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

IN RE: THE ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN

-----/

## PROCEEDINGS BEFORE HONORABLE MARTIN COLIN

DATE: MAY 23, 2014

TIME: 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

		2		
1	APPEARANCES:	1	one sort of an important issue that came up	
2		2	last night.	
	APPEARING ON BEHALF OF WILLIAM STANSBURY:	3	THE COURT: Go ahead.	
4	MR. PETER M. FEAMAN, ESQ. MR. JEFFREY T. ROYER, ESQ.	4	MR. ROSE: It will take 30 seconds.	
5	PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A.	5	Ted Bernstein sent me an email. And he	
	3695 W. Boynton Beach Blvd., Suite 9	6	replied to an email, and accidently the email	
6	Boynton Beach, FL 33436	7	went to Eliot Bernstein. It was	
	APPEARING OF BEHALF OF TED BERNSTEIN:	8	attorney-client privileged communication	
	MR. ALAN ROSE, ESQ.	9	directly to me from my client Ted Bernstein.	
10	PAGE MRACHEK	10	The email went to Eliot Bernstein. Under Rule	
	505 S. Flagler Drive West Palm Beach, FL 33401	11	1.285 I sent to Mr. Eliot Bernstein an email	
11		12	immediately asking him to delete or return the	
12	APPEARING ON BEHALF OF FOUR ADULT	13	privileged materials.	
13	GRANDCHILDREN: JOHN P. MORRISSEY, ESQ.	14	I discussed the issue with Mr. Eliot	
	JOHN P. MORRISSEY, P.A.	15		
14	330 Clematis Street, Suite 213	16	Bernstein this morning and he advised me that he has emailed the document to 2,000 people.	
15	West Palm Beach, FL 33401	17	He's had a history of posting things on	
	APPEARING AS THE CURATOR:	18		
	BENJAMIN BROWN, ESQ.		the internet. Because it's attorney-client	
10	MATWICZYK & BROWN, LLP	19	privileged information it's very sensitive and	
18	625 N. Flagler Drive, Suite 401 West Palm Beach, FL 33401	20 21	I'd request the Court to instruct him to comply	
19			with Rule 1.285. It was a reply to an email	
	APPEARING PRO SE:	22	that had a bunch of names and accidentally it	
21 22	ELIOT BERNSTEIN	23	went to him. Mr. Bernstein advised me	
23		24 25	immediately and I advised Eliot immediately.	
24 25		25	THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein, did you get an	
25				
		3		
1		3	email from counsel?	
1	BE IT REMEMBERED, that the following	-	email from counsel? MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email.	
	BE IT REMEMBERED, that the following proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause	1		
2	-	1 2	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email.	
2 3 4	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause	1 2 3	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me	
2 3 4	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach	1 2 3 4	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something	
2 3 4 5 6	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the	1 2 3 4 5	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or	
2 3 4 5 6 7	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of	1 2 3 4 5 6	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot	
2 3 4 5 6 7	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se. MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything. THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se. MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything. THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end. There's other things scheduled. If you	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se. MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff Royer.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything. THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end. There's other things scheduled. If you remember, we'll take it up.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se. MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff Royer. MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey on behalf	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything. THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end. There's other things scheduled. If you remember, we'll take it up. MR. ROSE: Fine.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se. MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff Royer. MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey on behalf of four of the adult grandchildren.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything. THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end. There's other things scheduled. If you remember, we'll take it up. MR. ROSE: Fine. THE COURT: Go ahead.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se. MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff Royer. MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey on behalf of four of the adult grandchildren. MR. ROSE: Alan Rose on behalf of Ted	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything. THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end. There's other things scheduled. If you remember, we'll take it up. MR. ROSE: Fine. THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. FEAMAN: May it please the Court.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se. MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff Royer. MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey on behalf of four of the adult grandchildren. MR. ROSE: Alan Rose on behalf of Ted Bernstein.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything. THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end. There's other things scheduled. If you remember, we'll take it up. MR. ROSE: Fine. THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. FEAMAN: May it please the Court. Peter Feaman, Your Honor, on behalf of William	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se. MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff Royer. MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey on behalf of four of the adult grandchildren. MR. ROSE: Alan Rose on behalf of Ted Bernstein. MR. BROWN: Ben Brown as curator of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything. THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end. There's other things scheduled. If you remember, we'll take it up. MR. ROSE: Fine. THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. FEAMAN: May it please the Court. Peter Feaman, Your Honor, on behalf of William Stansbury, interested person in the estate.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se. MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff Royer. MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey on behalf of four of the adult grandchildren. MR. ROSE: Alan Rose on behalf of Ted Bernstein. MR. BROWN: Ben Brown as curator of the estate.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything. THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end. There's other things scheduled. If you remember, we'll take it up. MR. ROSE: Fine. THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. FEAMAN: May it please the Court. Peter Feaman, Your Honor, on behalf of William Stansbury, interested person in the estate. This is Mr. Stansbury's petition for the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit: THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances. MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se. MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff Royer. MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey on behalf of four of the adult grandchildren. MR. ROSE: Alan Rose on behalf of Ted Bernstein. MR. BROWN: Ben Brown as curator of the estate. THE COURT: All right. What do we have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email. I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: It was from MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein. THE COURT: Not from the lawyer? MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents everything. THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end. There's other things scheduled. If you remember, we'll take it up. MR. ROSE: Fine. THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. FEAMAN: May it please the Court. Peter Feaman, Your Honor, on behalf of William Stansbury, interested person in the estate. This is Mr. Stansbury's petition for the appointment of an administrator ad litem which	

