon Burke and Solid View, not Ryan Burke. The Jamaican Supreme Court claim, case number and deciding documents would establish that separate dispute's result. The 2024 relief-spending records and replacement-event documentation would verify the promised assistance and whether a later staging occurred.[32] [33] [34] [35] [36]

Service or modification of the contempt sentence

The May 13, 2024 adjudication itself is established. Execution is a separate question. A jail commitment return or custody record tied to this order would establish whether Burke reported and served the written three-day term. A notice of appeal, $500 appeal-bond record and appellate orders would establish whether he challenged it. Broward's civil file and the applicable appellate docket are the public starting points; access to particular custody records may be restricted.[37]

The April 8 hearing transcript and original sentencing record would establish the complete defense and oral sentence before the written reduction. A reported May 16, 2025 modification replacing jail with a $5,000 fine and 30 hours of community service remains unverified. The modification order, referenced creditor motion ECF 36 and any compliance receipts would establish the terms and completion. The bankruptcy conversion order does not amend the state sentence.[38] [39]

Identity, authority and corporate ownership

The Illinois appearance's phrase "Putative Defendant Ryan Matthew Burke, erroneously sued as 'Ryan Burke'" requires the underlying appearance, attempted-service report, declaration and jurisdiction ruling before its meaning can be explained. The docket wording alone does not prove that another individual was served. The provisionally identified state cases likewise require complaints, service records or orders connecting the defendant to the promoter's documented businesses.[40] [12]

The identification chapter also leaves the self-portrait's original post and date unverified. An original public post or publication record could answer that limited provenance question. Name-only criminal-record matches remain excluded; more searching of unrelated names would not establish identity.

For companies, Sunbiz filing images could establish the NWE conversion instrument and which VEW Marketing document number the VEW Live manager entry intended. Articles, operating agreements, member registers and transaction-specific authorizations would establish ownership percentages and authority beyond filed titles. UCA's ownership and any Jamaican registration remain unverified; the appropriate company registry and signed agreements would answer those questions. Partner lists in event publicity do not establish ownership or allocate debts.[41] [42] [43] [44]

A current Florida professional-license record would answer present talent-agency licensing, not Sunbiz incorporation. Current primary USPTO records for serial 86785472 would resolve VEW LIVE!'s trademark status; attributable serials would be needed for VEWtopia or BZR. No registration should be invented from a brand name. The unexplained "2034" debtor caption and "Ruyan" spelling could be clarified by correction orders or clerk correspondence, without treating either as an alias.[45] [46] [22] [24]

The 2026 artist agreement and payments

The executed Cardi B agreement, production rider, amendments and payment schedule would establish the contracting party, fee, expense allocation, deadlines and cancellation rights. The five transfers described by CVM need beneficiary, settlement and purpose records, with private identifiers withheld. Records for the asserted late US$750,000 and its return would establish that separate movement. They cannot be reconciled solely by comparing public statements about US$2.5 million and approximately US$900,000.[47] [48]

Lawyers' correspondence and delivery records would establish notice and any deadline changes. The alleged government communications would establish who said what and with what authority, while the Ministry's denial remains a documented position. A filed complaint, receipt or docket would establish litigation; the chapter's incomplete public searches establish only that none was located. Authenticated PACER, relevant state clerks or the Jamaican court registry would be appropriate once a court or filing party is identified.[49] [50] [51] [52]

Ticket refunds and replacement events

Refund-request registers, processor settlement reports and recipient confirmations would establish requested, issued and received amounts separately. For VEWtopia, original-venue refunds and shortened-program remedies require separate ticket terms. For BZR 2024 and 2025, vendor records and contemporaneous cancellation notices would establish refund offers and delivery; the 2024 replacement date remains disputed in later reports.[53] [34] [35] [36]

For 2026, Tikkets/Kanoo Pays records and V12's refund register could reconcile the November 4 completion statement with later descriptions of ongoing reimbursement. Purchase terms would establish treatment of transaction fees and the relationship between the standing policy and special refund offer. Travel-payment receipts, complimentary-ticket issuance and any filed chargeback or regulatory decisions would verify remedies beyond announcements. Patrons' private correspondence need not be published to document totals.[54] [55] [56] [57]

Finally, artist confirmations, a venue agreement and a dated program would establish the December replacement bookings. The event site's December 19–20 dates and forthcoming-lineup notice are announcements, not proof that Cardi B agreed to return or that a replacement concert was completed.[58]

What remains unresolved

These questions are the limits of this edition, not conclusions about the people involved. A later order, authenticated agreement or reconciled payment record may answer an individual question without changing the others. Corrections and new replies belong alongside the affected chapter so readers can see what changed.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. PacerMonitor case page, case-information fields, filed January 26, 2012; terminated January 23, 2013; free page inspected November 11, 2026. For amended claims and freeze: DE 104, p. 2 and p. 12, footnote 8 — official PDF.
2. Order, DE 104, pp. 20–21, conclusion denying release of escrow and reserving ZAO's claims for trial — official PDF.
3. Courthouse News Service, "Bogus!", identified in the supplied research as December 2012; complete accessible one-sentence report, fetched November 11, 2026. The retrieved page does not display an exact publication day or identify the claimants by name. Its wording expressly attributes the accusation to the woman and bankruptcy trustee and identifies Rihanna as a nonparty.
4. Possible-match research lead supplied for checking: Youngman et al. v. Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Burke, No. 2012-046329-CA-01; identity and reported lack-of-prosecution dismissal not independently verified. The Miami-Dade Clerk civil portal was accessed November 11, 2026, but no case-specific result was obtained. The portal is a search resource, not corroboration of the lead or the dismissal.
5. DE 42, pp. 23–24, attorney-fee application and signed $105,000 judgment for MJP — public court-order copy.

6. Final Judgment for Damages, Joe Clark v. Burke and VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2019-037826-CA-01 (Feb. 19, 2020), DIN 16, e-filing 103560400, OR Book 31833, pp. 2101–2102, CFN 20200130597, award identified at instrument p. 1. Official Records search. Citation retained; judgment and settlement not independently re-retrieved.
7. Joe Clark v. Burke and VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2019-037826-CA-01, reported motion to vacate March 30, 2020, DIN 26. Civil docket search. Motion text, grounds and ruling not independently verified.
8. Final judgment, VEW Capital Group v. Ryan Burke and VEW Live LLC, N.J. Super. Ct., Law Div., Bergen County, BER-L-321-23 (Feb. 17, 2023), identified in Miami-Dade OR Book 34008, pp. 758–760, CFN 2023 R 895299; signed judgment identified at instrument p. 3 / OR p. 760. Official Records search. Citation retained; instrument not independently re-retrieved for this edition.
9. VEW Capital Group v. Burke and VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2023-028109-CA-01, foreign-judgment filing reported Dec. 2023; garnishment judgment DIN 19 (May 2024), OR Book 34221, p. 515; satisfaction DIN 24 (June 2024). Civil docket search and Official Records search. CFNs unavailable for these enforcement entries; scope and amounts not independently verified.
10. Default Final Judgment, Bayfront Park Management Trust v. VEW Live LLC, Miami-Dade No. 2024-016045-CA-01 (May 26, 2026), DIN 19, e-filing 248964897, OR Book 35320, pp. 4699–4700, CFN 20260360056, award identified at instrument p. 2; clerk default reported Dec. 30, 2024. Official Records search. Instrument and docket not independently re-retrieved.
11. Marlins Stadium Operator v. VEW Live, Miami-Dade No. 2020-002259-CA-01, reported dismissal Aug. 2021, DIN 13, OR Book 32708, p. 1760; CFN unavailable. Civil docket search and Official Records search. Reported motions and dismissal not independently verified.
12. Miami-Dade Clerk, Official Records online system and Civil, Family and Probate Courts online system; Broward Clerk, Public Case Search, accessed Nov. 11, 2026. Search interfaces opened, not case-specific verification. Miami-Dade interfaces describe Clerk's File Number and Recording Book/Page search options and anti-bot verification.
13. Broward County, Official Records instrument-number search, retrieval portal named in supplied record citations. Instruments in this table were not independently retrieved. Portal links are locators, not case-specific evidence.
14. Amended Final Default Judgment Establishing and Foreclosing Equitable Lien, July 12, 2022, ¶¶ 1–3, 5, 11, attached to Claim 4, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, May 21, 2025, PDF pp. 4–6 — redacted copy. The complaint and loan instruments are not in the reviewed packet.
15. Aug. 21 hearing, PDF pp. 71–72, Tr. 71:6–72:16 — redacted copy; plaintiffs' description of Aug. 23 order, contempt motion, PDF pp. 1–2 — redacted copy.
16. Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs Through December 20, 2024, attached to Claim 4, certificate dated May 6, 2025, PDF pp. 9–11, ¶¶ 1–3 — redacted copy. March and December underlying rulings are not attached.
17. Notice of Hearing on Defendant's Emergency Motion to Cancel/Vacate Sale Date Scheduled for February 20, 2025, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, e-filed February 6, 2025, PDF p. 1 (filing stamp, matter, judge and February 18 hearing), p. 2 (Mittelberg's representation of Burke and the LLC) — redacted copy.
18. Defendants Kameka Management Solutions, Inc. and Eryck Dzotsi's Notice of Taking Deposition, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, April 1, 2026, PDF p. 1 (caption and April 14 date), p. 2 (time, purpose and counsel), p. 3 (service) — redacted copy.
19. Final Judgment, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, July 16, 2026, PDF p. 1 (summary judgment, parties, note, interest and fees), p. 2 (credits, total, statutory interest, property and sale), p. 3 (distribution, possession and reserved jurisdiction), p. 4 (Senior Judge Christopher William Pole's signature) — redacted copy.
20. Notice of Sale Pursuant to Chapter 45, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, July 22, 2026, PDF p. 1 (judgment reference, defendants, parcel and August 20 sale), p. 2 (Rehns's signature) — redacted copy.
21. BKalerts, public docket reproduction for Bankr. S.D. Fla., 24-14947-PDR, undated, checked November 11, 2026, case header (May 21 filing, Chapter 11, Judge Russin and counsel), Doc. 34 (June 26 schedules reference), Doc. 39 (July 16 dismissal entry), Doc. 43 (August 22 closure) — docket reproduction. Underlying petition and schedules were not reviewed.
22. Order Dismissing Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Case Resolving the Motion to Convert Case to Chapter 7 or Appoint a Trustee as Filed by United States Trustee, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 24-14947-PDR, Doc. 39, signed July 15 and entered July 16, 2024; reproduced with certificate of notice, Doc. 40, filed July 18. PDF pp. 1–2 (recipients and attorney roles), p. 3 (signature, caption, July 11 hearing and debtor position), p. 4 (dismissal, no discharge, stay termination, reports and fees), p. 5 (professional applications and eventual closure) — redacted copy.
23. Order Converting Chapter 11 Case to Chapter 7, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, Doc. 47, signed September 9 and entered September 10, 2025, PDF p. 1 (signature, hearing and motions), p. 2 (conversion, creditors' motion moot and turnover), pp. 2–3 (accounting, schedules, notices and professional applications), p. 4 (U.S. Trustee submission) — redacted copy.
24. Order Granting Trustee's Motion Requesting the Entry of an Order Allowing Chapter 7 Trustee to Distribute $74.92 to the Representative of the Debtor, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, Doc. 123, November 2, 2026, PDF p. 1 (Chief Judge Grossman's signature and "Ruyan Burke" authorization), p. 2 (Kenneth A. Welt as trustee) — redacted copy.
25. CourtListener, Echols v. Burke, entries 13, 15, 18–19, 24 and 29–30; last updated Sept. 16, 2026; checked Nov. 11, 2026 — docket. Docket labels verified; underlying orders and judgment not available as free RECAP downloads on the reviewed page.
26. Order, DE 104, pp. 11–12, account balance and Burke deposition estimate, DE 98-2 at 26 — official PDF.
27. Order, DE 104, p. 2, footnote 2, identifying clerk's default DE 34 and final default judgment DE 63 (June 14, 2012) against Sergeev/WMA — official PDF.
28. Kameka Management Solutions, Inc. and Eryck Dzotsi, Joint Proof of Claim 4, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, May 21, 2025, PDF pp. 1–3 (amount, security, value and declaration), pp. 4–6 (attached historical state judgment), pp. 7–8 (interest), pp. 9–13 (additional-fee motion and declaration), pp. 14–19 (billing and expenses). PDF p. 19 gives $4,118.04 expenses; pp. 10 and 13 state $4,476.04 in claimed costs — redacted copy.

