

IN THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA
PROBATE DIVISION
CASE NO. 502012CP004391XXXXSB

IN RE:
ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN,

Deceased.

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE,

Petitioner,

vs.

TESCHER & SPALLINA, P.A., (and all parties, associates and of counsel);
ROBERT L. SPALLINA (both personally and professionally); DONALD R. TESCHER (both personally and professionally);
THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN (as alleged personal representative, trustee, successor trustee) (both personally and professionally); et al.,

Respondents.

- - -
PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE
HONORABLE MARTIN H. COLIN
VOLUME II
- - -

DATE: FEBRUARY 19, 2014
TIME: 2:30 P.M. - 5:03 P.M.

49

1 APPEARING ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:
 2 Eliot Bernstein, Pro se
 3 2753 NW 34th Street
 4 Boca Raton, Florida 33434
 5 APPEARING ON BEHALF OF TED S. BERNSTEIN:
 6 Alan B. Rose, Esq.
 7 MRACHEK, FITZGERALD, ROSE
 8 KONOPKA, THOMAS & WEISS, P.A.
 9 505 South Flagler Drive, Suite 600
 10 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
 11
 12 John J. Pankauski, Esq.
 13 PANKAUSKI LAW FIRM, PLLC
 14 120 South Olive Avenue, Suite 701
 15 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
 16
 17 APPEARING ON BEHALF OF CREDITOR WILLIAM
 18 STANSBURY:
 19 Peter M. Feaman, Esq.
 20 Nancy E. Guffey, Esq.
 21 PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A.
 22 3615 W. Boynton Beach Boulevard
 23 Boynton Beach, Florida 33436
 24
 25 APPEARING ON BEHALF OF LISA SUE FRIEDSTEIN
 AND JILL IANTONI:
 William H. Glasko, Esq.
 GOLDEN & COWAN, P.A.
 Palmetto Bay Law Center
 17345 South Dixie Highway
 Palmetto Bay, Florida 33157
 ALSO PRESENT:
 Ted S. Bernstein
 William Stansbury
 Candice Bernstein

51

1 BE IT REMEMBERED, that the following
 2 proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause
 3 before Judge Martin H. Colin, at the South County
 4 Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, Courtroom 2,
 5 City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of
 6 Florida, beginning at 2:30, on Wednesday, the 19th
 7 day of February, 2014, to wit:
 8 ---
 9 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. Be seated.
 10 Okay. So we're back on the Estate of
 11 Simon Bernstein, 2012CP004391. Let the record
 12 reflect counsel is present following
 13 yesterday's hearing and Mr. Feaman has now
 14 filed the verified motion to disqualify counsel
 15 which we're going to first hear.
 16 So Mr. Feaman, you're up.
 17 MR. FEAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 18 MR. PANKAUSKI: Excuse me, Your Honor.
 19 Because I have not been able to provide a written
 20 response and because you were kind enough to give
 21 Mr. Feaman an opening statement yesterday, may I
 22 be briefly heard?
 23 THE COURT: Well, hold on. Let him give his
 24 opening statement and then you.
 25 Go ahead.

50

1 INDEX
 2
 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION PAGE
 4 ELIOT BERNSTEIN
 5 Direct by Mr. Feaman 77, 129
 6 Cross by Mr. Pankauski 86
 7 JOHN PANKAUSKI
 8 Direct by Mr. Rose 131, 159
 9 Cross by Mr. Feaman 152
 10
 11
 12
 13 EXHIBITS MARKED FOR:
 14 IDENTIFICATION EVIDENCE
 15 Exhibit Number 1 108
 16 Exhibit Number 2 108
 17 Exhibit Number 3 113
 18 Exhibit Number 4 118
 19 Exhibit Number 5 125 142
 20 Exhibit Number 6 141 142
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

52

1 MR. FEAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 2 Your Honor, we're traveling, as Your Honor
 3 is aware, under Rule 4-1.18 of the Rules of
 4 Professional Conduct dealing with prospective
 5 clients, which states that a person who
 6 discusses with a lawyer the possibility of
 7 forming a client-lawyer relationship with
 8 respect to a matter is a prospective client, at
 9 subpart (a). And then subpart (c), Your Honor,
 10 a lawyer subject to subdivision (b) shall not
 11 represent a client with an interest materially
 12 adverse to those of a prospective client in the
 13 same or substantially related matter.
 14 In this case, Your Honor, we have filed
 15 our verified motion to disqualify counsel as
 16 opposing counsel to Mr. Bernstein in this
 17 proceeding, which we do have a right to do.
 18 And in that verified motion it sets forth that
 19 there was indeed a relationship formed between
 20 Mr. Pankauski and the Bernsteins as
 21 prospective -- specifically Eliot Bernstein --
 22 as a prospective client.
 23 The law, Your Honor, as you know, states
 24 that, under Florida law, attorneys must avoid
 25 appearances of professional impropriety and any

53

1 doubt is to be resolved in favor of
 2 disqualifications.
 3 We respectively submit that based upon the
 4 papers submitted that, in fact, the
 5 relationship as prospective counsel was -- and
 6 prospective client -- was formed. We attach as
 7 Exhibit A to the motion an e-mail which, in
 8 fact, memorializes the existence of the
 9 relationship. And we would then respectfully
 10 request, through our motion, that there be a
 11 disqualification in this case. I don't know
 12 what opposing counsel's arguments are going to
 13 be, so I will reserve after I hear.
 14 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Pankauski.
 15 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. Good
 16 afternoon. So we're here today -- and I'm going
 17 to try to be concise with my opening statements --
 18 what I'm going to try to do is talk about the
 19 burden of proof, the standards which I believe are
 20 to exist under 4-1.18, because I don't see any
 21 published decisions on this rule. I know our rule
 22 in Florida is a little bit different than the
 23 model rules that the ABA has. I'm also going to
 24 try to concisely tell you what the evidence is
 25 going to show.

54

1 And then, in closing, I'd just like to
 2 address three points made by opposing counsel.
 3 And thank you for this opportunity to be heard.
 4 This is a tire kicker case. This is a case
 5 that the litigators, trial attorneys, who get
 6 lots of calls from prospective clients would
 7 refer to as, you know, what happens when
 8 somebody calls up a number of attorneys and
 9 says, hey, would you take my case, and
 10 confidential information is not relayed, and
 11 then that attorney ends up being involved in a
 12 case. Should an attorney be removed from a
 13 case -- in a tire kicking case -- because
 14 somebody is calling up and kicking the tires,
 15 should Your Honor, which you have the absolute
 16 discretion to do, impose your discretion to
 17 prohibit Mr. Ted Bernstein from having the
 18 counsel of his choice. So let me say at the
 19 beginning that Mr. Stansbury's counsel said
 20 that he has a right to file a motion to
 21 disqualify my firm. We contest that, Your
 22 Honor. That's not accurate. A third party,
 23 such as a creditor like Mr. Stansbury, does not
 24 have standing to determine whether Mr. Ted
 25 Bernstein can hire someone as his or her

55

1 attorney.
 2 THE COURT: Okay. So stop for a second. I
 3 just want to make sure I'm looking at something --
 4 because I agree time was quick on this. So in the
 5 packet that I received, the verified motion to
 6 disqualify counsel, it's brought by the
 7 petitioner, William Stansbury, as a creditor, an
 8 interested person in the estate, and it's -- it's
 9 verified by Eliot Bernstein and Candice Bernstein.
 10 But it's not brought by them. It's brought only
 11 by William. So -- and William doesn't verify it.
 12 So the moving party doesn't verify the pleading.
 13 So under the rule that governs these type of
 14 pleadings who has to -- two questions -- who has
 15 to verify the motion; and does the motion have to
 16 be brought by and/or in behalf of the alleged
 17 aggrieved individual?
 18 MR. FEAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. First
 19 with regard to the verification. The verification
 20 has to state that I declare that the facts alleged
 21 are true. And Mr. Stansbury was not in a position
 22 to verify that because it would have been through
 23 secondhand information. So we thought that the
 24 proper verification should be signed by the people
 25 who actually are the prospective clients against

56

1 whom we say --
 2 THE COURT: Now, I mean, they may be -- that
 3 is Eliot and Candice -- may be witnesses. But
 4 from the motion itself, the moving party is
 5 William. Eliot has not filed a motion. And so --
 6 I didn't know this until I saw the pleading -- so
 7 William has filed a motion. He is seeking to
 8 disqualify Mr. Pankauski from representing Ted
 9 Bernstein. Eliot has not filed any action on
 10 that. Has made no request for such a
 11 disqualification. And William hasn't even signed
 12 the pleading that he filed. So let me take a look
 13 at the rule for a second.
 14 MR. FEAMAN: Sure. I also have case law with
 15 regard to whether William can bring it as opposing
 16 counsel.
 17 THE COURT: As opposing party?
 18 MR. FEAMAN: As opposing party, yes, sir.
 19 THE COURT: Okay. So -- I mean, correct me
 20 if I'm wrong, the rule that is both 4-1.8 and
 21 4-1.9 are rules of professional conduct that
 22 advise about what lawyers can do under
 23 circumstances that may be involved here. But it
 24 doesn't really speak to the remedy. Both of you
 25 agree with that?

57

1 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
 2 THE COURT: So either of you have cases that
 3 speak to the issues of whether William, as the
 4 creditor, not as the purported client, who has an
 5 alleged conflict of interest with Mr. Pankauski,
 6 can bring this action. And secondly, whether --
 7 whether I can disqualify Mr. Pankauski without
 8 Eliot seeking that to happen, and by William as a
 9 creditor, interested person seeking that, and
 10 whether I can do it based upon a verified motion
 11 not signed by William. Those are the three issues
 12 I see on the surface.
 13 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
 14 THE COURT: You want to address that first?
 15 MR. FEAMAN: Sure. I have the burden, so
 16 I'll go first. First, I know there is a rule that
 17 when you seek to disqualify a judge, that it must
 18 be verified.
 19 THE COURT: Right. But the -- and in that
 20 area, the rule speaks out the procedure.
 21 MR. FEAMAN: Right.
 22 THE COURT: Here, the procedure in the Bar
 23 Lawyer's Rules of Professional Conduct, it doesn't
 24 speak to it. So I assume the case law speaks to
 25 it.

58

1 MR. FEAMAN: To my knowledge, the rules are
 2 silent as to the procedure.
 3 THE COURT: So what does the case law say the
 4 procedure is?
 5 MR. FEAMAN: We don't have a case law as to
 6 the procedure. We have it verified to show that
 7 these are true facts on their face being brought
 8 before the court. We didn't find a case that sets
 9 forth the procedure of how this is brought, other
 10 than this should be an evidentiary hearing.
 11 THE COURT: Okay.
 12 MR. FEAMAN: Now, with regard to
 13 Mr. Stansbury bringing -- being the moving party
 14 instead of Mr. Eliot Bernstein. We attached the
 15 case to our motion, which was the Smathers case
 16 which --
 17 THE COURT: Brent versus Smathers?
 18 MR. FEAMAN: Brent versus Smathers, yes, Your
 19 Honor, 529 So. 2d. 1267. And on Page 2 of that
 20 decision, Page 2 as copied to you, there is a
 21 discussion of Rule 4-1.9. And then at the bottom
 22 of the left-hand column, the last sentence, it
 23 says as to the law firm's second argument, the
 24 comments to Rule 4-1.7 states that: Although
 25 questions involving conflicts of interest are

59

1 primarily the responsibility of the lawyer
 2 undertaking the representation, opposing counsel
 3 may properly raise the issue, as is the case here.
 4 That's the authority that we're relying
 5 upon that we can bring it on behalf of
 6 Mr. Stansbury.
 7 THE COURT: So in this Brent case -- let me
 8 see who is who. Want to be heard on that matter,
 9 Mr. Pankauski?
 10 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
 11 The Brent v. Smathers case is outdated. It's a
 12 1988 case. That pre-dates the 2009 change to
 13 Florida Rule 4-1.18. It also is traveling under
 14 the wrong rule of professional conduct. 4-1.9 is
 15 not applicable here. We both agree it's 4-1.18
 16 dealing with a prospective client. The standards
 17 are different for a prospective client than an
 18 existing attorney-client relationship.
 19 THE COURT: Okay. Let me -- okay. Let me
 20 just look at that for one second. For that to be
 21 true, Mr. Feaman, it would have to be the position
 22 by Eliot, through the evidence, or Eliot
 23 Bernstein, that there was no lawyer-client
 24 relationship between him and Mr. Pankauski. Is
 25 that the case?

60

1 MR. FEAMAN: Was he formerly retained, is
 2 that your question?
 3 THE COURT: You're using the word formal, I'm
 4 not.
 5 MR. FEAMAN: All right.
 6 THE COURT: The cases don't use the word
 7 formal.
 8 MR. FEAMAN: As defined by the rules, he's a
 9 prospective client. The rules make a distinction.
 10 MR. PANKAUSKI: That's 4-1.18.
 11 THE COURT: So you don't think Rule 4-1.9
 12 applies?
 13 MR. FEAMAN: I do. Because it references
 14 4-1.9 in part B of 4-1.18, which states that even
 15 when no client-lawyer relationship ensues, a
 16 lawyer who has had discussions with a prospective
 17 client shall not use or reveal information learned
 18 in the consultation, except as Rule 4-1.9 would
 19 permit. And so a conflict under 4-1.9 would apply
 20 to a prospective client as defined under 4-1.18.
 21 THE COURT: Okay. All right. What about --
 22 Mr. Pankauski, what's your position on whether
 23 this could be brought by the creditor and not by
 24 Eliot Bernstein.
 25 MR. PANKAUSKI: He's not permitted -- the

61

1 creditor is not permitted to bring this action.
 2 The authority for that -- let me state what the
 3 authority is. Privity is required for someone to
 4 try to go up to an attorney and say you can't
 5 represent Ted Bernstein. There is no privity
 6 here. There is no attorney-client relationship
 7 between my firm and the creditor, Mr. Stansbury.
 8 The authority for that is a 2012 Second District
 9 case called THI Holdings, Thomas Howard Indigo
 10 Holdings, LLC. And it sets forth that privity is
 11 required. It involved a motion to disqualify, a
 12 motion for pro hac vice. And it says here as a
 13 matter of undisputed facts, there is no privity
 14 between the estate and Balassa or his firm. And
 15 it goes on to talk about that. And then it says
 16 even if the estate could convince this court that
 17 it had standing to raise the disqualification
 18 issue, it cannot establish the legal requirements
 19 for disqualification.
 20 THE COURT: So here's the thing that's
 21 concerning me, Mr. Feaman. The allegation,
 22 looking at the motion, is that there was -- I'm
 23 using this expression broadly -- some legal
 24 dealings between Eliot Bernstein and the Pankauski
 25 firm. That's what you allege, correct?

62

1 MR. FEAMAN: Correct.
 2 THE COURT: So -- and Eliot Bernstein has
 3 not -- and then we also know that Ted Bernstein
 4 has hired Mr. Pankauski, that same lawyer that
 5 Eliot says he had legal dealings with. True?
 6 MR. FEAMAN: True.
 7 THE COURT: So here's what I'm just not
 8 following you -- almost like a matter of logic.
 9 With Eliot not complaining, how can a creditor or
 10 any other outside person who doesn't claim a
 11 conflict of interest -- say I don't want
 12 Mr. Pankauski to continue to represent Ted when
 13 Eliot has not filed the motion complaining because
 14 Eliot is the other purported either prospective or
 15 former client, depending upon which rule you look
 16 at -- who has a right to either complain or not.
 17 So I'm sure it's not the case in reality, but if
 18 Eliot didn't complain -- I mean, it could be that
 19 Eliot is taking a position, you know, whatever I
 20 did with Mr. Pankauski and his firm, you know, it
 21 started where it started, ended where it ended,
 22 and, you know, it may be that Ted hired him and
 23 that's okay with me. And I'm not asking that
 24 Mr. Pankauski not represent Ted because of some
 25 conflict with me, Eliot. I don't -- I just don't

63

1 understand how William Stansbury can say there is
 2 a conflict that Eliot doesn't say exists.
 3 MR. FEAMAN: Mr. Stansbury is harmed as a
 4 result of the apparent dereliction of
 5 Mr. Pankauski's duties to Mr. Eliot Bernstein
 6 because --
 7 THE COURT: Even if Eliot doesn't complain?
 8 MR. FEAMAN: Yes, sir.
 9 THE COURT: Okay. Show me -- I need a case
 10 that says that that's possible. Because that's
 11 what I don't see. Eliot, I think, can complain,
 12 and I'm not sure that it's -- which rule applies.
 13 MR. FEAMAN: And he may yet complain, we
 14 don't know. And I can't --
 15 THE COURT: Right.
 16 MR. FEAMAN: -- speak for Eliot.
 17 THE COURT: I know. Eliot is representing
 18 himself.
 19 MR. FEAMAN: Nor do I prepare pleadings for
 20 Mr. Bernstein.
 21 THE COURT: Eliot went so far as to sign your
 22 verification, but it's not his motion. That's one
 23 problem. But also -- I'm almost positive because
 24 of some prior cases I had that the person who has
 25 to complain is -- about a lawyer representing

64

1 someone else, and in this case it's Mr. Pankauski
 2 continuing to represent Ted Bernstein, is the
 3 person who purportedly is the benefactor of these
 4 rules as an either prospective or former client.
 5 But if he says no -- if he doesn't seek
 6 disqualification, I'm not sure how someone else
 7 can -- has an interest, under the cases that I
 8 read, for that to happen. Let me just look here
 9 if there is a case I just saw in my research.
 10 MR. FEAMAN: The court --
 11 THE COURT: I did an extensive case right on
 12 Rule 4-1.9, very similar to this, and it was --
 13 everyone said it was that rule, not the
 14 prospective rule. Although, from reading your
 15 motion, it's almost the identical type of case.
 16 And both lawyers in that case said, though, that
 17 it was the 4-1.9 that applied not the 4-1.8. But
 18 the moving party was the alleged aggrieved party
 19 who said that they -- that the other lawyer had a
 20 conflict of interest because the other lawyer
 21 here, Mr. Pankauski, had performed some
 22 lawyer-client services, and there was other
 23 information that led to the -- because if there is
 24 no attorney-client relationship that is complained
 25 about that Eliot says was breached, I'm not sure

65

1 that William has standing. And I just -- I mean,
 2 if you have a case that says he does...
 3 MR. FEAMAN: Only thing I have is the comment
 4 to 4-1.7 --
 5 THE COURT: Okay.
 6 MR. FEAMAN: -- which deals with conflicts of
 7 interest.
 8 THE COURT: Sure. Let me see.
 9 MR. FEAMAN: And it's at the end in the
 10 book -- I don't know if you have the book.
 11 THE COURT: I have the book, yeah.
 12 MR. FEAMAN: On Page -- I have the 2013
 13 edition.
 14 THE COURT: Okay.
 15 MR. FEAMAN: Page 1985.
 16 THE COURT: Wait a minute. My Rule 4-1.8 the
 17 comments are on a different page, but what's the
 18 heading of the comment?
 19 MR. FEAMAN: Conflict charge by an opposing
 20 party.
 21 THE COURT: Okay. Got that. Let me read it.
 22 MR. FEAMAN: It says, the second sentence, in
 23 litigation a court may raise the question when
 24 there is reason to infer that the lawyer has
 25 neglected the responsibility.

66

1 THE COURT: Okay. Let me read the entire --
 2 what subsection of 4-1.8 do you say applies,
 3 Mr. Feaman?
 4 MR. FEAMAN: Well, our motion speaks to
 5 4-1.18.
 6 THE COURT: Eighteen. Okay. Say that again
 7 4 --
 8 MR. FEAMAN: 4-1.18.
 9 THE COURT: Let me look at that, it's
 10 different.
 11 Okay. That's duties to prospective
 12 client. Let's read.
 13 MR. FEAMAN: Right.
 14 THE COURT: Let me read that.
 15 MR. FEAMAN: Okay.
 16 THE COURT: Let me look at the comments for a
 17 second.
 18 Okay. So I think there is maybe a little
 19 overlap here. If Eliot Bernstein is a
 20 prospective client, the way the rule starts,
 21 there is a focus about when he purportedly
 22 consults with Mr. Pankauski and he's a
 23 prospective client, if Mr. Pankauski has some
 24 lawyer-client relationship with someone else at
 25 the time, then there are rules that say what he

67

1 can do or not do. That's not what's involved
 2 here. So here when -- Eliot was first in time,
 3 right?
 4 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
 5 THE COURT: You agree with that?
 6 MR. FEAMAN: Yes.
 7 THE COURT: So Eliot sees Mr. Pankauski, or
 8 his office does what he does -- we may be talking
 9 about that in a few moments. And then the
 10 question becomes where Mr. Pankauski then
 11 continues to -- or chooses to represent someone
 12 else, Ted Bernstein, it looks like Rule 4-1.18,
 13 subsection (c) applies. A lawyer subject to
 14 subdivision (b) shall not represent a client with
 15 interest materially adverse to those of a
 16 prospective client in the same or substantially
 17 related matter. And it goes on to talk about
 18 that.
 19 So is that the rule that you say applies?
 20 MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
 21 THE COURT: You agree that rule would apply?
 22 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
 23 THE COURT: I think Rule 4-1.9, which is the
 24 other conflict of interest rule, is where --
 25 arises where there actually is a situation where

68

1 Eliot Bernstein is then called a former client,
 2 and then Mr. Pankauski would represent Ted. And
 3 then subsection (a) there almost uses the exact
 4 same language.
 5 So I'm not sure if Eliot is a former
 6 client or a prospective client, but if he's
 7 first in line, then the rule is almost
 8 identical about when Mr. Pankauski then can
 9 represent Ted Bernstein in the same or
 10 related -- substantially related matter. The
 11 language is the same, true?
 12 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
 13 THE COURT: You agree?
 14 MR. FEAMAN: True.
 15 THE COURT: All right. So let me get passed,
 16 though, the procedural aspect as to whether
 17 William can bring that without -- William
 18 Stansbury -- can bring this complaint in
 19 connection with the motion to disqualify when
 20 Eliot doesn't. If Eliot is the purported party
 21 who is harmed by the potential conflicts of
 22 interest, either as a prospective client of
 23 Mr. Pankauski or former client, if it got that
 24 far.
 25 MR. FEAMAN: Our argument, Your Honor, on

69

1 behalf of Mr. Stansbury, is that because Eliot
 2 Bernstein's interests are more closely aligned
 3 with Mr. Stansbury's, and are clearly adverse to
 4 Ted Bernstein, and Mr. Stansbury's interests are
 5 clearly adverse to Ted Bernstein, that if Eliot
 6 Bernstein transmitted information as a prospective
 7 client to the attorney who's now Ted Bernstein's
 8 lawyer, and we're adverse to him, it's our
 9 position that we're harmed as a result of that.
 10 THE COURT: Well -- but it's not harm
 11 that's -- the rule is not a harm. The rule is a
 12 conflict of interest. And the conflict of
 13 interest has to be between Eliot and Ted. I'm not
 14 sure how it could be otherwise.
 15 MR. FEAMAN: Yes, as a result of that
 16 conflict of interest --
 17 THE COURT: Well, okay. But I still have
 18 to --
 19 MR. FEAMAN: -- we're hurt.
 20 THE COURT: But if Eliot says -- because
 21 there could be waivers, says here in the rule --
 22 4-1.9 says a lawyer who has formerly represented a
 23 client shall not thereafter represent another
 24 person, okay, unless -- and then there's unleses
 25 [sic] -- and one of those things are clearly in

70

1 this case Eliot could not complain about it.
 2 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: May I interject, Your
 3 Honor?
 4 THE COURT: You're objecting?
 5 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, can I interject?
 6 THE COURT: What do you want to say?
 7 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I politely asked him
 8 and told him that he was conflicted, and I felt
 9 harmed by it.
 10 THE COURT: That's evidence, though. That's
 11 potential evidence you want to interject, but you
 12 haven't filed this motion.
 13 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I didn't learn that
 14 until yesterday, so if I have to, I'll do another
 15 day.
 16 THE COURT: So let me ask this. If -- the
 17 motion is filed, it's in written form, it's filed
 18 by Mr. Stansbury. I think it needs to be joined,
 19 if not independently, at least joined by Eliot
 20 Bernstein. So what's your position -- and that's
 21 clearly what Eliot wants to do, he just doesn't
 22 know it yet. What about that, Mr. Pankauski? Can
 23 I treat this motion and go forward based upon it
 24 being joined by Eliot?
 25 MR. PANKAUSKI: No, Your Honor. Mr. Eliot

71

1 Bernstein received notice of that. He's chosen to
 2 go without counsel. He's chosen not to seek any
 3 affirmative relief.
 4 THE COURT: But that -- that's to the case.
 5 But I'm talking about the motion to disqualify
 6 you.
 7 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, that's what I am
 8 speaking about.
 9 THE COURT: So I mean -- I could do one of
 10 two things. I can tell Eliot go over to the
 11 library and start writing out -- Xeroxing this
 12 motion, sign it yourself, and bring it in, and
 13 then, you know --
 14 MR. PANKAUSKI: You just want an oral joinder
 15 right now?
 16 THE COURT: Yeah --
 17 MR. PANKAUSKI: That's fine.
 18 THE COURT: -- that's what I'm getting at.
 19 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes. Sorry, Judge.
 20 THE COURT: Okay. What's your position on
 21 that?
 22 MR. PANKAUSKI: But Mr. Stansbury can't do
 23 it. Eliot could do it.
 24 THE COURT: I think Eliot needs to be the
 25 complaining party. Now, I'm not saying you can't

72

1 participate as counsel to maybe help steer the
 2 evidence. I'm probably thinking that would be
 3 okay, but I think we need Eliot to join.
 4 Mr. Pankauski doesn't have an objection. What do
 5 you say?
 6 MR. FEAMAN: I have no objection to Mr. Eliot
 7 Bernstein joining. I'm just not going to be in a
 8 position of encouraging him to do something and
 9 violate my neutrality.
 10 THE COURT: You are not -- you don't
 11 represent him.
 12 MR. FEAMAN: That's correct.
 13 THE COURT: So Eliot is pro se.
 14 MR. FEAMAN: Correct.
 15 THE COURT: You know, there is a burden that
 16 is on Eliot to start, but since he's joining your
 17 motion, I'm going to allow -- just because for
 18 judicial economy and so we don't have to like come
 19 back on this matter and everyone is ready to go
 20 forward -- for you to help, almost be second chair
 21 counsel, standby counsel, although, I know you
 22 represent William, to just help bring out the
 23 evidence. So I'm going to allow that.
 24 Okay. So Eliot, this is your motion.
 25 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.