I

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

4

5

		6	
1	relief.	1	asset, or liquid assets for the estate. Now
2	We're asking this Court to appoint	2	that money presently has been put into the
3	Mr. Stansbury as an administrator ad litem of	3	registry of the court up in Illinois by the
4	the estate for the sole purpose of making an	4	insurance company. They were first requested
5	appearance on behalf of the estate in some	5	by the personal representatives of this estate,
6	litigation that is currently pending in	6	the former, to pay it to others. And the
7	Illinois involving a life insurance policy on	7	insurance company said we don't have any
8	Simon Bernstein's life, the deceased, with a	8	documentation to justify that. So they just
9	death benefit of \$1.7 million.	9	impleaded the funds.
10	That litigation has been pending for over	10	The litigation has been pending, and
11	a year from what I can tell, or about a year.	11	despite the fact that the estate is the owner
12	And it has not involved the estate which is	12	of the policy, the estate has never been
13	very interesting because the documents that	13	represented in that action. Now the estate has
14	I've recently obtained since the filing of our	14	a high probability of success, we believe, in
15	motion, Your Honor, we found out that insurance	15	this case. Because if they're going to try to
16	policy, according to internal records of the	16	establish a lost instrument without the
17	insurance company, is actually owned by the	17	original or without a copy it's going to be
18	deceased Simon Bernstein. So arguably not only	18	based, I assume, on oral testimony from people.
19	is it an asset of the estate, that insurance	19	And that is a high burden. Interestingly we
20	policy, and the proceeds therefrom, but any	20	found out at first, on this so-called insurance
21	litigation concerning the distribution of those	21	trust, Mr. Spallina (phonetic), who was the
22	proceeds should be in this court, Your Honor.	22	personal representative, formerly, of this
23	Now that's jumping ahead. But the point	23	estate, represented to the insurance company
24	is that we're dealing with an asset of the	24	that he was the trustee of this insurance
25	estate and, therefore, this court has every	25	trust. When that didn't work, Your Honor we
		7	
1			have a document that we'll show to the court up
1	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are	1	have a document that we'll show to the court up
2	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your	1 2	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now
2 3	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad	1 2 3	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein
2	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal	1 2	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that
2 3 4	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad	1 2 3 4	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein
2 3 4 5	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois.	1 2 3 4 5	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that
2 3 4 5 6	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of	1 2 3 4 5 6	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The
2 3 4 5 6 7	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance trust. And the records that we show show that the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life insurance trust. But the first beneficiary,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over provision of the will that leaves all the liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance trust. And the records that we show show that the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life insurance trust. But the first beneficiary, according to Heritage, which is the insurance	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over provision of the will that leaves all the liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of that trust are the ten grandchildren. So the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance trust. And the records that we show show that the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life insurance trust. But the first beneficiary, according to Heritage, which is the insurance company, is LaSalle National Trust. The second	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over provision of the will that leaves all the liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of that trust are the ten grandchildren. So the adults, the adult children of Mr. Simon
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance trust. And the records that we show show that the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life insurance trust. But the first beneficiary, according to Heritage, which is the insurance company, is LaSalle National Trust. The second beneficiary is the Simon Bernstein Trust,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over provision of the will that leaves all the liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of that trust are the ten grandchildren. So the adults, the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein, have every incentive, Your Honor, to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance trust. And the records that we show show that the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life insurance trust. But the first beneficiary, according to Heritage, which is the insurance company, is LaSalle National Trust. The second beneficiary is the Simon Bernstein Trust, whatever that is. But it's not the Simon	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over provision of the will that leaves all the liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of that trust are the ten grandchildren. So the adults, the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein, have every incentive, Your Honor, to see that the estate is not inherited with these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance trust. And the records that we show show that the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life insurance trust. But the first beneficiary, according to Heritage, which is the insurance company, is LaSalle National Trust. The second beneficiary is the Simon Bernstein Trust, whatever that is. But it's not the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust that is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over provision of the will that leaves all the liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of that trust are the ten grandchildren. So the adults, the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein, have every incentive, Your Honor, to see that the estate is not inherited with these life insurance proceeds because if they succeed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance trust. And the records that we show show that the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life insurance trust. But the first beneficiary, according to Heritage, which is the insurance company, is LaSalle National Trust. The second beneficiary is the Simon Bernstein Trust, whatever that is. But it's not the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust that is being alleged up in Illinois.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over provision of the will that leaves all the liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of that trust are the ten grandchildren. So the adults, the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein, have every incentive, Your Honor, to see that the estate is not inherited with these life insurance proceeds because if they succeed in this action in Illinois then the adult
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance trust. And the records that we show show that the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life insurance trust. But the first beneficiary, according to Heritage, which is the insurance company, is LaSalle National Trust. The second beneficiary is the Simon Bernstein Trust, whatever that is. But it's not the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust that is being alleged up in Illinois.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over provision of the will that leaves all the liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of that trust are the ten grandchildren. So the adults, the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein, have every incentive, Your Honor, to see that the estate is not inherited with these life insurance proceeds because if they succeed in this action in Illinois then the adult children inherit or receive the proceeds of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois. The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance trust. And the records that we show show that the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life insurance trust. But the first beneficiary, according to Heritage, which is the insurance company, is LaSalle National Trust. The second beneficiary is the Simon Bernstein Trust, whatever that is. But it's not the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust that is being alleged up in Illinois.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in Chicago when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr. Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over provision of the will that leaves all the liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of that trust are the ten grandchildren. So the adults, the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein, have every incentive, Your Honor, to see that the estate is not inherited with these life insurance proceeds because if they succeed in this action in Illinois then the adult

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

10		
in this estate.	1	beneficiary ever listed is this irrevocable
The curator, Your Honor, has no objection.	2	life insurance trust, their only piece of
Mr. Brown	3	evidence supporting their claim is that the
THE COURT: Let me stop and hear from Mr.	4	insurance trust cannot be found. But the trust
Brown. What's your position on their motion?	5	did exist. It has a tax ID number from a
MR. BROWN: I'm not taking a position on	6	federal tax ID number. There's numerous
the motion, Your Honor. I can get into it	7	references to it between different lawyers and
further, I don't really want to interrupt	8	nobody can find the trust document now. That's
Mr. Feaman. But it would seem to me that if	9	an issue that's going to be resolved in
the main estate creditor wants to try to	10	Illinois. But they have no evidence other
intervene in Chicago on behalf of the estate to	11	than the fact that the trust doesn't exist
bring assets into the estate without looking to	12	they don't have any parol evidence. They don't
the estate for current payment of his fees, in	13	have any documents. They don't have anything
other words, if he finally succeeds then he can	14	on behalf of the estate.
then come back to this Court and ask to have	15	Our concern is they're going to spend the
his fees reimbursed, then that would seem to be	16	precious few estate assets that are remaining
a benefit to the estate as far as marshaling	17	to go to Illinois and fight an issue that has
the assets of the estate and, of course, the	18	no merit, can subject the estate to a claim,
curator and/or personal representative has a	19	you know, for fees or indemnification or
duty to the creditors also to try to marshal	20	prevailing party attorney's fees award.
the assets of the estate.	21	The policy was owned by Simon Bernstein.
THE COURT: I got your position.	22	That means it's included in his taxable estate.
Mr. Rose?	23	But it does not mean it's owned in his probate
MR. ROSE: Our position is pretty simple.	24	estate. The beneficiary is the beneficiary.