29. Publication's addition of the fixed entries printed in Final Judgment, Broward Circuit Court, CACE-22-016620, July 16, 2026, PDF pp. 1–2: principal plus both displayed default-interest amounts plus title search, attorney fees, filing, summons, service, first notice and expert fees equals $2,189,599.73; the stated subtotal is $2,192,667.58. No separate per-diem accumulation is included. The stated subtotal minus $101,410.80 and $2,133.97 equals $2,089,122.81 — redacted copy.
30. "Vewtopia Music Festival announces full lineup and special $99 two-day pass," MLB.com, Jan. 7, 2020, release, opening, ticket and charitable-proceeds paragraphs. Announcement, not an audit of performances or donations.
31. Aaliyah Pasols, "With the Help of Cardi B, Vewtopia Music Festival Found Its Footing After a Shaky Start," Miami New Times, Feb. 3, 2020, review, first-night entry/cancellations/weather paragraphs, reproduced organizer statement, and second-night performance descriptions through Cardi B's closing set. Eyewitness account; reported deleted manager/promoter posts not independently retrieved.
32. Tanesha Mundle, "Promoter Sharon Burke sued for $6m," The Gleaner (Sept. 7, 2024), reported August 2 Supreme Court filing, named defendants and claimed sums for 2023 concert supplies — article. Underlying filing and disposition not independently retrieved; Ryan Burke is not named as a defendant in this report.
33. Tanesha Mundle, "Sharon Burke denies doing business with H&L," The Gleaner (Sept. 10, 2024), her statement and Isat Buchanan's response — article.
34. "BZR WKND postponed," Jamaica Star (July 19, 2024), organizer release, original dates, autumn promise and refund instructions — article.
35. Kyle Denis, "Cardi B Will Headline a Caribbean Stadium for the First Time at BZR WKND Jamaica 2026," Billboard (Aug. 14, 2026), announcement, organizer statement and retrospective paragraph on 2023–2025 — article.
36. Akeeile Harris, "Rap Sensation Sexyy Red Set to Headline BZR Weekend at Sabina Park," Kaboom Magazine (Mar. 30, 2025), April 26 venue and lineup; final paragraph says last staging was in 2023 — article.
37. May 13 contempt order, PDF p. 2, commitment, reduction, appeal-bond and further-contempt paragraphs — redacted copy. Execution and any subsequent amendment are not established by the supplied primary records.
38. May 13 contempt order, PDF p. 1, hearing and beyond-reasonable-doubt paragraph — redacted copy.
39. Reported May 16, 2025 state sentencing modification and creditors' conversion motion, Bankr. S.D. Fla., 25-14362-SMG, ECF 36: underlying records not seen by this publication, reported modification not independently verified. The supplied conversion order, signed Sept. 9/entered Sept. 10, 2025, PDF pp. 1–2, references ECF 36 and deems that motion moot but contains no sentencing amendment — redacted copy.
40. Justia docket reproduction, entries 11–12 (Oct. 23, 2025) and 13 (Nov. 13, 2025), appearance language, attempted-service report and motion attachments — docket.
41. Sunbiz, NWE Talent Agency & Management, Inc., P11000004653, officer/agent, filing and conversion fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
42. Sunbiz, NWE Talent Agency & Management Company LLC, L12000015455, filing/effective dates, manager, agent, last event and document index, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — Sunbiz search by document number, L12000015455.
43. Sunbiz, VEW Marketing, Inc., P11000004667 and VEW Marketing, Inc., P19000038710, verified filing, officer/agent and last-event fields in supplied Nov. 11, 2026 research. Two document numbers, not one registration.
44. Sunbiz, Universal Creative Agency Inc, P19000045308, filing/effective dates, agent/president, Michigan office and reinstatement fields, checked Nov. 11, 2026 — source.
45. Florida Statutes section 468.401, subsections 1, 5 and 10 (definition and department); section 468.403, subsection 1 (license, exemptions and advertising) and subsections 2–9 (application requirements), 2026 text.
46. Justia trademark reproduction, serial 86785472, filing/registration, registrant and claimed-first-use fields, 2016 status date; Trademarkia history, March 17, 2023 Section 8 cancellation, both checked Nov. 11, 2026. Correct-serial current primary USPTO status not independently retrieved.
47. "BZR Weekend Sues Cardi B; Patrons Being Reimbursed," CVM Television, November 10, 2026, interview account, five-transfer description and Lewis–Burke exchange — article.
48. Alex Ocho, "Cardi B Dares Jamaican Concert Promoter To Sue Her, Accuses Him Of Lying About $2.5 Million Payment," Complex, November 11, 2026, November 9 broadcast/livestream dates, deposit, production and threatened countersuit — article.
49. "Cardi B fires back at BZR WKND promoter Ryan Burke over lawsuit threat, reveals she was paid US$900,000," World Music Views, November 9, 2026, reported deposit, production requirements, lawyers' communications and letter — article.
50. "Gov't Says It Made No Commitment to Pay Fees for Proposed Cardi B Concert in Jamaica," CVM Television, November 10, 2026, Ministry statement — article.
51. PACER Case Locator, public entry page, checked November 11, 2026, registration/login requirement and case-currency notice; authenticated search not completed — page.
52. Supreme Court of Jamaica, public judgment-index page, checked November 11, 2026; limited review, not a newly filed-claims register — index.
53. Madeleine Marr, "What is the deal with Vewtopia? The music fest changed venues and folks are confused," Miami Herald, originally Jan. 29, updated Feb. 1, 2020, article, venue-change, repurchase, Burke quotation, refund-contact and gate/ticket paragraphs. Refund-completion statement attributed to spokeswoman, not independently reconciled transactions.
54. "All BZR WKND refunds now issued, organisers say," Jamaica Observer, November 4, 2026, social-media statement about backlog, processing and bank credit time — article.
55. "BZR confirms no Gov't funding Mum on other Cardi B claims," Jamaica Star, November 11, 2026, organiser release, payment assertions, refunds and December planning — article.
56. "Refund Policy," Tikkets / Kanoo Pays Jamaica, undated, checked November 11, 2026, merchant/facilitator responsibilities, final-sale terms, transaction fees and force-majeure clauses — policy.

57. “BZR WKND ticket buyers still waiting on refund weeks after organisers pledged money back,” Jamaica Observer, November 3, 2026, patron statements, attorney’s intended complaints, October 19 promise and failed request for comment — article. Private patrons are not named here.

58. BZR WKND Jamaica, live event website, undated, checked November 11, 2026, visible postponement, refund announcement, Tikkets links and updated-lineup notice — organiser website. Metadata retained an older date/headliner; current visible text is used.

CHAPTER 17 · TIMELINE

Master timeline, 2010–2026: dated events

Dated filings, rulings, testimony, announcements and reported developments, with links to the chapters that establish their sources and limits.

This timeline brings the dated events in the case chapters together. Each row links to the chapter carrying its sources; a date can describe a filing, statement, publication or announced future event rather than completed performance. Unverified state-index leads and provisional identity matches retain those qualifications. Amounts are historical figures, not current balances. Where several records describe one development, the row separates the relevant dates or combines them without turning a notice into a completed hearing or sale. Earlier company formation and claimed career dates are set out in Chapter 03, outside this timeline's 2010–2026 range.