73

1 THE COURT: So come on up and sit here so I
 2 can look at you and Judge your credibility when I
 3 hear things that are going on. So sit right there
 4 in the middle.
 5 So whether -- again, I'm not -- I'm not
 6 sure, I won't know til the end, what rule I
 7 think this comes under, but it looks like it's
 8 either 1-9 -- or 1.9 or 1.18, but it sounds
 9 like it's one of those two.
 10 So, okay, so you're up first.
 11 MR. FEAMAN: Thank you. I would call
 12 Mr. Eliot Bernstein to the stand.
 13 THE COURT: I figured that would be first.
 14 Okay. Come on, Eliot.
 15 MR. PANKAUSKI: Opening statements.
 16 THE COURT: He has a right to opening. So
 17 have a seat here and I'll let Mr. Pankauski finish
 18 his opening.
 19 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thanks, Judge. And I --
 20 okay. Thank you, Your Honor. So concisely, we
 21 are traveling -- and I agree with Mr. Stansbury's
 22 counsel -- under 4-1.18. The evidence is going to
 23 show that my firm never had an attorney-client
 24 relationship with Mr. Eliot Bernstein.
 25 And if I may, let's just -- we've dealt

74

1 with the standing issue of Mr. Stansbury. You
 2 know, I'm of the position he does not have
 3 standing. I'm also of the position that Eliot
 4 lacks standing to participate in this estate
 5 administration. He's not a beneficiary under
 6 the decedent's will. He's not a beneficiary
 7 under the decedent's revocable trust.
 8 I do recognize that I'm coming in late to
 9 this estate administration.
 10 Eliot Bernstein is not an interested
 11 person in this estate. He shouldn't even be
 12 here.
 13 So I need to --
 14 THE COURT: What is Eliot Bernstein other
 15 than the brother of Ted?
 16 MR. PANKAUSKI: Nothing.
 17 THE COURT: Okay.
 18 MR. PANKAUSKI: I mean, if this was a
 19 guardianship, he may have standing to come in and
 20 participate in the administration of his dad's
 21 person and property, but it's an estate. He
 22 totally lacks standing. And because he lacks
 23 standing, he doesn't -- he's not an interested
 24 person and can't come in and tell Ted Bernstein
 25 who he can hire as an attorney for an estate

75

1 administration.
 2 And that's my third point, Your Honor.
 3 This isn't an adverse lawsuit. This isn't a
 4 personal injury case. Mr. Ted Bernstein has
 5 asked Your Honor if he can administer this
 6 estate. He wants to be a fiduciary. As he is
 7 a fiduciary --
 8 THE COURT: Okay. But the participation of
 9 Ted is not questioned. It's whether you can do it
 10 for him.
 11 MR. PANKAUSKI: Understood.
 12 THE COURT: So Ted is -- no one is suggesting
 13 Ted is not eligible to request that he be a PR or
 14 curator. I mean, that wasn't objected to
 15 yesterday.
 16 MR. PANKAUSKI: Understood. And so, if I
 17 may, let me go to the standard that we're
 18 traveling under today and what we should be doing
 19 here. Because we are going to introduce evidence
 20 that there was no attorney-client relationship.
 21 Evidence is going to be introduced that there was
 22 no confidential information that Eliot Bernstein
 23 conveyed to my law firm. The evidence is going to
 24 show that he called up trying to find an attorney
 25 to sue Don Tescher for malpractice regarding some

76

1 estate matters of his parents.
 2 I'm going to testify about
 3 Mr. Bernstein's -- excuse me -- about
 4 Mr. Stansbury's verified motion. I'm going to
 5 testify as to what Mr. Stansbury's counsel told
 6 me out there yesterday when you asked me to
 7 step out. And I'm going to demonstrate the
 8 amazing amount of inconsistencies in this
 9 fiction that we had an attorney-client
 10 relationship, or there is some type of
 11 confidential information that is going to be
 12 adverse to Mr. Eliot Bernstein.
 13 So it's a three-fold test or three-prong
 14 test, Your Honor. For you to disqualify this
 15 firm -- for you to say Ted Bernstein, you can
 16 not hire the Pankauski law firm for estate
 17 administration. You would have first to make a
 18 finding of fact that the interests of Ted
 19 Bernstein are materially adverse, not just
 20 adverse, but materially adverse to the
 21 prospective client, Eliot Bernstein.
 22 The second thing that you would need to
 23 find is that I received confidential
 24 information from Mr. Eliot Bernstein.
 25 And then the third thing that you would

<p style="text-align: right;">77</p> <p>1 have to find is that I am going to use that 2 information, that confidential information, to 3 the disadvantage of Mr. Eliot Bernstein in an 4 estate. 5 THE COURT: That you are going to or could? 6 I mean, it couldn't be going to -- 7 MR. PANKAUSKI: That I could. Thank you, 8 Your Honor. 9 So that's the standard under 4-1.18. What 10 does our Fourth District say about this? 11 THE COURT: I kind of want opening and not 12 closing. So I got that part. 13 MR. PANKAUSKI: Okay. So the standard that I 14 would direct our attention to is the Coolis 15 (phonetic) case. You would need to find -- and 16 again, it's a finding of fact -- that I had actual 17 knowledge of material confidential information. 18 What the Fourth has described as protected 19 information. The burden is on Eliot. 20 Finally, because disqualification of a 21 party's counsel is such an egregious 22 punishment, that we can't resort to 23 speculation. Mr. Eliot Bernstein needs to 24 prove by a greater weight of the evidence those 25 three prongs that I described in 4-1.18.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">79</p> <p>1 don't volunteer, because that's important. Okay. 2 THE WITNESS: Sure. 3 BY MR. FEAMAN 4 Q Is your brother Ted Bernstein presently a 5 beneficiary under the trust established by the estate 6 documents, if you know? 7 A I don't believe so. 8 Q That would be Ted Bernstein? 9 A That would be. 10 Q And are your interests with Ted Bernstein 11 adverse in connection with the estate of Simon Bernstein? 12 A Yes, sir. 13 Q And how so? 14 A Well, I'm pursuing Ted in a number of legal 15 actions, criminal actions, for -- 16 THE COURT: So focus on the question. Okay. 17 He didn't ask anything about criminal actions. 18 So, you know, you're a witness now -- 19 THE WITNESS: We're adverse to each other. 20 THE COURT: You need to pay -- let me 21 finish -- you need to pay attention carefully to 22 the question. Listen. Let me finish. 23 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. 24 THE COURT: Okay. And not ramble outside the 25 scope of the question. Because Mr. Feaman's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">78</p> <p>1 Thank you, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's get the 3 evidence. Then we can talk about the law once we 4 see what the evidence is. 5 Okay. Raise your right hand. 6 (Thereupon, ELIOT BERNSTEIN was duly sworn 7 by the court) 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. FEAMAN 10 Q Thank you. Please state your name. 11 A Eliot Ivan Bernstein. 12 Q Your residence address? 13 A 2753 NW 34th Street, Boca Raton, Florida. 14 Q And you are the son of the late Simon 15 Bernstein? 16 A I am. 17 Q And you reside in Florida presently? 18 A I do. 19 Q And are your children beneficiaries under the 20 estate as it presently is structured? 21 A I'm not a hundred percent sure at this point. 22 Q Okay. 23 A I believe I am. 24 THE COURT: So do this, though. That may be 25 true, but let's make sure you're asked a question,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">80</p> <p>1 questions are designed to be tailored for this 2 case. 3 Go ahead. 4 BY MR. FEAMAN 5 Q Thank you, Your Honor. 6 How is your interest in the estate of your 7 father directly, or through the trust, established by 8 your father's will, in conflict with that of Ted 9 Bernstein? 10 A I believe we're at conflict because Ted and I 11 differ if Ted and his children are part of the estates. 12 Q Okay. And what do you believe -- what is your 13 understanding, as you sit here today, as to whether Ted 14 and his children -- whether they should inherit under the 15 estate, what is your understanding? 16 MR. PANKAUSKI: Objection. Lack of 17 foundation. 18 THE COURT: I'll let you cross on that, or it 19 may be brought out by his answer. Go ahead. 20 THE WITNESS: I don't believe they should be. 21 BY MR. FEAMAN 22 Q And have you had discussions with Ted 23 concerning this? 24 A Yes. 25 Q And has Ted Bernstein disagreed with you?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">81</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q How so? What has he indicated to you?</p> <p>3 A He believes his children should be included</p> <p>4 in the estate.</p> <p>5 Q Do you disagree with that?</p> <p>6 A I do.</p> <p>7 Q And did you, in September of last year,</p> <p>8 approach, with your wife, the law offices of</p> <p>9 Mr. Pankauski?</p> <p>10 A Yes, sir.</p> <p>11 Q Do you recall about when that was?</p> <p>12 A September 20th or so, around that area.</p> <p>13 Q And was the approach in person or by phone?</p> <p>14 A By phone.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. And who called?</p> <p>16 A I believe my wife initiated the call.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Were you present when she made the phone</p> <p>18 call?</p> <p>19 A I don't believe so.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. And how long did she -- withdrawn. As a</p> <p>21 result of that phone call, was there an e-mail sent to</p> <p>22 your -- to Mr. Pankauski's office?</p> <p>23 A Yes, sir.</p> <p>24 Q Do you know to whom it was sent?</p> <p>25 A I believe to Mr. Pankauski and his assistant,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">83</p> <p>1 doesn't fit the question.</p> <p>2 MR. FEAMAN: Okay. Thank you. Hold on.</p> <p>3 BY MR. FEAMAN</p> <p>4 Q Are you aware that your wife sent an e-mail to</p> <p>5 Mr. Pankauski's office?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And after that e-mail, did you personally have</p> <p>8 a conversation with Mr. Pankauski's office?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q With whom did you speak?</p> <p>11 A Mr. Pankauski.</p> <p>12 Q Directly?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Was this by telephone?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q For how long?</p> <p>17 A An hour or so.</p> <p>18 Q Was this shortly after -- or within a few days</p> <p>19 after the e-mail was sent by your wife?</p> <p>20 A Yes, sir.</p> <p>21 Q And was he in possession of documents that had</p> <p>22 been transmitted by your wife to him?</p> <p>23 A Yes, sir.</p> <p>24 Q And did you discuss with Mr. Pankauski anything</p> <p>25 that you would consider to be confidential?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">82</p> <p>1 Michelle Morley.</p> <p>2 MR. PANKAUSKI: Objection, speculation. He's</p> <p>3 believing.</p> <p>4 THE COURT: Okay. Try to avoid belief, tell</p> <p>5 me what you know. Can you reanswer?</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Yes. We sent information to</p> <p>7 both Mr. Pankauski and his assistant.</p> <p>8 BY MR. FEAMAN</p> <p>9 Q And were you -- did your wife send an e-mail as</p> <p>10 a follow-up to that telephone conversation?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. And were you copied on that e-mail?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. Let me show you what's been marked as</p> <p>15 Exhibit A, ask you if this is a true copy of the e-mail</p> <p>16 that was sent by your wife, in which you were copied,</p> <p>17 after the initial conversation that she had with</p> <p>18 Mr. Pankauski's office?</p> <p>19 THE COURT: So just -- because I think I have</p> <p>20 the Exhibit A at the top part of that doesn't</p> <p>21 apply, correct? Because that's February 10th.</p> <p>22 MR. FEAMAN: Correct.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: So if the other -- your question</p> <p>24 is, what did Candice send. But this is an e-mail</p> <p>25 from Michelle. So it doesn't -- the e-mail</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">84</p> <p>1 A Yeah, confidential and adverse to the</p> <p>2 information about my brother.</p> <p>3 Q Like what?</p> <p>4 A Like what we thought about my brother's</p> <p>5 actions with the other attorneys. The fact that there</p> <p>6 was forgery going on. We believed he was working with</p> <p>7 the attorneys who resigned yesterday, Tescher and</p> <p>8 Spallina. That Tescher and Spallina had brought them</p> <p>9 in, had business dealings, et cetera. We gave him a</p> <p>10 lot of confidential information, I feel.</p> <p>11 Q Did you discuss Mr. Pankauski's law firm</p> <p>12 representing you?</p> <p>13 A Yes, sir.</p> <p>14 Q And was a retainer asked for?</p> <p>15 A It was.</p> <p>16 Q And what were the terms of the retainer that</p> <p>17 you recall?</p> <p>18 A To -- he wanted us to pay money and to retain</p> <p>19 his services. And we couldn't afford it. And I</p> <p>20 basically told him we couldn't afford it.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: That's not the question.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. Yeah, a retainer was</p> <p>23 sought.</p> <p>24 BY MR. FEAMAN</p> <p>25 Q Was a retainer discussed?</p>

85

1 A Yes, sir.
 2 Q And was it an amount of money that you didn't
 3 presently have at that time?
 4 A Yes.
 5 Q And did you set about to try to obtain the
 6 retainer?
 7 A I told him I would try to get it from the
 8 court, and make a petition to the court, which I filed
 9 with the court. And I've been waiting for an answer on
 10 that. And then I would have called him back and got
 11 the money for him.
 12 Q All right. Did you ever receive any
 13 communication from Mr. Pankauski saying he was
 14 affirmatively not going to represent you?
 15 A No.
 16 Q When did you hear that Mr. Pankauski had been
 17 retained by Mr. Ted Bernstein?
 18 A Oh, week or two ago.
 19 Q And did you review the notice of appearance
 20 that was filed by Mr. Pankauski in this case?
 21 A I did.
 22 Q When did you receive that?
 23 A Oh, no, I don't think I've ever reviewed a
 24 notice of appearance from him.
 25 Q Okay. And when you found out that

86

1 Mr. Pankauski was coming in on behalf of Mr. Ted
 2 Bernstein, what was your reaction?
 3 A I contacted him and said that I felt that he
 4 was conflicted. And -- that was the first contact.
 5 Q Did you send him an e-mail in that regard?
 6 A I did.
 7 Q And did you express any desire that he not
 8 represent Mr. Bernstein?
 9 A Yes, sir.
 10 Q Okay. And what was his response?
 11 A He didn't see eye to eye with me, basically.
 12 I sent him then the Bar rules that I felt applied, as a
 13 follow-up e-mail. Then, you know, I figured I'd come
 14 here and talk to the judge or something.
 15 Q So this motion is not something that you have
 16 expressed to Mr. Pankauski prior to today, is that
 17 correct?
 18 A No. No, I asked him politely to disqualify,
 19 you know, under ethical rules.
 20 Q Okay. And, obviously, you felt that request
 21 was rejected, correct?
 22 A Correct. He's here.
 23 Q How do you feel as a result of his continuing
 24 this case in terms of your personal involvement in this
 25 case?

87

1 A Violated, you know.
 2 Q What is it?
 3 A Violated.
 4 Q Why?
 5 A Because it's a big risk. You know, he was
 6 also referred to me by Joel Weissman, who has very
 7 intimate knowledge of our case and what's going on in
 8 my life, and information regarding my brother. And
 9 I've had conversations with Mr. Weissman about that.
 10 And he was trying to help me out. And I, you know, I
 11 feel violated, that's all I can say.
 12 MR. FEAMAN: Okay. No further questions.
 13 THE COURT: Cross-examination.
 14 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.
 15 CROSS EXAMINATION
 16 BY MR. PANKAUSKI
 17 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Bernstein.
 18 A Good afternoon, sir.
 19 Q In addition to contacting my law firm, you
 20 contacted Joel Weissman's law firm?
 21 A Joel Weissman was referred to us.
 22 Q Is that a yes?
 23 A Yes.
 24 Q And you contacted Norman Fleisher?
 25 A I might have.

88

1 Q You did contact Norman Fleisher?
 2 A Are you telling me I did?
 3 Q I'm asking you.
 4 A No, you were telling me. But I don't know.
 5 Who is Norman Fleisher?
 6 Q And you contacted attorney Amy Beller?
 7 A I might have.
 8 Q And you contacted Brandon Pratt?
 9 MR. FEAMAN: Outside the scope of direct.
 10 THE COURT: Overruled.
 11 THE WITNESS: I retained Brandon Pratt.
 12 BY MR. PANKAUSKI
 13 Q Please tell us what other --
 14 A The children retained Brandon Pratt.
 15 Q Your children are minors, correct?
 16 A Yes.
 17 Q Please tell us who the other attorneys in Palm
 18 Beach County are that you contacted regarding this
 19 matter?
 20 A No.
 21 MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, the witness is
 22 refusing to answer my question and he hasn't --
 23 THE COURT: I'm sorry.
 24 THE WITNESS: I answered. I said no.
 25 THE COURT: I thought he said none.