24 MR. ROSE: Our position is pretty simple. 25 And I -- this is an evidentiary hearing --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

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 5 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 10 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 15 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 20 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 25 that's shorthand, but in our forms the only

11

25

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 5 competing claims, to the proceeds of this race. 6 Eliot Bernstein is there asserting the exact 7 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 10 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 15 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 20 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 25 recovery might take place and then he'll make

The policy proceeds are in Illinois. They've

4 12

1				
		14		16
	an application with funds then available,	1	MR. MORRISSEY: He attempted to intervene	
	meaning the \$1.7 million would then apparently	2	2 individually and was denied. He was denied	
3	come into the estate.	3	because I've attached the order. I filed an	
4	MR. ROSE: I haven't heard testimony to	4		
5	that effect yet.		5 read from a couple of sections of the order to	
6	THE COURT: That's a representation.	6		
7	MR. ROSE: He'd also need to represent	7	5	
8	that he would indemnify and hold the estate	8	3 THE COURT: Hold on. I see it here.	
9	harmless if there's any adverse action as a	g		
10	result of him intervening in that case and	10		
11	losing either an award of attorneys fees or	11		
12	THE COURT: I'm not sure about that part	12		
13	yet. I got your position.	13	5 / 1	
14	MR. ROSE: And then the final point is	14		
15	Mr. Stansbury is a potential creditor of the	15		
16	estate. To the extent he goes and even if	16	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
17	he would win that lawsuit and bring money into	17		
18	the estate I don't think it's fair to let him	18		
19	get a I don't know what his fee arrangement	19	,	
20	would be.	20		
21	THE COURT: I'd hear that. Under the	21		
22	statute he has to prove that he provided a	22	5	
23	benefit to the estate.	23		
24	MR. ROSE: We don't even know if his claim	24		
25	will still exist	25	,	
		15		17
1	THE COURT: It may or may not.	1	proceeds nor the Bernstein Trust."	
2	Mr. Morrissey?		2 THE COURT: You represent, Mr. Morrissey,	
3	MR. MORRISSEY: To address first the last			
			3 who?	
4	point why should Mr. Stansbury not be allowed		3 who?	
4 5	point why should Mr. Stansbury not be allowed to act even though his fees may or may not come		<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> </ul>	
5	to act even though his fees may or may not come	2	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> </ul>	
	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a	2	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> </ul>	
5 6 7	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a	2 5 6 7	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> </ul>	
5 6	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a	5	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he	2	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the	2 5 7 8 9	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he	2 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action	2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain	2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not	2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end	2 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 12	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> <li>the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end up having to negotiate with a claimant to	2 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 12 13 12 15 16	<ul> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> <li>the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than</li> <li>that?</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end up having to negotiate with a claimant to satisfy a claim. We don't want him privy to	2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> <li>the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than</li> <li>that?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: They amended subsequently and</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end up having to negotiate with a claimant to satisfy a claim. We don't want him privy to certain information. We don't want him	2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> <li>the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than</li> <li>that?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: They amended subsequently and</li> <li>joined the adult four of the five of the</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end up having to negotiate with a claimant to satisfy a claim. We don't want him privy to certain information. We don't want him intervening in actions, and certainly in	2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 12 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> <li>the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than</li> <li>that?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: They amended subsequently and</li> <li>joined the adult four of the five of the</li> <li>adult children were joined as plaintiffs.</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end up having to negotiate with a claimant to satisfy a claim. We don't want him privy to certain information. We don't want him intervening in actions, and certainly in actions that he's already sought intervention	2 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>who?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> <li>the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than</li> <li>that?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: They amended subsequently and</li> <li>joined the adult four of the five of the</li> <li>adult children were joined as plaintiffs.</li> <li>THE COURT: And who is representing them?</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end up having to negotiate with a claimant to satisfy a claim. We don't want him privy to certain information. We don't want him intervening in actions, and certainly in actions that he's already sought intervention and been denied.	2 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> <li>the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than</li> <li>that?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: They amended subsequently and</li> <li>joined the adult four of the five of the</li> <li>adult children were joined as plaintiffs.</li> <li>THE COURT: And who is representing them?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: Somebody up in Chicago in</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end up having to negotiate with a claimant to satisfy a claim. We don't want him privy to certain information. We don't want him intervening in actions, and certainly in actions that he's already sought intervention and been denied. THE COURT: Was he denied because he	2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> <li>the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than</li> <li>that?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: They amended subsequently and</li> <li>joined the adult four of the five of the</li> <li>adult children were joined as plaintiffs.</li> <li>THE COURT: And who is representing them?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: Somebody up in Chicago in</li> <li>that action.</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end up having to negotiate with a claimant to satisfy a claim. We don't want him privy to certain information. We don't want him intervening in actions, and certainly in actions that he's already sought intervention and been denied. THE COURT: Was he denied because he didn't have standing because he hadn't been	2 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> <li>the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than</li> <li>that?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: They amended subsequently and</li> <li>joined the adult four of the five of the</li> <li>adult children were joined as plaintiffs.</li> <li>THE COURT: And who is representing them?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: Somebody up in Chicago in</li> <li>that action.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay.</li> </ul>	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end up having to negotiate with a claimant to satisfy a claim. We don't want him privy to certain information. We don't want him intervening in actions, and certainly in actions that he's already sought intervention and been denied. THE COURT: Was he denied because he	2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four</li> <li>grandchildren.</li> <li>THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman,</li> <li>may benefit if this money comes to the estate?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: So the way the case is being</li> <li>litigated now is the only plaintiff the</li> <li>Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs.</li> <li>the life insurance company?</li> <li>MR. MORRISSEY: Well</li> <li>THE COURT: That's the way the style of</li> <li>the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than</li> <li>that?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: They amended subsequently and</li> <li>joined the adult four of the five of the</li> <li>adult children were joined as plaintiffs.</li> <li>THE COURT: And who is representing them?</li> <li>MR. FEAMAN: Somebody up in Chicago in</li> <li>that action.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay.</li> <li>MR. ROSE: I think technically the lawsuit</li> </ul>	

