

Filing # 14457934 Electronically Filed 06/05/2014 10:29:02 AM
IN THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA CASE NO:
502012CP004391XXXXSB
IN RE: THE ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN

-----I
PROCEEDINGS BEFORE
HONORABLE MARTIN COLIN

DATE: MAY 23, 2014
TIME: 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

1 PPEARANCES:

2

3 PPEARING ON BEHALF OF WILLIAM STANSBURY:

4 R. PETER M. FEAMAN, ESQ.

MR. JEFFREY T. ROYER, ESQ.

PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A.

3695 w. Boynton Beach Blvd., Suite 9

6 oynton Beach, FL 33436

7

8 PPEARING OF BEHALF OF TED BERNSTEIN:

9 R. ALAN ROSE, ESQ.

PAGE MRACHEK

505 S. Flagler Drive

West Palm Beach, FL 33401

11

12 APPEARING ON BEHALF OF FOUR ADULT GRANDCHILDREN:

13 JOHN P. MORRISSEY, ESQ. JOHN P. MORRISSEY, P.A. 14 330 Clematis Street, Suite 213 west Palm Beach, FL
33401

16 APPEARING AS THE CURATOR: 17 BENJAMIN BROWN, ESQ. MATWICZYK & BROWN, LLP 18 625 N.

Flagler Drive, Suite 401 West Palm Beach, FL 33401 19

APPEARING PRO SE: 21 ELIOT BERNSTEIN 22 23 24

1

2 BE IT REMEMBERED, that the following

3 proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause

4 before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach

county courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the

6 City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of

7 Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to

8 wit:

9

THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my

11 computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case.

12 Appearances.

13 MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se.

14 MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of

William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff

16 Royer.

17 MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey on behalf

18 of four of the adult grandchildren.

19 MR. ROSE: Alan Rose on behalf of Ted

Bernstein.

21 MR. BROWN: Ben Brown as curator of the
22 estate.

23 THE COURT: All right. What do we have
24 for today?

MR. ROSE: Before we get to that, I have

1 one -sort of an important issue that came up
2 last night.

3 THE COURT: Go ahead.

4 MR. ROSE: It will take 30 seconds.

Ted Bernstein sent me an email. And he

6 replied to an email, and accidently the email

7 went to Eliot Bernstein. It was

8 attorney-client privileged communication

9 directly to me from my client Ted Bernstein.

The email went to Eliot Bernstein. Under Rule

11 1.285 I sent to Mr. Eliot Bernstein an email

12 immediately asking him to delete or return the

13 privileged materials.

14 I discussed the issue with Mr. Eliot

Bernstein this morning and he advised me that

16 he has emailed the document to 2,000 people.

17 He's had a history of posting things on

18 the internet. Because it's attorney-client

19 privileged information it's very sensitive and

I'd request the Court to instruct him to comply

21 with Rule 1.285. It was a reply to an email

22 that had a bunch of names and accidentally it

23 went to him. Mr. Bernstein advised me

24 immediately and I advised Eliot immediately.

THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein, did you get an

1 email from counsel?

2 MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email.

3 I got an email from my brother addressed to me

4 only. I read it, as usual when I get something

bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or

6 whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot

7 Bernstein.

8 THE COURT: It was from -

9 MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot

Bernstein.

11 THE COURT: Not from the lawyer?

12 MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents

13 everything.

14 THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end.

There's other things scheduled. If you

16 remember, we'll take it up.

17 MR. ROSE: Fine.

18 THE COURT: Go ahead.

19 MR. FEAMAN: May it please the Court.

Peter Feaman, Your Honor, on behalf of William

21 Stansbury, interested person in the estate.

22 This is Mr. Stansbury's petition for the

23 appointment of an administrator ad litem which
24 has been submitted to Your Honor together with
a supplement to the petition to the requested

1 relief.

2 We're asking this Court to appoint
3 Mr. Stansbury as an administrator ad litem of
4 the estate for the sole purpose of making an
appearance on behalf of the estate in some
6 litigation that is currently pending in
7 Illinois involving a life insurance policy on
8 Simon Bernstein's life, the deceased, with a
9 death benefit of \$1.7 million.

That litigation has been pending for over
11 a year from what I can tell, or about a year.
12 And it has not involved the estate which is
13 very interesting because the documents that
14 I've recently obtained since the filing of our
motion, Your Honor, we found out that insurance
16 policy, according to internal records of the
17 insurance company, is actually owned by the
18 deceased Simon Bernstein. So arguably not only
19 is it an asset of the estate, that insurance
policy, and the proceeds therefrom, but any
21 litigation concerning the distribution of those
22 proceeds should be in this court, Your Honor.
23 Now that's jumping ahead. But the point
24 is that we're dealing with an asset of the
estate and, therefore, this court has every

1 interest in seeing that the estate's assets are
2 marshaled. The first step for that, Your
3 Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad
4 litem to at least intervene in that federal
court action that's up in Illinois.
6 The former personal representatives of
7 this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything
B they could to keep the money out of the estate
9 from that life insurance policy. They have
alleged that the beneficiary is the life
11 insurance trust. The problem is nobody can
12 find the original life insurance trust. Nobody
13 can find even a copy of the life insurance
14 trust. And the records that we show show that
the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life
16 insurance trust. But the first beneficiary,
17 according to Heritage, which is the insurance
18 company, is LaSalle National Trust. The second
19 beneficiary is the Simon Bernstein Trust,
whatever that is. But it's not the Simon
21 Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust that is
22 being alleged up in Illinois.
23 Now if there's no clear beneficiary, as
24 Your Honor is aware, then the life insurance

proceeds would go to the estate and become an

1 asset, or liquid assets for the estate. Now
2 that money presently has been put into the
3 registry of the court up in Illinois by the
4 insurance company. They were first requested
by the personal representatives of this estate,
6 the former, to pay it to others. And the
7 insurance company said we don't have any
B documentation to justify that. So they just
9 impleaded the funds.

The litigation has been pending, and
11 despite the fact that the estate is the owner
12 of the policy, the estate has never been
13 represented in that action. Now the estate has
14 a high probability of success, we believe, in
this case. Because if they're going to try to
16 establish a lost instrument without the
17 original or without a copy it's going to be
18 based, I assume, on oral testimony from people.
19 And that is a high burden. Interestingly we
found out at first, on this so-called insurance
21 trust, Mr. Spallina (phonetic), who was the
22 personal representative, formerly, of this
23 estate, represented to the insurance company
24 that he was the trustee of this insurance
trust. When that didn't work, Your Honor -we

1 have a document that we'll show to the court up
2 in Chicago -when that didn't work they're now
3 in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein
4 is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that
insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that
6 trust before the court in any fashion. The
7 plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the
8 insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust,
9 it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon
Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor
11 the adult children are not beneficiaries of
12 this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten
13 grandchildren who are the residual
14 beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over
provision of the will that leaves all the
16 liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of
17 that trust are the ten grandchildren. So the
18 adults, the adult children of Mr. Simon
19 Bernstein, have every incentive, Your Honor, to
see that the estate is not inherited with these
21 life insurance proceeds because if they succeed
22 in this action in Illinois then the adult
23 children inherit or receive the proceeds of the
24 life insurance not the ten grandchildren over
whom you have jurisdiction as the beneficiaries

1 in this estate.

2 The curator, Your Honor, has no objection.

3 Mr. Brown -

4 THE COURT: Let me stop and hear from Mr.
Brown. What's your position on their motion?

6 MR. BROWN: I'm not taking a position on

7 the motion, Your Honor. I can get into it

8 further, I don't really want to interrupt

9 Mr. Feaman. But it would seem to me that if

the main estate creditor wants to try to

11 intervene in Chicago on behalf of the estate to

12 bring assets into the estate without looking to

13 the estate for current payment of his fees, in

14 other words, if he finally succeeds then he can

then come back to this Court and ask to have

16 his fees reimbursed, then that would seem to be

17 a benefit to the estate as far as marshaling

18 the assets of the estate and, of course, the

19 curator and/or personal representative has a

duty to the creditors also to try to marshal

21 the assets of the estate.

22 THE COURT: I got your position.

23 Mr. Rose?

24 MR. ROSE: Our position is pretty simple.

And I -this is an evidentiary hearing -

1 THE COURT: It's an opening to tell me

2 what's going on. I just want your position.

3 MR. ROSE: Tetra (phonetic) and Spallina,

4 who were the prior PRs, believe that the claim

to the insurance policy by the estate had no

6 merit because of their discussions with their

7 client, because of their investigation of

8 facts. These people have no evidence to

9 support they have no parol evidence. This

is a fight over an insurance policy that only

11 beneficiary -there's no dispute that the

12 beneficiary the insurance company has on

13 record, there was a prior beneficiary which was

14 a company pension plan that the company is

dissolved, and that's out -the only

16 contingent beneficiary, and there's an

17 affidavit that's been filed attached to one of

18 their motions in this Court where the insurance

19 company says the only other beneficiary ever

named was the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Life

21 Insurance Trust. There's a shorthand in a

22 computer system, where somebody shorthanded it

23 in the computer, and the affidavit in the

24 insurance company addressing that which says

that's shorthand, but in our forms the only

1 2 3 4 6 7 8 9 11 12 13 14 16 17 18 19 21 22 23 24 beneficiary ever listed is this irrevocable life insurance trust, their
only piece of evidence supporting their claim is that the insurance trust cannot be found. But the trust did exist. It has a

tax ID number from -a federal tax ID number. There's numerous references to it between different lawyers and nobody can find the trust document now. That's an issue that's going to be resolved in Illinois. But they have no evidence other than the fact that the trust doesn't exist -they don't have any parol evidence. They don't have any documents. They don't have anything on behalf of the estate. our concern is they're going to spend the precious few estate assets that are remaining to go to Illinois and fight an issue that has no merit, can subject the estate to a claim, you know, for fees or indemnification or prevailing party attorney's fees award. The policy was owned by Simon Bernstein. That means it's included in his taxable estate. But it does not mean it's owned in his probate estate. The beneficiary is the beneficiary. The policy proceeds are in Illinois. They've

1 been deposited into the court -

2 THE COURT: What's the issue that the

3 Illinois judge is being asked to decide?

4 MR. ROSE: Being asked to decide, among competing claims, to the proceeds of this race.

6 Eliot Bernstein is there asserting the exact position that Mr. Stansbury wants to go there

8 to assert. Eliot is asserting that the money

9 should go to the estate and not the irrevocable life insurance trust. That issue is going to

11 require, you know, a summary judgment or a

12 trial with parol evidence to determine who the

13 beneficiary is of that policy.

14 Mr. Stansbury has gone there to intervene

and was denied by the judge the right to

16 intervene in the case already once.

17 our main concern really is twofold. The

18 expense on both -what's actively being spent.

19 We want to make sure no estate funds are being expended to pursue this. In an estate that

21 has a very limited amount of funds here -

22 THE COURT: Mr. Feaman says that his

23 client will not seek fees for his role as

24 administrator ad litem unless and until a

recovery might take place and then he'll make

1 an application with funds then available,

2 meaning the \$1.7 million would then apparently

3 come into the estate.