2010–2013

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
Since 2010	Burke later testified he had lived in Sunrise without interruption and worked from home.	TESTIMONY	02
August 12, 2010	Miles judgment reported; file and party linkage not independently verified.	EVENT	06
September 24, 2010	Vision administratively dissolved for annual-report reasons.	EVENT	03
January 6, 2011	Miles new trial and judgment set-aside reported; not independently verified.	EVENT	06
January 10–14, 2011	Vision reinstated January 10; NWE Inc. and first VEW Marketing filed January 13; VEW Live filed January 14.	EVENT	03
Mid-August 2011	Burke said his relationship with Troy Carter could secure Lady Gaga and requested a binder.	BURKE	04
August 23, 2011	WMA–NWE binder signed; NWE received $150,000, with stated fees of $300,000.	EVENT	04
August 28, 2011	ZAO–WMA binder contemplated $300,000 and $1.5 million artist compensation plus expenses.	EVENT	04
October 27, 2011	Miles dismissal without prejudice reported; not independently verified.	EVENT	06
October 30, 2011	Artist-acceptance deadline in the ZAO–WMA refund provision.	EVENT	04
December 16, 2011	Unaccepted Lady Gaga proposal dated; no authorized artist signature obtained.	EVENT	04
December 23, 2011	Burke demanded escrow funding by December 27 and described an onward artist deposit.	BURKE	04
About December 27, 2011	WMA paid NWE $1,350,000 on ZAO's behalf.	EVENT	04
January 1–6, 2012	VEW Music Group effective January 1; filed January 6.	EVENT	03
January 10, 2012	NWE sent an unaccepted proposal for October 9 at $3.5 million.	BURKE	04
January 12, 2012	Vision name corrected from the registry's misspelled "WORLWIDE."	EVENT	03
January 20, 2012	ZAO demanded $1,650,000 back.	ALLEGATION	04
January 26–29, 2012	ZAO case filed January 26, rather than January 27 in news coverage; NewsCore reported allegations and NWE's reported lack of comment January 29.[1]	EVENT	04

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
January 31, 2012	NWE had $1,050,000 remaining of $1.5 million received; NWE Inc. converted and NWE LLC filed.	EVENT	04, 03
February 1, 2012	Court froze escrow funds, DE 6.	FINDING	04
February 9–10, 2012	ZAO amended complaint February 9; RAPSI reported expanded allegations February 10.	ALLEGATION	04
March 12, 2012	Burke entities answered and counterclaimed; clerk default entered separately against Sergeev/WMA.	EVENT	04
April 16–30, 2012	Court gave default defendants until April 30 to respond; order signed April 16.	FINDING	04
June 1, 2012	Originally proposed MUZ-TV appearance date; no accepted Lady Gaga engagement established.	EVENT	04
June 14–20, 2012	Default judgment against Sergeev/WMA entered June 14; RAPSI reported $1.65 million June 20.	REPORT	04
September 28, 2012	VEW Live and first VEW Marketing administratively dissolved.	EVENT	03
October 1, 2012	Amended Blige Live Performance Agreement dated for December 9 in Dallas.	EVENT	05
October 9, 2012	Date proposed in NWE's January document; artist acceptance was not established.	EVENT	04
November 28–December 31, 2012	ZAO sought summary judgment November 28; defense responded December 18; ZAO replied December 31.	EVENT	04
December 2012	Courthouse News described a $75,000 Rihanna booking allegation; exact publication day and case identity unverified.	ALLEGATION	05
December 6, 2012	VEW sent $19,800 travel wires; Blige assistant sent cancellation email; Burke encouraged performance.	BURKE	05
December 7, 2012	MJP lawyer said ready to perform at 1:50 p.m.; VEW notified venue of cancellation nearly two hours later.	EVENT	05
December 8–9, 2012	VEW alleged Rolling Stones appearance December 8 displaced the December 9 Dallas show, which did not occur.	ALLEGATION	05
January 9, 2013	ZAO counterclaim and liquidated damages rejected; ZAO's affirmative claims and escrow release left for trial.	FINDING	04
January 16–23, 2013	Courthouse News reported ruling January 16; docket lists termination January 23, terms unavailable.	EVENT	04
March 21, 2013	VEW Live reinstated.	EVENT	03
June 18–20, 2013	Vision sued MJP and Blige June 18; artist representative denied breach; Pollstar reported claim June 20.	BURKE	05
July 22, 2013	NWE LLC dissolved for registered-agent reasons.	EVENT	03
September 30–October 1, 2013	TMZ and CNN reported MJP's travel-based countersuit and $105,000 demand.	ALLEGATION	05
November 2013	McLean judgment reported; promoter identity and instrument unverified.	EVENT	06

2014–2019

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
October 17–23, 2014	Torres entered $105,000 for MJP against Vision October 17; VEW claims rejected. TheJasmineBRAND reported and reproduced judgment October 23.	FINDING	05
November 21, 2014	Deadline directed for MJP's attorney-fee application; later award unverified.	FINDING	05

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
October 12, 2015	VEW LIVE! trademark application filed, serial 86785472.	EVENT	03
February–March 2016	First Wells Fargo judgment, vacatur and dismissal reported; identity and documents unverified.	EVENT	06
August 2016	Agreement later described in Capital judgment locator; underlying papers unverified.	EVENT	06
September 6, 2016	VEW LIVE! trademark registered, registration 5034854, per reproduction.	EVENT	03
2017	Capital locator describes promissory note and confession affidavit reaffirming or modifying the 2016 agreement.	EVENT	06
August 10, 2017	Vision amendment recorded in event history.	EVENT	03
July 2018	Second Wells Fargo foreclosure judgment reported; later relief and identity require file.	EVENT	06
April 2019	Santiago mediation/disposition reported; no award verified.	EVENT	06
May 1, 2019	Second VEW Marketing registration filed.	EVENT	03
May 20–23, 2019	UCA effective May 20; filed May 23.	EVENT	03
June 18, 2019	Second Wells Fargo judgment reportedly vacated and action dismissed; not independently verified.	EVENT	06
December 7–9, 2019	VEWtopia announced December 7 for January 31–February 1; early-bird sales scheduled December 9.	BURKE	07

2020–2021

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
January 2020	Clark settlement reported; actual terms not retrieved.	EVENT	06
January 7, 2020	VEW Live release advertised Marlins Park, $99 two-day pass, full lineup and charitable proceeds.	BURKE	07
January 29, 2020	Herald and New Times reported move to Miami Gardens, production-issue explanation, refund claims and $149 starting passes.	BURKE	07
January 31, 2020	VEWtopia first night: admission about 4:15 p.m., missing advertised acts and lightning-related early shutdown.	REPORT	07
February 1–3, 2020	DaBaby, Migos and Cardi B performed February 1; Herald story updated that day. New Times review published February 3, including organizer weather statement.	REPORT	07
February 19, 2020	Clark $625,000 plus interest judgment reported against Burke and VEW Live; instrument unverified.	EVENT	06
March 2020	Regions default judgment reported; scope and documents unverified.	EVENT	06
March 30, 2020	Clark motion to vacate reported, DIN 26; grounds and ruling unverified.	BURKE	06
May 2020	Mercedes-Benz judgment reported; amount and promoter identity unverified.	EVENT	06
October 2020	Puntropolis default entry reported; no final money award verified.	EVENT	06
February 2021	Regions stipulation order reported; operative terms unverified.	EVENT	06
March 1–May 6, 2021	Burke Development Group effective March 1/filed March 3; Saddle Club effective April 19/filed April 20; 2045 LLC effective May 1/filed May 6.	EVENT	03
July 23, 2021	$962,000 senior promissory note dated, as identified in later foreclosure judgment.	EVENT	09
August 2021	Marlins dismissal for lack of prosecution reported; instrument and VEWtopia connection unverified.	EVENT	06

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
September 1, 2021	Start of first default-interest period stated in senior foreclosure judgment.	FINDING	09

2022

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
February 3, 2022	Kameka complaint filing date asserted in later defense motion; original complaint absent.	BURKE	08
February 18–23, 2022	Summonses e-filed February 18; Lowe later testified she received process February 23.	EVENT	08
March 2022	Puntropolis dismissal and voluntary-dismissal entries reported; instruments unverified.	EVENT	06
March 31, 2022	Date Burke said applied to questioned Florida purchases, distinct from later posting dates.	BURKE	08
April 1, 2022	AA462 Miami–Las Vegas manifest lists Burke successfully flown.	EVENT	08
April 1–3 and April 9–13, 2022	Hotel reservation periods Burke identified; he explained gap by staying with a cousin.	BURKE	08
April 4, 2022	AA2742 Las Vegas–Miami manifest lists Burke successfully flown; actual overnight departure 23:50.	EVENT	08
April 11, 2022	Lowe described serving Burke at home; he denied encounter. One corporate return conflicts between April 4 and April 11.	ALLEGATION	08
April 14, 2022	Return date Burke claimed; later carrier letter could not locate specified AA1524 manifest.	BURKE	08
May 5, 2022	Service returns e-filed.	EVENT	08
July 2022	McLean satisfaction reported; instrument and promoter identity unverified.	EVENT	06
July 12, 2022	Amended default judgment: $200,000 principal, $120,000 payment credit, $107,212 lien; $4,080 fees separately stated.	FINDING	08
August 24, 2022	Conditional sale date in amended judgment; completion not established.	FINDING	08
October 4, 2022	Later sale notice referenced order setting November 9 sale; standalone order absent.	EVENT	08
October 17, 2022	Burke executed affidavit claiming continuous April 1–14 Las Vegas stay and denying service.	TESTIMONY	08
October 18 and 25, 2022	November sale notice published on both dates; notice-of-filing submitted October 25.	EVENT	08
November 9, 2022	Noticed sale date; purchaser, price and completion not established.	EVENT	08
November 22, 2022	Defendants moved to quash service and set aside default and sale order.	BURKE	08

2023

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
January 26, 2023	Defense filed supplemental service authorities.	BURKE	08
January 30, 2023	Haury allowed deposition and canceled noticed February 8 sale; no substantive sworn testimony taken.	ORDER	08