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

PLEASANTON,	GREENHILL,	MEEK	&	MARSAA
	561/833.78	11		

18		
company. The insurance company filed an	1	I think they're just the battle I think is
interpleaded, probably by counterclaim. My	2	between Eliot who is asserting that these funds
understanding is, subject to someone correcting	3	should come into this estate
me, the insurance company was granted	4	THE COURT: Eliot was allowed to
interpleader. They put the funds in the	5	intervene?
registry of the court. The insurance company	6	MR. BERNSTEIN: I got sued in the case,
is out of the case and even though you have the	7	Your Honor, because they had gone behind my
original style what's left is people asserting	8	back to try to steal this policy around you
a claim to the proceeds.	9	too and they were told by the insurance
Eliot is there, I think, advocating the	10	company, when Robert Spallina submitted what I
claim on behalf of the estate	11	allege is a fraudulent insurance claim, and
THE COURT: Eliot is pro se. I want we	12	they were told by the insurance company that
recognize that. From Mr. Morrissey's point of	13	the claim was denied and they needed a probate
view, do you take a position that your clients,	14	court order from you to approve the beneficiary
the grandchildren, may have an interest in	15	scheme they were proposing using some mashugana
these monies?	16	lost trust
MR. MORRISSEY: No well, our position	17	THE COURT: Eliot, you're named as a
is the following	18	cross-plaintiff, so you are
THE COURT: That question first.	19	MR. BERNSTEIN: Now I've somehow become a
MR. MORRISSEY: Our position no, on	20	plaintiff a defendant that you showed me
behalf of the four grandchildren.	21	last week, or two weeks ago, when you handed me
THE COURT: You waive any on behalf of	22	that order. I haven't quite figured out how
those children you waive any claim to that	23	I'm the named defendant.
money?	24	Your Honor, I'm representing their my
MR. MORRISSEY: I'm not going to waive on	25	children's interests.
19		
the record.	1	THE COURT: Hold it. I'm reading
THE COURT: You have to stand on one side	2	something. I see a entity in the style of the
of the fence or the other on that.	3	case up there called the Simon Bernstein Trust,
MR. MORRISSEY: Quite honestly, I haven't	4	N.A. What's that? Is that something different
asked them that question. I can't waive	5	than the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Trust?
something on behalf of my clients when I	6	MR. ROSE: It's in the affidavit that was
haven't asked them that question point blank.	7	filed, I think attached to Mr. Brown's recent
THE COURT: All right. So you have who	8	petition for instructions, but In the
the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Trust is	9	insurance company's computer they shorthanded
represented by Chicago	10	the name of the trust. The beneficiary is the
MR. BERNSTEIN: Adam Simon who is the	11	Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Life Insurance
brother to David Simon who is married to my	12	Trust which is the
sister Pam Simon who stands to benefit if the	13	THE COURT: Ted Bernstein is an individual
money goes through Illinois.	14	in this suit now. And who is representing him?
THE COURT: Illinois counsel, okay. And	15	MR. ROSE: I don't know that he is an
the four children are represented by one	16	individual. If he's an individual he's
	1	

the four children are represented by one lawyer? MR. FEAMAN: That's Adam Simon.

- THE COURT: Because of the impleading of the funds the battle right now is between the trust and these four children because those are
- the parties that are now competing for the
- money? MR. ROSE: I don't think -- I don't know
- if the four children are technically parties.

individual. If he's an individual he's represented by Adam Simon. THE COURT: I'm reading it. That's where I get it. They're individually and/or as purported trustee of the irrevocable trust. Eliot is a cross-plaintiff -- that's where you're named, Eliot -- vs. Ted, individually and as trustee of the irrevocable trust. And then a bunch of other people and entities are cross-defendants. Right now the competing

		22		24
1	parties in Illinois are the irrevocable trust	1	THE COURT: He represents himself	
2	and Eliot. Is that basically it	2	individually. So someone who may look for the	
3	MR. ROSE: Yes.	3	interest of the estate. And, you know, these	
4	THE COURT: who are active; is that	4	type of litigation, obviously, the Illinois	
5	true?	5	judge is going to have to take evidence I'm	
6	So the question is should the claimant be	6	not going to do that in my hearing on who	
7	declared here an administrator ad litem for the	7	the beneficiary is of this policy. That's what	
8	purposes of being permitted to ask the court to	8	has to be determined.	
9	be able to intervene, which the court may or	9	MR. FEAMAN: That's correct.	
10	may not do?	10	THE COURT: The issue is narrow and I	
11	MR. ROSE: There's one other part of my	11	think everyone agrees with that.	
12	opening I missed on my notes	12	MR. FEAMAN: And	
13	THE COURT: Go ahead. Sure.	13	THE COURT: What I'm thinking about is	
14	MR. ROSE: Mr. Morrissey touched on it and	14	you kind of want to be able to make sure that	
15	reminded me. If you're going to appoint an	15	everyone who, perhaps, could ultimately be a	
16	administrator ad litem it should not be	16	beneficiary of this policy have a voice in that	
17	Mr. Stansbury. You can appoint somebody and	17	litigation. That's the due process part of it.	
18	Mr. Stansbury could fund it, he could pay the	18	So my thought is, having heard everybody say	
19	expenses of, let's say, Mr. Brown or an	19	what they said, I rarely find it to be a	
20	independent person to hire a Chicago lawyer	20	problem allowing someone to intervene unless	
21	and, you know, advance the case. But you would	21	they're a stranger, this wouldn't be a	
22	then be preserving issues of privilege and you	22	stranger because a voice is a good thing to	
23	would be preserving the integrity of the system	23	have. We allow interventions all the time here	
24	rather than have Mr. Stansbury, who is a	24	on my cases. I just hear from someone else.	
25	claimant, who is adverse on multiple levels to	25	They don't win or lose unless there's merit to	
		23		25
1	the estate, as the active person he would be	1	them. Someone right now is hovering the	
2	funding the litigation and, in my view, he	2	position that the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable	
3	should be required to indemnify. But you'd	3	Trust is the beneficiary. They're lawyered up.	
4	have a neutral third person doing it rather	4		
5	that Mr. Stansbury which I think makes a lot		The only other person that seems to suggest	
		5	that that may not be the case and it is the	
6	more sense.	6	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm	
7	THE COURT: What do you say about the	6 7	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot	
7 8	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you	6 7 8	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there	
7 8 9	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address.	6 7 8 9	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not	
7 8 9 10	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury	6 7 8 9 10	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent	
7 8 9 10 11	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address.	6 7 8 9 10 11	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate.	
7 8 9 10 11 12	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr.	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown THE COURT: I'll allow someone else to	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown THE COURT: I'll allow someone else to intervene to appropriately determine whether	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say about that?	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown THE COURT: I'll allow someone else to intervene to appropriately determine whether the estate has an interest in this money or	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say about that? MR. FEAMAN: We came up with Mr. Stansbury	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown THE COURT: I'll allow someone else to intervene to appropriately determine whether the estate has an interest in this money or not. That's the issue, correct?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say about that? MR. FEAMAN: We came up with Mr. Stansbury because if he's the one that's willing to fund	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown THE COURT: I'll allow someone else to intervene to appropriately determine whether the estate has an interest in this money or not. That's the issue, correct? MR. FEAMAN: Yes.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say about that? MR. FEAMAN: We came up with Mr. Stansbury because if he's the one that's willing to fund the intervention and to fund the person the	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown THE COURT: I'll allow someone else to intervene to appropriately determine whether the estate has an interest in this money or not. That's the issue, correct? MR. FEAMAN: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Right now the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say about that? MR. FEAMAN: We came up with Mr. Stansbury because if he's the one that's willing to fund the intervention and to fund the person the lawyer to make sure that the estate is going	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown THE COURT: I'll allow someone else to intervene to appropriately determine whether the estate has an interest in this money or not. That's the issue, correct? MR. FEAMAN: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Right now the person technically doing that is Eliot who	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say about that? MR. FEAMAN: We came up with Mr. Stansbury because if he's the one that's willing to fund the intervention and to fund the person the lawyer to make sure that the estate is going to be protected	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown THE COURT: I'll allow someone else to intervene to appropriately determine whether the estate has an interest in this money or not. That's the issue, correct? MR. FEAMAN: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Right now the person technically doing that is Eliot who tries his best as a pro se. But it's pretty	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say about that? MR. FEAMAN: We came up with Mr. Stansbury because if he's the one that's willing to fund the intervention and to fund the person the lawyer to make sure that the estate is going to be protected THE COURT: He has more he's like	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown THE COURT: I'll allow someone else to intervene to appropriately determine whether the estate has an interest in this money or not. That's the issue, correct? MR. FEAMAN: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Right now the person technically doing that is Eliot who tries his best as a pro se. But it's pretty tough	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say about that? MR. FEAMAN: We came up with Mr. Stansbury because if he's the one that's willing to fund the intervention and to fund the person the lawyer to make sure that the estate is going to be protected THE COURT: He has more he's like Eliot. He has his own interests, personal	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one I want you to address. MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information  THE COURT: Well, we're not at MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown THE COURT: I'll allow someone else to intervene to appropriately determine whether the estate has an interest in this money or not. That's the issue, correct? MR. FEAMAN: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Right now the person technically doing that is Eliot who tries his best as a pro se. But it's pretty	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say about that? MR. FEAMAN: We came up with Mr. Stansbury because if he's the one that's willing to fund the intervention and to fund the person the lawyer to make sure that the estate is going to be protected THE COURT: He has more he's like	