<p style="text-align: right;">89</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: I said no. 2 THE COURT: No, you weren't going to answer 3 or no -- 4 THE WITNESS: No, I don't know to tell him 5 who I've contacted in Palm Beach County. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 8 Q I'm sorry, let me ask you again because I don't 9 think we were clear. Besides the attorneys that I've 10 mentioned, sir, please tell us what other attorneys 11 you've contacted in Florida regarding this matter. 12 A I don't know. 13 MR. FEAMAN: Objection. I think that's 14 confidential. 15 THE WITNESS: And it is. I feel it's 16 confidential too. 17 THE COURT: I'll overrule that. Good ahead. 18 So you can answer if you know of others that you 19 did contact. If not, say so. 20 THE WITNESS: I think I've contacted others, 21 I don't know who. I didn't bring a list of who I 22 contacted and who I haven't. 23 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 24 Q You contacted between 6 and 12 attorneys to 25 represent you in this matter?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">91</p> <p>1 the estate and has been working closely with them and 2 to block us from getting proper notices and notices of 3 his supposed titles and information and accountings and 4 everything else too. And, you know, so I feel that we 5 have a differing interest in the outcome of the 6 estates. And I've expressed that to you and told you 7 about the documents, and what I thought about him 8 working with Spallina and Tescher and all of those 9 things. So that's stuff I don't normally tell somebody 10 unless they're asking -- and all my documents were 11 marked confidential that I sent you, all my e-mails 12 were marked confidential, et cetera. 13 Q You sent me e-mails? 14 A Me or my wife. 15 Q Okay. You don't remember if you sent me 16 e-mails? 17 A I don't recall at this moment. 18 Q In fact, you never -- 19 A I have sent you e-mails. Yes, I have. 20 Q You sent me, John Pankauski, e-mails? 21 A Yes, sir. 22 Q Do you have any of those with you today? 23 A I believe the ones I just sent you last week, 24 weren't those e-mails? 25 Q Okay. Other than February 10th and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">90</p> <p>1 A Possibly. 2 Q Okay. And you've provided those attorneys that 3 you've contacted with the information that you provided 4 to my law firm? 5 A Not all of them. Only the ones that 6 requested information under confidentiality. 7 Q And which lawyers -- 8 A Similar to you. 9 Q And which lawyers are those? 10 A I can't recall. 11 Q Okay. Mr. Feaman asked you whether you were 12 adverse to your brother Ted, and you said yes? 13 A Yes. 14 Q How are you adverse to your brother Ted? 15 A We have differing interests in the outcomes 16 out of the estate. 17 Q Can you explain what the differing outcomes 18 are? 19 A Yeah. I believe that there's been fraud in 20 the estate by the estate planners and Ted to change 21 beneficiaries in the estate. I've asserted those 22 claims in the courts and in criminal authorities. And 23 I believe that there's now evidence that certain 24 documents were signed postmortem for my father and 25 myself illegally. Ted brought these attorneys in to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">92</p> <p>1 February 12th, other than those two, did you send me any 2 e-mails? 3 A I believe my wife did. 4 Q Let's get this straight now. Your wife Candice 5 sent me, personally, John Pankauski, e-mails? 6 A Sorry, your law firm. 7 Q Okay. So let's get this straight. And I'm 8 sorry, but this is important. 9 A No, I don't mind the badgering. 10 THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Stop. Eliot, 11 that's not badgering. 12 THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry. 13 THE COURT: Okay. So just answer a straight 14 question and this will go smoother. 15 Go ahead. 16 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 17 Q Mr. Bernstein -- Mr. Eliot Bernstein -- you 18 personally, not Candice, you personally never sent an 19 e-mail to my law firm? 20 A I did. 21 Q Other than February 10th and February 12th? 22 A I don't believe so. 23 Q Thank you. 24 Okay. You've read your dad Simon's will? 25 A Yes, sir.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">93</p> <p>1 Q You are not mentioned in the will as a 2 beneficiary? 3 A Which will? 4 Q Your dad's will. The one that's before this 5 court. 6 A I don't believe so. 7 Q May I approach the witness with a copy of 8 Simon's will? 9 THE COURT: You're allowed to do that. 10 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 11 Q Would you like to take a look at it. If you 12 can just look through your dad, Simon's, will, which I 13 just handed to you, can you just confirm, please, that 14 you are not a beneficiary under your dad's will? 15 A I was convinced under this one I wasn't. But 16 I was told by Spallina and Tescher that I was a 17 personal property beneficiary or something. 18 Q So, you know, are you a beneficiary under your 19 dad's will that I just handed to you? 20 THE COURT: So the date of the will? 21 MR. FEAMAN: Objection, asked and answered. 22 THE COURT: Yeah. Sustained. Date of the 23 will? 24 MR. PANKAUSKI: The date of the will is 25 July 20 -- looks like first -- 2012.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">95</p> <p>1 A. Do you see that that looks like an e-mail from your 2 wife Candice? 3 A Yes, sir. 4 THE COURT: No, that's -- but that's on 5 February 10th. Is that what you're getting at? 6 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, the date doesn't matter. 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 9 Q What is mentioned in line item three? 10 A Copies of revised wills, trusts for Simon 11 Bernstein. 12 Q Thank you. 13 A That means it's an amended and restated trust 14 of Simon, not the trust of Simon that you asked about, 15 just for your edification. 16 Q And, in fact, his amended trust is your dad's 17 last trust, correct? 18 A If you believe what they are saying. 19 Q So you have seen your dad's trust? 20 A No, I've never seen my dad's trust. I've 21 seen an amended and restated trust. The original 22 trust, I believe, has me and my two sisters as 23 beneficiary, and Ted and his children wholly excluded 24 with my sister Pam as the only non-beneficiaries in 25 this whole thing.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">94</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Okay. Next question. 2 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 3 Q And you are not a beneficiary of your father, 4 Simon's, revocable trust? 5 A I've never seen that. That's been withheld 6 and suppressed and denied by former counsel -- 7 THE COURT: So is the answer I don't know? 8 THE WITNESS: No, it's I've never seen it. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Straight answer, we'll 10 move through this. 11 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 12 Q Your testimony is you've never seen your dad, 13 Simon's, revocable trust? 14 A That's correct. 15 Q Do you have Exhibit A in front of you that 16 Mr. Feaman asked you about earlier? 17 A No. 18 Q And Exhibit A was attached to the verified 19 motion filed by Mr. Stansbury? 20 A No. 21 Q Okay. May I approach the witness? 22 THE COURT: Yeah. 23 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 24 Q I'm going to hand you my verified motion and 25 I'm going to ask you to direct your attention to Exhibit</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">96</p> <p>1 Q You earlier testified that you sent an e-mail 2 to me, Pankauski, and my assistant. Do you recall that 3 testimony? 4 A I believe it was my wife sent an e-mail to 5 your firm. 6 Q Yes. But I'd like to correct that. 7 A Okay. 8 Q Your wife Candice sent an e-mail to my 9 assistant, not to me? 10 A Correct. 11 Q And my assistant followed up with Candice by 12 e-mail? 13 A Well, actually, you requested that your 14 assistant get the documents for your meeting with me. 15 That's how I recall it. Candice came and asked me, and 16 we sent you the information to your assistant for your 17 review for our meeting because you were in California 18 or something. 19 Q Let's be clear. I've never spoken to your wife 20 Candice? 21 A Correct. 22 Q I have never asked Candice for any documents? 23 A Except your assistant asked Candice for 24 documents for our meeting, correct. 25 Q Correct. You said that you had one</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">97</p> <p>1 conversation with me for an hour or so. Do you remember 2 that testimony? 3 A Yeah. And I believe it was two conversations 4 I had with you total. 5 Q Now, it's two conversations? 6 A Yeah. You called me back to tell me you had 7 found a way to pay for your bill. 8 Q And when were those two conversations? 9 A September something. I don't have it in 10 front of me today. I can check my calendar. 11 Q Do you have your calendar with you? 12 A I don't. 13 Q Okay. And how far apart were those two 14 conversations? 15 A Shortly thereafter, I believe. 16 Q And they were in the evening, right? 17 A I believe. 18 Q Both of them were? 19 A I believe. 20 Q And you said the first one lasted an hour or 21 so. Do you recall how long this supposed second 22 conversation lasted? 23 A I believe it was rather brief. 24 Q Less than five minutes? 25 A Maybe more.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">99</p> <p>1 read that, Mr. Bernstein? 2 A Mr. Pankauski -- 3 Q No, I'm sorry, I meant just read it to 4 yourself, so... 5 A All right. 6 MR. PANKAUSKI: I'm sorry, I don't. I 7 should, but I don't. If you'd like to come over 8 here, you're more than welcome to look at it with 9 me. 10 MR. FEAMAN: May I approach the witness? 11 THE COURT: You may. 12 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 13 Q Do you see about -- in your e-mail -- one, two, 14 three, four, five, six -- bless you, Mr. Rose -- seven 15 lines up from the bottom? 16 A Correct. 17 Q You see that as of February 10th, 18 Mr. Bernstein, your story was that I proposed a retainer 19 of \$200,000? 20 A Correct. 21 Q Okay. So let me go on from there. You were 22 asked whether you had -- whether you discussed 23 confidential information to me, and you said yes? 24 A Correct. 25 Q And you said that it involved forgery and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">98</p> <p>1 Q And I asked you for -- your belief is that I 2 asked you for a \$200,000 retainer? 3 A No. My belief -- 4 THE COURT: No. No. Wait. Next question. 5 THE WITNESS: Okay. 6 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 7 Q Isn't it your belief that -- strike that. 8 What's your understanding of how much I asked for a 9 retainer? 10 A I don't recall the exact amount for the 11 retainer. 12 THE COURT: Then stop. That's your answer. 13 Next question. 14 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 15 Q You sent me an e-mail on February 10th? 16 A Correct. 17 Q Okay. May I approach the witness. And this is 18 a copy of the February 10th e-mail that you sent to me, 19 correct? 20 A Correct. 21 MR. FEAMAN: Do you have another copy of 22 that? 23 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yeah, I should. 24 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 25 Q And while I'm looking, could you just please</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">100</p> <p>1 Tescher and Spallina, correct? 2 A Yes. 3 Q Any other confidential information? 4 A Yeah, all kinds of stuff. 5 Q Okay. 6 A We talked about in the course of our 7 conversation about you representing us. 8 Q Well, please tell us what that is. 9 A You know, I believe we spoke mainly about the 10 problems in the estate with the forgeries and the 11 notary public, the police investigations that we were 12 launching against Ted, Tescher, et cetera. I believe 13 we talked about the various aspects of our legal 14 strategy in, you know, against the estates and Ted, et 15 cetera, and were looking to retain you. 16 Q Is your testimony that you and I had a 17 conversation about a legal strategy against the estate? 18 A Against -- yes, against the estates, and the 19 people in charge, Tescher, Spallina, the personal 20 representatives, getting rid of them, et cetera. 21 Q And is it your testimony that I discussed trial 22 strategy with you about suing your brother Ted? 23 A Removing the personal representative and Ted 24 from having any interest in the estates. 25 Q I had a discussion with you about removing</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">101</p> <p>1 Ted's interest in your dad's estate? 2 A In all the estates. 3 Q Okay. 4 A That I told you I believe these documents of 5 2012 were forged and fraudulent and that we had 6 evidence, you know, I went into all that. 7 Q Sir, do we agree Ted is not a beneficiary of 8 your dad's estate and that there would be nothing to 9 remove him from? 10 A It's his children, excuse me. 11 Q Isn't it true that you spoke to me about filing 12 a malpractice action? 13 A Excuse me, let me correct that. I did want 14 you to remove Ted. Because Ted was representing that 15 he was trustee of this trust of my father's. And I 16 expressed to you that he hadn't sent out the proper 17 forms. He hadn't followed any of the rules. And that 18 he was acting in bad faith as an alleged fiduciary 19 under alleged documents. 20 Q You spoke to me about a potential malpractice 21 action against Don Tescher? 22 A That was only a small part. 23 Q In fact, you told me that you -- 24 A Excuse me, in fact, you are the one -- we 25 just told you that you should fund your bill from</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">103</p> <p>1 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 2 Q So you and I did discuss malpractice against 3 Mr. Tescher? 4 A Correct. 5 Q Okay. When I asked you about confidential 6 information a moment ago, you were talking about some 7 criminal inquiries, you were talking about some 8 forgeries. You and I discussed a postdated or backdated 9 notary clause? 10 A No. 11 Q We didn't discuss a notary clause that was 12 presented to this court whose notary seal was improper? 13 A Not only the notary seal, but the signatures. 14 Q Okay. So forgive me. You and I had a 15 discussion about a deficient notary clause, correct? 16 A A forgery and deficient notary on a forged 17 document, yes. 18 Q Correct. And when you spoke with me in 19 September of 2013, the notary clause information was 20 already before this court? 21 A Part of it. 22 Q Yeah, it was public information? 23 A Some of it. 24 Q And the criminal matters that you're talking 25 about, those were -- there was already an ongoing</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">102</p> <p>1 Kimberly Moran's forgery and fraud, which Mr. Tescher 2 and Spallina were responsible under Florida law for the 3 acts of their notary who committed postmortem forgery 4 of my father's signature, et cetera. 5 Q You told me that you had been looking for a 6 lawyer to sue Mr. Tescher, but you couldn't find one? 7 A Did I? 8 Q Well, that's my question to you. 9 A Oh, that was a statement. 10 THE COURT: He asked you the question. You 11 can answer. 12 THE WITNESS: What was the -- how -- 13 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 14 Q You told me that you were trying to find an 15 attorney to sue Don Tescher for malpractice? 16 A No. 17 Q You didn't tell me that you were looking for an 18 attorney to sue Don Tescher for malpractice? What did 19 you tell me about the malpractice? 20 A Well, you contacted me and said -- 21 THE COURT: Listen to the question. 22 THE WITNESS: Okay. In regards to the 23 malpractice, I said that case against Tescher and 24 Spallina should be the point of funding for an 25 attorney to get their fees paid for.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">104</p> <p>1 investigation by the time you and I chatted in September 2 of 2013? 3 A And I don't know if anybody else knew about 4 that, et cetera. 5 Q Is that a yes? 6 A Yes. There were several investigations 7 going. 8 THE COURT: Try not to volunteer, 9 Mr. Bernstein. 10 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 11 Q The matters that you spoke to me about in 12 September of 2013, you had spoken to -- you had spoken 13 about with other individuals? 14 A I had. 15 Q And, in fact, most of that information was 16 public record because much of it was going on right here 17 in this estate proceeding? 18 A No. 19 Q What wasn't a public record? 20 A I don't want to disclose it. I mean, it was 21 confidential information I gave you at the time. 22 That's -- I still feel it's confidential and feel that 23 I'm -- you might be exposing that stuff. 24 Q What's the confidential information? 25 A Just information about the documents we're</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">105</p> <p>1 discussing in this case.</p> <p>2 Q What information about the documents?</p> <p>3 A I don't want to --</p> <p>4 THE COURT: Okay. He's objecting.</p> <p>5 Sustained.</p> <p>6 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>7 Q The February 10th e-mail from Candice to me</p> <p>8 that's in front of you.</p> <p>9 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>10 Q You would agree that those documents, 1 through</p> <p>11 4, are the only documents that Candice provided to my law</p> <p>12 firm?</p> <p>13 MR. FEAMAN: Objection, form.</p> <p>14 Mischaracterizes the date of the e-mail.</p> <p>15 MR. PANKAUSKI: Is it February 12th?</p> <p>16 MR. FEAMAN: It's September 20th -- September</p> <p>17 19th.</p> <p>18 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you.</p> <p>19 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>20 Q Thank you. I'm not even close. Thank you.</p> <p>21 The e-mail that I handed you, the</p> <p>22 September 20, 2013 e-mail.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: September 19th.</p> <p>24 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>25 Q Thank you. September 19, 2013 --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">107</p> <p>1 Bernstein will 2008, Simon Bernstein --</p> <p>2 MR. FEAMAN: Got to go slower because the</p> <p>3 court reporter --</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Sorry, sir. Okay. Shirley</p> <p>5 Bernstein trust, 2008. Shirley Bernstein will,</p> <p>6 2008. Simon Bernstein amended trust, 2012. Simon</p> <p>7 Bernstein will, 2012. Waivers unnotarized and</p> <p>8 notarized, transcripts part 2, 2013, 09/13,</p> <p>9 Bernstein Holdings, LLC, 2008, last pages,</p> <p>10 Bernstein Holdings, LLC, Shirley Bernstein</p> <p>11 petition for discharge.</p> <p>12 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>13 Q Bernstein, LLC, you were not a member of that</p> <p>14 entity, correct?</p> <p>15 A I don't know.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. So those are the --</p> <p>17 A I believe I am a member.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. So those are all the documents that</p> <p>19 Candice provided to my law firm?</p> <p>20 A I believe so.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. And you did not provide any other</p> <p>22 documents to my law firm?</p> <p>23 A I do not believe so.</p> <p>24 Q So all the documents that were provided to my</p> <p>25 law firm were documents that are either public documents</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">106</p> <p>1 A It's not in front of me.</p> <p>2 Q I'm sorry. Is it --</p> <p>3 THE COURT: That's the Exhibit A that is</p> <p>4 attached to the motion.</p> <p>5 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you, Judge. May I</p> <p>6 approach the witness?</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: But I don't have that.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: Okay. He'll give you a copy. Go</p> <p>9 ahead.</p> <p>10 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>11 Q Okay. Mr. Bernstein, so I'm handing you what</p> <p>12 is Composite Exhibit A, the first page of that, and</p> <p>13 that's attached to the verified motion of Mr. Stansbury.</p> <p>14 That's the e-mail that you previously identified sent to</p> <p>15 my law firm from your wife, Candice, correct?</p> <p>16 A Correct.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. And you would agree that the documents</p> <p>18 listed 1 through 4 are the documents that Candice</p> <p>19 provided to my law firm?</p> <p>20 A No.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. What documents did Candice provide to</p> <p>22 this law firm?</p> <p>23 A It's on the next page.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. And what documents are those?</p> <p>25 A Shirley Bernstein trust 2008, Shirley</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">108</p> <p>1 or which have been filed with this court?</p> <p>2 A No.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. What's not a public document from that</p> <p>4 list?</p> <p>5 A Bernstein, LLC stuff.</p> <p>6 Q And where did you obtain those documents?</p> <p>7 A I don't recall.</p> <p>8 Q You obtained them from Tescher and Spallina,</p> <p>9 didn't you?</p> <p>10 A I don't think so. I didn't.</p> <p>11 MR. PANKAUSKI: May I approach and get that?</p> <p>12 Thanks.</p> <p>13 Your Honor, I'd like to move Composite</p> <p>14 Exhibit A into evidence.</p> <p>15 THE COURT: Any objection?</p> <p>16 MR. FEAMAN: No objection.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: Okay. That's the February 19</p> <p>18 letter?</p> <p>19 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: From Michelle Morley to Candice,</p> <p>21 correct?</p> <p>22 MR. PANKAUSKI: Forgive me, it's the Monday,</p> <p>23 February 10th, 2014, Candice Bernstein e-mail</p> <p>24 to -- it's not even to Michelle --</p> <p>25 MR. FEAMAN: That's the heading because it's</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">109</p> <p>1 how it was transmitted, but it's the September 19, 2 2013 e-mail from Michelle Morley to 3 Mrs. Bernstein. And then the follow-up e-mail 4 from Mrs. Bernstein. 5 THE COURT: September 19 e-mail from Michelle 6 to Candice is 1. 7 (Thereupon, Exhibit Number 1 was marked in 8 evidence) 9 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you. 10 THE COURT: Number 2 will be the 11 September 20, 2013 e-mail from Candice to 12 Michelle. 13 (Thereupon, Exhibit Number 2 was marked in 14 evidence) 15 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you. 16 THE COURT: So I'll need stamps on them 17 eventually. 18 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes. 19 THE COURT: I have them here. 20 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 21 Q Do you remember when Mr. Stansbury's counsel 22 questioned you about you receiving a letter from 23 Pankauski saying there was no representation? 24 A What do you mean? 25 Q I'm just asking you if you remember that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">111</p> <p>1 lawyers and you are not a client? 2 A Yeah. 3 Q You received this letter from my office within 4 a day or two of September 24, 2013? 5 A I never got it. 6 Q Okay. 7 A I've never seen that letter in my life. 8 How did you send it? 9 MR. FEAMAN: You don't get to ask questions. 10 THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. 11 Can I show that to my wife? 12 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 13 Q Mr. Stansbury's counsel, in his opening 14 statement, said that a relationship was formed between 15 you and me. You have never signed a legal services 16 contract with my law firm? 17 A Correct. 18 Q You've never provided an initial fee or 19 retainer to my law firm? 20 A Correct. 21 MR. FEAMAN: We'll stipulate, Your Honor, 22 there is -- 23 THE COURT: Stipulation accepted. Got it. 24 MR. FEAMAN: -- no formal relationship. 25 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">110</p> <p>1 Mr. Stansbury's counsel asked you did you ever receive a 2 letter from Pankauski saying I don't represent you? 3 A Correct. 4 Q And you replied in the negative. You said you 5 never received the letter? 6 A Correct. 7 MR. PANKAUSKI: May I approach the witness, 8 Your Honor? 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 11 Q Mr. Bernstein, be kind enough to look at the 12 one-page document that I handed you. Do you see that it 13 is a September 24, 2013 letter addressed to you at your 14 home address? 15 A Allegedly. I've never seen it. 16 Q And do you see that it's from my law firm? 17 A I do. 18 Q And do you see in the third paragraph it 19 references a malpractice action? 20 A Yeah. 21 Q And do you see in the first sentence -- 22 A Yeah. 23 Q Excuse me, do you see in the second paragraph 24 where it says, because we have not been hired, we are not 25 doing any work on your behalf, period. We are not your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">112</p> <p>1 Q The documents that's on Exhibit 1 that Candice 2 sent to my law firm were documents which you obtained 3 from Tescher and Spallina? 4 A No. 5 Q Who did you obtain those from? 6 A Christine Yates. 7 Q And who's Christine Yates? 8 A She's an attorney at Tripp Scott law firm. 9 Q Okay. And how did you get those documents on 10 Exhibit 1 from the Tripp Scott law firm? 11 MR. FEAMAN: Objection, attorney-client 12 privilege. 13 THE COURT: I don't know that there is one. 14 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll object on that 15 ground, too. 16 THE COURT: Well -- 17 THE WITNESS: That means she is my attorney 18 for me and my children. 19 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to overrule. I 20 think you need to say how you got the documents. 21 THE WITNESS: She transmitted them to me. 22 THE COURT: All right. 23 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 24 Q Where did she receive them from? 25 A No idea.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">113</p> <p>1 Q Okay. So you also hired Tripp Scott to 2 represent you regarding your mom and dad's estate? 3 A I hired them to represent us, my children and 4 I. And then I had to split it out to just my children 5 because of the conflicts. 6 Q Tripp Scott still does not represent you? 7 A No, they don't now. 8 Q Because you can't pay them? 9 A Partially. 10 Q And Brandon Pratt doesn't represent you because 11 you can't pay him? 12 A No. 13 MR. FEAMAN: Objection, relevancy. 14 THE COURT: Yeah, sustained. 15 THE WITNESS: I actually overpaid him. 16 THE COURT: Don't do that. Eliot, you know 17 the rules. 18 THE WITNESS: Sorry, sir. 19 MR. PANKAUSKI: May I approach the witness, 20 Your Honor? 21 THE COURT: May you what? 22 MR. PANKAUSKI: Approach the witness. 23 THE COURT: Sure. You don't have to ask me. 24 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 25 Q Mr. Bernstein, I'm going to hand you a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">115</p> <p>1 MR. FEAMAN: I have a relevancy objection to 2 number 4, the batch of documents. 3 THE COURT: Let's get through the ID part of 4 it first, though. 5 MR. FEAMAN: Okay. 6 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 7 Q So Mr. Bernstein, you recognize that I've 8 handed you a 74-page e-mail? 9 A Yes, sir. 10 Q And that was an e-mail that you prepared? 11 A I'd have to read it all and check that 12 nothing has been changed. But -- 13 Q Well, I -- 14 A Looks like it could be. 15 Q I'm sorry? 16 A I said it looks like it could be, but I'd 17 have to check. There's been a lot of document 18 tampering going on, so I'm not going to attest to it a 19 hundred percent. I haven't had time to review it. 20 Q Okay. Would you turn to Page 2, please? 21 A Yes. 22 Q And I'm directing this question to you about 23 your claim that you shared confidential information with 24 my firm. So please keep that in mind when I ask you 25 these questions. On Page 2 -- excuse me. Go back to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">114</p> <p>1 composite exhibit, a number of documents -- forgive me, 2 it's not a composite document. It's one e-mail. And 3 Mr. Bernstein, you recognize that as an e-mail that you 4 sent to Ted Bernstein and a number of other people? 5 THE COURT: Okay. Can I ask one thing before 6 you do. You were talking about a September 24 7 letter that wasn't introduced into evidence, is 8 that -- I think that you were short copies of 9 that. 10 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. 11 The September 24, 2013 letter, I'd like to move 12 into evidence. 13 THE COURT: Any objection. 14 MR. FEAMAN: No objection. 15 THE COURT: All right, number 3. I'll give 16 you these things to stamp, here's one, two and -- 17 you'll have three. 18 (Thereupon, Exhibit Number 3 was marked in 19 evidence) 20 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you. May I grab the 21 stamp? 22 MR. FEAMAN: I do. 23 THE COURT: Let him finish stamping them and 24 then -- so next one will be purportedly number 4, 25 but we're not there yet.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">116</p> <p>1 Page 1 for a moment. In this e-mail you not only sent it 2 to Ted Bernstein, but you sent it to everybody after the 3 to, T-O, colon, correct? 4 A Is the date missing on that? 5 MR. FEAMAN: That's my objection; improper, 6 lack of foundation. Wait. Excuse me. 7 THE WITNESS: Sorry. 8 THE COURT: Let me see it. 9 MR. FEAMAN: My objection is lack of 10 predicate, foundation. 11 THE COURT: I need to see it, so. This is 12 I.D. Number 4. Are you moving this into evidence? 13 Because you need to do that if you're going to 14 refer to it. 15 MR. PANKAUSKI: Most probably. Yes, Your 16 Honor. 17 THE COURT: Okay. But Mr. Feaman, Eliot 18 Bernstein identified this as his e-mail. He just 19 said he didn't have a chance to look at all the 20 pages to make sure there weren't any documents 21 that were snuck in, in essence. 22 THE WITNESS: Without the date, I would say 23 it's not my e-mail. 24 MR. FEAMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Bernstein, if I 25 may.</p>

117

1 THE WITNESS: Sorry.

2 MR. FEAMAN: Without a date, Your Honor, you

3 can't connect confidential -- he's offering it for

4 the purpose that somehow it was --

5 THE COURT: First thing is to identify it. I

6 haven't determined more than that right now. So

7 this is -- it's being shown to Eliot Bernstein,

8 purportedly, to be an e-mail from him to others.

9 MR. FEAMAN: Correct.

10 THE WITNESS: Well, now that it's missing the

11 date, I would say it's not my e-mail.

12 THE COURT: Okay. So are you sure you want

13 me to believe that part of your testimony? Listen

14 to me carefully. Because if I don't believe it,

15 I'm likely not to believe anything else you say.

16 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll believe it.

17 THE COURT: Look at the e-mail. Let's not

18 play games with me.

19 THE WITNESS: I'm not.

20 THE COURT: Well, that was a game playing --

21 THE WITNESS: Well, I notice right off the

22 bat my normal stamp on my e-mails isn't here.

23 That scared me. So I said --

24 THE COURT: So is I-V-I-E-W-I-T --

25 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. That's all good.

119

1 give -- the weight I give it, I'm not sure. If

2 there is an issue about when it was sent. So do

3 you remember when you sent this e-mail?

4 THE WITNESS: Looks like maybe shortly after

5 December 26 in response to letters from Tescher

6 and Spallina that are attached.

7 THE COURT: Of what year?

8 THE WITNESS: 2013.

9 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So objection

10 overruled. This is Number 4.

11 (Thereupon, Exhibit Number 4 was marked in

12 evidence)

13 MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, may I get that

14 copy back and use this one?

15 THE COURT: All right.

16 MR. PANKAUSKI: I'll stamp it.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 BY MR. PANKAUSKI

19 Q Mr. Bernstein, would you be good enough to turn

20 to Page 2, please?

21 A Yes, sir.

22 Q And so you see on Page 2 that in this

23 communication to all these people, this e-mail?

24 A Yes, sir.

25 Q You're discussing forgery and fraud?

118

1 THE COURT: I mean, that's you, right? I

2 mean, if we go ahead and pull your hard drive,

3 will we find this e-mail?

4 THE WITNESS: No. No. We can go on that

5 assumption.

6 THE COURT: Okay. That's -- okay. All

7 right. But I don't know the date of it, and you

8 can ask questions about that. But the subject is

9 response to Ted and Donald letters, re, emergency

10 distributions. And then there's a whole bunch of

11 other things there. Okay. And then there's some

12 other dates that are in the body of this exhibit.

13 So Mr. Feaman, your objection is what?

14 MR. FEAMAN: Without an establishment of a

15 date on the e-mail it has no probative value as to

16 whether the communications that Eliot made with

17 Mr. Pankauski in September were confidential or

18 not.

19 THE COURT: Okay. So let me think about

20 that. I'm looking here at the documents and

21 they -- that are contained in this e-mail -- and

22 there are a bunch of dates there. I see 2012,

23 2013 dates, court proceedings before me at some

24 point in 2013. And so admissibility versus

25 weight -- it's admissible. I mean, I may have to

120

1 A Yes, sir.

2 Q And you're discussing wills and trusts of

3 Simon's estate, correct?

4 A Well, this is all after our conversation by a

5 long time, I believe.

6 Q Is that a yes?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And you're discussing a power of appointment,

9 right?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And you're talking about grandchildren and

12 beneficiaries, correct?

13 A Correct.

14 Q And if you turn back to one, you sent this to

15 attorney Mark Manceri?

16 A Yes, sir.

17 Q And you sent it to attorney Caroline Rogers?

18 A Yes, sir.

19 Q Mark Garber?

20 A Yes, sir.

21 Q You sent it to lawyers at Plaster Greenberg?

22 A Yes, sir.

23 Q In fact, you sent it to, what, a dozen or so

24 attorneys?