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
February 8, 2023	Sale date canceled by January 30 bench direction.	EVENT	08
February 17, 2023	Capital $1,100,534.43 judgment reported against Burke and VEW Live; underlying instrument unverified.	EVENT	06
February 23, 2023	Burke repeated Las Vegas account in deposition and explained missing records, posting dates and hotel gap.	TESTIMONY	08
March 2023	Defense later described proposed acceptance of service conditioned on vacatur; agreement not independently established.	BURKE	08
March 17, 2023	Trademarkia lists VEW LIVE! Section 8 cancellation; current primary status not retrieved.	EVENT	03
April 26, 2023	Defense magistrate-referral objection, later reproduced in special-appearance exhibits.	BURKE	08
June 2–6, 2023	Special appearance served June 2 and e-filed June 6; alleged agreement, sanctions and fees asserted.	BURKE	08
July 14, 2023	Observer launch story projected 45,000 patrons and advertised suites up to US$15,000.	REPORT	12
July 16, 2023	Gleaner quoted Burke on Chris Brown, production, US$45-and-up tiers and more than 47,000 over 48 hours.	BURKE	12
July 17, 2023	Star reported ticket range up to US$10,000 and concert-linked loans from an outside lender.	REPORT	12
August 2–14, 2023	Radio Jamaica reported additions August 2; DancehallMag reported 12 suites sold August 3 and 50,000-plus projected across five events. Caribbean National Weekly described suite inclusions/loans August 14.	REPORT	12
August 21, 2023	Burke and Lowe testified; defense disputed identification; Haury granted quashing and left future contempt open.	ORDER	08
August 23, 2023	Written quashing/vacatur order described in plaintiffs' later motion; operative copy absent.	ALLEGATION	08
August 24, 2023	Defense moved for untimely-service dismissal; Radio Jamaica separately reported concert security instructions.	BURKE	08, 12
August 25–27, 2023	Announced debut BZR weekend, including parties, brunch and National Stadium finale.	BURKE	12
August 27–29, 2023	Gleaner reported entry/vendor complaints August 27; Brown performed after midnight into August 28, ending after 2 a.m.; Observer review published August 29.	REPORT	12
September 21, 2023	Deadline printed in subpoena attachment preceded October filing; orderly completion on that date not established.	EVENT	08
September 22, 2023	VEW Music Group and Saddle Club administratively dissolved.	EVENT	03
October 5–10, 2023	Carrier letter October 5 could not locate specified April 14, 2022 AA1524 manifest; nonparty-production notice/subpoena filed October 10.	EVENT	08
October 20, 2023	Service certificate date on later-filed withdrawal of dismissal motion.	BURKE	08
October 30, 2023	Carrier letter accompanied successfully-flown April 4, 2022 return record; underlying date controls over motion narrative.	EVENT	08
November 2, 2023	Defense withdrawal e-filed; no reason stated.	BURKE	08
November 21, 2023	Plaintiffs filed verified contempt/vacatur motion alleging perjury and a forged or altered itinerary.	ALLEGATION	08
November 22–30, 2023	Hearing notice filed November 22 scheduled November 30; occurrence and result not established by notice.	EVENT	08

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
December 2023	Capital foreign judgment filing reported in Miami-Dade; case-specific file not retrieved.	EVENT	06
December 1, 2023	Boundary between senior judgment's two default-interest periods; per diem separately stated.	FINDING	09
December 2, 2023	Show-cause order issued and served, according to May 2024 signed order; separate records absent.	FINDING	08

2024

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
January–February 2024	Bramwell lack-of-prosecution dismissal reported January; Regions voluntary dismissal with prejudice reported February. Instruments and effect on earlier Regions judgment unverified.	EVENT	06
March 20, 2024	Plaintiffs' later fee motion recounted fee-entitlement order and deferred show-cause ruling; order absent.	ALLEGATION	08
April 8, 2024	Contempt hearing at 9:30 a.m., recited in signed order; transcript absent.	FINDING	08
April 24–27, 2024	Joint promotional caption April 24 named partners; Observer April 27 announced July 26–28 return.	BURKE	12
May 2024	Capital garnishment judgment reported, DIN 19; scope and amount unverified.	EVENT	06
May 13, 2024	Haury found Burke lied, supplied fake travel material and obstructed justice; adjudged indirect and direct criminal contempt.	FINDING	08
May 15–24, 2024	Contempt order recorded May 15, instrument 119575457; service window began. Company Chapter 11 filed May 21; contempt order filed there May 24 as Doc. 10-1.	EVENT	08, 10
June 2024	Capital garnishment satisfaction and Spotlite bankruptcy suggestion reported; state documents unverified.	EVENT	06
June 26, 2024	First bankruptcy docket lists schedules/statements filed; totals and signatory not reviewed.	EVENT	10
July 2024	Spotlite disposition/closure entries reported; state outcome not independently verified.	EVENT	06
July 11, 2024	Bankruptcy dismissal hearing; debtor did not object and U.S. Trustee did not oppose dismissal.	BURKE	10
July 15–16, 2024	Dismissal signed July 15, entered July 16; no discharge, stay terminated. July 15 also ended contempt-service window.	FINDING	10, 08
July 17–18, 2024	State notice filed July 17; bankruptcy notice certificate filed July 18, listing Spotlite and others.	EVENT	10
July 18–19, 2024	Organizers announced Beryl-related postponement July 18, reported July 19; autumn date and refund offer promised.	BURKE	12
July 26–28, 2024	Originally announced BZR return dates; program postponed. Later staging unverified.[2] [3]	EVENT	12
August 2, 2024	Hardware and Lumber reportedly filed supplier claim against Sharon Burke and Solid View, not Ryan Burke.	ALLEGATION	12
August 22, 2024	First company bankruptcy closure recorded in public docket reproduction.	EVENT	10
September 7–10, 2024	Gleaner reported supplier claim September 7; Sharon Burke and lawyer denied personal liability September 10.	REPORT	12
Autumn 2024	Replacement season promised for BZR; no fixed date or independently verified staging.	BURKE	12
December 20, 2024	Plaintiffs' later fee motion recounted second-contempt fee ruling; underlying ruling absent.	ALLEGATION	08

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
December 30, 2024	Bayfront clerk default reported; instrument and docket not independently retrieved.	EVENT	06

2025

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
January 2025	Nemzer dismissal/settlement entries reported; terms and promoter identity unverified.	EVENT	06
February 6, 2025	Defense filed hearing notice seeking cancellation/vacatur of February 20 foreclosure sale.	BURKE	09
February 14, 2025	Echols/Mosley complaint alleges $15,645.95 paid to VEW Live.	ALLEGATION	11
February 18–20, 2025	Emergency hearing scheduled February 18 concerning February 20 sale; outcome and completion unverified.	EVENT	09
March 15, 2025	Complaint alleges $150,000 paid to UCA.	ALLEGATION	11
March 24, 2025	Complaint alleges $62,500 paid to Burke personally.	ALLEGATION	11
March 30, 2025	Kaboom advertised April 26 Carnival show and said last Jamaican staging was 2023.	REPORT	12
April 4, 2025	Complaint alleges $70,000 paid to VEW Live; four listed transfers total $298,145.95.	ALLEGATION	11
April 8, 2025	Alleged promised repayment date; date of conversation itself not stated.	ALLEGATION	11
April 10, 2025	Prior continuance date in later Davie code minutes.	EVENT	09
April 21, 2025	Second company Chapter 11 filed, 25-14362-SMG.	EVENT	10
April 26, 2025	Announced Sabina Park Carnival show date; later Billboard account reports weather cancellation.	REPORT	12
May 2025	Prestige default final judgment reported; amount and promoter identity unverified.	EVENT	06
May 2, 2025	Debtor summary: stop-foreclosure purpose, $2.9 million assets, $962,000/$107,212 secured estimates and no unsecured claims.	BURKE	10
May 6, 2025	Certificate date on plaintiffs' fee motion later attached to Claim 4.	EVENT	08
May 16, 2025	Sentence modification to $5,000 fine and 30 community-service hours reported only in secondary material; unverified.	EVENT	08
May 21, 2025	Kameka/Dzotsi filed Claim 4 for $178,415.77, including $131,104.73 secured and $47,311.04 unsecured.	ALLEGATION	10
June 13–16, 2025	Echols/Mosley verified complaint filed June 13; Cummings assigned June 16.	EVENT	11
July 1–30, 2025	Illinois order July 1 required joint status report by July 30.	ORDER	11
July 10, 2025	Davie code minutes recorded permits/landscaping matter canceled/corrected before hearing.	EVENT	09
August 25, 2025	Illinois court extended missing status-report deadline to September 5 and warned of dismissal.	ORDER	11
September 3–5, 2025	Bankruptcy conversion hearing September 3; Illinois extended status-report deadline September 5.	EVENT	10, 11
September 9–10, 2025	Conversion signed September 9, entered September 10; U.S. Trustee motion granted, creditor motion moot.	FINDING	10
September 18, 2025	Illinois order noted notice problem and required service report by October 3, with mailed notice.	ORDER	11
September 26, 2025	Vision, VEW Live and 2045 company administratively dissolved.	EVENT	03
October 3, 2025	Illinois plaintiffs filed status report on service; text unavailable.	EVENT	11

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
October 23, 2025	Counsel appeared for putative Ryan Matthew Burke, asserted erroneous designation and filed attempted-service report.	BURKE	11
November 13, 2025	Jurisdiction-dismissal motion filed with defendant and counsel declarations; substantive texts unavailable.	BURKE	11
December 18, 2025	Illinois docket lists order on jurisdiction motion; granted/denied result unverified.	EVENT	11