4 MR. ROSE: I haven't heard testimony to that effect yet.

6 THE COURT: That's a representation.

7 MR. ROSE: He'd also need to represent

8 that he would indemnify and hold the estate

9 harmless if there's any adverse action as a

result of him intervening in that case and

11 losing either an award of attorneys fees or

12 THE COURT: I'm not sure about that part

13 yet. I got your position.

14 MR. ROSE: And then the final point is

Mr. Stansbury is a potential creditor of the

16 estate. To the extent he goes and -even if

17 he would win that lawsuit and bring money into

18 the estate I don't think it's fair to let him

19 get a -I don't know what his fee arrangement

would be.

21 THE COURT: I'd hear that. Under the
22 statute he has to prove that he provided a
23 benefit to the estate.

24 MR. ROSE: We don't even know if his claim
will still exist -

1 THE COURT: It may or may not.

2 Mr. Morrissey?

3 MR. MORRISSEY: To address first the last
4 point why should Mr. Stansbury not be allowed
5 to act even though his fees may or may not come
6 at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a
7 creditor. There's a distinction here. As a
8 claimant he might not be privy, or should not
9 be privy, to certain information because he
10 doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the
11 eight classes of people. If he's allowed to
12 intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action
13 he may, in fact, become privy to certain
14 information that we, or the estate, does not
15 want him to become privy to because we may end
16 up having to negotiate with a claimant to
17 satisfy a claim. We don't want him privy to
18 certain information. We don't want him
19 intervening in actions, and certainly in
20 actions that he's already sought intervention
21 and been denied.

22 THE COURT: Was he denied because he
23 didn't have standing because he hadn't been
24 appointed as an administrator? Is that the
25 reason why he was denied?

1 MR. MORRISSEY: He attempted to intervene
2 individually and was denied. He was denied
3 because -I've attached the order. I filed an
4 opposition and attached the order. And I can
read from a couple of sections of the order to
6 indicate and let Your Honor know why he was
7 denied.

8 THE COURT: Hold on. I see it here.

9 MR. MORRISSEY: The court there went
through an extensive analysis, legal standard
11 and analysis in its order speaking of
12 intervention as a right, and permissive
13 intervention. And the court said, "The fact
14 that you might anticipate a benefit from a
judgment in favor of one of the parties to a
16 lawsuit, maybe, for example, you're a creditor
17 of one of them, does not entitle you to
18 intervene in their lawsuit." That is really
19 the position that Mr. Stansbury is in. The
court went on, "Here Stansbury's claimed
21 interest is merely an economic interest that is

22 too remote for purposes of the rule because the
23 estate is not a party to this lawsuit. And
24 Stansbury does not assert that he or the estate
are beneficiaries to the life insurance

1 proceeds nor the Bernstein Trust."

2 THE COURT: You represent, Mr. Morrissey,
3 who?

4 MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four
grandchildren.

6 THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,
7 may benefit if this money comes to the estate?

8 MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.

9 THE COURT: So the way the case is being
litigated now -is the only plaintiff the
11 Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.
12 the life insurance company?

13 MR. MORRISSEY: Well -

14 THE COURT: That's the way the style of
the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than
16 that?

17 MR. FEAMAN: They amended subsequently and
18 joined the adult four of the five of the
19 adult children were joined as plaintiffs.

THE COURT: And who is representing them?

21 MR. FEAMAN: Somebody up in Chicago in
22 that action.

23 THE COURT: Okay.

24 MR. ROSE: I think technically the lawsuit
was started by the trust against the insurance

1 company. The insurance company filed an
2 interpleaded, probably by counterclaim. My
3 understanding is, subject to someone correcting
4 me, the insurance company was granted
interpleader. They put the funds in the
6 registry of the court. The insurance company
7 is out of the case and even though you have the
8 original style what's left is people asserting
9 a claim to the proceeds.

Eliot is there, I think, advocating the
11 claim on behalf of the estate

12 THE COURT: Eliot is prose. I want -we
13 recognize that. From Mr. Morrissey's point of
14 view, do you take a position that your clients,
the grandchildren, may have an interest in
16 these monies?

17 MR. MORRISSEY: No -well, our position
18 is the following

19 THE COURT: That question first.

MR. MORRISSEY: our position -no, on
21 behalf of the four grandchildren.

22 THE COURT: You waive any -on behalf of
23 those children you waive any claim to that

24 money?

MR. MORRISSEY: I'm not going to waive on

1 the record.

2 THE COURT: You have to stand on one side
3 of the fence or the other on that.

4 MR. MORRISSEY: Quite honestly, I haven't
asked them that question. I can't waive

6 something on behalf of my clients when I

7 haven't asked them that question point blank.

8 THE COURT: All right. So you have who

9 the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Trust is

represented by Chicago

11 MR. BERNSTEIN: Adam Simon who is the

12 brother to David Simon who is married to my

13 sister Pam Simon who stands to benefit if the

14 money goes through Illinois.

THE COURT: Illinois counsel, okay. And

16 the four children are represented by one

17 lawyer?

18 MR. FEAMAN: That's Adam Simon.

19 THE COURT: Because of the impleading of

the funds the battle right now is between the

21 trust and these four children because those are

22 the parties that are now competing for the

23 money?

24 MR. ROSE: I don't think -I don't know

if the four children are technically parties.

1 I think they're just -the battle I think is

2 between Eliot who is asserting that these funds

3 should come into this estate -

4 THE COURT: Eliot was allowed to

intervene?

6 MR. BERNSTEIN: I got sued in the case,

7 Your Honor, because they had gone behind my

8 back to try to steal this policy -around you

9 too -and they were told by the insurance

company, when Robert Spallina submitted what I

11 allege is a fraudulent insurance claim, and

12 they were told by the insurance company that

13 the claim was denied and they needed a probate

14 court order from you to approve the beneficiary

scheme they were proposing using some mashugana

16 lost trust -

17 THE COURT: Eliot, you're named as a

18 cross-plaintiff, so you are -

19 MR. BERNSTEIN: Now I've somehow become a

plaintiff -a defendant that you showed me

21 last week, or two weeks ago, when you handed me

22 that order. I haven't quite figured out how

23 I'm the named defendant.

24 Your Honor, I'm representing their -my

children's interests.

1 THE COURT: Hold it. I'm reading
2 something. I see a entity in the style of the
3 case up there called the Simon Bernstein Trust,
4 N.A. What's that? Is that something different
than the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Trust?

6 MR. ROSE: It's in the affidavit that was
7 filed, I think attached to Mr. Brown's recent
8 petition for instructions, but... In the
9 insurance company's computer they shorthanded
the name of the trust. The beneficiary is the
11 Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Life Insurance
12 Trust which is the -

13 THE COURT: Ted Bernstein is an individual
14 in this suit now. And who is representing him?

MR. ROSE: I don't know that he is an
16 individual. If he's an individual he's
17 represented by Adam Simon.

18 THE COURT: I'm reading it. That's where
19 I get it. They're individually and/or as
purported trustee of the irrevocable trust.

21 Eliot is a cross-plaintiff -that's where
22 you're named, Eliot -vs. Ted, individually
23 and as trustee of the irrevocable trust. And
24 then a bunch of other people and entities are
cross-defendants. Right now the competing

1 parties in Illinois are the irrevocable trust
2 and Eliot. Is that basically it -

3 MR. ROSE: Yes.

4 THE COURT: -who are active; is that
true?

6 So the question is should the claimant be
7 declared here an administrator ad litem for the
8 purposes of being permitted to ask the court to
9 be able to intervene, which the court may or
may not do?

11 MR. ROSE: There's one other part of my
12 opening I missed on my notes -

13 THE COURT: Go ahead. Sure.

14 MR. ROSE: Mr. Morrissey touched on it and
reminded me. If you're going to appoint an
16 administrator ad litem it should not be
17 Mr. Stansbury. You can appoint somebody and
18 Mr. Stansbury could fund it, he could pay the
19 expenses of, let's say, Mr. Brown or an
independent person to hire a Chicago lawyer
21 and, you know, advance the case. But you would
22 then be preserving issues of privilege and you
23 would be preserving the integrity of the system
24 rather than have Mr. Stansbury, who is a
claimant, who is adverse on multiple levels to

1 the estate, as the active person he would be

2 funding the litigation and, in my view, he
3 should be required to indemnify. But you'd
4 have a neutral third person doing it rather
5 that Mr. Stansbury which I think makes a lot
6 more sense.

7 THE COURT: What do you say about the
8 latter comment? That's the only one I want you
9 to address.

MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury
11 will become privy to confidential information
12

13 THE COURT: Well, we're not at -

14 MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown -

THE COURT: - I'll allow someone else to
16 intervene to appropriately determine whether
17 the estate has an interest in this money or
18 not. That's the issue, correct?

19 MR. FEAMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Right now the
21 person technically doing that is Eliot who
22 tries his best as a pro se. But it's pretty
23 tough

24 MR. FEAMAN: That's right. He doesn't
represent the estate.

1 THE COURT: He represents himself
2 individually. So someone who may look for the
3 interest of the estate. And, you know, these
4 type of litigation, obviously, the Illinois
5 judge is going to have to take evidence -I'm
6 not going to do that in my hearing -on who
7 the beneficiary is of this policy. That's what
8 has to be determined.

9 MR. FEAMAN: That's correct.

THE COURT: The issue is narrow and I
11 think everyone agrees with that.

12 MR. FEAMAN: And

13 THE COURT: What I'm thinking about is
14 you kind of want to be able to make sure that
15 everyone who, perhaps, could ultimately be a
16 beneficiary of this policy have a voice in that
17 litigation. That's the due process part of it.
18 So my thought is, having heard everybody say
19 what they said, I rarely find it to be a
20 problem allowing someone to intervene -unless
21 they're a stranger, this wouldn't be a
22 stranger -because a voice is a good thing to
23 have. We allow interventions all the time here
24 on my cases. I just hear from someone else.
They don't win or lose unless there's merit to

1 them. Someone right now is hovering the
2 position that the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable
3 Trust is the beneficiary. They're lawyered up.

4 The only other person that seems to suggest
that that may not be the case and it is the
6 estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm
7 considering having someone other than Eliot
8 or in addition to Eliot, because he's there
9 individually on behalf of himself and he's not
representing the estate -someone represent
11 the interest of the estate.

12 And so the proposal is that that be
13 someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but
14 not -but someone who is more neutral like Mr.
Brown or something like that. What do you say
16 about that?

17 MR. FEAMAN: We came up with Mr. Stansbury
18 because if he's the one that's willing to fund
19 the intervention and to fund the person -the
lawyer -to make sure that the estate is going
21 to be protected

22 THE COURT: He has more -he's like
23 Eliot. He has his own interests, personal
24 interest.

MR. FEAMAN: He does. He has interests in

1 money coming into the estate, absolutely.

2 THE COURT: But someone who is more
3 neutral may be the right move there. If that's
4 where I'm going on this, what is your position
on that?

6 MR. FEAMAN: If that's where you're going
7 on that then Ben Brown is acceptable in that
8 regard. I would just -since Mr. Stansbury is
9 the one that's volunteering, if you will, to
fund initially the cost of this, then he needs,
11 through me, some input with Mr. Brown.