25 A Yes, sir.

<p style="text-align: right;">121</p> <p>1 Q Okay.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: I need the Exhibit 4 so I can see</p> <p>3 it. As well as the other exhibits if you've</p> <p>4 stamped them.</p> <p>5 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, I think we did. I'll</p> <p>6 complete them before we leave.</p> <p>7 Thank you.</p> <p>8 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>9 Q Mr. Bernstein, just a couple questions about</p> <p>10 your interest in this estate of your father. You</p> <p>11 mentioned that -- I believe you testified that you</p> <p>12 believe you inherit from your dad Simon's estate, is that</p> <p>13 accurate.</p> <p>14 A I do.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. And you don't want to have Ted be the</p> <p>16 personal representative of the curator because your</p> <p>17 interests are adverse to Ted's?</p> <p>18 A And because Ted's been involved in a lot of</p> <p>19 confidential information, I discussed with you on the</p> <p>20 phone.</p> <p>21 Q The truth is, is that you've asked Ted for</p> <p>22 money to live on and Ted won't give you that money?</p> <p>23 A That's your interpretation.</p> <p>24 THE COURT: Listen to the question. Try to</p> <p>25 answer it.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">123</p> <p>1 done this before and you're experienced in this.</p> <p>2 I've warned you --</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I have never done it.</p> <p>4 THE COURT: Listen to the question. Okay.</p> <p>5 You don't understand the question, ask that it be</p> <p>6 repeated. Mr. Feaman is a really good trial</p> <p>7 lawyer. He's not objecting. That means it's a</p> <p>8 proper question. And limit your answer to the</p> <p>9 question. But when you do a narrative, I block it</p> <p>10 out. I don't pay attention to anything you're</p> <p>11 saying. You are not helping your cause. You're</p> <p>12 hurting yourself.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, it's my first time</p> <p>14 ever being --</p> <p>15 THE COURT: So it's your first time wanting</p> <p>16 to hurt yourself.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: No, now that you've explained</p> <p>18 it --</p> <p>19 THE COURT: So your answer is stricken. If</p> <p>20 the reporter will read back the question, we can</p> <p>21 get a clean answer. And don't give a rambling</p> <p>22 narrative, please.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Okay. I apologize.</p> <p>24 (Record read)</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">122</p> <p>1 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>2 Q Yes or no? Is that a yes?</p> <p>3 A I have been forced to ask Ted, yes.</p> <p>4 Q You've asked Ted to pay your -- the expenses of</p> <p>5 your residence?</p> <p>6 A What happened was --</p> <p>7 THE COURT: No. No. Listen. Stop. Stop.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p> <p>9 THE COURT: Listen. Your question has to be</p> <p>10 narrow to the -- your answer has to be narrow to</p> <p>11 the --</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I was directed to Ted to pay</p> <p>13 those bills.</p> <p>14 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>15 Q And Ted has refused?</p> <p>16 A Ted has denied that Janet Craig at</p> <p>17 Oppenheimer directed that he volunteer to pay the</p> <p>18 bills. And I was supposed to deal with Ted only, since</p> <p>19 she had -- he had volunteered to become manager of a</p> <p>20 company which he didn't have legal rights to and she</p> <p>21 didn't have the --</p> <p>22 THE COURT: Stop. Stop.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Sorry, Your Honor.</p> <p>24 THE COURT: Your answer is stricken. So,</p> <p>25 Eliot, here's the last -- you know, I mean, you've</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">124</p> <p>1 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>2 Q And Ted's refused to?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. You've asked your brother Ted to pay</p> <p>5 your children's tuition?</p> <p>6 A I've asked him to pay the expenses of</p> <p>7 Bernstein Family Realty and the welfare --</p> <p>8 THE COURT: No. No. See, he didn't ask you</p> <p>9 about that.</p> <p>10 MR. FEAMAN: Wait. I have to object to the</p> <p>11 form. And it doesn't define Ted in what capacity.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: I don't know that I need a</p> <p>13 capacity for that question. It's a little</p> <p>14 different type of question. So the objection is</p> <p>15 overruled. But, again, Eliot, listen to the</p> <p>16 question. Answer it as asked.</p> <p>17 Go ahead. Let's read it back.</p> <p>18 (Record read)</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>20 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>21 Q You are not currently employed?</p> <p>22 A No, I am currently employed.</p> <p>23 Q Where are you employed?</p> <p>24 MR. FEAMAN: Relevancy.</p> <p>25 THE COURT: Yeah, tell me the relevancy.</p>

125	<p>1 MR. PANKAUSKI: Impeachment.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: Impeachment of what?</p> <p>3 MR. PANKAUSKI: This isn't about his brother</p> <p>4 not serving in a fiduciary capacity. It's about</p> <p>5 his wanting for money. He's unemployed. He keeps</p> <p>6 asking for money.</p> <p>7 MR. FEAMAN: Objection. Move to strike.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: Okay. So the objection to that</p> <p>9 last question is sustained.</p> <p>10 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>11 Q You are blogging and speaking publicly about</p> <p>12 the issues that you communicated to my law firm?</p> <p>13 A Anything public I communicate to people who</p> <p>14 are watching the public record.</p> <p>15 Q Is that a yes?</p> <p>16 A Ask the question again, please.</p> <p>17 MR. PANKAUSKI: Sure. The court reporter, if</p> <p>18 you could read it back, please.</p> <p>19 (Record read)</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>21 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>22 Q Okay. May I approach the witness?</p> <p>23 THE COURT: You may.</p> <p>24 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>25 Q Mr. Bernstein, I'm going to hand you a</p>	127	<p>1 Q Is that a no?</p> <p>2 A I don't believe so.</p> <p>3 Q You were contacted by a firm on behalf of Ted</p> <p>4 Bernstein to ask you to stop blogging about this case?</p> <p>5 MR. FEAMAN: Objection to the form. It's not</p> <p>6 a question, it's a statement.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: Restate what you're saying in the</p> <p>8 form of a question.</p> <p>9 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>10 Q Were you contacted by a firm on behalf of Ted</p> <p>11 Bernstein to request that you stop blogging about this</p> <p>12 case?</p> <p>13 A I do not believe so.</p> <p>14 Q You have seen this document that's in front of</p> <p>15 you before?</p> <p>16 A No.</p> <p>17 Q It's your testimony that you have never seen</p> <p>18 the document that I just placed in front of you before,</p> <p>19 ever?</p> <p>20 A No.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Wait. But, no, I'm not sure your</p> <p>22 testimony is you have seen it before, or you</p> <p>23 haven't?</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I've never seen this document</p> <p>25 before.</p>
126	<p>1 document -- would you like a copy?</p> <p>2 MR. FEAMAN: If you have one.</p> <p>3 Thank you.</p> <p>4 MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, may I approach?</p> <p>5 THE COURT: This will be Number 5?</p> <p>6 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>8 (Thereupon, Exhibit Number 5 was marked</p> <p>9 for identification)</p> <p>10 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>11 Q This is a blog about Ted Bernstein?</p> <p>12 A Looks like it.</p> <p>13 Q And Judge Colin?</p> <p>14 A Yeah.</p> <p>15 Q And Don Tescher?</p> <p>16 A Yeah.</p> <p>17 Q This is a blog that you published on the</p> <p>18 Internet?</p> <p>19 A Incorrect.</p> <p>20 Q Who published this blog?</p> <p>21 A Looks like investigative blogger Crystal Cox.</p> <p>22 Q You were contacted by your brother Ted</p> <p>23 beseeching you, asking you to stop blogging about this</p> <p>24 case.</p> <p>25 A I was?</p>	128	<p>1 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>2 BY MR. PANKAUSKI</p> <p>3 Q You know a blogger known as Crystal Cox?</p> <p>4 A I do.</p> <p>5 Q And you provide Crystal Cox with information</p> <p>6 about this case?</p> <p>7 A About several cases.</p> <p>8 Q In fact, the blog that's in front of you, the</p> <p>9 document that I just handed you, that is the product of</p> <p>10 information which you provided to blogger Crystal Cox?</p> <p>11 A I have no idea. She could have got it</p> <p>12 anywhere. Most of it's public information, looks like</p> <p>13 to me. I can take a look.</p> <p>14 Q I didn't ask you where -- about the source.</p> <p>15 What I'm trying to tell -- trying to ask you is that the</p> <p>16 information that Crystal Cox blogged on, that's in front</p> <p>17 of you, came from information which you provided to</p> <p>18 Crystal Cox?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q It didn't?</p> <p>21 A Not that I know of.</p> <p>22 Q You have provided Crystal Cox information about</p> <p>23 Judge Colin.</p> <p>24 A I've provided information --</p> <p>25 MR. FEAMAN: Objection to the form.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">129</p> <p>1 THE COURT: What's wrong with the form? 2 MR. FEAMAN: It's a statement. You have 3 provided information. You have to ask a question. 4 THE COURT: Do it in the form of a question. 5 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 6 Q Have you provided information to Crystal Cox 7 about Judge Colin? 8 A I believe so. 9 Q About this estate? 10 A I believe so. 11 Q About your mother and father's wills and 12 trusts? 13 A I don't recall. 14 Q About Ted Bernstein? 15 A Yes. 16 Q And after you provided this information to 17 Crystal Cox, Crystal Cox blogged about those things? 18 A Okay. 19 Q That's a yes? 20 A That was a statement, wasn't it? 21 Q Okay. No, that was a leading question. 22 A Okay. 23 Q Do you need it read back to you? 24 MR. FEAMAN: Objection to the form. 25 THE COURT: Go ahead.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">131</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And was Mr. Ted Bernstein subsequently 2 appointed as personal representative of Shirley 3 Bernstein's estate after you spoke to him? 4 A Yes, sir. 5 Q Do you still wish to remove Ted Bernstein as 6 personal representative of the estate of Shirley 7 Bernstein? 8 A Yes, sir. 9 Q Do you wish to remove him as trustee of -- in 10 what -- as the apparent trustee of your father's trust? 11 A Yes, sir. 12 Q Okay. Did you discuss that with Mr. Pankauski? 13 A Yes. 14 MR. FEAMAN: No further questions. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 All right. Thanks. You can step down, 17 Eliot. 18 MR. FEAMAN: The e-mails are in, so I -- 19 THE COURT: One through 4 is in. 20 MR. FEAMAN: So there is no need for me to 21 call Candice Bernstein to authenticate them. 22 THE COURT: They are in evidence. 23 Next witness. 24 MR. FEAMAN: No other witnesses. 25 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Pankauski, you're</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">130</p> <p>1 MR. PANKAUSKI: Could you please read it 2 back, Mr. Reporter. 3 (Record read) 4 BY MR. PANKAUSKI 5 Q Okay. It was a yes or no question. 6 A It was? Okay. Appears she blogged about 7 certain of those things. 8 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I 9 don't have any more questions. 10 THE COURT: Number 5 is ID only, not in 11 evidence. 12 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MR. FEAMAN: I have one question. 15 THE COURT: Redirect, yes. 16 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. FEAMAN 18 Q Mr. Eliot Bernstein -- 19 A Yes, sir. 20 Q -- in September of 2013, about the time that 21 the e-mails went back and forth from Mr. Pankauski's 22 office to your wife, did you talk to Mr. Pankauski about 23 opposing Mr. Ted Bernstein as personal representative of 24 the estate of Shirley Bernstein? 25 A Yes, sir.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">132</p> <p>1 first. 2 MR. PANKAUSKI: I'm going to testify, 3 Mr. Rose is going to examine me. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you. 6 MR. ROSE: Your Honor, is it okay if I 7 examine from the counsel table? 8 THE COURT: Sure. I need -- I do need the 9 Exhibits 1 through 3. I only have -- 10 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes. One, two, three. 11 Four should be here. 12 Thank you, Your Honor. 13 (Thereupon, JOHN PANKAUSKI was duly sworn 14 by the court) 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. ROSE 17 Q State your name for the record. 18 A John Pankauski. 19 Q Do you have any -- did you bring any papers 20 with you today? 21 A I did. I have an affidavit that I've had 22 executed, that I'd like to file with the court, because 23 they -- a case that says affidavits should be filed, 24 and it's my understanding that's part of the procedure. 25 I'd like to provide a copy to counsel and have it filed</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">133</p> <p>1 and introduced into evidence. 2 THE COURT: You can file the affidavit and it 3 goes into the court file. You can give a copy to 4 Mr. Feaman and to Eliot Bernstein. 5 THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 6 MR. FEAMAN: I object to it as evidence. 7 THE COURT: Yeah. No, it's -- 8 MR. FEAMAN: It's hearsay and it's 9 cumulative. 10 THE COURT: You can file it. I don't know 11 what I'm going to do with it, but you're there to 12 testify live. So go ahead. But you can file 13 that, the original with the clerk, and give 14 copies -- I'll let you give two copies for 15 Mr. Feaman so he can get one for Eliot. 16 THE WITNESS: Thank you, I'll give those to 17 him now. 18 BY MR. ROSE 19 Q Can you describe and explain to the court how 20 you came to represent Ted Bernstein? 21 A I did. I was contacted by you on a Sunday 22 morning in January, I was on my way to the Estate 23 Planning Institute in Orlando, and you had asked me to 24 change my travel plans to meet with you and Mr. Ted 25 Bernstein in your office downtown.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">135</p> <p>1 did you continue on with your trip to wherever you were 2 going while we interrupted it? 3 A After I met with you and Mr. Ted Bernstein, I 4 did, I went up to Orlando. 5 Q Okay. Did you subsequently conduct an 6 investigation to determine whether there was anything 7 that would prohibit you from representing my client, Ted 8 Bernstein, as a fiduciary in these matters now that his 9 lawyers had indicated there was a problem and they would 10 need to withdraw? 11 A Yes, I did. What I did is I went back and I 12 spoke to my office, I spoke to the person who does our 13 intake. When a prospective client calls our office, 14 they do not speak with an attorney, they speak with a 15 person who does the intake. I spoke with that person. 16 She said that she did recall this issue about a 17 backdated notary clause. She went on her computer. I 18 examined her computer screen with her. She revealed to 19 me that Candice, the wife of Eliot Bernstein, had 20 spoken to her about a matter involving Don Tescher and 21 a backdated notary clause. I had her review her 22 e-mails. I had her review whatever documents that were 23 sent. She confirmed that the only documents that were 24 sent were public documents, wills and trusts. I think 25 there was a deposition transcript from a hearing.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">134</p> <p>1 Q Did we give you any indication as to the 2 subject matter of the meeting? 3 A You did. There was a great sense of urgency 4 and distraught. You had said that you were involved in 5 an estate matter that had been -- you had just been 6 informed -- your client had just been informed that 7 somebody evidently fabricated a trust amendment and 8 you'd requested to speak to me about that. 9 Q Did we, in fact, meet that day? 10 A We did. You met with me and your client, Ted 11 Bernstein, in your office. You began telling me about 12 an estate case down here involving Don Tescher. And 13 you told me that there had been this backdated or 14 post-death dated waiver or notary clause. And at that 15 time I conveyed to you that -- I asked you the names of 16 all the parties. None of the party's names rang a 17 bell. But when you mentioned Mr. Tescher and a 18 backdated notary clause, I told you that somebody had 19 called our office regarding Mr. Tescher and a 20 malpractice claim involving a backdated notary clause. 21 And I conveyed to you and Ted that I would need to 22 conduct an investigation as to whether I owed any 23 duties to a prospective client and the nature of that 24 communication with my law firm. 25 Q Did you -- did you have -- after our meeting,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">136</p> <p>1 After that, I went into my own computer, I looked at my 2 e-mails. I didn't see any e-mails about this subject 3 matter. I looked in my computer and what I saw was a 4 one take -- one-page intake sheet from the person who 5 does my intakes saying she spoke with Candice on a 6 particular date in September. And I also found what is 7 Exhibit 3, which is what we call a no-rep letter. It's 8 a letter that my office sent to Eliot Bernstein on 9 September 23, 2003 [sic]. It's a standard practice in 10 our firm that when a prospective client calls us and we 11 are not retained, we send out a do-not-rep letter. 12 And, basically, it says that you contacted us. You 13 decided not to hire us. We're not your lawyers and you 14 are not a client. This letter went out from my office 15 to Eliot Bernstein on September 24, 2013. 16 Q Can you -- by looking at Exhibits 1 and 2, can 17 you tell the date the documents were sent to you? 18 A Yes, I just need to get them. 19 Q Okay. 20 A May I, Your Honor? Yeah, Candice and Eliot 21 did not e-mail me. They didn't even know my e-mail 22 address. They e-mailed Michelle at my firm, the intake 23 person. I had one conversation with Eliot, not two. 24 It wasn't during the day, it was during the evening. 25 And so Exhibit 1 was an e-mail from Michelle to, I</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">137</p> <p>1 guess, it's Eliot's wife, Candice, on Thursday, 2 September 19, 2013. Exhibit 2 is an e-mail to Michelle 3 from Candice on Friday, September 20, 2013. The 4 September 20th is an evening e-mail from Candice to 5 Michelle, 7:10 p.m., I think that's why they're 6 confused about speaking with me in the evening. I 7 never spoke with Candice. I only spoke with Eliot once 8 and that was in the afternoon. 9 Q Do you know which day -- was it the 19th, the 10 20th or a different day, that you actually spoke with 11 him? 12 A I don't. I remember where I was. I was -- I 13 was in my office. I was at my desk. I had my headset 14 on. I don't have a headset at home. I spoke with 15 Mr. Bernstein and I remember it because he wanted to 16 sue Don Tescher. And I know Don Tescher's name. I 17 don't really know Mr. Spallina, but I know Don Tescher. 18 And he was talking about a malpractice case and he was 19 talking about a backdated notary. And this was like 20 out of a novel, so I do remember those facts. But the 21 reason for the call was to discuss a malpractice 22 action. And I even referenced that in Exhibit 3; I 23 tell him that there is a two-year statute of 24 limitations for malpractice. He did mention that the 25 malpractice was committed within the estate of his mom</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">139</p> <p>1 ten minutes I can tell whether they're adverse to an 2 existing client, what the legal issue is, and whether I 3 can help them or not. I try to politely then shift the 4 conversation to the sad realities of the business of 5 law, whether you can afford us or not. When they can't 6 afford us, the conversation gets very short. And 7 that's what happened with my conversation with Eliot 8 Bernstein. It didn't last an hour. It didn't last a 9 half an hour. It lasted less than that. And it was 10 clear that while the facts are interesting, he was not 11 going to hire us. He didn't have the money to hire us. 12 He did not reveal any confidential information to me. 13 What he did say was that there was a malpractice case, 14 there was two matters involving mom and dad's estate, 15 and his focus was Don Tescher. 16 Q If you look at the letter that you wrote 17 Mr. Bernstein declining to represent him, what's the date 18 of that? 19 A September 24, 2013. 20 Q So Friday, the 20th, was -- is the date on 21 Exhibit 2. And by the following Tuesday, the 23rd, you 22 sent him a letter declining to represent him? 23 A (witness nods head). Yes. 24 Q Okay. Did -- 25 A Was September 24th a Monday?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">138</p> <p>1 or his dad. We didn't talk about removing Ted as 2 trustee. What he told me was, he had been calling up 3 lawyers and he couldn't find anyone to take his case. 4 And that he had called me -- and what he wanted to know 5 was, do you have a conflict with Don Tescher? Will you 6 sue Don Tescher? I said, I don't have a conflict with 7 Don Tescher. I know the gentleman, but he's not a 8 friend. I don't do any business with him. So I was 9 open to that. Mr. Bernstein later contended that I 10 asked for a \$200,000 retainer. I have never in my life 11 asked for a \$200,000 retainer. I hope to get there one 12 day, but I'm not there just yet. Our standard 13 retainer -- and we don't even use the word retainer -- 14 it's initial fee, it's \$15,000. When Mr. Bernstein -- 15 Eliot Bernstein -- to his credit -- told me that he 16 couldn't afford to pay us and he wanted this on some 17 type of a contingency, the conversation got short very 18 fast. Our firm receives literally sometimes dozens of 19 calls a month. And if I listen to everyone's story and 20 read every single document that they want us to read, I 21 would have no time to practice law. So I have a 22 practice, I have a custom, I have a procedure, I do not 23 spend a lot of time on the phone with a prospective 24 client. I give them up to 30 minutes free of charge 25 and that's it. The reason for that is within five to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">140</p> <p>1 Q Friday the -- if you look -- 2 A Friday was the 20th, Saturday was the 21st, 3 Sunday is the 22nd, Monday is 23rd. So this went out a 4 Tuesday, September 24th. So if Candice communicated 5 with Michelle on September 20th, I probably spoke with 6 Eliot on Monday or Tuesday because I remember my -- my 7 immediate reaction to Michelle, who does my intake, 8 was, there is nothing here to represent. We are not 9 representing Eliot Bernstein, he can't afford us. 10 Q Could you just describe generally the nature of 11 your law practice? 12 A Yeah. We handle estate litigation and 13 administration. Predominantly restricted to estates, 14 trusts, guardianships, wills, inheritances. That's all 15 we do. 16 Q Are you aware that our law firm does not do 17 trusts and estate administration work? 18 A Yes, that's why you called on me. You 19 originally went to another lawyer, but he was 20 conflicted out, and that's why you've asked our firm to 21 assist Ted Bernstein with the administration of trusts 22 and estates. 23 Q Before you agreed to become the lawyer for Ted 24 Bernstein in this case, did you undertake, in your view, 25 a thorough and detailed analysis of your ethical duties</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">141</p> <p>1 that might be owed to Mr. Eliot Bernstein as a 2 prospective client? 3 A I did. I did that twice. I mean, I did it 4 when you contacted me and I met with Mr. Bernstein 5 subsequently to our initial meeting, which was on a 6 Sunday. That's the procedure and that's the 7 investigation that I conducted with Michelle in my 8 office. And then subsequently I filed a motion to have 9 Mr. Ted Bernstein appointed as curator. Within 48 10 minutes I received an e-mail from Eliot Bernstein 11 saying, hey, Pankauski, you can't represent Ted. I'm 12 going to disqualify you. When that happened, I went 13 back to Michelle and I said we need to discuss this 14 again. We re-examined everything that I've already 15 described. I found no e-mails from Ted Bernstein or 16 Candice Bernstein. I felt -- I found no confidential 17 information. I found no documents that were -- excuse 18 me -- I found no documents that were Eliot Bernstein's. 19 The only documents that Eliot Bernstein provided were 20 someone else's that had been shared with others, like 21 wills and trusts. I, again, came to the conclusion 22 that my representation of Ted Bernstein would not 23 violate any duty that I owed a prospective client; such 24 as, Eliot Bernstein. I reviewed 4-1.18. I called the 25 ethics hotline of the Florida Bar. I also did a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">143</p> <p>1 A Yes, 2014. 2 MR. ROSE: I move this into evidence, Your 3 Honor? 4 THE COURT: Any objection? 5 MR. FEAMAN: No objection. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Number 6. 7 (Thereupon, Exhibit Number 6 was marked in 8 evidence) 9 BY MR. ROSE 10 Q If you look at Exhibit Number 6, Mr. Pankauski, 11 this was received by you at 5:52 p.m. on February 10th? 12 A Yes. 13 Q And if you turn to the Page 2, it appears to be 14 in response to a letter you sent Mr. Bernstein on 15 February the 10th at 5:06 p.m.? 16 A Yes. The letter was, I believe, the motion 17 to appoint Ted Bernstein as curator. 18 Q Forty-six minutes later you get this e-mail 19 from Mr. Bernstein? 20 A Yes. 21 Q And in response to receiving this e-mail you 22 undertook the second investigation you just told us 23 about? 24 A Correct. 25 Q Are there things in this e-mail that you find</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">142</p> <p>1 Westlaw search for cases and authority regarding this 2 issue. 3 Q You mentioned an e-mail you received from 4 Mr. Bernstein. Do you have a copy of that with you? 5 A I do. There's two of them. 6 Q May I approach, Your Honor? 7 A I've got a February 10th, 2014 from Eliot 8 Bernstein to me at 5:52 p.m. 9 Q Do you have more than one copy of that? 10 A There should be a few copies there. Oh, you 11 know what, I have the extra copy. 12 So on Monday, February 10th, 2014, Eliot 13 Bernstein's -- 14 Q Before you do that, what number are we up to, 15 6? 16 A This would be -- 17 THE COURT: Six. 18 MR. ROSE: Can we mark this as 6 for 19 identification, Your Honor? 20 (Thereupon, Exhibit Number 6 was marked 21 for identification) 22 THE COURT: Yes. 23 BY MR. ROSE 24 Q Is this an e-mail you received from Eliot 25 Bernstein on February 10th?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">144</p> <p>1 to be inaccurate? 2 A Yes. There's a number of them. In his 3 second line, he says I -- the end of the first line, 4 beginning of the second line -- I sent you over private 5 and confidential, highly sensitive information. He 6 didn't. He never communicated with me. He didn't send 7 over any confidential information. He didn't send me 8 anything. His wife Candice sent some of Simon and 9 Shirley's wills and trusts to Michelle in my office. 10 He also said we've had, quote, several correspondences 11 on the phone, close quote. We didn't. Candice called 12 Michelle. I spoke with Eliot Bernstein one time. He 13 thinks it was in the evening, it was in the afternoon 14 before the sun was setting. He said there was a series 15 of e-mails with you. That's inaccurate. Eliot 16 Bernstein never sent an e-mail to me, nor did Candice. 17 And several members of your office. Inaccurate. He -- 18 his wife, Candice, sent e-mails to Michelle who handles 19 my intake. He also said -- he says, complete removal 20 of any papers filed in conflict -- strike that. He 21 says, I'm uncertain how you can forget our meetings. 22 We never had any meetings. We had one phone 23 conversation for less than 30 minutes. He says, that 24 you even told me and Candice once you reviewed the 25 volumes of materials sent to you. I never spoke with</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">145</p> <p>1 Candice. He didn't send me volumes of material. He 2 sent Michelle those four or five documents that 3 Mr. Eliot Bernstein previously identified when he 4 testified. 5 Q Did you ever agree to review the materials he 6 sent you? 7 A No. 8 Q Did you, in fact, ever review the materials he 9 sent you? 10 A I did not. 11 Q Once you sent the letter on February 24 12 declining to represent him, you took no further action? 13 A Correct. 14 Q I didn't mean to interrupt you, you can 15 continue, if you see anything else in the letter. 16 A Yes. He says you also proposed a retainer of 17 \$200,000. I've never proposed a retainer of \$200,000. 18 Our retainers -- our standard retainer is \$15,000. 19 Q You asked Mr. Bernstein that question today and 20 he denied that he indicated you demanded the \$200,000 21 retainer? 22 MR. FEAMAN: Object to form. Repetitive. 23 THE COURT: Sustained. 24 BY MR. ROSE 25 Q Anything else in the letter that's inaccurate?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">147</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Yeah, I would. 2 MR. ROSE: I apologize for not having the 3 prior one. 4 (Thereupon, Exhibit Number 7 was marked in 5 evidence) 6 BY MR. ROSE 7 Q So 5:23 on February 11th, the day after you 8 received the e-mail from Mr. Bernstein, you wrote him and 9 indicated that you disagreed with his objection to you? 10 A I did. I said, I disagree with the substance 11 and content of your e-mail. My firm intends to remain 12 as counsel to your brother, Ted. 13 Q You received a response from Eliot Bernstein 14 the following day at 3:07 in the afternoon? 15 A Yeah. And you know who he cc'd on that? 16 Crystal Cox, the blogger. 17 Q I guess he cc'd Crystal L. Cox and Crystal L. 18 Cox at liquidating trustee? 19 A Yes. 20 Q Have you ever heard that name before? 21 A No. 22 Q Have you seen information about you published 23 on the Internet? 24 A I have. Nothing -- 25 MR. FEAMAN: Objection, relevancy.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">146</p> <p>1 A Just a moment, please. He said, I informed 2 you I would be working on raising those monies to 3 retain you. Absolutely not. He never told me that. 4 He said he didn't have the money. That's why the 5 conversation got cut short. That's why we sent him the 6 September 24, 2013 letter saying we don't represent 7 you. He said -- he references your promise of 8 confidentiality. I've never made a promise of 9 confidentiality to anybody. And I certainly didn't 10 make any promise of confidentiality to Mr. Eliot 11 Bernstein. 12 Q Did you respond to Mr. Eliot Bernstein's 13 e-mail? 14 A I did. 15 Q May I approach. I -- 16 A I responded to him on February 11th, the next 17 day, I believe, just before 6 p.m. And that's 18 reflected on a two-page document that's in front of me. 19 And then Mr. Eliot Bernstein responded to that response 20 on Wednesday, February 12, 2014. 21 MR. ROSE: I would move this in evidence as 22 Exhibit 7, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Any objection? 24 MR. FEAMAN: No objection. 25 MR. ROSE: Would you like a copy, Your Honor?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">148</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Yeah. Sustained. 2 THE WITNESS: I have never known -- 3 THE COURT: Sustained. I sustained the 4 objection. Next question. 5 BY MR. ROSE 6 Q Are there any inaccuracies in Mr. Bernstein's 7 e-mail to you dated February 12 at 3:07, which is in 8 evidence as Exhibit 7? 9 A Yes. His first line of his e-mail of 10 Wednesday, February 12, 2014 to me, he says, I think 11 applied to our discussions, plural, to retain your 12 firm. We didn't have discussions. Candice spoke to my 13 intake person. I spoke with Eliot once, for less than 14 a half an hour. He talks about the transfer of highly 15 confidential sensitive information and strategies. I 16 discussed no trial strategy with Eliot Bernstein. I 17 know that when a prospective client calls up, that my 18 responsibility and custom and practice is to take in a 19 minimum amount of facts to determine whether I can 20 provide assistance to that client or not. Trial 21 strategies comes later. Eliot Bernstein did not share 22 any trial strategies with me or any litigation 23 strategies with me. He says, I believe we had several 24 phone calls with you directly and others with your 25 staff. That's inaccurate. There were not several</p>

149

1 phone calls. He had one call with me. Then he says,
 2 including several lengthy conversations between my wife
 3 and your employees. And, again, a large amount of
 4 information and strategies were given to members of
 5 your office as well. Entirely inaccurate. His wife
 6 sent my intake person copies of Shirley's and Simon's
 7 estate planning documents. There was no large amount
 8 of information. He didn't speak with any employees
 9 other than me once. I don't think he even spoke with
 10 Michelle, I think that was Candice. Again, he says I
 11 promised him confidentiality. I didn't do that.
 12 And that concludes my testimony about this
 13 e-mail, Exhibit 7.
 14 THE COURT: You need to really move it along,
 15 we're going to run out of time.
 16 THE WITNESS: Okay.
 17 BY MR. ROSE
 18 Q Did you have a conversation with Mr. Feaman
 19 outside of the courtroom yesterday at the judge's
 20 request?
 21 A I did. And I have my notes that I took
 22 contemporaneous with that conversation.
 23 MR. FEAMAN: Objection, relevancy.
 24 THE COURT: Well, hold on.
 25 MR. FEAMAN: Materiality.