2026

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
January 2026	Nationstar filing reported; promoter identity and case-specific record unverified.	EVENT	06
January 20, 2026	Illinois order and AO450 judgment entered; beneficiary, grounds and award unverified.	EVENT	11
February 17, 2026	Illinois miscellaneous-relief motion filed; purpose unavailable.	EVENT	11
February 24, 2026	Vision, VEW Live, UCA and second VEW Marketing reinstated; Vision/VEW Live reports filed.	EVENT	03
March 2, 2026	V12 Group LLC filed; Burke listed as authorized member and Roy Morgan as agent.	EVENT	03
April 1–14, 2026	Eli Hen deposition noticed April 1 for April 14; testimony not established.	EVENT	09
May 26, 2026	Bayfront company-only $83,487.37 plus interest default judgment reported; instrument unverified.	EVENT	06
July 15–16, 2026	Foreclosure hearing July 15; Pole signed July 16 judgment stating $2,089,122.81 and senior priority.	FINDING	09
July 22, 2026	Chapter 45 notice filed for August 20 auction.	EVENT	09
August 14, 2026	Billboard announced Cardi B for October 18, quoted Burke/Morgan and retrospectively described earlier BZR editions.	BURKE	13, 12
August 20, 2026	Conditional foreclosure sale scheduled for 10 a.m.; completion, title and proceeds not established.	EVENT	09
August 21, 2026	Announced start of BZR early-bird sales; transaction record not verified.	BURKE	13
August 26–28, 2026	Kingston launch August 26 attended by Grange/Seiveright; artist manager expressed support. JIS report August 27 projected 50,000-plus, said tier one sold out and announced tier two August 28; page updated August 28.	REPORT	13
September 16, 2026	Illinois miscellaneous-relief order and further order entered; operative terms unavailable.	EVENT	11
September 17, 2026	Production-payment deadline Cardi B alleged was missed; agreement not reviewed.	ALLEGATION	13
Late September 2026	Burke later pointed to Cardi B's management change as a possible cancellation factor.	BURKE	13
September 25, 2026	Burke Development Group administratively dissolved.	EVENT	03
September 28, 2026	Billboard expanded lineup with Keyshia Cole, Spice and other artists.	REPORT	13
October 8, 2026	Cardi B's representatives confirmed withdrawal from October 18; no reason in statement.	REPORT	13
October 9, 2026	Cardi B apologized in video; organizers asked patience while working through developments.	BURKE	13
October 10, 2026	DancehallMag reported website suspension of ticket sales, without refund terms at that point.	BURKE	13

Date	Event	Type	Chapter
October 12, 2026	National Stadium booking canceled, according to officials cited by World Music Views.	REPORT	13
October 13–14, 2026	Organizers announced December 20 postponement/refunds October 13; World Music Views observed renewed advertising. Caribbean National Weekly published refund/complimentary-ticket instructions October 14.	BURKE	13
October 16–19, 2026	Originally advertised BZR weekend; October 18 Cardi B performance did not occur.	EVENT	13
October 19, 2026	Promised refund-initiation date, with three to seven business days for bank reflection; completion not established.	BURKE	13
November 1, 2026	Chapter 7 trustee sought minimal-funds distribution to enable closing; motion description in public docket.	EVENT	10
November 2, 2026	Grossman authorized $74.92 to debtor representative, spelled “Ruyan Burke”; receipt/closure unverified.	FINDING	10
November 2, 2026	Nationstar default entry reported; promoter identity and case-specific file unverified.	EVENT	06
November 3, 2026	Observer reported some refunds received and others delayed, planned complaints and unsuccessful organizer contact.	REPORT	13
November 4, 2026	Organizers apologized and said all outstanding refunds processed/issued, with additional bank time.	BURKE	13
November 9, 2026	Reported CVM broadcast: Burke claimed full US$2.5 million payment and legal action; Cardi B livestream disputed payment/production account.[4]	BURKE	13
November 10, 2026	CVM interview article published; Ministry denied funding commitment; artist agent and further livestream disputed full payment.	REPORT	13
November 11, 2026	BZR denied government funding; reports carried artist apology/deposit position; no lawsuit located in limited checks. Edition/site/profile review recorded December 19–20 announcement and lineup forthcoming.	BURKE	13, 00, 02, 03
December 19–20, 2026 (announced)	Live site advertised replacement weekend, with December 20 marquee date; lineup and completed event not established at cutoff.	BURKE	13

What remains unresolved

The timeline is not a docket-completeness certificate. For later outcomes, payment balances, sentence compliance and announced replacement events, see the open questions. The 2024 staging conflict has no verified replacement date, and the CVM broadcast and written article have separate dates, rather than two interviews established by the record.

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. DeShayla Strachan, “Trial Needed to Sort Out Botched Lady Gaga Deal”, Courthouse News Service (January 16, 2013), ruling coverage. The signed order identifies O’Sullivan as a magistrate judge; PacerMonitor’s filing date is used rather than the article’s January 27 date.
2. Kyle Denis, “Cardi B Will Headline a Caribbean Stadium for the First Time at BZR WKND Jamaica 2026,” Billboard (Aug. 14, 2026), announcement, organizer statement and retrospective paragraph on 2023–2025 — article.
3. Akeeile Harris, “Rap Sensation Sexyy Red Set to Headline BZR Weekend at Sabina Park,” Kaboom Magazine (Mar. 30, 2025), April 26 venue and lineup; final paragraph says last staging was in 2023 — article.
4. Alex Ocho, “Cardi B Dares Jamaican Concert Promoter To Sue Her, Accuses Him Of Lying About $2.5 Million Payment,” Complex, November 11, 2026, November 9 broadcast/livestream dates, deposit, production and threatened countersuit — article.

APPENDIX A

Register of redacted court filings

These 26 filings are posted in redacted form at ryan-burke-bzr-wknd-vew-live.com/documents/. Telephone numbers, email addresses, dates of birth, account numbers, airline record locators, third-party passenger data and residential service addresses were permanently removed before publication.

Date	Document	Court / case	Type	Pp.
February 18, 2022	Summons Issued to Ryan Burke	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Summons	2
February 18, 2022	Summons Issued to VEW Live, LLC	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Summons	3
October 25, 2022	Notice of Filing Notice of Sale	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Notice	2
November 22, 2022	Defendants' Motion to Quash Service, Set Aside Default and Order of Sale	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Motion with affidavit	10
January 26, 2023	Defendants' Notice of Supplemental Authority on Service of Process	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Notice	2
February 23, 2023	Deposition of Ryan Burke (Condensed Transcript)	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Deposition transcript	25
June 2, 2023	Special Appearance by Defendants (Service-Dated Copy)	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Special appearance	7
June 6, 2023	Defense Exhibits: January 30, 2023 Hearing Transcript and Correspondence	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Exhibits	36
June 6, 2023	Special Appearance by Defendants in Response to Request for Case Management Conference	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Special appearance	7
August 21, 2023	Transcript of the August 21, 2023 Evidentiary Hearing on the Motion to Quash	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Hearing transcript	91
August 24, 2023	Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Untimely Service	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Motion	2
October 10, 2023	Notice of Production From Non-Party American Airlines Group (Subpoena)	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Subpoena	5
November 2, 2023	Defendants' Notice of Withdrawal of Motion to Dismiss	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Notice	2

Date	Document	Court / case	Type	Pp.
November 21, 2023	Plaintiffs' Verified Motion for Order to Show Cause (Criminal Contempt) and to Vacate Order Quashing Service	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Verified motion with exhibits	98
November 30, 2023	Notice of Hearing on the Motion for Order to Show Cause	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Hearing notice	2
May 13, 2024	Order Adjudging Ryan Burke in Indirect Criminal Contempt of Court and Order of Commitment	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Order	2
July 16, 2024	Order Dismissing the Chapter 11 Case of 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC, With Certificate of Notice	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida 24-14947-PDR	Order	5
July 17, 2024	Plaintiffs' Notice of Filing Order Dismissing Chapter 11 Case	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-001852	Notice	5
February 18, 2025	Notice of Hearing on Defendants' Emergency Motion to Cancel the February 20, 2025 Sale	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-016620	Hearing notice	2
May 2, 2025	Chapter 11 Case Management Summary of 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida 25-14362-SMG	Case management summary	5
May 21, 2025	Proof of Claim No. 4 by Kameka Management Solutions and Eryck Dzotsi	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida 25-14362-SMG	Proof of claim	19
September 10, 2025	Order Converting Chapter 11 Case to Chapter 7	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida 25-14362-SMG	Order	4
April 1, 2026	Notice of Taking Deposition of Eli Hen	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-016620	Deposition notice	3
July 16, 2026	Final Judgment of Foreclosure ($2,089,122.81)	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-016620	Judgment	4
July 22, 2026	Notice of Sale Pursuant to Chapter 45	Broward County Circuit Court (17th Judicial Circuit, Fla.) CACE-22-016620	Sale notice	2
November 2, 2026	Order Allowing Chapter 7 Trustee to Distribute $74.92 to the Debtor's Representative	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida 25-14362-SMG	Order	2

APPENDIX B

Source index

161 sources, checked November 11, 2026.