Т

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

	26			28
1	money coming into the estate, absolutely.	1	be a personal representative appointed at some	
2	THE COURT: But someone who is more	2	point. I've been asked by the parties to	
3	neutral may be the right move there. If that's	3	consider being the personal representative.	
4	where I'm going on this, what is your position	4	Frankly, Your Honor, this case is goes off	
5	on that?	5	in a lot of different directions. Whoever the	
6	MR. FEAMAN: If that's where you're going	6	personal representative is going to spend a lot	
7	on that then Ben Brown is acceptable in that	7	of money just dealing with the different	
8	regard. I would just since Mr. Stansbury is	8	parties and the different people who are	
9	the one that's volunteering, if you will, to	9	involved. And, frankly, I don't know that I	
10	fund initially the cost of this, then he needs,	10	have the time. And I really don't want to be	
11	through me, some input with Mr. Brown.	11	the personal representative.	
12	THE COURT: Sure.	12	THE COURT: Okay.	
13	MR. FEAMAN: On all matters.	13	MR. BROWN: If I'm appointed administrator	
14	THE COURT: You'd be allowed to have input	14	ad litem it seems like I'm in there for the	
15	with him. But Mr. Brown would be there,	15	long run on a federal case. They do move them	
16	assuming he's willing to take the assignment,	16	pretty quickly here in the Southern District of	
17	to preserve issues of confidentiality and other	17	Florida. I know that from experience. I don't	
18	concerns that could exist. He sounded, all	18	know about the Northern District of Illinois.	
19	along, from the beginning, as the perfect	19	MR. FEAMAN: Well, there's been I can	
20	centerpiece to do this. What do you say?	20	answer that question.	
21	MR. BROWN: Actually, I a few things to	21	THE COURT: Okay.	
22	say, Your Honor. The first thing is with	22	MR. FEAMAN: There's been a notification	
23	regard to the privilege issue. I'm not aware	23	of a docket entry entered by the judge on it	
24	of any privilege that would apply.	24	said that all case dispositive motions are to	
25	THE COURT: And I'm not either. But let's	25	be filed by mid-July, July 13. So it sounds	
	27			29
1	get past that point.	1	like we're on a rocket docket to me, Your	29
1			like we're on a rocket docket to me, Your Honor.	29
	get past that point.	1		29
2	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception,	1 2	Honor.	29
2 3	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception,	1 2 3	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would	29
2 3 4	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this.	1 2 3 4	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able	29
2 3 4 5	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay.	1 2 3 4 5	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up	29
2 3 4 5 6	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I	1 2 3 4 5 6	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review	29
2 3 4 5 6 7	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction.	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR?	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR? MR. FEAMAN: Not today.	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the revocable trust don't want this policy to go to the estate. I've been accused of conflict of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR? MR. FEAMAN: Not today. THE COURT: Not today, okay. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I don't know if that's set for hearing at all. Although I	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the revocable trust don't want this policy to go to the estate. I've been accused of conflict of interest. I've been accused of beaches of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR? MR. FEAMAN: Not today. THE COURT: Not today, okay. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I don't know if that's set for hearing at all. Although I request that it be set for hearing. The other	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the revocable trust don't want this policy to go to the estate. I've been accused of conflict of interest. I've been accused of beaches of fiduciary duty already by David Simon who,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR? MR. FEAMAN: Not today. THE COURT: Not today, okay. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I don't know if that's set for hearing at all. Although I request that it be set for hearing. The other issue with a PR versus a curator is that	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the revocable trust don't want this policy to go to the estate. I've been accused of conflict of interest. I've been accused of beaches of fiduciary duty already by David Simon who, apparently, is Adam Simon's brother and the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR? MR. FEAMAN: Not today. THE COURT: Not today, okay. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I don't know if that's set for hearing at all. Although I request that it be set for hearing. The other issue with a PR versus a curator is that Mr. Stansbury has active litigation going on in	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the revocable trust don't want this policy to go to the estate. I've been accused of conflict of interest. I've been accused of beaches of fiduciary duty already by David Simon who, apparently, is Adam Simon's brother and the father of some of the grandchildren.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR? MR. FEAMAN: Not today. THE COURT: Not today, okay. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I don't know if that's set for hearing at all. Although I request that it be set for hearing. The other issue with a PR versus a curator is that Mr. Stansbury has active litigation going on in front of Judge Blanc right now. So far there	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the revocable trust don't want this policy to go to the estate. I've been accused of conflict of interest. I've been accused of beaches of fiduciary duty already by David Simon who, apparently, is Adam Simon's brother and the father of some of the grandchildren. My third issue is that, I think it's from	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR? MR. FEAMAN: Not today. THE COURT: Not today, okay. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I don't know if that's set for hearing at all. Although I request that it be set for hearing. The other issue with a PR versus a curator is that Mr. Stansbury has active litigation going on in front of Judge Blanc right now. So far there hasn't been any conflict as far as Ted	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the revocable trust don't want this policy to go to the estate. I've been accused of conflict of interest. I've been accused of beaches of fiduciary duty already by David Simon who, apparently, is Adam Simon's brother and the father of some of the grandchildren. My third issue is that, I think it's from the Vietnam War, this comes within the category	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR? MR. FEAMAN: Not today. THE COURT: Not today, okay. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I don't know if that's set for hearing at all. Although I request that it be set for hearing. The other issue with a PR versus a curator is that Mr. Stansbury has active litigation going on in front of Judge Blanc right now. So far there hasn't been any conflict as far as Ted Bernstein and the estate defending against	29
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	get past that point. MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr. Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the revocable trust don't want this policy to go to the estate. I've been accused of conflict of interest. I've been accused of beaches of fiduciary duty already by David Simon who, apparently, is Adam Simon's brother and the father of some of the grandchildren. My third issue is that, I think it's from	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Honor. And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction. THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR? MR. FEAMAN: Not today. THE COURT: Not today, okay. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I don't know if that's set for hearing at all. Although I request that it be set for hearing. The other issue with a PR versus a curator is that Mr. Stansbury has active litigation going on in front of Judge Blanc right now. So far there hasn't been any conflict as far as Ted	29