12 THE COURT: Sure.

13 MR. FEAMAN: on all matters.

14 THE COURT: You'd be allowed to have input
with him. But Mr. Brown would be there,
16 assuming he's willing to take the assignment,
17 to preserve issues of confidentiality and other
18 concerns that could exist. He sounded, all
19 along, from the beginning, as the perfect
centerpiece to do this. What do you say?

21 MR. BROWN: Actually, I -a few things to
22 say, Your Honor. The first thing is with
23 regard to the privilege issue. I'm not aware
24 of any privilege that would apply.

THE COURT: And I'm not either. But let's

1 get past that point.

2 MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception,
3 this is squarely in the testamentary exception,
4 so there is no privilege in my view of this.

THE COURT: Okay.

6 MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I
7 promised David Simon, I've given to you before,
8 this email thread where he sent me an email and
9 said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury
appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate
11 should not be appearing in Illinois, you're
12 going to be wasting estate assets and you have
13 a conflict of interest because you're the
14 curator and the estate pours over into the
revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the
16 revocable trust don't want this policy to go to
17 the estate. I've been accused of conflict of
18 interest. I've been accused of breaches of
19 fiduciary duty already by David Simon who,
apparently, is Adam Simon's brother and the
21 father of some of the grandchildren.
22 My third issue is that, I think it's from
23 the Vietnam War, this comes within the category
24 of mission creek. I'm supposed to be temporary
interim limited curator. There's supposed to

1 be a personal representative appointed at some
2 point. I've been asked by the parties to
3 consider being the personal representative.
4 Frankly, Your Honor, this case is -goes off
in a lot of different directions. Whoever the
6 personal representative is going to spend a lot
7 of money just dealing with the different
8 parties and the different people who are
9 involved. And, frankly, I don't know that I
have the time. And I really don't want to be
11 the personal representative.

12 THE COURT: Okay.

13 MR. BROWN: If I'm appointed administrator
14 ad litem it seems like I'm in there for the
long run on a federal case. They do move them
16 pretty quickly here in the Southern District of
17 Florida. I know that from experience. I don't
18 know about the Northern District of Illinois.

19 MR. FEAMAN: Well, there's been -I can
answer that question.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. FEAMAN: There's been a notification
23 of a docket entry entered by the judge on -it
24 said that all case dispositive motions are to
be filed by mid-July, July 13. So it sounds

1 like we're on a rocket docket to me, Your
2 Honor.
3 And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would
4 like to, since he is running the cost, be able
to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up
6 in Chicago. And that and to review
7 counsel's bills from Chicago and to help

8 strategize with that counsel the best way to
9 proceed up there should Your Honor go that
direction.

11 THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this
12 question: Is there also before me a petition
13 to appoint or determine a PR?

14 MR. FEAMAN: Not today.

THE COURT: Not today, okay.

16 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I don't know if
17 that's set for hearing at all. Although I
18 request that it be set for hearing. The other
19 issue with a PR versus a curator is that
Mr. Stansbury has active litigation going on in
21 front of Judge Blanc right now. So far there
22 hasn't been any conflict as far as Ted
23 Bernstein and the estate defending against
24 Mr. Stansbury's claim, but there have been
multiple instances where people in this case,

1 in this room, basically, have said that there
2 could eventually be a conflict of interest
3 because there could be some finger pointing in
4 cross claims.

THE COURT: It's hard to purify a case
6 like this and not have it - not have a
7 situation where it's allegation free of a
8 purported conflict of interest. But it just
9 sounds logical that if - especially when I'm
looking at the latest heading out of the case
11 in Illinois - if this is, in its simplest
12 form, a dispute as to who the beneficiary of
13 this life insurance policy is, I mean that's a
14 - that's kind of a narrow hearing. We do
those types of things in state court. You
16 know, you need some discovery. And then you
17 present the evidence and the judge makes a
18 decision. Kind of like the way you do in
19 contract cases. And so the parties who claim
to be beneficiaries of the policy seem to be
21 Simon Bernstein's Irrevocable Trust and their
22 representative. I'm treating Simon Bernstein
23 Trust as the same party for the purpose of this
24 discussion. Eliot, individually, he's there.
And no one who may have a voice to say I want,

1 on behalf of the estate, because there's no PR.
2 If there's a PR the PR would take care of that.
3 Especially where Mr. Stansbury is willing to
4 front the cost of the fees for that up front it
sounds beneficial to have that voice.

6 So I'll put it this way, Mr. Brown, I
7 would expand your curator duties, if you're
8 willing, to take the assignment. If not, we
9 got to go elsewhere. It's up to you.

MR. BROWN: The curator duties basically
11 to just effectively be the party who's
12 intervening using Mr. Stansbury's counsel?
13 THE COURT: No. You would be the party.
14 You would hire a lawyer. You're allowed to,
like in any other case, you and your lawyer can
16 hear, because your phones work and your emails
17 work, from anyone else including Mr. Feaman and
18 Mr. Rose and Mr. Morrissey, and anyone else can
19 stick their two sense in. That's the way
litigation goes. But it seems to be that this
21 isn't an issue that's a finger-pointing issue.
22 This is who the beneficiary of the policy is.
23 The judge is going to look at the documents and
24 either say it's clear on its face or else take
parol evidence and we're on our way. This

1 isn't a personal type of litigation. And so,
2 you know, the strategies are legal strategies
3 that would be in charge of you and the lawyer
4 you hire.

MR. BROWN: I understand that, Your Honor.
6 Basically what you just described is something
7 that Mr. Stansbury could very easily do and pay
8 for himself.

9 THE COURT: Right. But he's but I
don't want him to be the party to do that
11 because I think there's -he's a claimant.
12 There's -I'm not comfortable there.

13 MR. BROWN: Okay.

14 THE COURT: And, you know, you're the
neutral person looking out for the estate's
16 interest. He has -he's not -he's looking
17 out for the estate's interest but in a
18 different manner. So hypothetically if you
19 went up into the litigation and you got
convinced by looking at everything you looked
21 at, you and your lawyer, that the beneficiary
22 was the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance
23 Trust, whatever that is, and not the estate,
24 you have a duty to argue in good faith. You
follow what I'm saying? That's where the

1 2 3 4

6 7 8 9

11 12 13 14

16 17 18 19

21 22 23 24

neutrality part comes in. But you are more advocating, primarily, to the estate at -that's the assignment.

MR. BROWN: I understand that, Your Honor.

But --and I know there's the estate has about 6 to assets, that includes the

THE COURT: Remember, Mr. Stansbury pay.

a lot of but's here \$700,000 worth of jewelry.

I'm having

MR. BROWN: Oh, you are having Mr. Stansbury, okay.

THE COURT: That was the deal.

MR. BROWN: And just using his counsel that he already has retained and already tried to intervene with?

THE COURT: No. No. You pick the lawyer.

He pays.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I will do it

subject to whatever personal representative is appointed going ahead and taking over

THE COURT: Ultimately if we get to the stage where there's a PR taking the place of you, that would be different. This is --let me just tell you, I mean a couple of reasons why I think that works is Mr. Brown has worked

1 with me as curator in a lot of cases. I mean I

2 haven't had one challenge to the reasonableness

3 of the fees ever. He keeps control of the

4 lawyers. You know, and he does really a good

job there. So I really, you know, I can't

6 think of a better person to deal with this

7 issue given everyone's competing interest.

8 He'll be fair on what he argues on behalf of

9 the estate. He's not going to run up fees.

He's not going to allow the lawyer to run up

11 fees. If you want, I don't think he should be

12 the lawyer probably because I don't think he's

13 admitted in Illinois

14 MR. BROWN: No.

THE COURT: -and he'll be able to best

16 determine how to filter whatever the

17 information is that other counsel want to give

18 to them. Again, it's a narrow issue. Okay,

19 everyone is jumping up.

MR. MORRISSEY: If I could respond on

21 behalf of four of the grandchildren. We're now

22 talking about having to pay, you know, from my

23 client's perspective pockets, Mr. Brown's fees,

24 an attorney up in Illinois -

THE COURT: I just said that won't be the

1 case.

2 MR. MORRISSEY: That could potentially be

3 the case.

4 THE COURT: It would only be the case if

there was a recovery for the estate to which

6 then Mr. Stansbury would say, under the

7 statute, I performed a benefit for the estate.

8 How could that not benefit - and from what I'm

9 told your clients, the grandchildren, would be

the people who would benefit from that. So why

11 would you complain about that if that's what

12 wound up happening? There's not a dollar

13 coming out of the estate unless there's a

14 recovery basically, and then the recovery would

take place and he would seek some recovery of

16 fees.

17 MR. MORRISSEY: And he would seek that -

18 THE COURT: Here.

19 MR. MORRISSEY: Here?

THE COURT: Sure. You can say what I

21 think you're going to say, it's okay.

22 MR. MORRISSEY: I just want to go back to

23 the basics. The fact that the estate is only a

24 taker in default. So the estate doesn't need

to be represented in the Illinois action.

1 It's, for example, there was even talk, I

2 believe, in the Illinois case by one of the

3 banks or insurance companies that it's possible

4 if there's no beneficiary then the State of

Illinois could be the taker in default. Well,

6 the State of Illinois wasn't named as a party.

7 They don't have counsel there. Likewise, why

8 should the estate have counsel in an action

9 where they're only the taker of last resort?

THE COURT: Because if they're the taker

11 as a matter of law -I mean -I don't really

12 follow your argument because let's say there's

13 a hearing, which there will be, and the trust

14 is there, Eliot is there, and the estate is

there, and the judge hears it all and says the

16 decision is the beneficiary should be the

17 estate, would we say that that's a ridiculous

18 thing that we had the estate participate? I

19 don't think so.

MR. MORRISSEY: I don't know what -I

21 mean there is no evidence that anyone on behalf

22 of the estate can present that they have ever

23 been named as a beneficiary

24 THE COURT: That could be. It may be then

that once Mr. Brown and counsel intervene, see

1 the documents -I mean you're not talking

2 how many pages of documents could the

3 beneficiary forms be? It can't be that many.

4 When we sign our life insurance forms we sign a

page or two, that's about it. It's not like

6 it's going to be really exotic litigation.

7 This is a narrow, single issue who the

8 beneficiary is of this policy. You know, it

9 may be that it is clear that it's this

irrevocable trust and then they'll go from

11 there to see whether that really is an entity

12 that exists. That may be a separate issue. If

13 the judge says -someone can name on the life

14 insurance policy, you know, the Star Spangled

Banner Fund and if that doesn't exist then we

16 know from contract law what happens if you name

17 a beneficiary that doesn't exist. You go to

18 the next level. You certainly want the life

19 insurance funds going somewhere. That's what

we would determine if that took place. Step 1,

21 step 2, step 3, doesn't sound to be that
22 complexed. Last word.
23 MR. ROSE: If I understand what you are
24 saying, which makes sense, Mr. Brown will keep
separate time for the time he spends as curator

1 working on the Illinois issue. He will hire
2 counsel and the fees of Mr. Brown and the
3 Illinois counsel, under his direction and his
4 discretion, would be paid by Mr. Stansbury?

THE COURT: That's the case. Subject to a
6 claim for reimbursement under the statute.

7 MR. ROSE: I'd want to hear from
8 Mr. Stansbury under oath that he's willing to
9 undertake that expense. Not to talk out of
school, but I haven't had discussion with
11 counsel and I didn't necessarily get the sense
12 that that was going to be the case.