Court records: federal

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
1	TV Service ZAO: order requiring response to default-judgment motion against Sergeev and WMA, DE 48 Response deadline only; final default judgment DE 63 was entered June 14, 2012, as identified in DE 104.	U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida / GovInfo	Apr 16, 2012
2	TV Service ZAO v. NWE Talent Agency and Management, Inc. et al.: public case summary Lists filed January 26, 2012 and terminated January 23, 2013; inspected November 11, 2026. Free page does not disclose termination terms.	PacerMonitor	2013
3	Vision Entertainment Worldwide v. Mary Jane Productions and Mary Jane Blige — docket reproduction	Justia / U.S. District Court, S.D. New York	2013
4	TV Service ZAO v. NWE — summary-judgment order, DE 104	U.S. District Court, S.D. Florida / GovInfo	Jan 9, 2013
5	Vision Entertainment Worldwide v. Mary Jane Productions and Mary Jane Blige, DE 42, Memorandum, Order and Judgment No. 1:13-cv-04215-AT, p. 24: $105,000 judgment for Mary Jane Productions against VEW, not Burke personally. News-hosted watermarked primary ruling; current balance unknown.	U.S. District Court, S.D. New York; external reproduction by theJasmineBRAND	Oct 17, 2014
6	Public docket reproduction, 2045 SW 127 Avenue, LLC, 24-14947-PDR Undated reproduction of 2024 docket, checked November 11, 2026; supports May 21 filing, July 16 dismissal and August 22 closure; underlying petition and schedules not reviewed.	BKalerts	2024
7	Order dismissing Chapter 11 case and certificate of notice, 24-14947-PDR Order signed July 15 and entered July 16; certificate filed July 18; no discharge and stay terminated; attached order caption says 2034.	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida	Jul 16, 2024
8	Debtor's Chapter 11 case-management summary, Doc. 18, 25-14362-SMG April 21 filing, debtor purpose, management, approximate income, assets and debts; includes temporary insurance binder.	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida	May 2, 2025
9	Kameka Management Solutions and Eryck Dzotsi, joint Proof of Claim 4, 25-14362-SMG $178,415.77 claimed, not a reviewed allowance order; historical judgment and fee materials attached; expense entries contain unexplained $358 difference.	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida	May 21, 2025
10	Verified complaint, Echols et al. v. Burke et al., 1:25-cv-06604, docket entry 1 Project-payment allegations for the 2025 Carnival Edition; external unredacted filing contains private data and is not re-hosted.	U.S. District Court, N.D. Illinois; CourtListener RECAP	Jun 13, 2025
11	Order converting Chapter 11 case to Chapter 7, Doc. 47, 25-14362-SMG Signed September 9 and entered September 10; U.S. Trustee motion granted; creditors' separate conversion motion moot; hearing reasons not supplied.	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida	Sep 10, 2025

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
12	Echols et al. v. Burke et al.: docket reproduction through November 13, 2025 Defense appearance and jurisdiction-motion descriptions.	Justia Dockets & Filings	Nov 13, 2025
13	CourtListener/RECAP search: BZR WKND Checked November 11; returned Echols v. Burke 2025, not Cardi litigation.	CourtListener / Free Law Project	2026
14	CourtListener/RECAP search: Belcalis AND Ryan Burke Checked November 11; no results, not a comprehensive PACER certification.	CourtListener / Free Law Project	2026
15	CourtListener/RECAP search: Cardi B AND Ryan Burke Checked November 11; no results; RECAP coverage incomplete.	CourtListener / Free Law Project	2026
16	PACER Case Locator public entry page Checked November 11; registration/login required; no authenticated nationwide search completed.	Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	2026
17	Public docket reproduction, 2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC, 25-14362-SMG Undated reproduction checked November 11, 2026; last reviewed entry November 2, 2026; no later case closure shown.	Inforuptcy	2026
18	Echols v. Burke, 1:25-cv-06604: docket through September 16, 2026 January 20 judgment and September orders are listed; their operative terms were not freely available for review.	CourtListener / Free Law Project	Sep 16, 2026
19	Order allowing Chapter 7 trustee distribution of $74.92, Doc. 123, 25-14362-SMG Authorizes payment to debtor representative spelled Ruyan Burke; does not establish receipt, full distribution history or closure.	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida	Nov 2, 2026

Court records: Florida

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
20	Miles Entertainment LLC v. Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Burke, CACE10007738 Reported judgment August 12, 2010; new trial/vacatur January 6, 2011; dismissal without prejudice October 27, 2011. Party list and history not independently verified.	Broward Clerk of Courts	2011
21	Wells Fargo civil index lead, CACE15000510 Reported judgment followed by March 2016 vacatur/dismissal; instruments 113509761 and 113588217. Promoter identity, aliases and disposition not independently verified.	Broward Clerk of Courts	2016
22	Christian Santiago v. VEW Live, CACE14022119 Reported mediation and April 2019 disposition; instrument 115734710. No award established; history not independently verified.	Broward Clerk of Courts	2019
23	Wells Fargo civil index lead, CACE17004624 Reported July 2018 judgment, sale vacatur and June 18, 2019 vacatur/dismissal; instrument 115216627. Identity and history provisional/unverified.	Broward Clerk of Courts	2019
24	Mercedes-Benz Financial Services civil index lead, COSO19013400 Reported May judgment and later collection; instrument 116503060. Middle-initial match provisional; amount, balance and identity unverified.	Broward Clerk of Courts	2020
25	Joe Clark v. Burke and VEW Live — judgment locator Miami-Dade 2019-037826-CA-01; OR Book 31833, pp. 2101–2102. Instrument not independently retrieved this edition.	Miami-Dade Clerk, Official Records retrieval portal	Feb 19, 2020

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
26	Joe Clark v. Burke and VEW Live: final judgment for damages, 2019-037826-CA-01 DIN 16; OR 31833/2101–2102; CFN 20200130597; e-filing 103560400. Award identified at instrument p. 1. Citation only; instrument not re-retrieved.	Miami-Dade Circuit Court	Feb 19, 2020
27	Joe Clark v. Burke and VEW Live: reported motion to vacate, DIN 26 2019-037826-CA-01. Motion text, grounds and ruling not independently verified.	Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts	Mar 30, 2020
28	Marlins Stadium Operator v. VEW Live — dismissal locator Miami-Dade 2020-002259-CA-01; DIN 13; OR Book 32708, p. 1760. Case-specific record not independently retrieved.	Miami-Dade Clerk, Official Records retrieval portal	2021
29	Marlins Stadium Operator v. VEW Live: reported dismissal, 2020-002259-CA-01 August 2021 dismissal reported; DIN 13, OR 32708/1760; CFN unavailable. Complaint, motions and instrument not independently verified.	Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts	2021
30	Jermaine McLean civil index lead, COWE13008216 Reported November 2013 judgment and July 2022 satisfaction; instruments 111909199 and 118285704. Identity and disposition unverified.	Broward Clerk of Courts	2022
31	Puntropolis Inc. v. VEW Music Group, 2020-010605-CA-01 Reported 2020 default and March 2022 dismissals; DIN 25, OR 33052/3509; DIN 27, OR 33053/2570. No final award established; not independently verified.	Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts	2022
32	Summons issued to Ryan Burke, CACE-22-001852 Issuance does not establish completed service.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Feb 18, 2022
33	Summons to VEW Live, CACE-22-001852 Redacted hosted copy; pinpoint cited in chapter.	Circuit Court, Broward County, Florida	Feb 18, 2022
34	Notice of filing notice of sale and publication affidavit, CACE-22-001852 Notice of a November 9, 2022 sale; completion not established.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Oct 25, 2022
35	Defendants' motion to quash service, set aside default and sale order, CACE-22-001852 Defense motion with Burke's October 17 affidavit asserting Las Vegas travel and denying service.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Nov 22, 2022
36	Defense exhibit compilation: January 30 hearing, correspondence, objection and authority Underlying January–May materials; compilation filing date not shown.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	2023
37	Defendants' notice of supplemental service authorities, CACE-22-001852	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Jan 26, 2023
38	VEW Capital Group v. Burke and VEW Live — foreign judgment locator New Jersey BER-L-321-23; Miami-Dade 2023-028109-CA-01; OR Book 34008, pp. 758–760. Instrument not independently retrieved.	Miami-Dade Clerk, Official Records retrieval portal	Feb 17, 2023
39	Ryan Burke deposition, CACE-22-001852 Redacted hosted copy; pinpoint cited in chapter.	Circuit Court, Broward County, Florida	Feb 23, 2023
40	Special appearance responding to request for a case-management conference, service-dated copy Substantively duplicates the June 6 filed response; not a separate judicial event.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Jun 2, 2023
41	Defendants' special appearance responding to request for a case-management conference, CACE-22-001852 Defense allegations about an agreement and magistrate scheduling; June 2 service certificate.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Jun 6, 2023
42	Transcript of evidentiary hearing on motion to quash, CACE-22-001852 Contains sworn testimony and bench ruling granting motion to quash.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Aug 21, 2023

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
43	Defendants' Rule 1.070(j) motion to dismiss for untimely service, CACE-22-001852 Later withdrawn; not a dismissal order.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Aug 24, 2023
44	Nonparty-production notice and American Airlines subpoena, CACE-22-001852 Attached September deadline predates the October filing.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Oct 10, 2023
45	Defendants' withdrawal of untimely-service dismissal motion, CACE-22-001852 E-filed November 2; certificate dated October 20.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Nov 2, 2023
46	Plaintiffs' verified criminal-contempt and vacatur motion, CACE-22-001852 Party allegations and account of prior vacatur; not itself a contempt adjudication.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Nov 21, 2023
47	Notice scheduling evidentiary hearing on plaintiffs' contempt motion, CACE-22-001852 Schedules November 30; notice alone does not establish hearing or outcome.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Nov 22, 2023
48	Kemar Bramwell v. VEW Live and We Do Eventz, 2022-011979-CA-01 Reported January 2024 lack-of-prosecution dismissal; DIN 30, OR 34054/107. Not independently verified.	Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts	2024
49	Patrick St Fleur d/b/a Spotlite Images: civil index lead, CACE22018263 Reported bankruptcy suggestion and July disposition/closure; instrument 119688902. State caption and outcome unverified. Bankruptcy notice involvement independently supported by Doc. 40.	Broward Clerk of Courts	2024
50	Regions Bank v. Arellano-Valle and VEW Music Group, CACE19021242 Reported 2020 default judgment, 2021 stipulation order and 2024 dismissal with prejudice; instruments 116412280, 117033174, 119378078. Operative coverage and effect unverified; no individual Burke defendant identified in supplied account.	Broward Clerk of Courts	2024
51	VEW Capital Group v. Burke and VEW Live: Florida enforcement entries, 2023-028109-CA-01 Foreign-judgment filing reported December 2023; garnishment DIN 19, OR 34221/515, May 2024; garnishment satisfaction DIN 24, June 2024. CFNs unavailable; entries not independently verified.	Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts	2024
52	Order adjudging Burke in criminal contempt and order of commitment, CACE-22-001852 Signed state-court order filed in bankruptcy 24-14947-PDR as Doc. 10-1 on May 24, 2024; service of jail term, appeal and later modification not established.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	May 13, 2024
53	Plaintiffs' notice filing bankruptcy dismissal order, CACE-22-001852 State notice date, not federal dismissal date; attaches the July 15 signed, July 16 entered order.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Jul 17, 2024
54	Erena Nemzer civil index lead, 2022-019906-CA-01 Reported January dismissal/settlement; DIN 52, OR 34565/4734. Terms and promoter identity unverified; no VEW entity in reported caption.	Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts	2025
55	Prestige Motor Car Imports civil index lead, COCE25008319 Reported May default final judgment; instrument 120222521. Amount unavailable and promoter identity uncorroborated.	Broward Clerk of Courts	2025
56	Defense notice of emergency sale-cancellation hearing, CACE-22-016620 February 18 hearing scheduled regarding February 20 sale; actual motion and disposition not reviewed.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Feb 6, 2025
57	Broward Official Records instrument-number search Retrieval portal named in supplied citations. Instruments listed in Chapter 06 were not independently retrieved.	Broward County	2026
58	Broward public case search November 11 Burke/Ryan party-search submission returned processing error, not no-record result.	Broward County Clerk of Courts	2026