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

	30			32
1	in this room, basically, have said that there	1	isn't a personal type of litigation. And so,	
2	could eventually be a conflict of interest	2	you know, the strategies are legal strategies	
3	because there could be some finger pointing in	3	that would be in charge of you and the lawyer	
4	cross claims.	4	you hire.	
5	THE COURT: It's hard to purify a case	5	MR. BROWN: I understand that, Your Honor.	
6	like this and not have it not have a	6	Basically what you just described is something	
7	situation where it's allegation free of a	7	that Mr. Stansbury could very easily do and pay	
8	purported conflict of interest. But it just	8	for himself.	
9	sounds logical that if especially when I'm	9	THE COURT: Right. But he's but I	
10	looking at the latest heading out of the case	10	don't want him to be the party to do that	
11	in Illinois if this is, in its simplest	11	because I think there's he's a claimant.	
12	form, a dispute as to who the beneficiary of	12	There's I'm not comfortable there.	
13	this life insurance policy is, I mean that's a	13	MR. BROWN: Okay.	
14	that's kind of a narrow hearing. We do	14	THE COURT: And, you know, you're the	
15	those types of things in state court. You	15	neutral person looking out for the estate's	
16	know, you need some discovery. And then you	16	interest. He has he's not he's looking	
17	present the evidence and the judge makes a	17	out for the estate's interest but in a	
18	decision. Kind of like the way you do in	18	different manner. So hypothetically if you	
19	contract cases. And so the parties who claim	19	went up into the litigation and you got	
20	to be beneficiaries of the policy seem to be	20	convinced by looking at everything you looked	
21	Simon Bernstein's Irrevocable Trust and their	21	at, you and your lawyer, that the beneficiary	
22	representative. I'm treating Simon Bernstein	22	was the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance	
23	Trust as the same party for the purpose of this	23	Trust, whatever that is, and not the estate,	
24	discussion. Eliot, individually, he's there.	24	you have a duty to argue in good faith. You	
25	And no one who may have a voice to say I want,	25	follow what I'm saying? That's where the	
	31			33
1	on behalf of the estate, because there's no PR.	1	neutrality part comes in. But you are more	
2	If there's a PR the PR would take care of that.	2	advocating, primarily, to the estate at	
3	Especially where Mr. Stansbury is willing to	3	that's the assignment.	
4	front the cost of the fees for that up front it	4	MR. BROWN: I understand that, Your Honor.	
5	sounds beneficial to have that voice.	5	But and I know there's a lot of buts here	
6	So I'll put it this way, Mr. Brown, I	6	the estate has about 6 to \$700,000 worth of	
7	would expand your curator duties, if you're	7	assets, that includes the jewelry.	
8	willing, to take the assignment. If not, we	8	THE COURT: Remember, I'm having	
9	got to go elsewhere. It's up to you.	9	Mr. Stansbury pay.	
10	MR. BROWN: The curator duties basically	10	MR. BROWN: Oh, you are having Mr.	
11	to just effectively be the party who's	11	Stansbury, okay.	
12	intervening using Mr. Stansbury's counsel?	12	THE COURT: That was the deal.	
13	THE COURT: No. You would be the party.	13	MR. BROWN: And just using his counsel	
14	You would hire a lawyer. You're allowed to,	14	that he already has retained and already tried	
15	like in any other case, you and your lawyer can	15	to intervene with?	
16	hear, because your phones work and your emails	16	THE COURT: No. No. You pick the lawyer.	
17	work, from anyone else including Mr. Feaman and	17	He pays.	
18	Mr. Rose and Mr. Morrissey, and anyone else can	18	MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I will do it	
19	stick their two sense in. That's the way	19	subject to whatever personal representative is	
20	litigation goes. But it seems to be that this	20	appointed going ahead and taking over	
21	isn't an issue that's a finger-pointing issue.	21	THE COURT: Ultimately if we get to the	
22	This is who the beneficiary of the policy is.	22	stage where there's a PR taking the place of	
23	The judge is going to look at the documents and	23	you, that would be different. This is let	
24	either say it's clear on its face or else take	24	me just tell you, I mean a couple of reasons	
25	parol evidence and we're on our way. This	25	why I think that works is Mr. Brown has worked	

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

		34		
1	with me as curator in a lot of cases. I mean I		1	It's, for example, there was even talk, I
2	haven't had one challenge to the reasonableness		2	believe, in the Illinois case by one of the
3	of the fees ever. He keeps control of the		3	banks or insurance companies that it's possible
4	lawyers. You know, and he does really a good		4	if there's no beneficiary then the State of
5	job there. So I really, you know, I can't		5	Illinois could be the taker in default. Well,
6	think of a better person to deal with this		6	the State of Illinois wasn't named as a party.
7	issue given everyone's competing interest.		7	They don't have counsel there. Likewise, why
8	He'll be fair on what he argues on behalf of		8	should the estate have counsel in an action
9	the estate. He's not going to run up fees.		9	where they're only the taker of last resort?
10	He's not going to allow the lawyer to run up		10	THE COURT: Because if they're the taker
11	fees. If you want, I don't think he should be		11	as a matter of law I mean I don't really
12	the lawyer probably because I don't think he's		12	follow your argument because let's say there's
13	admitted in Illinois		13	a hearing, which there will be, and the trust
14	MR. BROWN: No.		14	is there, Eliot is there, and the estate is
15	THE COURT: and he'll be able to best		15	there, and the judge hears it all and says the
16	determine how to filter whatever the		16	decision is the beneficiary should be the
17	information is that other counsel want to give		17	estate, would we say that that's a ridiculous
18	to them. Again, it's a narrow issue. Okay,		18	thing that we had the estate participate? I
19	everyone is jumping up.		19	don't think so.
20	MR. MORRISSEY: If I could respond on		20	MR. MORRISSEY: I don't know what I
21	behalf of four of the grandchildren. We're now		21	mean there is no evidence that anyone on behalf
22	talking about having to pay, you know, from my		22	of the estate can present that they have ever
23	client's perspective pockets, Mr. Brown's fees,		23	been named as a beneficiary
24	an attorney up in Illinois		24	THE COURT: That could be. It may be then
25	THE COURT: I just said that won't be the		25	that once Mr. Brown and counsel intervene, see
		35		
1	case.		1	the documents I mean you're not talking
2	MR. MORRISSEY: That could potentially be		2	how many pages of documents could the
3	the case.		3	beneficiary forms be? It can't be that many.
4	THE COURT: It would only be the case if		4	When we sign our life insurance forms we sign a
5	there was a recovery for the estate to which		5	page or two, that's about it. It's not like
6	then Mr. Stansbury would say, under the		6	it's going to be really exotic litigation.
7	statute, I performed a benefit for the estate.		7	This is a narrow, single issue who the
8	How could that not benefit and from what I'm		8	beneficiary is of this policy. You know, it
ΙŤ		I	-	

- 8 How could that not benefit -- and from what I'm
- 9 told your clients, the grandchildren, would be
- 10 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
- 15 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?
- 20
- 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
- 25 to be represented in the Illinois action.