13 THE COURT: All right. Well, Mr. Feaman
14 can represent them.

MR. FEAMAN: I am representing as an
16 officer of the Court, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. FEAMAN: My only concern is if
19 there's - basically Mr. Stansbury is funding
this there's - there has to be some type of, I
21 don't want to use the word control, but real
22 input into the process.

23 THE COURT: Well, he's allowed to, like
24 anyone else in cases like this, you could have
conversations with Mr. Brown and his lawyer.

1 You can show them what documents there are.
2 You can ask them to discuss things with them.
3 And, you know, I mean they - they obviously
4 know he has an interest. And to the extent
that they're comfortable I think it's
6 appropriate they'll discuss these things with
7 them.

8 MR. FEAMAN: on behalf of Mr. Stansbury, I
9 would like assurances.

THE COURT: I'm not going to - I have to
11 keep the - there's a line of demarcation I
12 don't want to cross up front.

13 MR. FEAMAN: And I'm not objecting that
14 it's not Mr. Stansbury. I just want to make
sure the person who -

16 THE COURT: The person who is appointed is
17 going to advocate for the estate.

18 MR. FEAMAN: Right. Agree with that.

19 THE COURT: But let me tell you this, the
reason I appoint a curator to do this is the
21 curator is not advocating for Mr. Stansbury.
22 He's advocating for the estate. There's times

23 when the curator could say, after doing
24 everything, I don't think, for example, the
estate has a bona fide interest. That may be

1 bad news for your side. But if that's what
2 they conclude then that's what they conclude.
3 If they conclude they do they will continue
4 advocating. It's things we do as lawyers all
the time. We go after cases with merit, and
6 shy away from those we think don't have merit.

7 MR. FEAMAN: Yes.

8 THE COURT: There's multilevel here. If
9 someone says that the Bernstein Irrevocable
Trust is the beneficiary but that it doesn't
11 exist there may be an argument that could be
12 made how then still as a result of that the
13 estate should get the funds, that would be
14 something that Mr. Brown and counsel could
consider advocating. But it's all in good
16 faith stuff.

17 MR. FEAMAN: Sure. I just want to make
18 sure

19 THE COURT: You'll get copies of the
bills. You'll be able to see what's that. If
21 at anytime you think that Mr. Brown and the
22 lawyer are, you know, going way beyond what you
23 think they should, from an expense point of
24 view, you can always come back to me.

MR. FEAMAN: I'm less concerned with the

1 expense, although it is important, more with
2 being able to pick up the phone and speak to
3 counsel in Chicago and say, hey, have you
4 considered this, I have information that may
help your case.

6 THE COURT: I'm not going to micromanage
7 that part. Today if you want to call Mr. Brown
8 for this hearing, for example, and say, Mr.
9 Brown, this is what I think, what do you think,
you're allowed to have a discussion on that.

11 That happens all the time, doesn't it?

12 MR. BROWN: It does. It does with
13 everybody in the case, emails and phone calls.

14 THE COURT: You guys email between each
other like crazy now.

16 MR. BROWN: That's true. Your Honor, the
17 only as far as keeping my time, if I kept my
18 time at my rate as curator is Mr. Stansbury
19 supposed to pay for that, or is that still
payable by the estate?

21 THE COURT: Your time and the lawyer's
22 time are the only rate I approve -

23 MR. BROWN: Paid by Mr. Stansbury.

24 THE COURT: -the hourly rate, I approve

of 350.

1 MR. BROWN: I also propose, it doesn't
2 have to go on the order, it would seem to me,
3 there's nothing wrong, once I retain a Chicago
4 attorney, there's nothing wrong with Mr. Feaman
calling that Chicago attorney and me telling
6 the Chicago attorney don't get me on the phone
7

8 THE COURT: I agree. There's no question.
9 You're the conduit.

MR. BROWN: As far as the claim, I'll
11 absolutely rely on Illinois counsel.

12 THE COURT: All right. I think this is
13 pretty clear how it's going to be handled.

14 Yes, sir.

MR. ROSE: A couple of minor concerns, I
16 think Mr. Brown went too far. Mr. Stansbury
17 would not pay for all the curator fees, only
18 the curator fees directly related to the
19 Illinois matter.

THE COURT: That's what he said. Separate
21 times sheets, sure.

22 MR. ROSE: I'm concerned if they - he's
23 going to hire a Chicago lawyer, a Chicago
24 lawyer is going to be expensive. That's what
our main concern is -

1 THE COURT: Hold on. Mr. Brown

2 MR. ROSE: He's a practical guy

3 THE COURT: -he's going to find a good
4 lawyer with a reasonable rate, and that's a
little higher. He's not going to hire a
6 \$1,000-an-hour-guy.

7 MR. ROSE: But if he hires a lawyer and
8 the bill is \$12,000 and Mr. Stansbury's counsel
9 looks at it and says we don't think we should
pay it, Mr. Brown is retaining the person on
11 behalf of the estate, we need to have not a
12 chance for them to complain about bills.

13 THE COURT: Okay. I'm not worried about
14 that now. There's too much I'm not finding,
you know -I mean one -part of this is what
16 I think is the sincerity of Mr. Feaman's side
17 here. And it's kind of a good thing that we
18 have the ability to be able to use
19 Mr. Stansbury's funds that way. They've made
the pledge to do it. I don't think they're
21 going to go back on their word.

22 MR. ROSE: I understand. I think
23 Mr. Stansbury should at least, under oath

24 THE COURT: Your request is denied.
Mr. Feaman is an officer of the court. He

1 represents -

2 MR. ROSE: -it would be enforceable as a
3 judgment if he doesn't pay -the estate would
4 have a claim against Mr. Stansbury if he, for
example, didn't pay some invoices and we got
6 stuck paying the bill for a Chicago lawyer.
7 THE COURT: You want me to rule on that
8 now? Your answer is no. You're real premature
9 on that. Draft an order along the lines I
mention.

11 What else for today?

12 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I had two motions
13 for instructions.

14 THE COURT: one had to do with this issue,
right?

16 MR. BROWN: That one I basically just took
17 a backseat to because of the administrator ad
18 litem motion.

19 The other, Eliot Bernstein sends me a lot
of emails with a lot of requests. I'm not
21 saying it's a bad thing. But he asks me
22 questions I don't necessarily know I can
23 answer. For instance, he got the accounting by
24 Tetra and Spallina and then sent me an email
that I've attached to the motion. I don't know

1 if you have the motion for instructions.

2 THE COURT: I do.

3 MR. BROWN: That had 44 different
4 questions, not including subparts, and asked
that I hire a forensic accountant, an analyst
6 and acquire account statements from a number of
7 third-party institutions.

8 THE COURT: Is that the motion? I don't
9 have the attachments. It says motion for
instructions - that's the life insurance one.

11 Hold on.

12 MR. BROWN: It's not necessarily
13 important. Eliot is very thorough. But,
14 again, the estate has limited assets. My view
of what the curator should do with respect to
16 the accounting is not take the lead on
17 objecting to what Tetra and Spallina did,
18 investigating the underpinnings of the
19 accounting, that's up to - we have a lot of
beneficiaries here who are very, very
21 passionate and interested in what's going on
22 with the estate.

23 THE COURT: Stop. You don't have to go
24 further. That position, that's the law. You
don't do that. If there's an accounting,

1 there's a rule on objections, the parties

2 object. They don't use you -you don't work

3 for them.
4 MR. BROWN: Okay.
5 THE COURT: You work for the court.
6 MR. BROWN: I'll try and craft an order
7 that deals with that motion in that regard.
8 Also, there also was a motion, Eliot has
9 concerns about the 2012 will and its validity.
10 I think your ruling would be the same on that.
11 I don't have a role in trying to contest that
12 will
13 THE COURT: Exactly. You're not an
14 advocate. You don't investigate things that
15 the parties may be interested in. They can do
16 what they think they need to do based on the
17 rules of procedure and statutes.
18 MR. BROWN: That's it.
19 MR. ROSE: If I may address the privilege
20 issue?
21 THE COURT: okay. The privilege issue,
22 okay.
23 MR. ROSE: May I approach?
24 THE COURT: Yes.
25 MR. ROSE: I can file a copy of this.

1 This is the email in question. Without reading
2 the email, if you look at who it is addressed
3 to at the very top. Mr. Bernstein is saying,
4 this is Ted, telling me he sent it to Eliot by
mistake. Last night at 10:12 he got off an
6 airplane and wanted to tell me things. It's to
7 Eliot by accident. If you just read -
8 THE COURT: When you say to Eliot by
9 accident, the only person this is sent to is
Eliot.

11 MR. ROSE: Correct. He was trying to send
12 it to me. If you look below the word analysis,
13 the first word of the email is Alan.

14 THE COURT: So this was is supposed to go
to you and it went to Eliot?

16 MR. ROSE: By mistake. And Mr. Bernstein
17 has advised me this morning he sent it to 2,000
18 people already. He plans on publicizing it

19 THE COURT: I'm sure he didn't do that
because if he wants to participate in the case
21 he's obligated to have and comply with the
22 rules of court.

23 MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor

24 THE COURT: When you

MR. BERNSTEIN: I was sent an email to me.

1 Like I do when I get a letter that has
2 threatening stuff to me I sent it to my friends
3 who are lawyers. I sent it to a number of
4 people. Actually, I got so busy sending it to

people, because it scared me a little bit that
6 it was very threatening to people, that by the
7 time I was done my wife stopped me and said we
8 got to go to court. All I know is my brother
9 sent me an email that seems pretty threatening.
It was addressed to me. I was the intended
11 recipient.

12 THE COURT: Let me ask you, when the email
13 starts off Alan

14 MR. ROSE: I get a million emails -

THE COURT: That say Alan?

16 MR. BERNSTEIN: That say whoever's name.

17 THE COURT: Okay. All right. You know
18 what, I don't buy anything you just told me.

19 MR. BERNSTEIN: I thought my brother was
sending me a copy of an email

21 THE COURT: Stop. Stop. Stop speaking.

22 I'm going to look at the rule for a second.

23 MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

24 MR. ROSE: It's 1.285.

THE COURT: Okay.

1 MR.

2 for this,

3 THE

4 MR.

rules.

6 THE

7 MR.

BERNSTEIN: I so ... COURT: Okay. BERNSTEIN: I haven't been prepared haven't looked at the
COURT: Okay. BERNSTEIN: I can show you several

8 instances in my email of people sending me
9 letters addressed to other people, several
thousands of those.

11 THE COURT: So, all right. Everyone has
12 to take a deep breath. This situation is done
13 pursuant to Rule 1.285. So Mr. Rose, on your
14 side, correct me if you think I'm wrong,
Subsection A says, "When you" - your client
16 "takes a position that there's been an
17 inadvertent disclosure of privileged materials
18 to another person" - which is what you say
19 happened, correct?

MR. ROSE: Correct, sir.

21 THE COURT: It says here, "In order to
22 assert the privilege the party, person or
23 entity shall, within 10 days of actually
24 discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve
written notice of the assertion of privilege on

1 the party to whom the materials were disclosed.

2 The notice shall specify with particularity"

3 etc. And then there's a procedure.