150

1 THE COURT: Well, the only thing right now is
 2 the answer that he took notes. I don't even know
 3 what the next question is, so let's wait.
 4 MR. ROSE: I'll mark this as Exhibit 8 -- may
 5 I approach?
 6 THE COURT: Okay. I don't want to see notes
 7 yet.
 8 BY MR. ROSE
 9 Q Are these notes you took yesterday in
 10 discussion with Mr. Feaman?
 11 MR. FEAMAN: I object to any testimony
 12 concerning notes that he took in a conversation
 13 that you requested us to have out in the hall
 14 yesterday, Your Honor.
 15 THE COURT: Okay. So objection sustained.
 16 MR. FEAMAN: Can I just proffer?
 17 THE COURT: That was not for the purpose of
 18 using that conversation as something to fully
 19 regurgitate either side's idea of what was said.
 20 It wasn't recorded. It was not in my presence.
 21 There was no court reporter there. The purpose
 22 was to be informal, so that we'd be able to
 23 determine whether this hearing was necessary.
 24 So objection sustained.
 25 BY MR. ROSE

151

1 Q In what capacity do you represent Ted
 2 Bernstein?
 3 A I represent him in his fiduciary capacity.
 4 Ted Bernstein is the trustee of his dad Simon's rev
 5 trust. He's the PR of his mom's estate. He's the
 6 trustee of his mom's trust.
 7 THE COURT: I got to write this down.
 8 THE WITNESS: Sorry, Your Honor.
 9 THE COURT: Trustee of Simon's.
 10 THE WITNESS: Simon's trust.
 11 THE COURT: Okay.
 12 THE WITNESS: Personal representative of
 13 Shirley's estate, trustee of Shirley's trust.
 14 THE COURT: Okay.
 15 THE WITNESS: And he's seeking to be
 16 appointed as personal representative of Simon's
 17 estate.
 18 THE COURT: Okay. Got it.
 19 BY MR. ROSE
 20 Q Do you represent Mr. Bernstein individually in
 21 any matters?
 22 A I do not.
 23 Q Do you anticipate representing Mr. Bernstein
 24 individually in any matters?
 25 A I do not.

152

1 Q Are you familiar with the estate plan of
 2 Shirley Bernstein and Simon Bernstein?
 3 A Yes.
 4 Q Do you want to -- can you tell us the short
 5 version of how you --
 6 A Eliot doesn't inherit. I mean, you gave
 7 me --
 8 MR. FEAMAN: Objection, relevancy.
 9 THE COURT: Well, it goes to the issue of
 10 whether Eliot is an interested person under 731.
 11 So that's relevant.
 12 MR. FEAMAN: Okay. Go ahead.
 13 THE WITNESS: Eliot doesn't inherit under
 14 Simon's estate plan. You provided those documents
 15 to me, it's my understanding that his mom and dad
 16 provided for him outside of those estate plans
 17 through the use of trusts and gifts.
 18 THE COURT: You folks really need to wrap it
 19 up. I want to try to finish this and then,
 20 depending on what I rule, deal with the other
 21 issue, so you can have some direction from me. So
 22 time is of the essence.
 23 BY MR. ROSE
 24 Q You feel you have learned anything from -- from
 25 your one telephone conference with Eliot Bernstein in any

<p style="text-align: right;">153</p> <p>1 way compromises his position or materially disadvantages 2 him when you will be representing Ted as the beneficiary 3 in these matters? 4 A Absolutely not. 5 Q Do you anticipate there being some litigation 6 in this trust? 7 A Yeah, I do, on the trust. Not necessarily 8 the estate. In the trust. I think that Ted is going 9 to file a dec action and ask Judge Colin for 10 instructions on how property under the trust should be 11 distributed or not distributed. 12 Q And as counsel, is it your intention to file a 13 dec action and follow the instructions of the court? 14 A Absolutely. 15 MR. ROSE: I have nothing further, Your 16 Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Feaman. 18 MR. FEAMAN: I'll try to be as brief as I 19 can. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. 21 CROSS EXAMINATION 22 BY MR. FEAMAN 23 Q If I understood your testimony, Mr. Pankauski, 24 are you taking the position that there is a difference 25 between documents received by your office that you didn't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">155</p> <p>1 Q Now, the -- you actually spoke to this 2 particular prospective client, correct? 3 A Yes. 4 Q And you would agree with me that Mr. Eliot 5 Bernstein was, in fact, a prospective client, correct? 6 A Yes. 7 Q Okay. You said the focus was on Don Tescher. 8 But could you take a look at Exhibit 3? 9 A Sure. 10 Q That's your rejection letter right there? 11 A Yes. 12 Q The reference makes no reference to 13 Mr. Tescher, does it? It says, Estate of Shirley 14 Bernstein and Estate of Simon Bernstein, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Only. And the documents that you received, 17 which are shown on Exhibit 2, which was the e-mail from 18 Candice Bernstein to Michelle of your office -- by the 19 way, how long has she worked for you? 20 A Oh, Michelle has been with us probably three 21 to four years. 22 Q Okay. And you received documents that included 23 the Shirley Bernstein trust, the Shirley Bernstein will, 24 back to 2008, correct? 25 A Michelle from my law office received those</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">154</p> <p>1 see and, therefore, you didn't see those documents? Are 2 you making a distinction? 3 A Yeah. The only distinction I'm making is in 4 the testimony from Mr. Eliot Bernstein; he said that he 5 sent me documents. He didn't. His wife sent documents 6 to my intake person. 7 Q All right. And so you are taking the position 8 that, therefore, you didn't see them? 9 A No, my position is I didn't read them. There 10 is no therefor. I didn't read those documents that he 11 sent -- that Candice sent to my intake person. 12 Q You don't deny your office received them? 13 A No, not at all. 14 Q And you are familiar, I would assume, with Rule 15 of Professional Conduct 4-5.3 (c) which states that 16 although paralegals or legal assistants may perform the 17 duties delegated to them by the lawyer without the 18 presence or active involvement of the lawyer, the lawyer 19 shall review and be responsible for the work product of 20 paralegals or legal assistants? You would agree with 21 that, correct? 22 A For existing clients, absolutely. Not for 23 prospective clients. There is no duty on my behalf to 24 review any number of things that come in from dozens of 25 prospects.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">156</p> <p>1 documents on Exhibit 2. 2 Q Okay. And the Simon Bernstein Amended Trust of 3 2012, correct? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Have you now seen the Simon Bernstein original 6 trust? Before it was allegedly amended in 2012? 7 A The 2008? 8 Q I don't know. 9 A Yeah, when you say original, I don't know 10 what you mean by that. 11 Q Okay. 12 A I looked at Mr -- 13 Q The trust which this amendment purportedly 14 amends? 15 A I don't know if I've looked at it. I've 16 looked at Simon Bernstein's trust that Mr. Rose gave 17 me, I believe it's the 2012 document. 18 Q Now, you said you were familiar with the estate 19 plan. And all of the documents that are listed here 20 would be necessary documents that would make you familiar 21 with the estate plan, correct? 22 A Necessary, no. I believe the 2012 trust 23 amendment revokes all prior amendments, which would 24 make prior ones a non-issue. 25 Q There is also documents here that have no</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">157</p> <p>1 relationship to the -- as far as you can tell -- the 2 estate plan, like the Bernstein Holdings, LLC? 3 A I don't think that's accurate. It's my 4 understanding from Ted Bernstein and Mr. Rose that 5 Bernstein Holdings, LLC was an entity that Simon 6 created to own a house that Eliot lives in. So where 7 Eliot lives, that's actually owned by an LLC created by 8 his dad, Simon. And the members of the LLC are three 9 trusts. So I think that's all part of Simon's estate 10 plan, you know, that's one way he helped out Eliot. 11 Q By your cross-examination of Mr. Eliot 12 Bernstein, when you asked about whether he had asked Ted 13 Bernstein for money, that would be money that would be 14 due either Eliot Bernstein's children or Eliot Bernstein 15 through those trusts, correct? 16 A I don't know if they're due through that 17 trust. It's my understanding the residence that Eliot 18 lives in is owned in the LLC, which is responsible for 19 paying the real estate taxes, the maintenance and 20 everything like that. I think Eliot Bernstein asked 21 the trustees of those trusts for money and they've run 22 out of money, so he asked Ted for more money. 23 Q And the LLC is, in fact, the Bernstein 24 Holdings, LLC? 25 A Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">159</p> <p>1 Bernstein. 2 Q So even though you didn't learn about it then, 3 they still sent to you the Bernstein Holdings, LLC for a 4 reason I guess you have no idea, is that right? 5 A Yeah. I don't know why Eliot's wife, 6 Candice, sent Michelle Bernstein Holdings, LLC other 7 than she wanted someone to review them. 8 Q That's certainly -- I'm sorry, I don't mean to 9 interrupt -- 10 A That's all right, you're doing a great job. 11 You know, when prospective probate clients call you, 12 they won't do a document dump. They want to open up, 13 they want to talk to you for hours, and they want you 14 to read everything in the world. We don't do that. We 15 don't have the time or the patience to do it. 16 Q You would agree with me that the Bernstein 17 Holdings, LLC certainly has nothing to do with the 18 malpractice action against Don Tescher, isn't that 19 correct? 20 A I wouldn't say absolutely, no. I'm not 21 trying to be evasive. I don't think that's an element 22 of the purported malpractice by Tescher and Spallina. 23 Q Okay. Thanks. 24 A Sure. 25 THE COURT: All right.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">158</p> <p>1 Q Correct? 2 A Yes. 3 Q Okay. And you received those documents back in 4 September, correct? 5 A Michelle did, yes. 6 Q Okay. And you are aware that there is a 7 dispute over payments from the LLC from Mr. Ted Bernstein 8 to Mr. Eliot Bernstein, correct? You asked about it on 9 cross-examination? 10 A There is a dispute over payments to the LLC. 11 Q Payments from the LLC to either Mr. Eliot 12 Bernstein or his kids or for the support of the house? 13 A You're confusing the LLC with the trust. 14 Q Okay. So the trust should be making payments 15 to the Bernstein Holdings, LLC, is that your 16 understanding? 17 A No. Eliot wants money from Ted individually 18 and Ted as trustee of either Shirley or Simon's trust. 19 And Shirley and Simon's trust don't permit 20 distributions to Eliot. 21 Q You first found out about the issue -- that 22 dispute between Mr. Eliot Bernstein and Mr. Ted Bernstein 23 about the money when you spoke to him in September of 24 2013, didn't you? 25 A No, I learned about it from Alan Rose and Ted</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">160</p> <p>1 MR. FEAMAN: Okay. 2 MR. ROSE: Two questions? 3 THE COURT: Yes, that's it. 4 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. ROSE 6 Q Bernstein Family Realty is not a beneficiary of 7 the estate, the will, the trust, is that correct? 8 A That's correct. 9 Q Absolutely nothing to do with what proceedings 10 are going to be before Judge Colin, as far as you know? 11 A Absolutely correct. 12 MR. ROSE: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat. 14 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Any other witnesses on your end? 16 MR. PANKAUSKI: No, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Okay. I have just a question. 18 In the estate case, where you're representing Ted, 19 that's the one where Mr. Feaman you're 20 representing the creditor, correct? 21 MR. FEAMAN: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Eliot is representing himself. 23 Okay. I'll let you do this, Mr. Feaman. What's 24 pending in that case now, anything? Other than 25 the motion to appoint a curator.</p>

161

1 MR. FEAMAN: In the estate itself?

2 THE COURT: Yeah.

3 MR. FEAMAN: I am only aware of the motion to

4 appoint Ted Bernstein as the --

5 THE COURT: PR.

6 MR. FEAMAN: -- personal representative.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MR. FEAMAN: But I have not reviewed the

9 file.

10 THE COURT: All right. And so is there an

11 action filed with respect to Simon Bernstein's

12 trust?

13 MR. PANKAUSKI: No -- I'm sorry.

14 MR. FEAMAN: Not yet.

15 THE COURT: All right. Okay. Have a seat.

16 Can I see the motion that --

17 Mr. Pankauski -- that you filed on behalf of

18 Ted to be appointed PR and the motion that asks

19 for -- and I think it was both counsel,

20 including Mr. Glasko -- for a curator instead.

21 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Let me see those physically.

23 MR. PANKAUSKI: This is my motion for

24 appointment. And I can get you the response in

25 opposition.

163

1 appointed as personal representative.

2 THE COURT: Well, hear what I'm going to do,

3 and then you'll see if you want to do that.

4 MR. GLASKO: Yes, sir.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Motion to disqualify is

6 denied.

7 The burden is on Eliot. And I'm treating

8 this as really being Eliot's motion to show

9 that he's an interested person under 731.20.

10 He has not carried that burden. And so that

11 would disqualify him from being someone who has

12 an interest in trying to stop Mr. Pankauski

13 from representing Ted.

14 And, you know, I agree with the law that

15 counsel -- Mr. Feaman just cited. This is

16 really a view of Eliot from a subjective point

17 of view as to -- as a prospective client of

18 Mr. Pankauski, now that Mr. Pankauski is

19 venturing to represent Ted, which is a

20 subsequent representation. Mr. Pankauski is

21 barred from representing Ted if there are

22 interests that -- in the estate -- that

23 materially -- that are materially adverse to

24 those of Eliot, and the rest of the rule. I

25 find that Eliot has not carried his burden of

162

1 THE COURT: Okay. I remember seeing the

2 response, but -- okay. So here's -- everyone

3 finished, ready for me to rule? I'm ready to rule

4 on everything.

5 MR. FEAMAN: The only thing I would add, Your

6 Honor, would be the case that we faxed to you

7 earlier today, and to everybody else, Metcalf v.

8 Metcalf, 785 So. 2d. 747, which states, quote, in

9 considering whether the attorney-client privilege

10 applies to disqualify an attorney from opposing a

11 former client, the focus is on the perspective of

12 the person seeking out the lawyer, not on what the

13 lawyer does after the consultation.

14 THE COURT: Okay. I agree that's the law.

15 All right. So -- yes.

16 MR. GLASKO: Judge, are you making a ruling

17 on the appointment of curator today?

18 THE COURT: I am. I'm doing it in like about

19 a minute or two.

20 MR. GLASKO: I would like to ask the court --

21 because we wanted to lodge an ore tenus objection

22 to that. And I think the court needs --

23 THE COURT: Why?

24 MR. GLASKO: -- the court needs to hear some

25 information with regard to Ted's ability to be

164

1 proof on that, even from a light most favorable

2 to him, which I'm giving him.

3 So motion to disqualify denied.

4 Ted's motion for appointment of himself as

5 curator or administrator ad litem, denied.

6 William Stansbury and -- your client is

7 who?

8 MR. GLASKO: Excuse me, my client is Lisa and

9 Jill.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Are they -- are they a

11 moving party in a formal sense?

12 MR. GLASKO: They are the children of the

13 decedent, Judge.

14 THE COURT: But have they filed -- I don't

15 have all the paperwork, I want to make sure I

16 do -- have they filed requesting a -- that there

17 be a curator other than Ted.

18 MR. GLASKO: No, sir, I've only made an ore

19 tenus motion.

20 THE COURT: The ore tenus motion is denied

21 only -- not on the merit because I'm not doing

22 this -- but I don't have to because William is an

23 interested person, able to, as a secured creditor,

24 who does have an interest under the case law and

25 under the statute in having this estate, which is

165

1 Simon Bernstein's estate administered, taking
 2 himself as a creditor into consideration.
 3 That motion is granted.
 4 So you are going to have the following
 5 choices: Within x days, you'll tell me, in a
 6 moment, you're going to tell me how much time
 7 you, Pankauski, Feaman, Glasko, need, to tell
 8 me who you want as curator. If that person is
 9 a lawyer, the fees are capped at \$350 an hour
 10 and cannot exceed \$5,000 in any increment
 11 without coming before the court and telling me
 12 why I should raise that cap incrementally.
 13 We're putting a cap on this situation.
 14 Okay. So you may need to make sure you
 15 can find someone who is willing to serve in
 16 that capacity.
 17 If you can't agree on someone, Pankauski,
 18 you're going to write two names out; Feaman,
 19 you're going to write two names out;
 20 Mr. Glasko, you'll write two names out on a
 21 little piece of paper. We're going to put them
 22 in a jar and you three will come in on UMC
 23 after -- if you, unfortunately, can't agree
 24 upon someone, my judicial assistant will come
 25 out, and in your presence, shake the jar and

167

1 into something that is not or shouldn't be.
 2 Okay. So who's going to write up orders?
 3 MR. FEAMAN: As to two of the motions, I
 4 believe your ruling was that -- just that they
 5 were denied, and I have blank orders on that.
 6 That would be the order on the verified motion to
 7 disqualify counsel. And it says the motion of
 8 Eliot Bernstein.
 9 THE COURT: Okay.
 10 MR. FEAMAN: Because --
 11 THE COURT: But you can do it for reasons I
 12 mentioned on the record. So if someone --
 13 MR. FEAMAN: For reasons mentioned on the
 14 record.
 15 THE COURT: Yeah, that's a good way of doing
 16 it. That way you don't have to start recreating
 17 it. I gave reasons on there.
 18 MR. FEAMAN: And then I have a blank order on
 19 a motion for appointment of curator or
 20 administrator ad litem, which you denied, by Ted
 21 Bernstein.
 22 THE COURT: Okay. That's denied.
 23 MR. FEAMAN: And then the other order on
 24 Mr. Stansbury -- not sure how much detail you want
 25 to get in there.

166

1 pick. So I'll have nothing to do with the
 2 actual person because it will be someone that
 3 one of the three of you picks. They all -- the
 4 only way that that won't work out is if one of
 5 the people you pick are obviously not
 6 qualified, but I assume that's not going to be
 7 the case.
 8 So you need to -- if we go that route, on
 9 the two names that each side of the three sides
 10 are going to pick, make sure that they are
 11 willing to serve in advance.
 12 Okay. The reason I don't want Ted is
 13 because under 733.501 I take a position that
 14 given where this case is, and the hype that --
 15 we're achieving a disconnect between what
 16 should be involved and what could be a sensible
 17 straightforward estate administration on the
 18 estate portion of the case -- because that's
 19 all that's before me right now. And not get
 20 carried on into a whole bunch of other things
 21 that aren't yet before me or not yet filed.
 22 So we're going to take this in nice small
 23 steps. This order applies to the estate case
 24 because there is no other case before me.
 25 So we're not going to let this blossom

168

1 THE COURT: Well, you're going to enter that
 2 order once you folks talk now. Okay.
 3 MR. FEAMAN: Okay.
 4 THE COURT: Right now. And Eliot is
 5 included in that conversation of whether you can
 6 agree upon someone. Because, I mean, I am not
 7 suggesting that you, you know, you can't, but you
 8 should be able to. I mean, especially -- and you
 9 may want to say here's name one, here's name two,
 10 here's name three, just to make sure that the
 11 people that you now talk about will accept the
 12 assignment. Then don't give me the order yet. Go
 13 actually speak to these people, make sure they
 14 accept, and then under the conditions that I'm
 15 mentioning. And then we're going to go from
 16 there. And then you put the name in the order.
 17 Okay?
 18 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
 19 THE COURT: Understand?
 20 MR. PANKAUSKI: Understood.
 21 THE COURT: All right. Understand, Eliot?
 22 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
 23 THE COURT: Okay. Great. So speak now. I'm
 24 going to stay, but I'm going to ask you to
 25 start -- go outside because we need to kind of

1 close the court -- but I'm going to stay here and
2 let the lawyers and Eliot come back in to tell me
3 what you've agreed to.

4 Okay. Thanks.

5
6 (Thereupon, the proceedings
7 were concluded at 5:03 p.m.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 CERTIFICATE
3

4 THE STATE OF FLORIDA
5 COUNTY OF PALM BEACH.

6
7 I, DAVID L. MARSAA, Professional Reporter,
8 State of Florida at large, certify that I was
9 authorized to and did stenographically report the
10 foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a
11 true and complete record of my stenographic notes.