37

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

may be that it is clear that it's this

irrevocable trust and then they'll go from

there to see whether that really is an entity

that exists. That may be a separate issue. If

the judge says -- someone can name on the life

insurance policy, you know, the Star Spangled

Banner Fund and if that doesn't exist then we

a beneficiary that doesn't exist. You go to

the next level. You certainly want the life

step 2, step 3, doesn't sound to be that

complexed. Last word.

know from contract law what happens if you name

insurance funds going somewhere. That's what

we would determine if that took place. Step 1,

MR. ROSE: If I understand what you are

saying, which makes sense, Mr. Brown will keep

separate time for the time he spends as curator

	38		
1	working on the Illinois issue. He will hire	1	bad news for your side. But if that's what
2	counsel and the fees of Mr. Brown and the	2	they conclude then that's what they conclude.
3	Illinois counsel, under his direction and his	3	If they conclude they do they will continue
4	discretion, would be paid by Mr. Stansbury?	4	advocating. It's things we do as lawyers all
5	THE COURT: That's the case. Subject to a	5	the time. We go after cases with merit, and
6	claim for reimbursement under the statute.	6	shy away from those we think don't have merit.
7	MR. ROSE: I'd want to hear from	7	MR. FEAMAN: Yes.
8	Mr. Stansbury under oath that he's willing to	8	THE COURT: There's multilevel here. If
9	undertake that expense. Not to talk out of	9	someone says that the Bernstein Irrevocable
10	school, but I haven't had discussion with	10	Trust is the beneficiary but that it doesn't
11	counsel and I didn't necessarily get the sense	11	exist there may be an argument that could be
12	that that was going to be the case.	12	made how then still as a result of that the
13	THE COURT: All right. Well, Mr. Feaman	13	estate should get the funds, that would be
14	can represent them.	14	something that Mr. Brown and counsel could
15	MR. FEAMAN: I am representing as an	15	consider advocating. But it's all in good
16	officer of the Court, Your Honor.	16	faith stuff.
17	THE COURT: Okay.	17	MR. FEAMAN: Sure. I just want to make
18	MR. FEAMAN: My only concern is if	18	sure
19	there's basically Mr. Stansbury is funding	19	THE COURT: You'll get copies of the
20	this there's there has to be some type of, I	20	bills. You'll be able to see what's that. If
21	don't want to use the word control, but real	21	at anytime you think that Mr. Brown and the
22	input into the process.	22	lawyer are, you know, going way beyond what you
23	THE COURT: Well, he's allowed to, like	23	think they should, from an expense point of
24	anyone else in cases like this, you could have	24	view, you can always come back to me.
25	conversations with Mr. Brown and his lawyer.	25	MR. FEAMAN: I'm less concerned with the
	39		
1	You can show them what documents there are.	1	expense, although it is important, more with
2	You can ask them to discuss things with them.	2	being able to pick up the phone and speak to
3	And, you know, I mean they they obviously	3	counsel in Chicago and say, hey, have you
4	know he has an interest. And to the extent	4	considered this, I have information that may

- 4 know he has an interest. And to the extent
- 5 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.
- 10 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 15
- 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
- 20 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 25 estate has a bona fide interest. That may be

- 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, 10 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 15 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
- 20 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 25 of 350.

11

1	$\mathbf{r}$
т	4

		. –	
1	MR. BROWN: I also propose, it doesn't	1	represents
2	have to go on the order, it would seem to me,	2	MR. ROSE: it would be enforceable as a
3	there's nothing wrong, once I retain a Chicago	3	judgment if he doesn't pay the estate would
4	attorney, there's nothing wrong with Mr. Feaman	4	have a claim against Mr. Stansbury if he, for
5	calling that Chicago attorney and me telling	5	example, didn't pay some invoices and we got
6	the Chicago attorney don't get me on the phone	6	stuck paying the bill for a Chicago lawyer.
7		7	THE COURT: You want me to rule on that
8	THE COURT: I agree. There's no question.	8	now? Your answer is no. You're real premature
9	You're the conduit.	9	on that. Draft an order along the lines I
10	MR. BROWN: As far as the claim, I'll	10	mention.
11	absolutely rely on Illinois counsel.	11	What else for today?
12	THE COURT: All right. I think this is	12	MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I had two motions
13	pretty clear how it's going to be handled.	13	for instructions.
14	Yes, sir.	14	THE COURT: One had to do with this issue,
15	MR. ROSE: A couple of minor concerns, I	15	right?
16	think Mr. Brown went too far. Mr. Stansbury	16	MR. BROWN: That one I basically just took
17	would not pay for all the curator fees, only	17	a backseat to because of the administrator ad
18	the curator fees directly related to the	18	litem motion.
19	Illinois matter.	19	The other, Eliot Bernstein sends me a lot
20	THE COURT: That's what he said. Separate	20	of emails with a lot of requests. I'm not
21	times sheets, sure.	21	saying it's a bad thing. But he asks me
22	MR. ROSE: I'm concerned if they he's	22	questions I don't necessarily know I can
23	going to hire a Chicago lawyer, a Chicago	23	answer. For instance, he got the accounting by
24	lawyer is going to be expensive. That's what	24	Tetra and Spallina and then sent me an email
25	our main concern is	25	that I've attached to the motion. I don't know
		43	