4 MR. ROSE: I did that last night. I
emailed him last night.

6 THE COURT: I didn't know that. So you
7 gave him the written notice. I assume he got
8 it. Can I see a copy of the notice?

9 MR. ROSE: I'm trying to get a copy of the
notice. Perhaps -I'm not trying to have the
11 whole argument heard today. I just

12 THE COURT: The rule applies.

13 MR. ROSE: Right.

14 THE COURT: So once he gets notice, the
rule applies. So the notice will have -you
16 sent it by email?

17 MR. ROSE: I have it here now. I do find
18 it, sir. May I approach?

19 THE COURT: What's the time and date of
the notice?

21 MR. ROSE: May 22, 2014 at 11:07 p.m. I
22 said, "You received an email from Ted intended
23 solely for me, and accidentally sent to you by
24 mistake. The email was sent around 10:12 p.m.
tonight. Please delete the email immediately

1 without reading it and confirm that deletion by
2 email. The communication was attorney-client
3 protected and you are not entitled to read or
4 possess the email due to the accidental
transmission. Thank you in advance. And if
6 you fail to comply with this request we'll be
7 forced to take corrective action with the
8 court." Signed by me sent to the same email
9 address that -

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So the rule
11 says, to Eliot, he sent that to you, Rule
12 1.285, Subsection B tells you what you're
13 supposed to do.

14 MR. BERNSTEIN: I haven't seen it yet.

THE COURT: Okay.

16 MR. BERNSTEIN: He's saying he sent it
17 after Ted's email. The last email I read was
18 Ted's email. So I haven't seen it.

19 THE COURT: So open that email

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

21 THE COURT: Okay. And do what the rule
22 says.

23 MR. BERNSTEIN: Don't send it to anybody
24 else.

THE COURT: Well, okay, that, but it also

1 says some other things of what you're supposed
2 to do. You're supposed to return or destroy
3 it. That's one thing you're supposed to do.
4 And you are to notify anyone else who you

disclosed it to that they're to do the same
6 thing and you're also to take reasonable steps
7 to retrieve the materials disclosed -
8 MR. BERNSTEIN: I'll do all that.
9 THE COURT: And the only exception to this
is if you want to challenge that assertion that
11 you were provided an inadvertent privileged
12 matter. And then the rule says what could
13 happen and we can have litigation and spend a
14 lot of money.

MR. BERNSTEIN: No. I'll do whatever it
16 is -whatever the law says, as always.

17 THE COURT: There's nothing for me to do.

18 MR. ROSE: I understand. I just want to
19 make sure you -

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, it went out to
21 a lot of people. Like I said, I have a broad
22 base

23 THE COURT: Take a look. When you leave
24 the courthouse -

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'll notify

1 everybody though. 2 THE COURT: Go and take a look at the rule 3 and just do what the rule says. 4 MR. ROSE: And
it's not to be posted on social media. 6 THE COURT: You see, I'm not allowed to 7 have dialogue on that now. Other
than signing 8 the order, hearing over. Thank you. 9 (Whereupon the hearing is concluded at 10:00 a.m.)

11 12 13 14

16 17 18 19

21 22 23 24

1 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

2

3 I, JULIE ANDOLPHO, do hereby certify that
4 the foregoing transcript of the proceedings,
consisting of pages numbered 1 through 54,
6 inclusive, is a true and correct transcript of the
7 proceedings taken by me before the Honorable MARTIN
8 COLIN, on May 23, 2014.

9 I further certify that I am not a relative
or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the
11 parties, nor a relative or employee of such attorney
12 or counsel, or financially interested, directly or
13 indirectly, in this action.

14 The certification does not apply to any
reproduction of the same by any means unless under
16 direct control and/or direction or the reporter.

17 Dated this 27th day of May, 2014.

18

19 Julie Andolpho

21 22 23 24

Page 1 of 11

\$1,000-an-hourguy 43:6 \$1.7 6:9 14:2 \$12,000 43:B \$700,000 33:6 1 1 37:20 54:5 1.2B5 4:11,21 4B:24 49:13 51: 12
10 49:23 10:00 1:13 53:9 10:12 47:5 50:24 54 54:5 6 6 33:6 625 2:18 9 9 2:5 9: 00 1: 13 A a.m 1:13 53:9 ability 43: 18
able 22:9 24:14 29:4 34:15 21:17 27:20 addition 25:8 address 15:3 23:9 46:19 51:9 addressed 5:3 47:2 48:10 49:9
addressing 11:24 administrator 5:23 6:3 7:3 13:24 15:24 22:7,16 27:10 28:13 44:17 admitted 34:13 adult 2:12 3:18

9:9,11,18,22 17:18,19 33:14 47:18 am 38:15 54:9 amended 17:17 among 13:4 amount 13: 21 analysis 16:10,11 47:12 analyst 45:5 and/or 10: 19 21:19 54:16 Andolpho 54:3,19 answer 28: 20 44:8,23 anticipate 16:14
11: 07 50: 21 13 2B:25 2 2 37:21 2,000 4:16 47:17 200 3:5 2012 46:9 2014 1:12 3:7 40:20 41:2 43: 18 above-styled 3:3
absolutely 26:1 42:11 acceptable 26:7 accident 47: 7, 9 accidental 51: 4 accidentally 4:22 50:23 adults 9:18 advance
22:21 51:5 adverse 14:9 22:25 advised 4:15,23,24 47:17 advocate 39:17 46:14 anybody 51:23 anyone 31:17,18 36:21
38:24 52:4 anything 12:13 48:18 anytime 40:21 apparently 14:2 27:20 appearance 6: s
50:21 54:8,17 213 2:14 22 50:21 23 1:12 54:8 23rd 3: 7 27th 54:17 3 3 37:21 30 4:4 330 2:14 33401 2:10,14,18 33436
2:6 350 41:25 3695 2:5 4 401 2:18 44 45: 3 5 502012CP004391XXX XSB 1: 2 505 2:10 accidentally 4: 6 according 6:16
7:17 17:6 account 45:6 accountant 45:5 accounting 44:23 45:16,19,25 accused 27:17,18 acquire 45:6 act 15:5 action 7:
5 8: 13 9:22 14:9 15:12 17:22 35:25 36:8 51:7 54:13 actions 15:19,20 active 22:4 23:1 29:20 actively 13:18 actually 6:
17 26:21 48:4 49:23 ad 5:23 6:3 7:3 13:24 22:7,16 27:10 28:14 44:17 ~A-1q.11 10 advocating 18:10 33:2 39:21,22
40:4,15 affidavit 11:17,23 21:6 against 17:25 29:23 44:4 ago 20:21 ahead 4:3 5:18 6:23 22:13 33:20 airplane 47:6 Alan
2:9 3:19 47:13 48:13,15 allegation 30:7 allege 20: 11 alleged 7: 10, 22 allow 23:15 24:23 34:10 allowed 15: 4, 11 20:4
26:14 31:14 38:23 41:10 53:6 allowing 24:20 already 13:16 15:20 27:19 Appearances 2:1 3:12 appearing
2:3,8,12,16,20 27:11 application 14:1 applies 50:12,15 apply 26:24 54:14 appoint 6: 2 7: 3 22:15,17 29:13 39:20
appointed 15: 24 27:10 28:1,13 33:20 39:16 appointment 5: 23 approach 46: 23 50:18 appropriate 39:6 appropriately
23:16 approve 20:14 41:22,24 arguably 6:18 argue 32: 24 argues 34:8 ar.....ment 36: 12

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA
561/833.7811

Page 2 of 11

40:11 50:11 44:16 25:2 29:23
arrangement 14:19 assert 13:8 16:24 basics 35:23 battle 19:20 20:1 30:22 32:22 40:9 44:19 47:3,16,23,25 c care 31:2
49:22 asserting 13:6,8 18:8 20:2 assertion 49:25 52:10 asset 6:19,24 B:l assets 7: 1 a: 1 Beach 1:1 2:5,6,10,14,18 3:4,6
beaches 27:18 become 7 :25 15:13,15 20:19 23:11 48:16,19,23 49:1,4,7 51:14,16,20,23 52:8,15,20,25 Bernstein's 6:8
30 :21 best 23:22 29:8 34:15 case 1:2 3:11 8:15 13:16 14:10 17:9,15 18:7 20:6 21:3 22:21 25:5 28:4,15,24 29:25
30:5,10 31:15 35:1,3,4 36:2 38:5,12
9:16 10:12,18,21 12:16 27:12 33:7 45:14 assignment 26:16 31:8 33:3 assume 8:18 50:7 beginning 26:19 behalf 2: 3, 8,
12 3:14,17,19 5:20 6: 5 10: 11 12: 14 18:11,21,22 19:6 25:9 29:3 31:1 34:8,21 36:21 39:8 better 34:6 beyond 40: 22 bill
43:8 44:6 bills 29:7 40:20 43:12 bit 48:5 41:5,13 47:20 cases 24:24 30:19 34:1 38:24 40:5 category 27 :23 cause 3: 3
centerpiece 26:20
assuming 26:16 assurances 39: 9 Atlantic 3: 5 attached 11:17 16:3,4 21:7 43:11 behind 20:7 believe 8:14 11:4 36:2 Ben
3:21 23:14 bizarre 5:5 Blanc 29 :21 blank 19:7 Blvd 2:5 certain 15:9,13,18 certainly 15 : 19 37:18 CERTIFICATE
54:1
44:25 26:7 bona 39:25 certification
attachments 45:9 beneficial 31:5 Boynton 2:5,6 54: 14
attacking 5:5 beneficiaries breath 49:12 certify 54:3,9
attempted 16:1 7:15 9:11,14,16,25 bring 10:12 14:17 challenge 34:2 52:10
attorney 34:24 42:4,5,6 54: 10,11 16:25 27:15 30:20 45:20 beneficiary broad 52:21 brother 5:3 19:12 27:20 48:8,19
chance 43:12 charge 32:3
attorney-client 4:8,18 51:2 attorneys 14:11 attorney*s 12:20 available 14 : 1 7:10,16,19,23 11:11,12,13,16, 19 12:1,24
13:13 20:14 21:10 24:7,16 25:3,6 30:12 Brown 2 : 1 7 3: 21 10:3,5,6 22:19 23:14 25:15 26:7,11,15,21 27:2,6 28:13
29:16 31:6,10 Chicago 9:2 10:11 17:21 19:10 22:20 29:6,7 41:3 42:3,5,6,23 44:6
Avenue 3:5 31:22 32:21 36:4,16,23 32:5,13 33:4,10,13,18,2 children 9:9,11,18,23
award 12:20 14:11 37:3,8,17 40:10 5 34: 14 36: 25 17:19 18:23
aware 7:24 26:23 benefit 6:9 10:17 37:24 38:2,25 19:16,21,25
away 40:6 14:23 16:14 17:7 19:13 35:7,8,10 40:14,21 41:7,9,12,16,23 42:1,10,16 children's 20:25 CIRCUIT 1:1
B backseat 44:17 BENJAMIN 2:17 Bernstein 1:6 43:1,10 44:12,16 45:3,12 City 3:6 claim 11:4
bad 40:1 44:21 2:8,21 46:4,6,18 12:3,18 14:24
banks 36: 3 Banner 37:15 3:11,13,20 4:5,7,9,10,11,1 5,23,25 Brown*s 21: 7 34:23 15:17 18:9,11,23 20:11,13 29:24
base 52:22 5:2,6,7,9,10,12 bunch 4:22 21:24 30:19 38:6
based 8:18 46:16 basically 22:2 6:18 7:19,21 9:3,10,19 11:20 12:21 13:6 burden 8:19 busy 48:4 42:10 44:4 claimant
15:6,8,12,16