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
59	Miami-Dade Civil, Family and Probate Courts Online System Checked November 11; public interface/anti-bot limitations; no usable case-specific result obtained.	Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts	2026
60	Miami-Dade Civil, Family and Probate Courts online search Interface accessed November 11, 2026; no case-specific docket retrieved for these chapters.	Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts	2026
61	Miami-Dade Official Records online search Interface accessed November 11, 2026. Portal provides CFN and book/page search options; opening it does not verify a case or instrument.	Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts	2026
62	Miami-Dade civil docket search: Marlins case retrieval locator Portal accessed, but case-specific history for 2020-002259-CA-01 not independently retrieved. Locator, not proof of underlying claims.	Miami-Dade Clerk of Courts	2026
63	Nationstar Mortgage civil index lead, CACE26001527 Reported January filing and November 2 default; final foreclosure judgment not established. Promoter identity and entries unverified.	Broward Clerk of Courts	2026
64	Kameka and Dzotsi notice taking Eli Hen's deposition, CACE-22-016620 Party-filed procedural notice for April 14; no deposition transcript reviewed.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Apr 1, 2026
65	Bayfront Park Management Trust v. VEW Live LLC: default final judgment, 2024-016045-CA-01 DIN 19; OR 35320/4699–4700; CFN 20260360056; e-filing 248964897; award identified at instrument p. 2. Citation only; instrument and preceding clerk default not re-retrieved.	Miami-Dade Circuit Court	May 26, 2026
66	Bayfront Park Management Trust v. VEW Live — judgment locator Miami-Dade 2024-016045-CA-01; OR Book 35320, pp. 4699–4700. Instrument not independently retrieved.	Miami-Dade Clerk, Official Records retrieval portal	May 26, 2026
67	Final judgment of foreclosure, CACE-22-016620 $962,000 note principal, $2,089,122.81 stated judgment total and August 20 scheduled sale; completed sale not established.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Jul 16, 2026
68	Notice of sale pursuant to Chapter 45, CACE-22-016620 Notices August 20, 2026 sale; does not prove auction completion or title transfer.	Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, Broward County	Jul 22, 2026

Court records: other states

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
69	VEW Capital Group v. Burke and VEW Live: New Jersey final judgment, BER-L-321-23 OR 34008/758–760; CFN 2023 R 895299; signed judgment identified at instrument p. 3. Recorded-instrument citation only; not re-retrieved for this edition.	Superior Court of New Jersey, Bergen County; recorded by Miami-Dade Clerk	Feb 17, 2023
70	New York eCourts civil-index entry point Checked November 11; browser blocked; no completed party search.	New York State Unified Court System	2026

Government and corporate records

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
71	Vision Entertainment Worldwide LLC — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2008

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
72	NWE Talent Agency & Management, Inc. — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2011
73	VEW Live, LLC — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2011
74	VEW Marketing, Inc., 2011 registration — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2011
75	NWE Talent Agency & Management Company LLC — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter. Search document number L12000015455.	Florida Division of Corporations	2012
76	VEW Music Group, LLC — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2012
77	VEW LIVE! — serial 86785472, registration 5034854 Secondary reproduction with 2016 status date, not independently current USPTO status.	Justia Trademarks	2016
78	Universal Creative Agency Inc — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2019
79	VEW Marketing, Inc., 2019 registration — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2019
80	16260 Saddle Club Road, LLC — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2021
81	2045 SW 127th Avenue, LLC — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2021
82	Burke Development Group, LLC — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2021
83	VEW LIVE! — Section 8 cancellation history Secondary record reports cancellation; primary current TSDR status not verified.	Trademarkia	Mar 17, 2023
84	Town of Davie Special Magistrate minutes, code-compliance case 24-085078 Page 2 records the company's permits and landscape-maintenance matter as Canceled/Corrected before hearing; no fine or lien amount stated.	Town of Davie	Jul 10, 2025
85	Chapter 11 – Bankruptcy Basics Undated official guide accessed November 11, 2026; general explanations of debtor in possession, automatic stay, dismissal and conversion.	Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	2026
86	Chapter 7 – Bankruptcy Basics Undated official guide accessed November 11, 2026; liquidation, trustee administration and discharge limited to individuals.	Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	2026
87	Florida Statutes section 468.401 — talent-agency definitions	Florida Legislature	2026
88	Florida Statutes section 468.403 — license requirements	Florida Senate	2026
89	Supreme Court of Jamaica news-room entry page Checked November 11; no identified Cardi–BZR notice retrieved; not complete new-claims register.	Supreme Court of Jamaica	2026
90	Supreme Court of Jamaica public judgment index Limited page review November 11; not a full newly filed-claims search.	Supreme Court of Jamaica	2026

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
91	V12 Group LLC: Florida entity record L26000124570 Filed March 2, 2026; active; Roy Morgan agent; Ryan Burke AMBR. Checked November 11, 2026.	Florida Division of Corporations	2026
92	V12 Group, LLC — Sunbiz detail record Registry roles and status; checked Nov. 11, 2026. Private residential addresses omitted from chapter.	Florida Division of Corporations	2026
93	VEW Live event history Previously opened live event history in supplied verified research; repeated entries are not counted twice.	Florida Division of Corporations	2026
94	VEW Live page — access-restriction response Automated-query restriction returned; no company facts verified from this source.	Bizapedia	2026
95	VEW Live, LLC — corporate mirror	OpenCorporates	2026
96	Vision Entertainment Worldwide event history Previously opened live event history in supplied verified research; repeated entries are not counted twice.	Florida Division of Corporations	2026
97	Thousands of Patrons Expected at BZR Weekend in October Documents launch attendance and official projections; not a government artist-fee guarantee.	Jamaica Information Service	Aug 27, 2026
98	Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rules 3.830 and 3.840 Official compilation, printed pp. 331–334; cited for the direct/indirect criminal-contempt procedural distinction.	The Florida Bar	Oct 1, 2026

News reports: Jamaica and Caribbean

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
99	Chris Brown's 'Influence' booked Partner names, production statement, US$45–US$15,000 range and expected attendance.	Jamaica Observer	Jul 14, 2023
100	Chris Brown 'super excited' to perform in Jamaica at Bizarre Weekend Burke interview, UCA and other partners, ticket tiers and weekend projections.	The Gleaner	Jul 16, 2023
101	Big loans for Chris Brown concert Lender offers and US$45–US$10,000 ticket range; does not establish how many patrons borrowed.	Jamaica Star	Jul 17, 2023
102	Byron Messia, Aidonia added to Chris Brown and Friends concert Announced lineup and prospective crowd figure.	Radio Jamaica News	Aug 2, 2023
103	J$1.5 Million 'Sky VEW' Suites For Jamaican Chris Brown Concert Sold Out, Aidonia And Byron Messia Added To Lineup Solid Agency's 12-suite sellout report and weekend projection; not a complete box-office audit.	DancehallMag	Aug 3, 2023
104	Fans take out loans to afford tickets to Chris Brown's concert in Jamaica Cited only for ticket-package inclusions and concert-loan coverage, not unrelated biographical claims.	Caribbean National Weekly	Aug 14, 2023
105	No weapons allowed at Chris Brown concert Reports JCF's Instagram security instructions, not an incident at the event.	Radio Jamaica News	Aug 24, 2023
106	Chris Brown delivers on his influence Contemporary performance review; confirms the show, set timing and organizer list, not an audited attendance total.	Jamaica Observer	Aug 29, 2023
107	BZR WKND is back! July 26–28 National Stadium announcement and VEW Live/TGE statement; no named international headliner in the article.	Jamaica Observer	Apr 27, 2024