12 Dated this 5th day of July, 2014.
13
14

15
16 _____
17 DAVID L. MARSAA, COURT REPORTER
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

<p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> \$</p> <p>\$15,000 138:14 145:18</p> <p>\$200,000 98:2 99:19 138:10,11 145:17,20</p> <p>\$350 165:9</p> <p>\$5,000 165:10</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> 0</p> <p>09/13 107:8</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> 1</p> <p>1 50:15 105:10 106:18 109:6,7 112:1,10 116:1 132:9 136:16,25</p> <p>1.18 73:8</p> <p>1.9 73:8</p> <p>108 50:15,16</p> <p>10th 82:21 91:25 92:21 95:5 98:15,18 99:17 105:7 108:23 142:7,12,25 143:11,15</p> <p>113 50:17</p> <p>118 50:18</p> <p>11th 146:16 147:7</p> <p>12 89:24 146:20 148:7,10</p> <p>120 49:9</p> <p>125 50:19</p> <p>1267 58:19</p> <p>129 50:5</p> <p>12th 92:1,21 105:15</p> <p>131 50:8</p> <p>141 50:20</p> <p>142 50:19,20</p> <p>152 50:9</p> <p>159 50:8</p> <p>17345 49:20</p> <p>19 48:24 105:25 108:17 109:1,5 137:2</p> <p>1-9 73:8</p> <p>1985 65:15</p> <p>1988 59:12</p> <p>19th 51:6</p>	<p>105:17,23 137:9</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> 2</p> <p>2 50:16 51:4 58:19,20 107:8 109:10,13 115:20,25 119:20,22 136:16 137:2 139:21 143:13 155:17 156:1</p> <p>2:30 48:25 51:6</p> <p>20 93:25 105:22 109:11 137:3</p> <p>200 51:4</p> <p>2003 136:9</p> <p>2008 106:25 107:1,5,6,9 155:24 156:7</p> <p>2009 59:12</p> <p>2012 61:8 93:25 101:5 107:6,7 118:22 156:3,6,17,22</p> <p>2012CP004391 51:11</p> <p>2013 65:12 103:19 104:2,12 105:22,25 107:8 109:2,11 110:13 111:4 114:11 118:23,24 119:8 130:20 136:15 137:2,3 139:19 146:6 158:24</p> <p>2014 48:24 51:7 108:23 142:7,12 143:1 146:20 148:10 170:12</p> <p>20th 81:12 105:16 137:4,10 139:20 140:2,5</p> <p>21st 140:2</p> <p>22nd 140:3</p> <p>23 136:9</p> <p>23rd 139:21 140:3</p> <p>24 110:13 111:4 114:6,11 136:15 139:19 145:11 146:6</p> <p>24th 139:25 140:4</p> <p>26 119:5</p> <p>2753 49:2 78:13</p> <p>2d 58:19 162:8</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> 3</p> <p>3 50:17 114:15,18 132:9 136:7 137:22 155:8</p> <p>3:07 147:14 148:7</p> <p>30 138:24 144:23</p> <p>33157 49:20</p> <p>33401 49:7,10</p> <p>33434 49:3</p> <p>33436 49:15</p> <p>34th 49:2 78:13</p> <p>3615 49:15</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> 4</p> <p>4 50:18 66:7 105:11 106:18 114:24 115:2 116:12 119:10,11 121:2 131:19</p> <p>4-1.18 52:3 53:20 59:13,15 60:10,14,20 66:5,8 67:12 73:22 77:9,25 141:24</p> <p>4-1.7 58:24 65:4</p> <p>4-1.8 56:20 64:17 65:16 66:2</p> <p>4-1.9 56:21 58:21 59:14 60:11,14,18,19 64:12,17 67:23 69:22</p> <p>4-5.3 154:15</p> <p>48 141:9</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> 5</p> <p>5 50:19 126:5,8 130:10</p> <p>5:03 48:25 169:7</p> <p>5:06 143:15</p> <p>5:23 147:7</p> <p>5:52 142:8 143:11</p> <p>502012CP004391XXX XSB 48:2</p> <p>505 49:6</p> <p>529 58:19</p> <p>5th 170:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> 6</p>	<p>6 50:20 89:24 142:15,18,20 143:6,7,10 146:17</p> <p>600 49:6</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> 7</p> <p>7 146:22 147:4 148:8 149:13</p> <p>7:10 137:5</p> <p>701 49:9</p> <p>731 152:10</p> <p>731.20 163:9</p> <p>733.501 166:13</p> <p>747 162:8</p> <p>74-page 115:8</p> <p>77 50:5</p> <p>785 162:8</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> 8</p> <p>8 150:4</p> <p>86 50:6</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u> </u> A</p> <p>ABA 53:23</p> <p>ability 162:25</p> <p>able 51:19 150:22 164:23 168:8</p> <p>above-styled 51:2</p> <p>absolute 54:15</p> <p>absolutely 146:3 153:4,14 154:22 159:20 160:9,11</p> <p>accept 168:11,14</p> <p>accepted 111:23</p> <p>accountings 91:3</p> <p>accurate 54:22, 121:13 157:3</p> <p>achieving 166:15</p> <p>acting 101:18</p> <p>action 56:9 57:6 61:1 101:12,21 110:19 137:22 145:12 153:9,13 159:18 161:11</p> <p>actions 79:15,17 84:5</p> <p>active 154:18</p> <p>acts 102:3</p> <p>actual 77:16</p>
---	--	--	---

166:2	ago 85:18 103:6	153:5	arises 67:25
actually 55:25	agreed 140:23	anybody 104:3	aspect 68:16
67:25 96:13	169:3	146:9	aspects 100:13
113:15 137:10	ahead 51:25	anyone 138:3	asserted 90:21
155:1 157:7	80:3,19 89:17	anything 79:17	assignment 168:12
168:13	92:15 106:9	83:24 117:15	assist 140:21
ad 164:5 167:20	118:2 124:17	123:10 125:13	assistance 148:20
add 162:5	129:25 133:12	135:6 144:8	assistant 81:25
addition 87:19	152:12	145:15,25	82:7
address 54:2	al 48:16	152:24 160:24	96:2,9,11,14,16
57:14 78:12	Alan 49:5 158:25	anywhere 128:12	,23 165:24
110:14 136:22	aligned 69:2	apart 97:13	assistants
addressed 110:13	allegation 61:21	apologize 123:23	154:16,20
administer 75:5	allege 61:25	147:2	associates 48:12
administered	alleged 48:15	apparent 63:4	assume 57:24
165:1	55:16,20 57:5	131:10	154:14 166:6
administration	64:18 101:18,19	appearance	assumption 118:5
74:5,9,20 75:1	allegedly 110:15	85:19,24	Atlantic 51:4
76:17	156:6	appearances 52:25	attach 53:6
140:13,17,21	allow 72:17,23	APPEARING	attached 58:14
166:17	allowed 93:9	49:1,4,12,17	94:18 106:4,13
administrator	already 103:20,25	appears 130:6	119:6
164:5 167:20	141:14	143:13	attention 77:14
admissibility	am 71:7 77:1	applicable 59:15	79:21 94:25
118:24	78:16,23 107:17	applied 64:17	123:10
admissible 118:25	124:22 161:3	86:12 148:11	attest 115:18
advance 166:11	162:18 168:6	applies 60:12	attorney 54:11,12
adverse 52:12	amazing 76:8	63:12 66:2	55:1 61:4 69:7
67:15 69:3,5,8	amended	67:13,19 162:10	74:25 75:24
75:3	95:13,16,21	166:23	88:6
76:12,19,20	107:6 156:2,6	apply 60:19 67:21	102:15,18,25
79:11,19 84:1	amendment 134:7	82:21	112:8,17
90:12,14 121:17	156:13,23	appoint 143:17	120:15,17
139:1 163:23	amendments 156:23	160:25 161:4	135:14 162:10
advise 56:22	amends 156:14	appointed 131:2	attorney-client
affidavit 132:21	amount 76:8 85:2	141:9 151:16	59:18 61:6
133:2	98:10 148:19	161:18 163:1	64:24 73:23
affidavits 132:23	149:3,7	appointment 120:8	75:20 76:9
affirmative 71:3	Amy 88:6	161:24 162:17	112:11 162:9
affirmatively	analysis 140:25	164:4 167:19	attorneys 52:24
85:14	and/or 55:16	approach 81:8,13	54:5,8 84:5,7
afford 84:19,20	answer 80:19 85:9	93:7 94:21	88:17
138:16 139:5,6	88:22 89:2,18	98:17 99:10	89:9,10,24
140:9	92:13 94:7,9	106:6 108:11	90:2,25 120:24
afternoon 53:16	98:12 102:11	110:7 113:19,22	authenticate
87:17,18 137:8	121:25	125:22 126:4	131:21
144:13 147:14	122:10,24	142:6 146:15	authorities 90:22
against 55:25	123:8,19,21	150:5	authority 59:4
100:12,14,17,18	124:16 150:2	area 57:20 81:12	61:2,3,8 142:1
101:21 102:23	answered 88:24	aren't 166:21	authorized 170:9
103:2 159:18	93:21	argument 58:23	Avenue 49:9 51:4
aggrieved 55:17	anticipate 151:23	68:25	avoid 52:24 82:4
64:18		arguments 53:12	

<p>aware 52:3 83:4 140:16 158:6 161:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <p>backdated 103:8 134:13,18,20 135:17,21 137:19</p> <p>bad 101:18</p> <p>badgering 92:9,11</p> <p>Balassa 61:14</p> <p>Bar 57:22 86:12 141:25</p> <p>barred 163:21</p> <p>based 53:3 57:10 70:23</p> <p>basically 84:20 86:11 136:12</p> <p>bat 117:22</p> <p>batch 115:2</p> <p>Bay 49:19,20</p> <p>Beach 48:1 49:7,10,15 51:5 88:18 89:5 170:4</p> <p>become 122:19 140:23</p> <p>becomes 67:10</p> <p>beginning 51:6 54:19 144:4</p> <p>behalf 49:1,4,12,17 55:16 59:5 69:1 86:1 110:25 127:3,10 154:23 161:17</p> <p>belief 82:4 98:1,3,7</p> <p>believe 53:19 78:23 79:7 80:10,12,20 81:16,19,25 90:19,23 91:23 92:3,22 93:6 95:18,22 96:4 97:3,15,17,19,2 3 100:9,12 101:4 107:17,20,23 117:13,14,15,16 120:5 121:11,12 127:2,13 129:8,10 143:16 146:17 148:23</p>	<p>156:17,22 167:4</p> <p>believed 84:6</p> <p>believes 81:3</p> <p>believing 82:3</p> <p>bell 134:17</p> <p>Beller 88:6</p> <p>benefactor 64:3</p> <p>beneficiaries 78:19 90:21 120:12</p> <p>beneficiary 74:5,6 79:5 93:2,14,17,18 94:3 95:23 101:7 153:2 160:6</p> <p>Bernstein 48:6,9,14 49:2,4,23,24 50:4 51:11 52:16,21 54:17,25 55:9 56:9 58:14 59:23 60:24 61:5,24 62:2,3 63:5,20 64:2 66:19 67:12 68:1,9 69:4,5,6 70:2,5,7,13,20 71:1 72:7,25 73:12,24 74:10,14,24 75:4,22 76:12,15,19,21, 24 77:3,23 78:6,11,15 79:4,8,10,11 80:9,25 85:17 86:2,8 87:17 92:17 95:11 99:1,18 104:9 106:11,25 107:1,5,6,7,9,1 0,13 108:5,23 109:3,4 110:11 113:25 114:3,4 115:7 116:2,18,24 117:7 119:19 121:9 124:7 125:25 126:11 127:4,11 129:14 130:18,23,24 131:1,5,7,21 133:4,20,25 134:11 135:3,8,19 136:8,15 137:15 138:9,14,15 139:8,17</p>	<p>140:9,21,24 141:1,4,9,10,15 ,16,19,22,24 142:4,8,25 143:14,17,19 144:12,16 145:3,19 146:11,19 147:8,13 148:16,21 151:2,4,20,23 152:2,25 154:4 155:5,14,18,23 156:2,5 157:2,4,5,12,13 ,14,20,23 158:7,8,12,15,2 2 159:1,3,6,16 160:6 161:4 167:8,21 168:22</p> <p>Bernsteins 52:20</p> <p>Bernstein's 69:2,7 76:3 131:3 141:18 142:13 146:12 148:6 156:16 157:14 161:11 165:1</p> <p>beseeching 126:23</p> <p>Besides 89:9</p> <p>bill 97:7 101:25</p> <p>bills 122:13,18</p> <p>bit 53:22</p> <p>blank 167:5,18</p> <p>bless 99:14</p> <p>block 91:2 123:9</p> <p>blog 126:11,17,20 128:8</p> <p>blogged 128:16 129:17 130:6</p> <p>blogger 126:21 128:3,10 147:16</p> <p>blogging 125:11 126:23 127:4,11</p> <p>blossom 166:25</p> <p>Boca 49:3 78:13</p> <p>body 118:12</p> <p>book 65:10,11</p> <p>bottom 58:21 99:15</p> <p>Boulevard 49:15</p> <p>Boynton 49:15</p> <p>Brandon 88:8,11,14</p>	<p>113:10</p> <p>breached 64:25</p> <p>Brent 58:17,18 59:7,11</p> <p>brief 97:23 153:18</p> <p>briefly 51:22</p> <p>bring 56:15 57:6 59:5 61:1 68:17,18 71:12 72:22 89:21 132:19</p> <p>bringing 58:13</p> <p>broadly 61:23</p> <p>brother 74:15 79:4 84:2 87:8 90:12,14 100:22 124:4 125:3 126:22 147:12</p> <p>brother's 84:4</p> <p>brought 55:6,10,16 58:7,9 60:23 80:19 84:8 90:25</p> <p>bunch 118:10,22 166:20</p> <p>burden 53:19 57:15 72:15 77:19 163:7,10,25</p> <p>business 84:9 138:8 139:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <p>calendar 97:10,11</p> <p>California 96:17</p> <p>Candice 49:24 55:9 56:3 82:24 92:4,18 95:2 96:8,11,15,20,2 2,23 105:7,11 106:15,18,21 107:19 108:20,23 109:6,11 112:1 131:21 135:19 136:5,20 137:1,3,4,7 140:4 141:16 144:8,11,16,18, 24 145:1 148:12 149:10 154:11 155:18 159:6</p> <p>cap 165:12,13</p> <p>capacity</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>124:11,13 125:4 151:1,3 165:16</p> <p>capped 165:9</p> <p>carefully 79:21 117:14</p> <p>Caroline 120:17</p> <p>carried 163:10,25 166:20</p> <p>case 48:2 52:14 53:11 54:4,9,12,13 56:14 57:24 58:3,5,8,15 59:3,7,11,12,25 61:9 62:17 63:9 64:1,9,11,15,16 65:2 70:1 71:4 75:4 77:15 80:2 85:20 86:24,25 87:7 102:23 105:1 126:24 127:4,12 128:6 132:23 134:12 137:18 138:3 139:13 140:24 160:18,24 162:6 164:24 166:7,14,18,23, 24</p> <p>cases 57:2 60:6 63:24 64:7 128:7 142:1</p> <p>cause 51:2 123:11</p> <p>cc'd 147:15,17</p> <p>Center 49:19</p> <p>certain 90:23 130:7</p> <p>certainly 146:9 159:8,17</p> <p>certify 170:8</p> <p>cetera 84:9 91:12 100:12,15,20 102:4 104:4</p> <p>chair 72:20</p> <p>chance 116:19</p> <p>change 59:12 90:20 133:24</p> <p>changed 115:12</p> <p>charge 65:19 100:19 138:24</p> <p>chatted 104:1</p> <p>check 97:10 115:11,17</p> <p>children 78:19 80:11,14 81:3</p>	<p>88:14,15 95:23 101:10 112:18 113:3,4 157:14 164:12</p> <p>children's 124:5</p> <p>choice 54:18</p> <p>choices 165:5</p> <p>chooses 67:11</p> <p>chosen 71:1,2</p> <p>Christine 112:6,7</p> <p>CIRCUIT 48:1</p> <p>circumstances 56:23</p> <p>cited 163:15</p> <p>City 51:5</p> <p>claim 62:10 115:23 134:20</p> <p>claims 90:22</p> <p>clause 103:9,11,15,19 134:14,18,20 135:17,21</p> <p>clean 123:21</p> <p>clear 89:9 96:19 139:10</p> <p>clearly 69:3,5,25 70:21</p> <p>clerk 133:13</p> <p>client 52:8,11,12,22 53:6 57:4 59:16,17 60:9,17,20 62:15 64:4 66:12,20,23 67:14,16 68:1,6,22,23 69:7,23 76:21 111:1 134:6,10,23 135:7,13 136:10,14 138:24 139:2 141:2,23 148:17,20 155:2,5 162:11 163:17 164:6,8</p> <p>client-lawyer 52:7 60:15</p> <p>clients 52:5 54:6 55:25 154:22,23 159:11</p> <p>close 105:20 144:11 169:1</p>	<p>closely 69:2 91:1</p> <p>closing 54:1 77:12</p> <p>Colin 48:21 51:3 126:13 128:23 129:7 153:9 160:10</p> <p>colon 116:3</p> <p>column 58:22</p> <p>comes 73:7 148:21</p> <p>coming 74:8 86:1 165:11</p> <p>comment 65:3,18</p> <p>comments 58:24 65:17 66:16</p> <p>committed 102:3 137:25</p> <p>communicate 125:13</p> <p>communicated 125:12 140:4 144:6</p> <p>communication 85:13 119:23 134:24</p> <p>communications 118:16</p> <p>company 122:20</p> <p>complain 62:16,18 63:7,11,13,25 70:1</p> <p>complained 64:24</p> <p>complaining 62:9,13 71:25</p> <p>complaint 68:18</p> <p>complete 121:6 144:19 170:11</p> <p>composite 106:12 108:13 114:1,2</p> <p>compromises 153:1</p> <p>computer 135:17,18 136:1,3</p> <p>concerning 61:21 80:23 150:12</p> <p>concise 53:17</p> <p>concisely 53:24 73:20</p> <p>concluded 169:7</p> <p>concludes 149:12</p> <p>conclusion 141:21</p>	<p>conditions 168:14</p> <p>conduct 52:4 56:21 57:23 59:14 134:22 135:5 154:15</p> <p>conducted 141:7</p> <p>conference 152:25</p> <p>confidential 54:10 75:22 76:11,23 77:2,17 83:25 84:1,10 89:14,16 91:11,12 99:23 100:3 103:5 104:21,22,24 115:23 117:3 118:17 121:19 139:12 141:16 144:5,7 148:15</p> <p>confidentiality 90:6 146:8,9,10 149:11</p> <p>confirm 93:13</p> <p>confirmed 135:23</p> <p>conflict 57:5 60:19 62:11,25 63:2 64:20 65:19 67:24 69:12,16 80:8,10 138:5,6 144:20</p> <p>conflicted 70:8 86:4 140:20</p> <p>conflicts 58:25 65:6 68:21 113:5</p> <p>confused 137:6</p> <p>confusing 158:13</p> <p>connect 117:3</p> <p>connection 68:19 79:11</p> <p>consider 83:25</p> <p>consideration 165:2</p> <p>considering 162:9</p> <p>consultation 60:18 162:13</p> <p>consults 66:22</p> <p>contact 86:4 88:1 89:19</p> <p>contacted 86:3 87:20,24 88:6,8,18 89:5,11,20,22,2</p>
--	--	--	---

4 90:3 102:20 126:22 127:3,10 133:21 136:12 141:4 contacting 87:19 contained 118:21 contemporaneous 149:22 contended 138:9 content 147:11 contest 54:21 contingency 138:17 continue 62:12 135:1 145:15 continues 67:11 continuing 64:2 86:23 contract 111:16 conversation 82:10,17 83:8 97:1,22 100:7,17 120:4 136:23 138:17 139:4,6,7 144:23 146:5 149:18,22 150:12,18 168:5 conversations 87:9 97:3,5,8,14 149:2 conveyed 75:23 134:15,21 convince 61:16 convinced 93:15 Coolis 77:14 copied 58:20 82:12,16 copies 95:10 114:8 133:14 142:10 149:6 copy 82:15 93:7 98:18,21 106:8 119:14 126:1 132:25 133:3 142:4,9,11 146:25 correct 56:19 61:25 62:1 72:12,14 82:21,22 86:17,21,22 88:15 94:14 95:17	96:6,10,21,24,2 5 98:16,19,20 99:16,20,24 100:1 101:13 103:4,15,18 106:15,16 107:14 108:21 110:3,6 111:17,20 116:3 117:9 120:3,12,13 143:24 145:13 154:21 155:2,5,14,24 156:3,21 157:15 158:1,4,8 159:19 160:7,8,11,20 correspondences 144:10 counsel 48:12 51:12,14 52:15,16 53:5 54:2,18,19 55:6 56:16 59:2 71:2 72:1,21 73:22 76:5 77:21 94:6 109:21 110:1 111:13 132:7,25 147:12 153:12 161:19 163:15 167:7 counsel's 53:12 County 48:1 51:3,5 88:18 89:5 170:4 couple 121:9 course 100:6 court 48:1 51:9,23 53:14 55:2 56:2,17,19 57:2,14,19,22 58:3,8,11,17 59:7,19 60:3,6,11,21 61:16,20 62:2,7 63:7,9,15,17,21 64:10,11 65:5,8,11,14,16 ,21,23 66:1,6,9,14,16 67:5,7,21,23 68:13,15 69:10,17,20 70:4,6,10,16 71:4,9,16,18,20 ,24 72:10,13,15 73:1,13,16 74:14,17 75:8,12 77:5,11 78:2,7,24	79:16,20,24 80:18 82:4,19,23 84:21 85:8,9 87:13 88:10,23,25 89:2,6,17 92:10,13 93:5,9,20,22 94:1,7,9,22 95:4,7 98:4,12 99:11 102:10,21 103:12,20 104:8 105:4,23 106:3,8 107:3 108:1,15,17,20 109:5,10,16,19 110:9 111:23 112:13,16,19,22 113:14,16,21,23 114:5,13,15,23 115:3 116:8,11,17 117:5,12,17,20, 24 118:1,6,19,23 119:7,9,15,17 121:2,24 122:7,9,22,24 123:4,15,19 124:8,12,25 125:2,8,17,23 126:5,7 127:7,21 128:1 129:1,4,25 130:10,13,15 131:15,19,22,25 132:4,8,14,22 133:2,3,7,10,19 142:17,22 143:4,6 145:23 146:23 147:1 148:1,3 149:14,24 150:1,6,15,17,2 1 151:7,9,11,14,1 8 152:9,18 153:13,17,20 159:25 160:3,13,15,17, 22 161:2,5,7,10,15 ,22 162:1,14,18,20, 22,23,24 163:2,5 164:10,14,20 165:11 167:9,11,15,22 168:1,4,19,21,2 3 169:1 170:15 Courthouse 51:4	courtroom 51:4 149:19 courts 90:22 COWAN 49:19 Cox 126:21 128:3,5,10,16,1 8,22 129:6,17 147:16,17,18 Craig 122:16 created 157:6,7 credibility 73:2 credit 138:15 creditor 49:12 54:23 55:7 57:4,9 60:23 61:1,7 62:9 160:20 164:23 165:2 criminal 79:15,17 90:22 103:7,24 cross 50:6,9 80:18 87:15 153:21 cross-examination 87:13 157:11 158:9 Crystal 126:21 128:3,5,10,16,1 8,22 129:6,17 147:16,17 cumulative 133:9 curator 75:14 121:16 141:9 143:17 160:25 161:20 162:17 164:5,17 165:8 167:19 currently 124:21,22 custom 138:22 148:18 cut 146:5 <hr/> D <hr/> dad 92:24 93:12 94:12 121:12 138:1 151:4 152:15 157:8 dad's 74:20 93:4,14,19 95:16,19,20 101:1,8 113:2 139:14 date 48:24 93:20,22,24
---	---	--	--