30:1 31:10 32:6 17:1,11 19:9,11 but 33:5 22:6,25 32:11
35:14 38:19 20:6,19 21:3,5,11,13 buy 48:18 claimed 16: 20

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA
561/833.7811

Page 3 of 11

claims 13:5 30:4 confidentiality 11:1,18 31:7,10 34:1
classes 15: 11 clear 7:23 31:24 26:17 confirm 51:1 13:1,2,22 14:6,12,21 15:1,22 37:25 39:20,21,23 41:18 42:17,18
37:9 42:13 conflict 27:13,17 16:8,9,13,20 45:15
Clematis 2:14 client 4:9 11:7 13:23 25:13 29:22 30:2,B consider 28:3 40:15 17:2,6,9,14,20, 23 18:6,12,19,22
19:2,8,15,19 current 10:13 currently 6:6
49:15 clients 18:14 19:6 35:9 client's 34:23 COLIN 1: 9 3 : 4 54:8 considered 41:4 considering 25:7 consisting 54:5
contest 46:11 contingent 11:16 20:4,14,17 21:1,13,18 22:4,8,9,13 23:7,13,15,20 24:1,10,13 25:22 26:2,12,14,25 D date
1:12 50:19 Dated 54:17 David 19:12 27:7,19
comes 17:7 27:23 33:1 comfortable 32:12 continue 40:3 contract 30:19 37:16 27:5 28:12,21 29:11,15 30:5,15 31:13
32:9,14 day 3:7 54:17 days 49:23 deal 33:12 34:6
39:5 coming 26:1 35:13 cononent 2 3: B control 34:3 38:21 54:16 conversations 38:25 33:8,12,16,21 34:15,25
35:4,18,20 36:10,24 dealing 6:24 28:7 deals 46:7 death 6:9
communication 4:B 51:2 convinced 32: 20 38:5,13,16,17,2 3 39:10,16,19 deceased 6:8,18
companies 36:3 company 6:17 7:18 8:4,7,23 11:12,14,19,24 copies 40:19 copy 7:13 8:17 9:5 46:25 48:20 50:8,9
40:8,19 41:6,14,21,24 42:8,12,20 43:1,3,13,24,25 44:7,14 decide 13:3,4 decision 30:18 36:16 declared 22:7
17:12 18:1,4,6 20:10,12 correct 17:8 23:18 24:9 45:2,B,23 46:5,13,21,24 deep 49:12
company's 21: 9 47:11 49:14,19,20 47:8,14,19,22,2 4 default 35:24 36:5
competing 13: 5 19:22 21:25 34:7 54:6 correcting 18:3 48:8,12,15,17,2 1,25 49:3,6,11,21 defendant 20:20,23
complain 35: 11 43:12 complexed 37: 22 corrective 51:7 cost 26:10 29:4 31:4 50:6,12,14,19 51:8,10,15,19,2 1,25
52:9,17,23 53:2,6 54:1 defending 29:23 delete 4:12 50:25 deletion 51:1
comply 4:20 47:21 51:6 counsel 5:1 19:15 29:5,8 31:12 33:13 34:17 courthouse 3 : 5 52:24 Delray 3: 6 demarcation
39:11
computer 3:11 36:7,8,25 craft 46: 6 denied 13: 15
11:22,23 21:9 concern 12:15 13:17 38:18 42:25 38:2,3,11 40:14 41:3 42:11 43:8 54:10,12 counsel 1 s 29: 7 crazy 41:
15 creditor 10:10 14:15 15:7 16:16 15:21,22,25 16:2,7 20:13 43:24 deposited 13:1
concerned 40: 25 42:22 concerning 6 : 21 concerns 26:18 counterclaim 18:2 County 1:1 3:5,6 couple 16:5 33:24 42:15
creditors 10: 20 creek 27:24 cross 30:4 39:12 described 32:6 despite 8: 11 destroy 52:2
42:15 46:9 conclude 40:2,3 concluded 53: 9 conduit 42:9 course 10:18 court 1:1 3:10,23 4:3,20,25 5:8,11,14,18,19
6:2,22,25 7:5 cross-defendants 21:25 cross-plaintiff 20:18 21:21 curator 2:16 3:21 determine 13:12 23:16 29:13 34:16
37:20 determined 24:8 dialogue 53:7
confidential 8:3 9:1,3,6 10:2,19 different 12:7
23:11 10:4,15,22 27:14,25 29:19 21:4 28:5,7,8

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA
561/833.7811

Page 4 of 11

32: 18 33: 23 45:3 direct 54:16 direction 29:10 38:3 54:16 directions 28:5 directly 4:9 42:18 54:12 disclosed 50:1 52:5,7
disclosure 49:17,24 discovering 49:24 discovery 30:16 discretion 38:4 discuss 39:2,6 discussed 4:14 discussion 30:24
38:10 41:10 discussions 11:6 dispositive 28:24 dispute 11: 11 30:12 dissolved 11: 15 distinction 15:7 distribution 6:21
District 28:16,18 docket 28:23 29:1 document 4:16 9:1 12:8 documentation 8:8 documents 6:13 12:13 31:23 37:1,2 39:1
dollar 35: 12 done 48:7 49:12 Draft 44:9 Drive 2:10,10 due 24:17 51:4 duties 31:7,10 duty 10:20 27:19 32:24 E easily
32:7 economic 16:21 effect 14:5 effectively 31:11 eight 15:11 either 14:11 26:25 31:24 Eliot 2:21 3:13 4:7,10,11,14,24
5:6,9 13;6,8 18:10,12 20:2,4,17 21:21,22 22:2 23 :21 25:6,7,8,23 30: 24 36: 14 44:19 45:13 46:8 47:4,7,8,10,15 51:11
else 23:15 24:24 31:17,18,24 38:24 44:11 51:24 52:4 elsewhere 31: 9 email 4:5,6,10,11,21 5:1,2,3 27:8 41:14 44:24
47:1,2,13,25 48:9,12,20 49:8 50:16,22,24,25 51:2,4,8,17,18, 19 emailed 4:16 50:5 emails 31:16 41:13 44:20 48:14
employee 54:10,11 enforceable 44:2 entered 28:23 entities 21:24 entitle 16:17 entitled 51:3 entity 21:2 37:11 49:23

entry 28 :23 especially 30:9 31:3 ESQ 2:4,9,13,17 establish 8:16 estate 1:6 3:22 5:21 6:4,5,12,19,25 7:7,8,25
8:1,5,11,12,13, 23 9:12,20 10:1,10,11,12,1 3,17,18,21 11:5 12:14,16,18,22, 24 13:9,19,20 14:3,8,16,18,23 15:14
16:23,24 17:7 18:11 20:3 23:1,17,25 24:3 25:6,10,11,20 26:1 27:10,12,14,17 29:23 31:1 32:23 33:2,6 34:9
35:5,7,13,23,24 36:8,14,17,18,2 2 39:17,22,25 40:13 41:20 43:11 44:3 45:14,22 estate*s 7:1 32:15,17 eventually 30: 2
everybody 24: 18 41:13 53:1 everyone 24:11,15 34:19 49:11 everyone*s 34:7 everything 5:13 7:7 32:20 39:24 evidence
11:8,9 12:3,10,12 13:12 24:5 30:17 31:25 36:21 evidentiary 10:25 exact 13:6 Exactly 46: 13 example 16: 16 36:1 39:24
41:8 44:5 exception 27:2,3 52:9 exist 12:5,11 14:25 26:18 37:15,17 40:11 exists 37: 12 exotic 37:6 expand 31:7
expended 13 : 2 o expense 13: 18 38:9 40:23 41:1 expenses 22:19 expensive 42:24 experience 28:17 extensive 16: 10
extent 14:16 39:4 F face 31:24 fact 7:15 8:11 12:11 15:13 16:13 23:10 35:23 facts 11:8 fail 51:6 fair 14:18 34:8 faith
32:24 40:16 fashion 9:6 father 27: 21 favor 16:15 Feaman 2:4,5 3:14 5:19,20 10:9 13:22 17:6,17,21 19:18
23:10,14,19,24 24:9,12 25:13,17,25 26:6,13 28:19,22 29:14 31:17 38:13,15,18 39:8,13,18 40:7,17,25 42:4 43:25
Feaman*s 43:16 federal 7:4 12:6 28:15 fee 14:19 fees 10:13,16 12:19,20 13:23 14:11 15:5 31:4 34:3,9,11,23 35:16 38:2
42:17,18 fence 19: 3 fide 39: 25 fiduciary 27:19 FIFTEENTH 1:l fight 11:10 12:17 figured 20:22 file 46: 25 filed 11:17
16:3 18:1 21:7 28:25 filing 6: 14 filter 34: 16 final 14:14

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA
561/833.7811

Page 5 of 11

finally 10: 14 18:15,21 27:21 hire 22:20 31:14 4:12,24 50:25
financially 54:12 finding 43:14 Fine 5:17 finger 30: 3 finger-pointing 31:21 first 7:2,16 8:4,20 15:3 18:19 26:22 47:13
five 17:18 FL 2:6,10,14,18 34:21 35:9 granted 18: 4 guy 43:2 guys 41:14 H handed 20: 21 handled 42: 13 happen 52:
13 happened 4 9 : 19 happens 37:16 41:11 32:4 38:1 42:23 43:5 45:5 hires 43:7 history 4 : 1 7 hold 14:8 16:8 21:1 43:1
45:11 honestly 19:4 Honor 5:20,24 6:15,22 7:3,7,24 8:25 9:10,12,19 10:2,7 16:6 20:7,24 26:22 28:4 29:2,9,16
impleaded 8 : 9 impleading 19:19 important 4:1 41:1 45:13 inadvertent 49:17,24 52:11 incentive 9: 19 included 12:22
includes 33:7 including 31: 17 45:4 inclusive 54:6
Flagler 2:10,1a hard 30:5 32:5 33:4,18 indemnification
Florida 1: 1 3: 7 28:17 forced 51:7 foregoing 54: 4 forensic 45:5 form 30:12 harmless 14:9 haven't 14:4 19:4,7 20:22
34:2 38:10 49:1,4 51:14,18 having 15: 16 24:18 25:7 38:16 41:16 44:12 47:23 52:20 Honorable 1:9 3:4 54:7 hourly 41:
24 hovering 25:1 12:19 indemnify 14 : 8 23: 3 independent 22:20 indicate 16: 6 indirectly 54:13
former 7:6 8:6 33:8,10 34:22 hypothetically individual
formerly 8:22 heading 30:10 32:18 21:13,16
forms 11:25 37:3,4 frankly 28:4,9 fraudulent 20:11 free 30:7 hear 10:4 14:21 24:24 31:16 38:7 heard 14:4 24:18 50:11
hearing 10: 25 I I'd 4:20 14:21 38:7 ID 12:5,6 I'll 23:15 31:6 individually 16:2 21:19,22 24:2 25:9 30:24 information
4:19 15:9,14,18 23:11 34:17 41: 4
Friday 3: 7 friends 48: 2 front 29:21 31:4 24:6 29:17,18 30: 14 36: 13 41:8 53:8,9 42:10 46:6 52:8,15,25 Illinois 6: 7
inherit 9: 23 inherited 9:20
39:12 hears 36: 15 7:5,22 8:3 9:22 initially 26: 10
fund 22: 18 25:18, 19 26:10 37:15 He'd 14:7 he'll 13:25 34:8,15 12:10,17,25 13:3 15:12 19:14,15 22:1 24:4 27:11
input 26:11,14 38:22 instance 44:23
funded 25:13 help 29:7 41:5 28:18 30:11 instances 29:25
funding 23:2 38:19 hereby 54:3 Heritage 7: 17 34:13,24 35:25 36:2,5,6 38:1,3 42:11,19 49:8 institutions 45:7
funds 8:9 13:19,21 14:1 18:5 19:20 20:2 37:19 40:13 43: 19 he's 4:17 15:6 110,11,20 21:16 25:8,9,18,22 26:16 30:24
32:9,11,16 I'm 10:6 14:12 18:25 20:23,24 21:1,18 24:5,13 25:6 26:4,23,25 27:24 28:13,14 30:9,22 instruct 4:20
instructions 21:8 44:13 45:1,10 instrument a: 16 insurance
G 34:9,10,12 32:12,25 33:8 6:7,15,17,19
gets 50:14 38:8,23 39:22 35:8 39:10,13 7:9,11,12,13,16
given 27:7 34:7 42:22 43:2,3,5 47:21 51:16 40:25 41:6 42:22 43:13,14 ,17,21,24 8:4,7,20,23,24
gone 13:14 20:7 grandchildren 2:12 3:18 9:13,17,24 17:5 hey 41:3 high 8:14,19 higher 43: 5 44:20 47:19 48:22 49:14
50:9,10 53:6 immediately 9:5,8,21,24 11:5,10,12,18,2 1,24 12:2,4 13:10 16:25