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
108	BZR WKND postponed Organizer's Hurricane Beryl explanation, autumn-date promise and refund instructions; does not establish fulfillment.	Jamaica Star	Jul 19, 2024
109	Promoter Sharon Burke sued for $6m Reported supplier claim concerning the 2023 concert; named defendants Sharon Burke and Solid View Limited, not Ryan Burke. Underlying case number and disposition not independently verified.	The Gleaner	Sep 7, 2024
110	Sharon Burke denies doing business with H&L Reported denial of personal responsibility and lawyer's response to supplier claim.	The Gleaner	Sep 10, 2024
111	Rap Sensation Sexyy Red Set to Headline BZR Weekend at Sabina Park Announced April 26 lineup and venue; says last staging was in 2023.	Kaboom Magazine	Mar 30, 2025
112	Cardi B Cancels...BZR Weekend In Doubt | Entertainment Report Retrieved transcript reports Sharon Burke's statement that she was not involved in the 2026 staging; exact upload date not independently verified.	Television Jamaica	2026
113	From Chris Brown to Cardi B: BZR bets big on Kingston Gramps Morgan and Konnect Media at the launch; official promotional remarks.	Jamaica Observer	Aug 27, 2026
114	No Cardi B for BZR WKND Displayed October 8, updated October 9; URL contains October 9. Includes manager's launch remarks.	Jamaica Gleaner	Oct 8, 2026
115	BZR WKND organisers urge patience among patrons amid Cardi B cancellation Organiser social statement and artist apology video.	Jamaica Observer	Oct 9, 2026
116	BZR WKND Jamaica Suspends Ticket Sales After Cardi B Withdrawal Suspension notice and artist's unverified ticket-count understanding.	DancehallMag	Oct 10, 2026
117	BZR WKND National Stadium Booking Cancelled Following Cardi B Withdrawal Attributes October 12 booking cancellation to IPL officials; no cancellation instrument reproduced.	World Music Views	Oct 13, 2026
118	BZR WKND moves to December after Cardi B withdrawal Organizer postponement and refund statement; does not confirm Cardi B on the replacement date.	DancehallMag	Oct 13, 2026
119	BZR WKND postponed to December as organizers offer refunds, free tickets Withdrawal, ticket validity and announced refund terms.	Caribbean National Weekly	Oct 14, 2026
120	BZR WKND ticket buyers still waiting on refund weeks after organisers pledged money back Patrons' reported complaints; organizers could not be reached for comment in that report.	Jamaica Observer	Nov 3, 2026
121	All BZR WKND refunds now issued, organisers say Organizer response attributing delays to backlog; not independently verified receipt by every purchaser.	Jamaica Observer	Nov 4, 2026
122	'Take me to court!' – Cardi B challenges BZR promoter after lawsuit threat Reports Monday-night interview and competing artist allegations.	Jamaica Star	Nov 9, 2026
123	Cardi B fires back at BZR WKND promoter Ryan Burke over lawsuit threat, reveals she was paid US$900,000 Artist's reported payment, production and notice allegations.	World Music Views	Nov 9, 2026
124	Millions at Stake! BZR WKND to Sue Cardi B After Paying Rapper in Full for Cancelled Jamaican Concert Reports the organizer's intention to sue Cardi B, not a verified claim by Prism against BZR. Full-payment headline is attributed, not adjudicated.	Prism Marketing Consultants	Nov 9, 2026
125	BZR Weekend Sues Cardi B; Patrons Being Reimbursed Burke apology and full-payment claim. Headline does not independently establish a filed lawsuit.	CVM Television	Nov 10, 2026

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
126	Cardi B Vows to Countersue Jamaican Promoter Ryan Burke Over Canceled BZR WKND Show Disputed production/payment account and countersuit threat; filing unclear.	DancehallMag	Nov 10, 2026
127	Gov't Says It Made No Commitment to Pay Fees for Proposed Cardi B Concert in Jamaica Reported Ministry statement denying commitment or payment.	CVM Television	Nov 10, 2026
128	No Gov't involvement in BZR concert, says Grange Ministry denial of financial commitment or payment; distinguished from documented launch attendance.	The Gleaner	Nov 10, 2026
129	BZR confirms no Gov't funding Mum on other Cardi B claims Organiser funding denial, disputed full-payment assertion, refunds and December plans.	Jamaica Star	Nov 11, 2026
130	Cardi B Dares BZR Promoter Ryan Burke to Sue, Disputes $2.5 Million Payment Claim Artist's Instagram Live allegations reported by the outlet; not judicial findings.	DancehallMag	Nov 11, 2026
131	Cardi B apologizes to Jamaican government amid ongoing BZR Weekend dispute Tuesday-night apology, alleged misleading communications, funding denial and agent response.	Caribbean National Weekly	Nov 11, 2026
132	Cardi B's agent says she wasn't paid in full Accessible November 11 with displayed November 11 date despite November 12 URL. Agent X denial and second livestream/deposit position.	Jamaica Gleaner	Nov 11, 2026

News reports: United States and international

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
133	Bogus — Rihanna booking allegation brief	Courthouse News Service	2012
134	Bogus! — reported Rihanna booking allegation against Vision Entertainment Worldwide and Ryan Burke Identified in supplied research as December 2012; fetched text does not display exact publication day, claimant names, case number or outcome. Rihanna expressly a nonparty.	Courthouse News Service	2012
135	Russian TV company sues US firm over Lady Gaga performance, report says Reports allegations from court papers via TMZ; says NWE did not respond to TMZ's requests for comment.	The Australian / NewsCore	Jan 29, 2012
136	Russian TV channel extends defendants list in case over failed Lady Gaga's performance Contemporary account of ZAO's allegations and expanded defendant list.	RAPSI	Feb 10, 2012
137	MUZ-TV gets $1.65 mln over failed Lady Gaga performance Reports a $1.65 million default award against Sergeev and WMA, not Burke. Amount not independently read in DE 63; entry and defendants verified in DE 104.	RAPSI	Jun 20, 2012
138	Trial Needed to Sort Out Botched Lady Gaga Deal By DeShayla Strachan. The chapter follows the signed order's magistrate-judge designation and virtual-office wording, and PacerMonitor's filing date.	Courthouse News Service	Jan 16, 2013
139	Mary J. Blige Sued Over Canceled Concert -- Mick Jagger Stole Her!!! VEW's allegations and direct publicist denial; headline reproduced only as source title.	TMZ	Jun 18, 2013
140	Blige Sued Over Canceled Concert VEW's $145,000 claim and artist-side denial.	Pollstar	Jun 20, 2013
141	Mary J. Blige Lawsuit -- I'm A First Class Star -- So Treat Me Like One Countersuit account, travel requirement and $105,000 balance demand.	TMZ	Sep 30, 2013
142	Early Start with John Berman and Zoraida Sambolin: transcript, 05:30 ET Final entertainment segment describes travel-based countersuit. Green-M&M remark immediately retracted as a joke, not a contract fact.	CNN	Oct 1, 2013

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
143	(EXCLUSIVE) Mary J. Blige Awarded $105K In Battle With Promoter — page 2 By Kellie Williams. Links DE 42, which was retrieved and read directly; chapter uses precise award recipient MJP rather than the article's artist shorthand.	theJasmineBRAND	Oct 23, 2014
144	Cardi B Announced as 1st Headliner for VEWTOPIA Music Festival 2020 in Miami Promotional announcement of January 31–February 1, 2020 festival and original ticket offer; not proof of delivery.	The Hype Magazine	Dec 7, 2019
145	SuperFest and Vewtopia Stage a Super Bowl Gathering for Locals Preview identifies Burke and Marco Mall, SuperFest partnership and distinct free/ticketed areas.	Miami New Times	Jan 29, 2020
146	What is the deal with Vewtopia? The music fest changed venues and folks are confused Updated February 1, 2020. Venue move and attributed production/refund statements; not proof of the stadium lawsuit's subject.	Miami Herald	Jan 29, 2020
147	With the Help of Cardi B, Vewtopia Music Festival Found Its Footing After a Shaky Start Eyewitness review by Aaliyah Pasols. First-night disruption and second-night performances including Cardi B; no numeric attendance or artist-payment audit.	Miami New Times	Feb 3, 2020
148	Cardi B Will Headline a Caribbean Stadium for the First Time at BZR WKND Jamaica 2026 Retrospective 2024 staging reference conflicts with Kaboom's March 2025 account; reports 2025 weather cancellation.	Billboard	Aug 14, 2026
149	Keyshia Cole, Spice & Malie Donn Set to Join Cardi B at BZR WKND Jamaica 2026 Multi-artist lineup and Tikkets link.	Billboard	Sep 28, 2026
150	Cardi B Cancels BZR WKND Jamaica Headlining Set Direct representatives' withdrawal statement; no reason specified.	Billboard	Oct 8, 2026
151	Cardi B Dares Jamaican Concert Promoter To Sue Her, Accuses Him Of Lying About $2.5 Million Payment Reported Instagram Live allegations, production payment and countersuit threat.	Complex	Nov 11, 2026

Social media and promoter statements

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
152	Vewtopia Music Festival announces full lineup and special $99 two-day pass Announcement of original venue; does not establish the Marlins litigation's underlying claim.	VEW Live; release hosted by MLB.com	Jan 7, 2020
153	Early patrons denied access ahead of Chris Brown and Friends concert Newsroom post reports admission problems and vendors' lost-sales complaints; no verified delay duration or cause.	The Gleaner on X	Aug 27, 2023
154	BZR Weekend 2024 return announcement and partner caption Names VEW Live, PLXYBOY, Eyes Above Water, UCA and TGE; promotional description, not a partnership agreement.	Buzzz Caribbean Lifestyle and BZR WKND on Instagram	Apr 24, 2024
155	@vewryan public Instagram profile	Ryan Burke / Instagram	2026
156	BZR WKND Jamaica 2026: postponement and refund notice Undated live page checked November 11. Visible December 19–20 dates and lineup TBA; stale metadata not used as artist confirmation. Refund promise, not fulfillment audit.	BZR WKND / V12 Group	2026
157	BZR WKND Jamaica — organizer postponement and refund statement	V12 Group / BZR WKND	2026
158	BZR WKND Jamaica: live postponement, refund and lineup statement Checked November 11, 2026. Visible December 19–20 dates and lineup TBA; stale July/Cardi B metadata not treated as confirmation.	BZR WKND / V12 Group	2026

#	Source	Publisher / custodian	Date
159	Refund Policy Undated policy checked November 11. Final-sale, fees and force-majeure terms, distinct from subsequent refund offer; enforceability not adjudicated.	Tikkets / Kanoo Pays Jamaica	2026
160	Ryan Burke public @vewryan Instagram profile Checked November 11; December 19–20 self-published date; truncated bio and automated alt text not used as contract evidence.	Ryan Burke / Instagram	2026
161	Ryan Burke — Founder & Chief Executive Officer profile	Ryan Burke / LinkedIn	2026