95:6 105:14 116:4,22 117:2,11 118:7,15 136:6,17 139:17,20 dated 134:14 148:7 170:12 dates 118:12,22,23 DAVID 170:7,15 day 51:7 70:15 111:4 134:9 136:24 137:9,10 138:12 146:17 147:7,14 170:12 days 83:18 165:5 deal 122:18 152:20 dealing 52:4 59:16 dealings 61:24 62:5 84:9 deals 65:6 dealt 73:25 dec 153:9,13 Deceased 48:7 decedent 164:13 decedent's 74:6,7 December 119:5 decided 136:13 decision 58:20 decisions 53:21 declare 55:20 declining 139:17,22 145:12 deficient 103:15,16 define 124:11 defined 60:8,20 delegated 154:17 Delray 51:5 demanded 145:20 demonstrate 76:7 denied 94:6 122:16 145:20 163:6 164:3,5,20 167:5,20,22 deny 154:12	depending 62:15 152:20 deposition 135:25 dereliction 63:4 describe 133:19 140:10 described 77:18,25 141:15 designed 80:1 desire 86:7 desk 137:13 detail 167:24 detailed 140:25 determine 54:24 135:6 148:19 150:23 determined 117:6 differ 80:11 difference 153:24 different 53:22 59:17 65:17 66:10 124:14 137:10 differing 90:15,17 91:5 direct 50:5,8 77:14 78:8 88:9 94:25 132:15 directed 122:12,17 directing 115:22 direction 152:21 directly 80:7 83:12 148:24 disadvantage 77:3 disadvantages 153:1 disagree 81:5 147:10 disagreed 80:25 147:9 discharge 107:11 disclose 104:20 disconnect 166:15 discretion 54:16 discuss 83:24 84:11 103:2,11 131:12 137:21 141:13 discussed 84:25 99:22 100:21	103:8 121:19 148:16 discusses 52:6 discussing 105:1 119:25 120:2,8 discussion 58:21 100:25 103:15 150:10 discussions 60:16 80:22 148:11,12 dispute 158:7,10,22 disqualification 53:11 56:11 61:17,19 64:6 77:20 disqualifications 53:2 disqualify 51:14 52:15 54:21 55:6 56:8 57:7,17 61:11 68:19 71:5 76:14 86:18 141:12 162:10 163:5,11 164:3 167:7 distinction 60:9 154:2,3 distraught 134:4 distributed 153:11 distributions 118:10 158:20 District 61:8 77:10 DIVISION 48:2 Dixie 49:20 document 103:17 108:3 110:12 114:2 115:17 126:1 127:14,18,24 128:9 138:20 146:18 156:17 159:12 documents 79:6 83:21 90:24 91:7,10 96:14,22,24 101:4,19 104:25 105:2,10,11 106:17,18,21,24 107:18,22,24,25 108:6 112:1,2,9,20	114:1 115:2 116:20 118:20 135:22,23,24 136:17 141:17,18,19 145:2 149:7 152:14 153:25 154:1,5,10 155:16,22 156:1,19,20,25 158:3 Don 75:25 101:21 102:15,18 126:15 134:12 135:20 137:16,17 138:5,6,7 139:15 155:7 159:18 Donald 48:13 118:9 done 123:1,3 do-not-rep 136:11 doubt 53:1 downtown 133:25 dozen 120:23 dozens 138:18 154:24 drive 49:6 118:2 due 157:14,16 duly 78:6 132:13 dump 159:12 during 136:24 duties 63:5 66:11 134:23 140:25 154:17 duty 141:23 154:23 <hr/> E <hr/> earlier 94:16 96:1 162:7 economy 72:18 edification 95:15 edition 65:13 egregious 77:21 Eighteen 66:6 either 57:2 62:14,16 64:4 68:22 73:8 107:25 150:19 157:14 158:11,18
---	---	--	---

element 159:21	96:1,4,8,12	91:1 100:10,17	exact 68:3 98:10
eligible 75:13	98:15,18 99:13	101:1,8 104:17	EXAMINATION 50:3
Eliot 48:9 49:2	105:7,14,21,22	113:2 120:3	78:8 87:15
50:4 52:21 55:9	106:14 108:23	121:10,12 129:9	130:16 132:15
56:3,5,9 57:8	109:2,3,5,11	130:24 131:3,6	153:21 160:4
58:14 59:22	114:2,3	133:22 134:5,12	examine 132:3,7
60:24 61:24	115:8,10	137:25 139:14	examined 135:18
62:2,5,9,13,14,	116:1,18,23	140:12,17 149:7	exceed 165:10
18,19,25	117:8,11,17	151:5,13,17	except 60:18
63:2,5,7,11,16,	118:3,15,21	152:1,14,16	96:23
17,21 64:25	119:3,23	153:8 155:13,14	excluded 95:23
66:19 67:2,7	136:21,25	156:18,21	excuse 51:18 76:3
68:1,5,20	137:2,4 141:10	157:2,9,19	101:10,13,24
69:1,5,13,20	142:3,24	160:7,18 161:1	110:23 115:25
70:1,2,5,7,13,1	143:18,21,25	163:22 164:25	116:6,24 141:17
9,21,24,25	144:16 146:13	165:1	164:8
71:10,23,24	147:8,11	166:17,18,23	executed 132:22
72:3,6,13,16,24	148:7,9 149:13	estates 80:11	exhibit
,25 73:12,14,24	155:17	91:6	50:15,16,17,18,
74:3,10,14	e-mailed 136:22	100:14,18,24	19,20 53:7
75:22	e-mails	101:2 140:13,22	82:15,20
76:12,21,24	91:11,13,16,19,	et 48:16 84:9	94:15,18,25
77:3,19,23	20,24 92:2,5	91:12	106:3,12 108:14
78:6,11	117:22 130:21	100:12,14,20	109:7,13
92:10,17 113:16	131:18 135:22	102:4 104:4	112:1,10
116:17 117:7	136:2 141:15	ethical 86:19	114:1,18 118:12
118:16 122:25	144:15,18	140:25	119:11 121:2
124:15 130:18	emergency 118:9	ethics 141:25	126:8 136:7,25
131:17 133:4,15	employed	evasive 159:21	137:2,22 139:21
135:19	124:21,22,23	evening 97:16	142:20 143:7,10
136:8,15,20,23	employees 149:3,8	136:24 137:4,6	146:22 147:4
137:7 138:15	encouraging 72:8	144:13	148:8 149:13
139:7 140:6,9	ensues 60:15	eventually 109:17	150:4 155:8,17
141:1,10,18,19,	enter 168:1	everybody 116:2	156:1
24 142:7,12,24	entire 66:1	162:7	exhibits 50:13
144:12,15 145:3	Entirely 149:5	everyone 64:13	121:3 132:9
146:10,12,19	entity 107:14	72:19 162:2	136:16
147:13	157:5	everyone's 138:19	exist 53:20
148:13,16,21	especially 168:8	everything 91:4	existence 53:8
152:6,10,13,25	Esq	141:14 157:20	existing 59:18
154:4 155:4	49:5,8,13,14,18	159:14 162:4	139:2 154:22
157:6,7,10,11,1	essence 116:21	evidence 50:14	exists 63:2
4,17,20	152:22	53:24 59:22	expenses 122:4
158:8,11,17,20,	establish 61:18	70:10,11	124:6
22 160:22	established 79:5	72:2,23 73:22	experienced 123:1
163:7,16,24,25	80:7	75:19,21,23	explain 90:17
167:8	establishment	77:24 78:3,4	133:19
168:4,21,22	118:14	90:23 101:6	explained 123:17
169:2	estate 48:6 51:10	108:14 109:8,14	exposing 104:23
Eliot's 137:1	55:8 61:14,16	114:7,12,19	express 86:7
159:5 163:8	74:4,9,11,21,25	116:12 119:12	expressed 86:16
else 64:1,6 66:24	75:6 76:1,16	130:11 131:22	91:6 101:16
67:12 91:4	77:4 78:20	133:1,6 143:2,8	expression 61:23
104:3 117:15	79:5,11 80:6,15	146:21 147:5	
145:15,25 162:7	81:4	148:8	
else's 141:20	90:16,20,21	evidentiary 58:10	
e-mail 53:7 81:21		evidently 134:7	
82:9,12,15,24,2			
5 83:4,7,19			
86:5,13 92:19			
95:1			

extensive 64:11	89:13 90:11	133:2,3,10,12	49:3,7,10,15,20
extra 142:11	93:21 94:16	153:9,12 161:9	51:6 52:24
eye 86:11	98:21 99:10	filed 51:14 52:14	53:22 59:13
	105:13,16 107:2	56:5,7,9,12	78:13,17 89:11
	108:16,25	62:13 70:12,17	102:2 141:25
	111:9,21,24	85:8,20 94:19	170:4,8
F	112:11 113:13	108:1 132:23,25	focus 66:21 79:16
fabricated 134:7	114:14,22	141:8 144:20	139:15 155:7
face 58:7	115:1,5	161:11,17	162:11
fact 53:4,8 76:18	116:5,9,17,24	164:14,16	folks 152:18
77:16 84:5	117:2,9	166:21	168:2
91:18 95:16	118:13,14 123:6	filing 101:11	follow-up 82:10
101:23,24	124:10,24 125:7	Finally 77:20	86:13 109:3
104:15 120:23	126:2 127:5	finding 76:18	forced 122:3
128:8 134:9	128:25 129:2,24	77:16	foregoing 170:10
145:8 155:5	130:14,17	fine 71:17	forged 101:5
157:23	131:14,18,20,24	finish 73:17	103:16
facts 55:20 58:7	133:4,6,8,15	79:21,22 114:23	forgeries 100:10
61:13 137:20	143:5 145:22	152:19	103:8
139:10 148:19	146:24 147:25	finished 162:3	forgery 84:6
faith 101:18	149:18,23,25	firm 49:9 54:21	99:25 102:1,3
familiar 152:1	150:10,11,16	61:7,14,25	103:16 119:25
154:14	152:8,12	62:20 73:23	forget 144:21
156:18,20	153:17,18,22	75:23 76:15,16	forgive 103:14
Family 124:7	160:1,19,21,23	84:11 87:19,20	108:22 114:1
160:6	161:1,3,6,8,14	90:4 92:6,19	form 70:17 105:13
fast 138:18	162:5 163:15	96:5 105:12	124:11 127:5,8
father 80:7 90:24	165:7,18	106:15,19,22	128:25
94:3 121:10	167:3,10,13,18,	107:19,22,25	129:1,4,24
father's 80:8	23 168:3	110:16	145:22
101:15 102:4	Feaman's 79:25	111:16,19	formal 60:3,7
129:11 131:10	February 48:24	112:2,8,10	111:24 164:11
favor 53:1	51:7 82:21	115:24 125:12	formed 52:19 53:6
favorable 164:1	91:25 92:1,21	127:3,10 134:24	111:14
faxed 162:6	95:5 98:15,18	136:10,22	former 62:15 64:4
Feaman 49:13,14	99:17 105:7,15	138:18	68:1,5,23 94:6
50:5,9	108:17,23	140:16,20	162:11
51:13,16,17,21	142:7,12,25	147:11 148:12	formerly 60:1
52:1 55:18	143:11,15	firm's 58:23	69:22
56:14,18	145:11	first 51:15 55:18	forming 52:7
57:15,21	146:16,20 147:7	57:14,16 67:2	forms 101:17
58:1,5,12,18	148:7,10	68:7 73:10,13	forth 52:18 58:9
59:21	fee 111:18 138:14	76:17 86:4	61:10 130:21
60:1,5,8,13	feel 84:10 86:23	93:25 97:20	Forty-six 143:18
61:21 62:1,6	87:11 89:15	106:12 110:21	forward 70:23
63:3,8,13,16,19	91:4 104:22	115:4 117:5	72:20
64:10	152:24	123:13,15 132:1	foundation 80:17
65:3,6,9,12,15,	fees 102:25 165:9	144:3 148:9	116:6,10
19,22	felt 70:8	158:21	Fourth 77:10,18
66:3,4,8,13,15	86:3,12,20	fit 83:1	fraud 90:19 102:1
67:6,20	141:16	FITZGERALD 49:5	119:25
68:14,25	fiction 76:9	five 97:24 99:14	fraudulent 101:5
69:15,19	fiduciary 75:6,7	138:25 145:2	
72:6,12,14	101:18 125:4	Flagler 49:6	
73:11 78:9 79:3	135:8 151:3	Fleisher 87:24	
80:4,21 82:8,22	FIFTEENTH 48:1	88:1,5	
83:2,3 84:24	figured 73:13	Florida 48:1	
87:12 88:9	86:13		
	file 54:20 132:22		

free 138:24	Guffey 49:14	71:1,2 72:16	158:12
Friday 137:3		74:5,6,23 82:2	Howard 61:9
139:20 140:1,2		86:22 105:4	hundred 78:21
FRIEDSTEIN 49:17	<hr/> H <hr/>	117:3 123:7	115:19
friend 138:8	hac 61:12	125:5 138:7	hurt 69:19 123:16
front 94:15 97:10	half 139:9 148:14	151:5,15 163:9	hurting 123:12
105:8 106:1	hall 150:13	hey 54:9 141:11	hype 166:14
127:14,18	hand 78:5 94:24	highly 144:5	
128:8,16 146:18	113:25 125:25	148:14	<hr/> I <hr/>
fully 150:18	handed 93:13,19	Highway 49:20	I.D 116:12
fund 101:25	105:21 110:12	hire 54:25 74:25	IANTONI 49:17
funding 102:24	115:8 128:9	76:16 136:13	I'd 54:1 86:13
	handing 106:11	139:11	96:6 108:13
<hr/> G <hr/>	handle 140:12	hired 62:4,22	114:11
game 117:20	handles 144:18	110:24 113:1,3	115:11,16
games 117:18	happen 57:8 64:8	hold 51:23 83:2	132:22,25
Garber 120:19	happened 122:6	149:24	ID 115:3 130:10
generally 140:10	139:7 141:12	Holdings 61:9,10	idea 112:25
gentleman 138:7	happens 54:7	107:9,10	128:11 150:19
gets 139:6	hard 118:2	157:2,5,24	159:4
getting 71:18	harm 69:10,11	158:15	identical 64:15
91:2 95:5	harmed 63:3 68:21	159:3,6,17	68:8
100:20	69:9 70:9	home 110:14	identification
gifts 152:17	haven't 70:12	137:14	50:14 126:9
given 149:4	89:22 115:19	Honor 51:17,18	142:19,21
166:14	117:6 127:23	52:1,2,9,14,23	identified 106:14
giving 164:2	having 54:17	53:15 54:15,22	116:18 145:3
Glasko 49:18	100:24 147:2	55:18 57:1,13	identify 117:5
161:20	164:25	58:19 59:10	II 48:21
162:16,20,24	head 139:23	67:4,20,22	I'll 57:16 70:14
163:4	heading 65:18	68:12,25	73:17 80:18
164:8,12,18	108:25	70:3,25 73:20	89:17 109:16
165:7,20	headset 137:13,14	75:2,5 76:14	112:14 114:15
GOLDEN 49:19	hear 51:15 53:13	77:8 78:1 80:5	117:16 119:16
governs 55:13	73:3 85:16	87:14 88:21	121:5 133:14,16
grab 114:20	162:24 163:2	108:13 110:8	150:4 153:18
grandchildren	heard 51:22 54:3	111:21 113:20	160:23 166:1
120:11	59:8 147:20	114:10 116:16	illegally 90:25
granted 165:3	hearing 51:13	117:2 119:13	I'm 53:16,18,23
great 134:3	58:10 135:25	122:23 126:4	55:3 56:20 60:3
159:10 168:23	150:23	130:8 132:6,12	61:22
greater 77:24	hearsay 133:8	133:5 136:20	62:7,17,23
Greenberg 120:21	He'll 106:8	142:6,19 143:3	63:12,23
ground 112:15	help 72:1,20,22	146:22,25	64:6,25 68:5
guardianship	87:10 139:3	150:14 151:8	69:13
74:19	helped 157:10	153:16	71:5,18,25
guardianships	helping 123:11	160:12,14,16	72:2,7,17,23
140:14	here's 61:20 62:7	161:21 162:6	73:5 74:2,3,8
guess 137:1	114:16 122:25	168:18	76:2,4,7 78:21
147:17 159:4	162:2 168:9,10	HONORABLE 48:21	79:14 88:3,23
	he's 60:8,25	hope 138:11	89:8 92:7
	66:22 68:6	headline 141:25	94:24,25 98:25
		hour 83:17	99:3,6 104:23
		97:1,20 139:8,9	105:20 106:2,11
		148:14 165:9	109:25 112:19
		hours 159:13	113:25
		house 157:6	

115:15,18,22 117:15,19 118:20 119:1 123:13 125:25 127:21 128:15 132:2 133:11 138:12 141:11 144:21 154:3 159:8,20 161:13 162:3,18 163:2,7 164:2,21 168:14,23,24 169:1	infer 65:24 informal 150:22 information 54:10 55:23 60:17 64:23 69:6 75:22 76:11,24 77:2,17,19 82:6 84:2,10 87:8 90:3,6 91:3 96:16 99:23 100:3 103:6,19,22 104:15,21,24,25 105:2 115:23 121:19 128:5,10,12,16, 17,22,24 129:3,6,16 139:12 141:17 144:5,7 147:22 148:15 149:4,8 162:25 informed 134:6 146:1 inherit 80:14 121:12 152:6,13 inheritances 140:14 initial 82:17 111:18 138:14 141:5 initiated 81:16 injury 75:4 inquiries 103:7 instead 58:14 161:20 Institute 133:23 instructions 153:10,13 intake 135:13,15 136:4,22 140:7 144:19 148:13 149:6 154:6,11 intakes 136:5 intends 147:11 intention 153:12 interest 52:11 57:5 58:25 62:11 64:7,20 65:7 67:15,24 68:22 69:12,13,16 80:6 91:5 100:24 101:1 121:10 163:12 164:24	interested 55:8 57:9 74:10,23 152:10 163:9 164:23 interesting 139:10 interests 69:2,4 76:18 79:10 90:15 121:17 163:22 interject 70:2,5,11 Internet 126:18 147:23 interpretation 121:23 interrupt 145:14 159:9 interrupted 135:2 intimate 87:7 introduce 75:19 introduced 75:21 114:7 133:1 investigation 104:1 134:22 135:6 141:7 143:22 investigations 100:11 104:6 investigative 126:21 involved 54:11 56:23 61:11 67:1 99:25 121:18 134:4 166:16 involvement 86:24 154:18 involving 58:25 134:12,20 135:20 139:14 isn't 75:3 98:7 101:11 117:22 125:3 159:18 issue 59:3 61:18 74:1 119:2 135:16 139:2 142:2 152:9,21 158:21 issues 57:3,11 125:12 item 95:9 it's 55:6,8,10 59:11,15 62:17 63:12,22	64:1,15 65:9 66:9 69:8,10 70:17 73:7,9 74:21 75:9 76:13 77:16 87:5 89:15 94:8 95:13 97:5 101:10 104:22 105:16 106:1,23 108:22,24,25 109:1 110:16 114:2 116:23 117:7,10,11 118:25 123:7,13,15 124:13 125:4 127:5,6,17 128:12 129:2 132:24 133:7,8 136:7,9 137:1 138:14 152:15 156:17 157:3,17 Ivan 48:9 78:11 I've 85:9,23 87:9 89:5,9,20 90:21 91:6 94:5,8 95:20 96:19 110:15 111:7 115:7 123:2 124:6 127:24 128:24 132:21 141:14 142:7 145:17 146:8 156:15 164:18 I-V-I-E-W-I-T 117:24 <hr/> J <hr/> Janet 122:16 January 133:22 jar 165:22,25 Jill 49:17 164:9 job 159:10 Joel 87:6,20,21 John 49:8 50:7 91:20 92:5 132:13,18 join 72:3 joinder 71:14 joined 70:18,19,24 joining 72:7,16 judge 51:3 57:17 71:19 73:2,19 86:14 106:5 126:13 128:23 129:7 153:9
---	---	---	---

160:10 162:16 164:13 judge's 149:19 judicial 48:1 72:18 165:24 July 93:25 170:12 <hr/> K <hr/> kicker 54:4 kicking 54:13,14 kids 158:12 Kimberly 102:1 kinds 100:4 knew 104:3 knowledge 58:1 77:17 87:7 known 128:3 148:2 KONOPKA 49:6 <hr/> L <hr/> lack 80:16 116:6,9 lacks 74:4,22 language 68:4,11 large 149:3,7 170:8 last 58:22 81:7 91:23 95:17 107:9 122:25 125:9 139:8 lasted 97:20,22 139:9 late 74:8 78:14 later 138:9 143:18 148:21 launching 100:12 law 49:9,19 52:23,24 56:14 57:24 58:3,5,23 75:23 76:16 78:3 81:8 84:11 87:19,20 90:4 92:6,19 102:2 105:11 106:15,19,22 107:19,22,25 110:16 111:16,19 112:2,8,10 125:12 134:24 138:21 139:5 140:11,16 155:25 162:14 163:14 164:24	lawsuit 75:3 lawyer 52:6,10 59:1 60:16 62:4 63:25 64:19,20 65:24 67:13 69:8,22 102:6 123:7 140:19,23 154:17,18 162:12,13 165:9 lawyer-client 59:23 64:22 66:24 lawyers 56:22 64:16 90:7,9 111:1 120:21 135:9 136:13 138:3 169:2 Lawyer's 57:23 leading 129:21 learn 70:13 159:2 learned 60:17 152:24 158:25 least 70:19 leave 121:6 led 64:23 left-hand 58:22 legal 61:18,23 62:5 79:14 100:13,17 111:15 122:20 139:2 154:16,20 lengthy 149:2 less 97:24 139:9 144:23 148:13 let's 66:12 73:25 78:2,25 92:4,7 96:19 115:3 117:17 124:17 150:3 letter 108:18 109:22 110:2,5,13 111:3,7 114:7,11 136:7,8,11,14 139:16,22 143:14,16 145:11,15,25 146:6 155:10 letters 118:9 119:5 library 71:11 life 87:8 111:7 138:10	light 164:1 likely 117:15 limit 123:8 limitations 137:24 line 68:7 95:9 144:3,4 148:9 lines 99:15 liquidating 147:18 Lisa 49:17 164:8 list 89:21 108:4 listed 106:18 156:19 listen 79:22 102:21 117:13 121:24 122:7,9 123:4 124:15 138:19 litem 164:5 167:20 literally 138:18 litigation 65:23 140:12 148:22 153:5 litigators 54:5 little 53:22 66:18 124:13 165:21 live 121:22 133:12 lives 157:6,7,18 LLC 61:10 107:9,10,13 108:5 157:2,5,7,8,18, 23,24 158:7,10,11,13, 15 159:3,6,17 lodge 162:21 logic 62:8 long 81:20 83:16 97:21 120:5 155:19 lot 84:10 115:17 121:18 138:23 lots 54:6 <hr/> M <hr/> mainly 100:9 maintenance 157:19	malpractice 75:25 101:12,20 102:15,18,19,23 103:2 110:19 134:20 137:18,21,24,25 139:13 159:18,22 manager 122:19 Manceri 120:15 mark 120:15,19 142:18 150:4 marked 50:13 82:14 91:11,12 109:7,13 114:18 119:11 126:8 142:20 143:7 147:4 MARSAA 170:7,15 Martin 48:21 51:3 material 77:17 145:1 Materiality 149:25 materially 52:11 67:15 76:19,20 153:1 163:23 materials 144:25 145:5,8 matter 52:8,13 59:8 61:13 62:8 67:17 68:10 72:19 88:19 89:11,25 95:6 134:2,5 135:20 136:3 matters 76:1 103:24 104:11 135:8 139:14 151:21,24 153:3 may 51:21 56:2,3,23 59:3 62:22 63:13 65:23 67:8 70:2 73:25 74:19 75:17 78:24 80:19 93:7 94:21 98:17 99:10,11 106:5 108:11 110:7 113:19,21 114:20 116:25 118:25 119:13 125:22,23 126:4 136:20 142:6 146:15 150:4 154:16 165:14 168:9
--	--	--	---

<p>maybe 66:18 72:1 97:25 119:4</p> <p>mean 56:2,19 62:18 65:1 71:9 74:18 75:14 77:6 104:20 109:24 118:1,2,25 122:25 141:3 145:14 152:6 156:10 159:8 168:6,8</p> <p>means 95:13 112:17 123:7</p> <p>meant 99:3</p> <p>meet 133:24 134:9</p> <p>meeting 96:14,17,24 134:2,25 141:5</p> <p>meetings 144:21,22</p> <p>member 107:13,17</p> <p>members 144:17 149:4 157:8</p> <p>memorializes 53:8</p> <p>mention 137:24</p> <p>mentioned 89:10 93:1 95:9 121:11 134:17 142:3 167:12,13</p> <p>mentioning 168:15</p> <p>merit 164:21</p> <p>met 134:10 135:3 141:4</p> <p>Metcalf 162:7,8</p> <p>Michelle 82:1,25 108:20,24 109:2,5,12 136:22,25 137:2,5 140:5,7 141:7,13 144:9,12,18 145:2 149:10 155:18,20,25 158:5 159:6</p> <p>middle 73:4</p> <p>mind 92:9 115:24</p> <p>minimum 148:19</p> <p>minors 88:15</p> <p>minute 65:16 162:19</p> <p>minutes 97:24 138:24 139:1 141:10 143:18</p>	<p>144:23</p> <p>Mischaracterizes 105:14</p> <p>missing 116:4 117:10</p> <p>model 53:23</p> <p>mom 113:2 137:25 139:14 152:15</p> <p>moment 91:17 103:6 116:1 146:1 165:6</p> <p>moments 67:9</p> <p>mom's 151:5,6</p> <p>Monday 108:22 139:25 140:3,6 142:12</p> <p>money 84:18 85:2,11 121:22 125:5,6 139:11 146:4 157:13,21,22 158:17,23</p> <p>monies 146:2</p> <p>month 138:19</p> <p>Moran's 102:1</p> <p>Morley 82:1 108:20 109:2</p> <p>morning 133:22</p> <p>mother 129:11</p> <p>motion 51:14 52:15,18 53:7,10 54:20 55:5,15 56:4,5,7 57:10 58:15 61:11,12,22 62:13 63:22 64:15 66:4 68:19 70:12,17,23 71:5,12 72:17,24 76:4 86:15 94:19,24 106:4,13 141:8 143:16 160:25 161:3,16,18,23 163:5,8 164:3,4,19,20 165:3 167:6,7,19</p> <p>motions 167:3</p> <p>move 94:10 108:13 114:11 125:7 143:2 146:21 149:14</p>	<p>moving 55:12 56:4 58:13 64:18 116:12 164:11</p> <p>MRACHEK 49:5</p> <p>myself 90:25</p> <hr/> <p>N</p> <p>Nancy 49:14</p> <p>narrative 123:9,22</p> <p>narrow 122:10</p> <p>nature 134:23 140:10</p> <p>necessarily 153:7</p> <p>necessary 150:23 156:20,22</p> <p>negative 110:4</p> <p>neglected 65:25</p> <p>neutrality 72:9</p> <p>nice 166:22</p> <p>nods 139:23</p> <p>non-beneficiaries 95:24</p> <p>none 88:25 134:16</p> <p>non-issue 156:24</p> <p>nor 63:19 144:16</p> <p>no-rep 136:7</p> <p>normal 117:22</p> <p>normally 91:9</p> <p>Norman 87:24 88:1,5</p> <p>notarized 107:8</p> <p>notary 100:11 102:3 103:9,11,12,13, 15,16,19 134:14,18,20 135:17,21 137:19</p> <p>notes 149:21 150:2,6,9,12 170:11</p> <p>nothing 74:16 101:8 115:12 140:8 147:24 153:15 159:17 160:9 166:1</p> <p>notice 71:1 85:19,24 117:21</p> <p>notices 91:2</p> <p>novel 137:20</p>	<p>NW 49:2 78:13</p> <hr/> <p>O</p> <p>object 112:14 124:10 133:6 145:22 150:11</p> <p>objected 75:14</p> <p>objecting 70:4 105:4 123:7</p> <p>objection 72:4,6 80:16 82:2 89:13 93:21 105:13 108:15,16 112:11 113:13 114:13,14 115:1 116:5,9 118:13 119:9 124:14 125:7,8 127:5 128:25 129:24 143:4,5 146:23,24 147:9,25 148:4 149:23 150:15,24 152:8 162:21</p> <p>obtain 85:5 108:6 112:5</p> <p>obtained 108:8 112:2</p> <p>obviously 86:20 166:5</p> <p>offering 117:3</p> <p>office 67:8 81:22 82:18 83:5,8 111:3 130:22 133:25 134:11,19 135:12,13 136:8,14 137:13 141:8 144:9,17 149:5 153:25 154:12 155:18,25</p> <p>offices 81:8</p> <p>Oh 84:22 85:18,23 102:9 111:10 142:10 155:20</p> <p>okay 51:9,10 53:14 55:2 56:19 58:11 59:19 60:21 62:23 63:9 65:5,14,21 66:1,6,11,15,18 69:17,24 71:20 72:3,24,25 73:10,14,20</p>
---	---	--	--