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA
561/833.7811

17:11,12,25 18:1,4,6 20:9,11,12 21:9,11 30:13 32:22 36:3 37:4,14,19 45:10 integrity 22:23 intended 48: 10 50:22
interest 7:1 16:21 18:15 23:17 24:3 25:11,24 27:13,18 30:2,8 32:16,17 34:7 39:4,25 interested 5:21 45:21 46:15 54:12
interesting 6:13 Interestingly 8:19 9:10 interests 20:25 25:23,25 interim 27:25 internal 6:16 internet 4:18 interpleaded
18:2 interpleader 18:5 interrupt 10:8 intervene 7: 4 10:11 13:14,16 15:12 16:1,18 20:5 22:9 23:16 24:20 33:15 36:25
intervening 14:10 15: 19 31: 12 intervention 15:20 16:12,13 25:19 interventions 24:23 investigate 46:14 investigating
45:18 investigation 11:7 invoices 44:5 involved 6 : 12 28:9 involving 6: 7 irrevocable 7:21 11:20 12:1 13:9 17:11 19:9
21:5,11,20,23 22:1 25:2 30:21 32:22 37:10 40:9 isn't 31:21 32:1 issue 4:1,14 12:9,17 13:2,10 23: 18 24: 10 26:23
27:6,22 29:19 31:21 34:7,18 37:7,12 38:1 44:14 46:20,21 issues 22:22 26:17 it*s 4:18,19 1:20 8:17 9:9,12 11:1 12:22,23
14:18 21:6 23:22 27:22 30:5,7 31:9,24 34: 18 35 :21 36:1,3 37:5,6,9 39:5,14 40:4,15 42:13 43:17 44:21 45:12 47:6
48:24 53:4 I've 6:14 16:3 20:19 27:7,17,18 28:2 44:25 J Jeff 3:15 JEFFREY 2:4 jewelry 33:7 job 34:5 John 2:13 3:17
joined 17:18,19 judge 13:3,15 24:5 28:23 29:21 30:17 31:23 36:15 37:13 judgment 13:11 15:10 16:15 44:3 JUDICIAL
1:1 Julie 54:3,19 July 28:25 jumping 6: 23 34:19 jurisdiction 9:25 justify 8: 8 L LaSalle 7 : 18 last 4:2 15:3 20:21 36:9
37:22 47:5 50:4,5 51:17 latest 30:10 latter 23:8 law 36:11 37:16 45:24 52:16 lawsuit 9:7 14:17 16:16,18,23 17:24
lawyer 5:11 19:17 22:20 25:20 31:14,15 32:3,21 33:16 34:10,12 38:25 40:22 42:23,24 43:4,7 44:6 lawyered 25:3
lawyers 12:7 34:4 40:4 48:3 lawyer's 41:21 lead 45:16 least 7:4 43:23 leave 52 :23 leaves 9: 15 legal 16:10 32:2 less 40:
25 let's 22:19 26:25 36:12 letter 48:1 letters 49:9 level 37:18 levels 22:25 life 6:7,8 7:9,10,12,13,15 ,24 9:21,24 11:20
12:2 13:10 16:25 17:12 21:11 30:13 37:4,13,18 45:10 Likewise 3 6 : 7 limited 13: 21 27:25 45:14 line 39:11 lines 44:9
liquid 8:1 9:16 listed 12:1 litem 5:23 6:3 7:4 13:24 22:7,16 27:10 28:14 44:18 litigated 17:10 litigation 6:6,10,21 B:IO
23:2 24:4,17 29:20 31:20 32:1,19 37:6 52:13 little 43:5 48:5 LLP 2:17 logical 30: 9 long 28:15 lose 24:25 losing 14:11
lost 8:16 20:16 lot 23:5 28:5,6 33:5 34:1 44:19,20 45:19 52:14,21 M main 10: 10 13: 17 42:25 manner 32: 18 married
19: 12 marshal 10:20 marshaled 7: 2 marshaling 10:17 MARTIN 1 : 9 3 : 4 54:7 mashugana 2 o : 15 materials 4:13
49:17 50:1 52:7 matter 36:11 42:19 52:12 matters 26:13 MATWICZYK 2:17 may 1:12 3:7 5:19 15:1,5,13,15 17:7
18:15 22:9,10 24:2 25:5 26:3 30:25 36:24 37:9,12 39:25 40:11 41:4 46:15,19,23

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA
561/833.7811

22:20
50:18,21 54:8,17 maybe 16:16 mean 12:23 30:13 33: 24 34: 1 36:11,21 37:1 39:3 43:15 meaning 14:2 means 12:22
54:15 media 53:5 mention 44:10 merely 16: 21 merit 11:6 12:18 24:25 40:5,6 micromanage 41:6 mid-July 28: 25
million 6 : 9 14 : 2 48:14 minor 42:15 misrepresents 5: 12 missed 22: 12 mission 27 :24 mistake 47:5,16 50:24 money
7:8 8:2 13:8 14:17 17:7 18:24 19:14,23 23:17 26:1 28:7 52:14 monies 18:16 morning 3:10 4:15 47:17 Morrissey 2:13
3:17 15:2,3 16:1,9 17:2,4,8,13 18:17,20,25 19:4 22:14 31:18 34:20 35:2,17,19,22 36:20 Morrissey*s 18:13 motion 6:15
10:5,7 44:18,25 45:1,8,9 46:7,B motions 11:18 28:24 44:12 move 26:3 28:15 MRACHEK 2:9 multilevel 40:8 multiple
22:25 29 :25 N N.A 21:4 narrow 24: 10 30:14 34:18 37:7 National 7: 18 necessarily 38:11 44:22 45:12 negotiate 15:16
neutral 23:4 25:14 26:3 32:15 neutrality 33:1 news 40:1 night 4:2 47:5 50:4,5 nobody 7:11,12 12:8 nor 17:1
54:11Northern 28:18 notes 22:12 nothing 42:3,4 52:17 notice 49:25 50:2,7,8,10,14, 15,20 notification 28:22 notify
52:4,25 numerous 12 : 6 0 oath 38:8 43:23 object 46: 2 objecting 39: 13 45:17 objection 10: 2 objections 46:1 obligated
47:21 obtained 6 : 14 obviously 24: 4 39:3 office 3: 15 officer 38:16 43:25 Oh 33:10 okay 17:23 19:15 27:5 28:12,21
29:15 32:13 33:11 34:18 35:21 38:17 43:13 46:4,21,22 48:17,23,25 49:3,6 51:10,15,20,21, 25 52:25 open 51:19 opening
11:1 22:12 opposition 16:4 oral 8:18 order 16:3,4,5,11 20:14,22 42:2 44:9 46:6 49:21 53:8 original 7: 12 8:17 18:8
others 8:6 owned 6:17 12:21,23 owner 8: 11 p P.A 2:5,13 p.m 50:21,24 page 2:9 37:5 pages 37:2 54:5 paid 38:4 41:23
Palm 1 :1 2:10,14,18 3:4,6 Pam 19:13 parol 11: 9 12: 12 13:12 31:25 participate 36:18 47 :20 particularity 50:2 parties
16:15 19:22,25 22:1 28:2,8 30:19 46:1,15 54:11 party 12:20 16:23 30:23 31:11,13 32:10 36:6 49:22 50:1 passionate
45:21 past 27:1 pay 8:6 22:18 32:7 33:9 34:22 41:19 42:17 43:10 44:3,5 payable 41: 20 paying 44:6 payment 10:13
pays 33:17 pending 6:6,10 8:10 pension 11: 14 people 4:16 8:18 11:8 15:11 18:8 21:24 28:8 29:25 35:10 47:18 48:4,5,6
49:8,9 52:21 perfect 26:19 performed 35:7 perhaps 24: 15 50:10 permissive 16:12 permitted 22: 8 person 5:21 23:1,4,21
25:4,19 32:15 34:6 39:15,16 43:10 47:9 49:18,22 personal 7:6 8:5,22 10:19 25:23 28:1,3,6,11 32:1 33:19 perspective
34:23 Peter 2:4,5 3:14 5:20 petition 5:22,25 21:8 29:12 phone 41:2,13 42:6 phones 31:16 phonetic B: 21 11:3 pick 29:5
33:16 41:2 piece 12:2 plaintiff 17:10 20:20 plaintiffs 9:7 17:15,19 plan 11: 14 plans 47:18

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA

Page 8 of 11

please 5:19 50:25 privileged 42:8 47:1 remaining 12:16
 pledge 43: 20 pockets 34:23 point 6:23 14:14 4:8,13,19 49:17 52' 11 privy 15:8,9,13,15,17 questions 44:22 45:4
 quickly 28: 16 remember 5:16 33:8 REMEMBERED 3 : 2
 15:4 18:13 19:7 23' 11 quite 19:4 20:22 reminded 22:15
 27:1 28:2 40:23 pro 2:20 3:13 remote 16: 22
 pointing 30:3 18:12 23:22 R replied 4: 6
 policy 6:7,16,20 7:9 8:12 11:5 11:10 12:21,25 13:13 20:8 24:7,16 27:16 30:13,20 31:22 37:8,14 position 10:5,6,22,24 11:2
 13:7 14:13 16:19 probability 8:14 probably 18: 2 34:12 probate 12: 23 20:13 problem 7: 11 24:20 procedure 46:17
 50:3 race 13:5 rarely 24:19 rate 41:18,22,24 43:4 rather 22:24 23:4 RE 1:6 reading 21:1,18 47:1 51:1 real 38: 21 44: a
 reply 4:21 reporter 54:1,16 represent 14:7 17:2,4 23:25 25:10 38:14 representation 14:6 representative 8:22 10:19
 18:14,17,20 25:2 26:4 45:24 49:16 proceed 29:9 proceedings 1:9 3:3 54:4,7 really 10:8 13:17 16:18 28:10 34:4,5 36:11
 28:1,3,6,11 30:22 33:19 representatives
 possess 51:4 proceeds 6:20,22 37:6,11 7:6 8:5
 possible 36:3 7:25 9:21,23 reason 15 : 2 5 represented
 posted 53:4 12:25 13:5 17:1 18:9 39:20 8:13,23 19:10,16 21:17
 posting 4:17 process 24:17 reasonable 43: 4 52:6 35:25
 potential 14:15 38:22 representing
 potentially 35: 2 promised 27: 7 reasonableness 34:2 17:20 20:24 21:14 25:10
 pour-over 9: 14 proposal 25: 12 reasons 33:24 38:15
 pours 27:14 propose 42: 1 receive 9: 23 represents 24:1
 PR 29:13,19 proposing 20:15 received 50:22 44:1
 31:1,2 33:22 practical 43: 2 protected 25: 21 51:3 recent 21:7 reproduction 54:15
 precious 12:16 prove 14 :22 recently 6:14 recipient 48:11 request 4: 2 o 29:18 43:24
 premature 44:8 prepared 49:1 present 30:17 provided 14: 22 52:11 provision 9: 15 recognize 18:13 record 11:13 19:1
 51:6 requested 5:25 8:4
 36:22 PRs 11:4 records 6:16 7:14 requests 44:20
 presently 8:2 publicizing 47:18 recovery 13: 25 35:5,14,15 require 13: 11
 preserve 2 6 : 1 7 purify 30: 5 references 12:7 required 2 3: 3
 preserving 22:22,23 purported 21: 20 30:8 regard 26: 8,23 46:7 residual 9: 13 resolved 12:9
 pretty 10: 24 23' 22 28' 16 42:13 48:9 purpose 6:4 30:23 purposes 16:22 22:8 registry 8:3 18:6 reimbursed 10:16 resort
 36:9 respect 45:15
 prevailing 12:20 pursuant 49:13 reimbursement respond 34 : 2 o
 primarily 33:2 prior 11:4,13 pursue 13: 20 38:6 related 42:18 result 9:14 14:10 40:12
 privilege 22:22
 relative 54:9,11 retain 42:3
 26:23,24 27:4 question 18:19 :relief 6: 1 retained 33:14
 46:19,21 49:22,25 19:5,7 22:6 28:20 29:12 rely 42:11 retaining 43:10

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA

561/833.7811

Page 9 of 11

38:5

retrieve 52:7 seeing 7:1 situation 30:7 39:8,14,21
 return 4:12 52:2 seek 13:23 49:12 41:18,23 42:16
 review 29: 6 revocable 27:15,16 35:15,17 seem 10:9,16 30:20 42:2 so-called 8: 20 9:8 social 53: 5 43:23 44:4
 Stansbury's 5:216:20 29:24 31:12 43:8,19 2
 ridiculous 36:17 Robert 20: 10 rocket 29:1 seems 25:4 28:14 31:20 48:9 seen 51:14,18 send 47:11 51:23 sole 6: 4
 solely 50:23 somebody 11: 22 17:21 22:17 Star 37:14 started 17:25 starts 48:13
 role 13:23 46:11 room 30:1 Rose 2:9 3:19,25 sending 48:4,20 49:8 sends 44:19 somehow 20:19 someone 18:3 23:15
 state 3: 6 30: 15 36:4,6 statements 45: 6

4:4 5:17 10:23,24 11:3 13:4 14:4,7,14,24 17: 24 19: 24 21:6,15 22:3,11,14 31:18 37:23 38:7 42:15,22 43:2,7,22 44:2
46:19,23,25 sense 23:6 31:19 37:24 38:11 sensitive 4:19 sent 4:5,11 27:8 44:24 47:4,9,17,25 48:2,3,9 50:16,23,24
51:8,11,16 24:2,20,24 25:1,7,10,13,14 26:2 37:13 40:9 somewhere 37:19 sort 4:1 sought 15: 20 sound 37:21 sounded
26:18 statute 14: 22 35:7 38:6 statutes 46:17 steal 20:8 step 7:2 37:20,21 steps 52:6 stick 31:19 stop 10:4 45:23
47:11,16 separate 37:12,25 sounds 28:25 30:9 48 :21
48:14,24 49:13,20 50:4,9,13,17,21 42:20 serve 49:24 31:5 Southern 28:16 stopped 4 8 : 7 stranger 24:21,22
52:18 53:4 Royer 2: 4 3: 16 several 49:7,9 sheets 42:21 Spallina 8: 21 11:3 20:10 44:24 45:17 strategies 32:2
strategize 29:8
rule 4: 10,21 16:22 44:7 46:1 shorthand 11:21,25 Spangled 37:14 Street 2:14
48:22 49:13 shorthanded 11 : 2 2 speak 41:2 stuck 44:6
50:12,15 21:9 speaking 16 : 11 stuff 40:16 48:2
51:10,11,21 52:12 53:2,3 rules 46:17 47:22 49:5 showed 20: 20 shy 40:6 sign 37:4 48:21 specify 50: 2 spend 12:15
28:6 52:13 style 17:14 18:8 21:2 subject 12:18 18:3 33:19
ruling 46: 10 Signed 51:8 spends 37: 25 submitted 5:24
run 28:15 34:9,10 signing 53:7 spent 13:18 20:10
running 2 9 : 4 s satisfy 15:17 Simon 1:6 6:8,18 7:19,20 9:9,18 11:20 12:21 17:11 19:9,11,12,13,1 squarely 27:3 stage
33:22 stand 19:2 subparts 45:4 Subsection 49:151:12 subsequently 5
scared 48:5 8 21:3,5,11,17 standard 16:10 17:17
scheduled 5:15 25:2 27:7,19 30:21,22 32:22 standing 15: 23 succeed 9 : 21
scheme 20: 15 Simon's 27: 20 stands 19:13 succeeds 10: 14
school 38:10 Se 2:20 3:13 18:12 23:22 simple 10:24 simplest 30:11 Stansbury 2:3 3:15 5:21 6:3 13:7,14 14:15 15:4
16:19,24 success 8: 14 successor 9:4 sued 20:6
second 7:18 27:6 48:22 sincerity 43: 16 single 37: 7 22:17,18,24 23:5,10 25:17 suggest 25:4
seconds 4: 4 sections 16:5 sir 42:14 49:20 50:18 sister 19:13 26:8 27:9 29:3,20 31:3 32:7 33:9,11 35:6 38:4,8,19 suit
21:14 Suite 2:5,14,18 summary 13: 11

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA
561/833.7811

9:1
7:20
Page 10 of 11

supplement 5:25 38:5 40:1,2 trust
support 11: 9 supporting 12: 3 supposed 27:24,25 41:19 47:14 51:13 52:1,2,3 41:16 42:20,24 43:4 45:10,19,24 46:18
52:3 therefore 6: 25 therefrom 6: 2 o 7:11,12,14,16,1 8,19,21 8:21,25 9:5,6,8,16,17 11:21 12:2,4,8,11 13:10 17:1,11,25
w waive 18:22,23,219:5 War 27:23 wasn't 36: 6 5
sure 13:19 14:12 22:13 24:14 25:20 26:12 35:20 39:15 40:17,18 42:21 47:19 52:19 there's 5:15 7:23 11:11,16,21 12:6
14:9 15:7 22:11 24:25 27:25 28:19,22 31:1,2 32:11,12 19:9,21 20:16 21:3,5,10,12,20 ,23 22:1 25:3 27:15,16 30:21,23
32:23 36:13 37:10 wasting 27: 12 week 20:21 weeks 20: 21 we 1 ll 5:14,16 51:6
system 11: 22 33:5,22 40:10 we're 3:11 6:2,24
22:23 35:12,13 36:4,12 trustee 8:24 9:4 21:20,23 23:13 29:1 31:25 34:21
T taker 35:24 38:19,20 39:11,22 40:8 42:3,4,8 43:14 try 8:15 10:10,20 20:8 46:6 West 2:10,14,18 3:5
36:5,9,10 45:25 46:1 trying 27:9 46:11 whatever 5:6
taking 10:6 49:16 50:3 47:11 50:9,10 32:23 33:19
33:20,22 52: 17 twofold 13:17 34: 16 52: 15, 16
talk 36:1 38:9 talking 34: 22 they'll 37:10 39:6 type 24:4 32:1 38:20 Whereupon 53:9 whether 23: 16
37:1 tax 12:5,6 they're 8:15 9:2 12: 15 20: 1 21:19 24:21 types 30:15 37:11 Whoever 2 B : 5
taxable 12:22 25:3 36:9,10 u whoever's 48: 16
technically 17:24 39:5 43:20 52:5 ultimately 24:15 whole 50:11
19:25 23:21 Ted 2: 8 3: 19 4:5,9 5:6,9 9:3 They've 12:25 43: 19 third 23:4 27:22 33:21 underpinnings 45:18 whom
9:25 50:1 whomever 29:5
21:13,22 29:22 47:4 50:22 Ted's 51:17,18 temporary 27: 24 third-party 45:7 thorough 45:13 thousands 49:10
understand 32:5 33:4 37:23 43:22 52:18 understanding who's 31:11 wife 48:7 William 2:3 3:15 5:20

ten 9:12,17,24 thread 27:8 18:3 willing 25:18
testamentary 27:2,3 threatening 5: 5 48:2,6,9 undertake 38:9 unless 13:24 26:16 31:3,8 38:8
testimony 8: 18 14:4 Tetra 11:3 44:24 45:17 today 3: 24 29:14,15 41:7 44:11 50:11 tonight 50:25 24:20,25 35:13 54:15
usual 5:4 win 14:17 24:25 wit 3 :8 work 8 : 2 5 9 : 2 29:5 31:16,17
Thank 51:5 53:8 top 47:3 v 46:2,5
that's 5:5 6:23 touched 22:14 validity 46: 9 worked 33: 25
7:5 11:15,17,25 tough 23: 23 versus 29:19 working 38:1
12:8,9 14:6 17: 14 19: 18 21:18,21 23:8,18,24 24:7,9,17 transcript 54:4,6 transmission 51:5 treating 30: 22 Vietnam
27:23 view 18:14 23:2 27:4 40:24 45:14 works 33:25 worried 43:13 worth 33: 6
25:6,18 trial 13:12 voice 24:16,22 wound 35: 12
26:3,6,9 29:17 tried 33:14 30:25 31:5 written 49: 25
30:13,14 31:19,21 32:25 33:3 35:11 36:17 37:5,19 tries 23:22 true 22:5 41:16 54:6 volunteering 26:9 vs 17:11 21:22
50:7 wrong 42:3,4 49:14

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA
561/833.7811

Page 11 of 11
y yet 9:5 14:5,13 51:14 You'll 40:19,20

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA
561/833.7811