74:17 75:8 77:13 78:2,5,22 79:1,16,24 80:12 81:15,17,20 82:4,12,14 83:2 84:22 85:25 86:10,20 87:12 89:6 90:2,11 91:15,25 92:7,12,13,24 94:1,9,21 95:7 96:7 97:13 98:5,17 99:21 100:5 101:3 102:22 103:5,14 105:4 106:8,11,17,21, 24 107:4,16,18,21 108:3,17 111:6 112:9,14,19 113:1 114:5 115:5,20 116:17 117:12,16 118:6,11,19 119:9,17 121:1,15 123:4,23 124:4 125:8,22 126:7 128:1 129:18,21,22 130:5,6,13 131:1,12,15,25 132:4,6 133:5 135:5 136:19 139:24 143:6 149:16 150:6,15 151:11,14,18 152:12 153:20 155:7,22 156:2,11 158:3,6,14 159:23 160:1,13,17,23 161:7,15 162:1,2,14 163:5 164:10 165:14 166:12 167:2,9,22 168:2,3,17,23 169:4 Olive 49:9 one-page 110:12 136:4 ones 90:5 91:23 156:24 ongoing 103:25 open 138:9 159:12 opening 51:21,24 53:17	73:15,16,18 77:11 111:13 Oppenheimer 122:17 opportunity 54:3 opposing 52:16 53:12 54:2 56:15,17,18 59:2 65:19 130:23 162:10 opposition 161:25 oral 71:14 order 166:23 167:6,18,23 168:2,12,16 orders 167:2,5 ore 162:21 164:18,20 original 95:21 133:13 156:5,9 originally 140:19 Orlando 133:23 135:4 others 89:18,20 117:8 141:20 148:24 otherwise 69:14 outcome 91:5 outcomes 90:15,17 outdated 59:11 outside 62:10 79:24 88:9 149:19 152:16 168:25 overlap 66:19 overpaid 113:15 overrule 89:17 112:19 overruled 88:10 119:10 124:15 owed 134:22 141:1,23 owned 157:7,18 <hr/> P <hr/> P.A 49:6,14,19 P.A., (and 48:12 p.m 48:25 137:5 142:8 143:11,15 146:17 169:7 packet 55:5	page 50:3 58:19,20 65:12,15,17 106:12,23 115:20,25 116:1 119:20,22 143:13 pages 107:9 116:20 paid 102:25 Palm 48:1 49:7,10 51:5 88:17 89:5 170:4 Palmetto 49:19,20 Pam 95:24 Pankauski 49:8,9 50:6,7 51:18 52:20 53:14,15 56:8 57:1,5,7,13 59:9,10,24 60:10,22,25 61:24 62:4,12,20,24 64:1,21 66:22,23 67:4,7,10,22 68:2,8,12,23 70:22,25 71:7,14,17,19,2 2 72:4 73:15,17,19 74:16,18 75:11,16 76:16 77:7,13 80:16 81:9,25 82:2,7 83:11,24 85:13,16,20 86:1,16 87:14,16 88:12,21 89:7,23 91:20 92:5,16 93:10,24 94:2,11,23 95:6,8 96:2 98:6,14,23,24 99:2,6,12 102:13 103:1 104:10 105:6,15,18,19, 24 106:5,10 107:12 108:11,19,22 109:9,15,18,20, 23 110:2,7,10 111:12,25 112:23 113:19,22,24 114:10,20 115:6 116:15 118:17	119:13,16,18 121:5,8 122:1,14 124:1,20 125:1,3,10,17,2 1,24 126:4,6,10 127:9 128:2 129:5 130:1,4,8,12,22 131:12,25 132:2,5,10,13,1 8 141:11 143:10 153:23 160:16 161:13,17,21,23 163:12,18,20 165:7,17 168:18,20 Pankauski's 63:5 81:22 82:18 83:5,8 84:11 130:21 paper 165:21 papers 53:4 132:19 144:20 paperwork 164:15 paragraph 110:18,23 paralegals 154:16,20 parents 76:1 Partially 113:9 participate 72:1 74:4,20 participation 75:8 particular 136:6 155:2 parties 48:12 134:16 party 54:22 55:12 56:4,17,18 58:13 64:18 65:20 68:20 71:25 164:11 party's 77:21 134:16 passed 68:15 patience 159:15 pay 79:20,21 84:18 97:7 113:8,11 122:4,12,17 123:10 124:4,6 138:16 paying 157:19
--	--	--	--

<p>payments 158:7,10,11,14</p> <p>pending 160:24</p> <p>people 55:24 100:19 114:4 119:23 125:13 166:5 168:11,13</p> <p>percent 78:21 115:19</p> <p>perform 154:16</p> <p>performed 64:21</p> <p>period 110:25</p> <p>permit 60:19 158:19</p> <p>permitted 60:25 61:1</p> <p>person 52:5 55:8 57:9 62:10 63:24 64:3 69:24 74:11,21,24 81:13 135:12,15 136:4,23 148:13 149:6 152:10 154:6,11 162:12 163:9 164:23 165:8 166:2</p> <p>personal 48:15 75:4 86:24 93:17 100:19,23 121:16 130:23 131:2,6 151:12,16 161:6 163:1</p> <p>personally 48:13,14,15 83:7 92:5,18</p> <p>perspective 162:11</p> <p>Peter 49:13,14</p> <p>petition 85:8 107:11</p> <p>petitioner 48:10 49:1 55:7</p> <p>phone 81:13,14,17,21 121:20 138:23 144:11,22 148:24 149:1</p> <p>phonetic 77:15</p> <p>physically 161:22</p> <p>pick 166:1,5,10</p> <p>picks 166:3</p> <p>piece 165:21</p>	<p>placed 127:18</p> <p>plan 152:1,14 156:19,21 157:2,10</p> <p>planners 90:20</p> <p>planning 133:23 149:7</p> <p>plans 133:24 152:16</p> <p>Plaster 120:21</p> <p>play 117:18</p> <p>playing 117:20</p> <p>pleading 55:12 56:6,12</p> <p>pleadings 55:14 63:19</p> <p>please 78:10 88:13,17 89:10 93:13 98:25 100:8 115:20,24 119:20 123:22 125:16,18 130:1 146:1</p> <p>PLLC 49:9</p> <p>plural 148:11</p> <p>point 75:2 78:21 102:24 118:24 163:16</p> <p>points 54:2</p> <p>police 100:11</p> <p>politely 70:7 86:18 139:3</p> <p>portion 166:18</p> <p>position 55:21 59:21 60:22 62:19 69:9 70:20 71:20 72:8 74:2,3 153:1,24 154:7,9 166:13</p> <p>positive 63:23</p> <p>possession 83:21</p> <p>possibility 52:6</p> <p>possible 63:10</p> <p>Possibly 90:1</p> <p>postdated 103:8</p> <p>post-death 134:14</p> <p>postmortem 90:24 102:3</p> <p>potential 68:21 70:11 101:20</p>	<p>power 120:8</p> <p>PR 75:13 151:5 161:5,18</p> <p>practice 136:9 138:21,22 140:11 148:18</p> <p>Pratt 88:8,11,14 113:10</p> <p>pre-dates 59:12</p> <p>predicate 116:10</p> <p>Predominantly 140:13</p> <p>prepare 63:19</p> <p>prepared 115:10</p> <p>presence 150:20 154:18 165:25</p> <p>present 49:22 51:12 81:17</p> <p>presented 103:12</p> <p>presently 78:17,20 79:4 85:3</p> <p>previously 106:14 145:3</p> <p>primarily 59:1</p> <p>prior 63:24 86:16 147:3 156:23,24</p> <p>private 144:4</p> <p>privilege 112:12 162:9</p> <p>privity 61:3,5,10,13</p> <p>pro 48:9 49:2 61:12 72:13</p> <p>probably 72:2 116:15 140:5 155:20</p> <p>probate 48:2 159:11</p> <p>probative 118:15</p> <p>problem 63:23 135:9</p> <p>problems 100:10</p> <p>procedural 68:16</p> <p>procedure 57:20,22 58:2,4,6,9 132:24 138:22 141:6</p> <p>proceeding 52:17 104:17</p>	<p>proceedings 48:20 51:2 118:23 160:9 169:6 170:10</p> <p>product 128:9 154:19</p> <p>professional 52:4,25 56:21 57:23 59:14 154:15 170:7</p> <p>professionally 48:13,14,16</p> <p>proffer 150:16</p> <p>prohibit 54:17 135:7</p> <p>promise 146:7,8,10</p> <p>promised 149:11</p> <p>prongs 77:25</p> <p>proof 53:19 164:1</p> <p>proper 55:24 91:2 101:16 123:8</p> <p>properly 59:3</p> <p>property 74:21 93:17 153:10</p> <p>proposed 99:18 145:16,17</p> <p>prospective 52:4,8,12,21,22 53:5,6 54:6 55:25 59:16,17 60:9,16,20 62:14 64:4,14 66:11,20,23 67:16 68:6,22 69:6 76:21 134:23 135:13 136:10 138:23 141:2,23 148:17 154:23 155:2,5 159:11 163:17</p> <p>prospects 154:25</p> <p>protected 77:18</p> <p>prove 77:24</p> <p>provide 51:19 106:21 107:21 128:5 132:25 148:20</p> <p>provided 90:2,3 105:11 106:19 107:19,24 111:18 128:10,17,22,24 129:3,6,16 141:19</p>
--	---	---	--

160:18,20,22 163:13,21 request 53:10 56:10 75:13 86:20 127:11 149:20 requested 90:6 96:13 134:8 150:13 requesting 164:16 required 61:3,11 requirements 61:18 research 64:9 reserve 53:13 reside 78:17 residence 78:12 122:5 157:17 resigned 84:7 resolved 53:1 resort 77:22 respect 52:8 161:11 respectfully 53:9 respectively 53:3 respond 146:12 responded 146:16,19 Respondents 48:17 response 51:20 86:10 118:9 119:5 143:14,21 146:19 147:13 161:24 162:2 responsibility 59:1 65:25 148:18 responsible 102:2 154:19 157:18 rest 163:24 Restate 127:7 restated 95:13,21 restricted 140:13 result 63:4 69:9,15 81:21 86:23 retain 84:18 100:15 146:3 148:11 retained 60:1 85:17 88:11,14	136:11 retainer 84:14,16,22,25 85:6 98:2,9,11 99:18 111:19 138:10,11,13 145:16,17,18,21 retainers 145:18 rev 151:4 reveal 60:17 139:12 revealed 135:18 review 85:19 96:17 115:19 135:21,22 145:5,8 154:19,24 159:7 reviewed 85:23 141:24 144:24 161:8 revised 95:10 revocable 74:7 94:4,13 revokes 156:23 rid 100:20 rights 122:20 risk 87:5 ROBERT 48:13 Rogers 120:17 Rose 49:5 50:8 99:14 132:3,6,16 133:18 142:18,23 143:2,9 145:24 146:21,25 147:2,6 148:5 149:17 150:4,8,25 151:19 152:23 153:15 156:16 157:4 158:25 160:2,5,12 route 166:8 rule 52:3 53:21 55:13 56:13,20 57:16,20 58:21,24 59:13,14 60:11,18 62:15 63:12 64:12,13,14 65:16 66:20 67:12,19,21,23, 24 68:7 69:11,21 73:6	152:20 154:14 162:3 163:24 rules 52:3 53:23 56:21 57:23 58:1 60:8,9 64:4 66:25 86:12,19 101:17 113:17 ruling 162:16 167:4 run 149:15 157:21 <hr/> s <hr/> sad 139:4 Saturday 140:2 saw 56:6 64:9 136:3 scared 117:23 scope 79:25 88:9 Scott 112:8,10 113:1,6 screen 135:18 se 48:9 49:2 72:13 seal 103:12,13 search 142:1 seat 73:17 160:13 161:15 seated 51:9 second 55:2 56:13 58:23 59:20 61:8 65:22 66:17 72:20 76:22 97:21 110:23 143:22 144:3,4 secondhand 55:23 secondly 57:6 secured 164:23 seeing 162:1 seek 57:17 64:5 71:2 seeking 56:7 57:8,9 151:15 162:12 seen 94:5,8,12 95:19,20,21 110:15 111:7 127:14,17,22,24 147:22 156:5 sees 67:7 send 82:9,24 86:5	92:1 111:8 136:11 144:6,7 145:1 sense 134:3 164:11 sensible 166:16 sensitive 144:5 148:15 sent 81:21,24 82:6,16 83:4,19 86:12 91:11,13,15,19, 20,23 92:5,18 96:1,4,8,16 98:15,18 101:16 106:14 112:2 114:4 116:1,2 119:2,3 120:14,17,21,23 135:23,24 136:8,17 139:22 143:14 144:4,8,16,18,2 5 145:2,6,9,11 146:5 149:6 154:5,11 159:3,6 sentence 58:22 65:22 110:21 September 81:7,12 97:9 103:19 104:1,12 105:16,22,23,25 109:1,5,11 110:13 111:4 114:6,11 118:17 130:20 136:6,9,15 137:2,3,4 139:19,25 140:4,5 146:6 158:4,23 series 144:14 serve 165:15 166:11 services 64:22 84:19 111:15 serving 125:4 sets 52:18 58:8 61:10 setting 144:14 seven 99:14 several 104:6 128:7 144:10,17 148:23,25 149:2 shake 165:25
---	---	---	---

share 148:21	101:7 107:4	speak 56:24	110:1 111:13
shared 115:23	113:18 115:9	57:3,24 63:16	start 71:11 72:16
141:20	119:21,24	83:10 134:8	167:16 168:25
sheet 136:4	120:1,16,18,20,	135:14 149:8	started 62:21
She's 112:8	22,25 123:25	168:13,23	starts 66:20
shift 139:3	130:19,25	speaking 71:8	state 51:5 55:20
Shirley 106:25	131:4,8,11	125:11 137:6	61:2 78:10
107:4,5,10	163:4 164:18	speaks 57:20,24	132:17 170:4,8
130:24 131:2,6	168:22	66:4	statement
152:2 155:13,23	sister 95:24	specifically	51:21,24 102:9
158:18,19	sisters 95:22	52:21	111:14 127:6
Shirley's 144:9	sit 73:1,3 80:13	speculation 77:23	129:2,20
149:6 151:13	situation 67:25	82:2	statements 53:17
short 114:8	165:13	spend 138:23	73:15
138:17 139:6	six 99:14 142:17	split 113:4	states 52:5,23
146:5 152:4	slower 107:2	spoke 100:9	58:24 60:14
shortly 83:18	small 101:22	101:11,20	154:15 162:8
97:15 119:4	166:22	103:18 104:11	statute 137:23
shown 117:7	Smathers	131:3 135:12,15	164:25
155:17	58:15,17,18	136:5	stay 168:24 169:1
sic 69:25 136:9	59:11	137:7,10,14	steer 72:1
sides 166:9	smoother 92:14	140:5 144:12,25	stenographic
side's 150:19	snuck 116:21	148:12,13 149:9	170:11
sign 63:21 71:12	somebody 54:8,14	155:1 158:23	stenographically
signature 102:4	91:9 134:7,18	spoken 96:19	170:9
signatures 103:13	somehow 117:4	104:12 135:20	step 76:7 131:16
signed 55:24	someone 54:25	staff 148:25	steps 166:23
56:11 57:11	61:3 64:1,6	stamp 114:16,21	stipulate 111:21
90:24 111:15	66:24 67:11	117:22 119:16	Stipulation
silent 58:2	141:20 159:7	stamped 121:4	111:23
similar 64:12	163:11	stamping 114:23	stop 55:2 92:10
90:8	165:15,17,24	stamps 109:16	98:12 122:7,22
Simon 48:6 51:11	166:2 167:12	stand 73:12	126:23 127:4,11
78:14 79:11	168:6	standard 75:17	163:12
95:10,14	son 78:14	77:9,13 136:9	story 99:18
107:1,6 144:8	sorry 71:19 88:23	138:12 145:18	138:19
152:2 155:14	89:8 92:6,8,12	standards 53:19	straight
156:2,5,16	99:3,6 106:2	59:16	92:4,7,13 94:9
157:5,8 161:11	107:4 111:10	standby 72:21	straightforward
165:1	113:18 115:15	standing 54:24	166:17
Simon's 92:24	116:7 117:1	61:17 65:1	strategies
93:8,12 94:4,13	122:23 123:13	74:1,3,4,19,22,	148:15,21,22,23
120:3 121:12	151:8 159:8	23	149:4
149:6	161:13	Stansbury	strategy
151:4,9,10,16	sought 84:23	49:12,23 54:23	100:14,17,22
152:14 157:9	sounds 73:8	55:7,21 58:13	148:16
158:18,19	source 128:14	59:6 61:7	Street 49:2 78:13
single 138:20	South 49:6,9,20	63:1,3 68:18	stricken 122:24
sir 56:18 63:8	51:3	69:1 70:18	123:19
79:12 81:10,23	Spallina 48:12,13	71:22 74:1	strike 98:7 125:7
83:20,23 84:13	84:8 91:8 93:16	94:19 106:13	144:20
85:1 86:9 87:18	100:1,19	164:6 167:24	structured 78:20
89:10 91:21	102:2,24 108:8	Stansbury's 54:19	
92:25 95:3	112:3 119:6	69:3,4 73:21	
	137:17 159:22	76:4,5 109:21	

STUART 48:14	125:9 145:23	163:13,19,21	that's 54:22 59:4
stuff 91:9 100:4	148:1,3	164:17 166:12	60:10 61:20,25
104:23 108:5	150:15,24	167:20	62:23 63:10,22
subdivision 52:10	sworn 78:6 132:13	Ted's 101:1	66:11 67:1
67:14		121:17,18 124:2	69:11 70:10,20
subject 52:10	<u>T</u>	162:25 164:4	71:4,7,17,18
67:13 118:8	table 132:7	telephone 82:10	72:12 75:2 77:9
134:2 136:2	tailormade 80:1	83:14 152:25	79:1 82:21
subjective 163:16	taking 62:19	ten 139:1	84:21 87:11
submit 53:3	153:24 154:7	tenus 162:21	89:13 91:9
submitted 53:4	165:1	164:19,20	92:11 93:4
subpart 52:9	talk 53:18 61:15	terms 84:16 86:24	94:5,14 95:4
subsection 66:2	67:17 78:3	Tescher 48:12,13	96:15 98:12
67:13 68:3	86:14 130:22	75:25 84:7,8	102:8 104:22
subsequent 163:20	138:1 159:13	91:8 93:16	105:8
subsequently	168:2,11	100:1,12,19	106:3,13,14
131:1 135:5	talked 100:6,13	101:21	108:17,25 112:1
141:5,8	talking 67:8 71:5	102:1,6,15,18,2	116:5 117:25
substance 147:10	103:6,7,24	3 103:3 108:8	118:1,6 121:23
substantially	114:6 120:11	112:3 119:5	127:14 128:8,16
52:13 67:16	137:18,19	126:15	129:19 132:24
68:10	talks 148:14	134:12,17,19	137:5 138:25
successor 48:15	tampering 115:18	135:20	139:7
sue 49:17 75:25	taxes 157:19	137:16,17	140:14,18,20
102:6,15,18	Ted 49:4,23	138:5,6,7	141:6 144:15
137:16 138:6	54:17,24 56:8	139:15 155:7,13	145:25
suggesting 75:12	61:5	159:18,22	146:4,5,17,18
168:7	62:3,12,22,24	Tescher's 137:16	148:25 152:11
suing 100:22	64:2 67:12	test 76:13,14	155:10
Suite 49:6,9	68:2,9	testified 96:1	157:3,7,9,10
sun 144:14	69:4,5,7,13	121:11 145:4	159:8,10,21
Sunday 133:21	74:15,24	testify 76:2,5	160:3,8,19
140:3 141:6	75:4,9,12,13	132:2 133:12	162:14
support 158:12	76:15,18	testimony 94:12	166:6,18,19
supposed 91:3	79:4,8,10,14	96:3 97:2	167:15,22
97:21 122:18	80:8,10,11,13,2	100:16,21	THEODORE 48:14
suppressed 94:6	2,25 85:17 86:1	117:13	thereafter 69:23
sure 55:3 56:14	90:12,14,20,25	127:17,22	97:15
57:15 62:17	95:23	149:12 150:11	therefore
63:12 64:6,25	100:12,14,22,23	153:23 154:4	154:1,8,10
65:8 68:5 69:14	101:7,14 114:4	thank 51:17 52:1	there's 69:24
73:6 78:21,25	116:2 118:9	53:15 54:3	90:19,23 115:17
79:2 113:23	121:15,21,22	55:18 59:10	118:10,11 142:5
116:20 117:12	122:3,4,12,15,1	73:11,20 77:7	144:2
119:1 125:17	6,18 124:4,11	78:1,10 80:5	Thereupon 78:6
127:21 132:8	126:11,22	83:2 87:14	109:7,13 114:18
155:9 159:24	127:3,10 129:14	92:23 95:12	119:11 126:8
164:15 165:14	130:23 131:1,5	105:18,20,25	132:13 142:20
166:10 167:24	133:20,24	106:5 109:9,15	143:7 147:4
168:10,13	134:10,21	114:10,20 121:7	169:6
surface 57:12	135:3,7 138:1	126:3 130:8,12	they're 91:10
sustained 93:22	140:21,23	132:5,12	137:5 139:1
105:5 113:14	141:9,11,15,22	133:5,16	157:16
	143:17 147:12	160:12,14	they've 157:21
	151:1,4 153:2,8	Thanks 51:9 73:19	THI 61:9
	157:4,12,22	108:12 131:16	third 54:22 75:2
	158:7,17,18,22,	153:20 159:23	76:25 110:18
	25 160:18	169:4	Thomas 49:6 61:9
	161:4,18		thorough 140:25

<p>whole 95:25 118:10 166:20</p> <p>wholly 95:23</p> <p>whom 56:1 81:24 83:10</p> <p>who's 69:7 112:7 167:2</p> <p>whose 103:12</p> <p>wife 81:8,16 82:9,16 83:4,19,22 91:14 92:3,4 95:2 96:4,8,19 106:15 111:11 130:22 135:19 137:1 144:8,18 149:2,5 154:5 159:5</p> <p>William 49:12,18,23 55:7,11 56:5,7,11,15 57:3,8,11 63:1 65:1 68:17 72:22 164:6,22</p> <p>willing 165:15 166:11</p> <p>wills 95:10 120:2 129:11 135:24 140:14 141:21 144:9</p> <p>wish 131:5,9</p> <p>wit 51:7</p> <p>withdraw 135:10</p> <p>withdrawn 81:20</p> <p>withheld 94:5</p> <p>witness 50:3 79:2,18,19,23 80:20 82:6 84:22 88:11,21,24 89:1,4,15,20 92:12 93:7 94:8,21 98:5,17 99:10 102:12,22 106:6,7 107:4 110:7 111:10 112:14,17,21 113:15,18,19,22 116:7,22 117:1,10,16,19, 21,25 118:4 119:4,8 122:8,12,23 123:3,13,17,23, 25 124:19 125:20,22 127:24 131:23</p>	<p>133:5,16 139:23 148:2 149:16 151:8,10,12,15 152:13 160:14</p> <p>witnesses 56:3 131:24 160:15</p> <p>work 110:25 140:17 154:19 166:4</p> <p>worked 155:19</p> <p>working 84:6 91:1,8 146:2</p> <p>world 159:14</p> <p>wrap 152:18</p> <p>write 151:7 165:18,19,20 167:2</p> <p>writing 71:11</p> <p>written 51:19 70:17</p> <p>wrong 56:20 59:14 129:1</p> <p>wrote 139:16 147:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <hr/> <p>Xeroxing 71:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <hr/> <p>Yates 112:6,7</p> <p>yesterday 51:21 70:14 75:15 76:6 84:7 149:19 150:9,14</p> <p>yesterday's 51:13</p> <p>yet 63:13 70:22 114:25 138:12 150:7 161:14 166:21 168:12</p> <p>you'll 114:17 163:3 165:5,20</p> <p>yourself 71:12 99:4 123:12,16</p> <p>you've 89:11 90:2,3 92:24 94:12 111:18 121:3,21 122:4,25 123:17 124:4 140:20 169:3</p>		
--	--	--	--