	1 THE COURT: Hold on. Mr. Brown	1	if you have the motion for instructions.
	2 MR. ROSE: He's a practical guy	2	THE COURT: I do.
	3 THE COURT: he's going to find a good	3	MR. BROWN: That had 44 different
-	4 lawyer with a reasonable rate, and that's a	4	questions, not including subparts, and asked
	5 little higher. He's not going to hire a	5	that I hire a forensic accountant, an analyst
	6 \$1,000-an-hour-guy.	6	and acquire account statements from a number of
	7 MR. ROSE: But if he hires a lawyer and	7	third-party institutions.
	8 the bill is \$12,000 and Mr. Stansbury's counsel	8	THE COURT: Is that the motion? I don't
	9 looks at it and says we don't think we should	9	have the attachments. It says motion for
1	0 pay it, Mr. Brown is retaining the person on	10	instructions that's the life insurance one.
1	1 behalf of the estate, we need to have not a	11	Hold on.
1	2 chance for them to complain about bills.	12	MR. BROWN: It's not necessarily
1	3 THE COURT: Okay. I'm not worried about	13	important. Eliot is very thorough. But,
1	4 that now. There's too much I'm not finding,	14	again, the estate has limited assets. My view
1	5 you know I mean one part of this is what	15	of what the curator should do with respect to
1	6 I think is the sincerity of Mr. Feaman's side	16	the accounting is not take the lead on
1	7 here. And it's kind of a good thing that we	17	objecting to what Tetra and Spallina did,
1	8 have the ability to be able to use	18	investigating the underpinnings of the
1	9 Mr. Stansbury's funds that way. They've made	19	accounting, that's up to we have a lot of
2	0 the pledge to do it. I don't think they're	20	beneficiaries here who are very, very
2	1 going to go back on their word.	21	passionate and interested in what's going on
2	2 MR. ROSE: I understand. I think	22	with the estate.
2	3 Mr. Stansbury should at least, under oath	23	THE COURT: Stop. You don't have to go
2	4 THE COURT: Your request is denied.	24	further. That position, that's the law. You
2	5 Mr. Feaman is an officer of the court. He	25	don't do that. If there's an accounting,

	46			48
1	there's a rule on objections, the parties	1	Like I do when I get a letter that has	
2	object. They don't use you you don't work	2	threatening stuff to me I sent it to my friends	
3	for them.	3	who are lawyers. I sent it to a number of	
4	MR. BROWN: Okay.	4	people. Actually, I got so busy sending it to	
5	THE COURT: You work for the court.	5	people, because it scared me a little bit that	
6	MR. BROWN: I'll try and craft an order	6	it was very threatening to people, that by the	
7	that deals with that motion in that regard.	7	time I was done my wife stopped me and said we	
8	Also, there also was a motion, Eliot has	8	got to go to court. All I know is my brother	
9	concerns about the 2012 will and its validity.	9	sent me an email that seems pretty threatening.	
10	I think your ruling would be the same on that.	10	It was addressed to me. I was the intended	
11	I don't have a role in trying to contest that	11	recipient.	
12	will	12	THE COURT: Let me ask you, when the email	
13	THE COURT: Exactly. You're not an	13	starts off Alan	
14	advocate. You don't investigate things that	14	MR. ROSE: I get a million emails	
15	the parties may be interested in. They can do	15	THE COURT: That say Alan?	
16	what they think they need to do based on the	16	MR. BERNSTEIN: That say whoever's name.	
17	rules of procedure and statutes.	17	THE COURT: Okay. All right. You know	
18	MR. BROWN: That's it.	18	what, I don't buy anything you just told me.	
19	MR. ROSE: If I may address the privilege	19	MR. BERNSTEIN: I thought my brother was	
20	issue?	20	sending me a copy of an email	
21	THE COURT: Okay. The privilege issue,	21	THE COURT: Stop. Stop. Stop speaking.	
22	okay.	22	I'm going to look at the rule for a second.	
23	MR. ROSE: May I approach?	23	MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.	
24	THE COURT: Yes.	24	MR. ROSE: It's 1.285.	
25	MR. ROSE: I can file a copy of this.	25	THE COURT: Okay.	

This is the email in question. Without reading the email, if you look at who it is addressed to at the very top. Mr. Bernstein is saying, this is Ted, telling me he sent it to Eliot by mistake. Last night at 10:12 he got off an airplane and wanted to tell me things. It's to Eliot by accident. If you just read --THE COURT: When you say to Eliot by accident, the only person this is sent to is Eliot. MR. ROSE: Correct. He was trying to send it to me. If you look below the word analysis, the first word of the email is Alan. THE COURT: So this was is supposed to go to you and it went to Eliot? MR. ROSE: By mistake. And Mr. Bernstein has advised me this morning he sent it to 2,000 people already. He plans on publicizing it --THE COURT: I'm sure he didn't do that because if he wants to participate in the case he's obligated to have and comply with the rules of court. MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor --THE COURT: When you --MR. BERNSTEIN: I was sent an email to me. 

1	MR. BERNSTEIN: I haven't been prepared
2	for this, so
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MR. BERNSTEIN: I haven't looked at the
5	rules.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	MR. BERNSTEIN: I can show you several
8	instances in my email of people sending me
9	letters addressed to other people, several
0	thousands of those.
1	THE COURT: So, all right. Everyone has
2	to take a deep breath. This situation is done
3	pursuant to Rule 1.285. So Mr. Rose, on your
4	side, correct me if you think I'm wrong,
15	Subsection A says, "When you" your client
6	"takes a position that there's been an
17	inadvertent disclosure of privileged materials
8	to another person" which is what you say
9	happened, correct?
20	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
25	written notice of the assertion of privilege on

		50			52
1	the party to whom the materials were disclosed.		1	says some other things of what you're supposed	
2	The notice shall specify with particularity"		2	to do. You're supposed to return or destroy	
3	etc. And then there's a procedure.		3	it. That's one thing you're supposed to do.	
4	MR. ROSE: I did that last night. I		4	And you are to notify anyone else who you	
5	emailed him last night.		5	disclosed it to that they're to do the same	
6	THE COURT: I didn't know that. So you		6	thing and you're also to take reasonable steps	
7	gave him the written notice. I assume he got		7	to retrieve the materials disclosed	
8	it. Can I see a copy of the notice?		8	MR. BERNSTEIN: I'll do all that.	
9	MR. ROSE: I'm trying to get a copy of the		9	THE COURT: And the only exception to this	
10	notice. Perhaps I'm not trying to have the		10	is if you want to challenge that assertion that	
11	whole argument heard today. I just		11	you were provided an inadvertent privileged	
12	THE COURT: The rule applies.		12	matter. And then the rule says what could	
13	MR. ROSE: Right.		13	happen and we can have litigation and spend a	
14	THE COURT: So once he gets notice, the		14	lot of money.	
15	rule applies. So the notice will have you		15	MR. BERNSTEIN: No. I'll do whatever it	
16	sent it by email?		16	is whatever the law says, as always.	
17	MR. ROSE: I have it here now. I do find		17	THE COURT: There's nothing for me to do.	
18	it, sir. May I approach?		18	MR. ROSE: I understand. I just want to	
19	THE COURT: What's the time and date of		19	make sure you	
20	the notice?		20	MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, it went out to	
21	MR. ROSE: May 22, 2014 at 11:07 p.m. l		21	a lot of people. Like I said, I have a broad	
22	said, "You received an email from Ted intended		22	base	
23	solely for me, and accidentally sent to you by		23	THE COURT: Take a look. When you leave	
24	mistake. The email was sent around 10:12 p.m.		24	the courthouse	
25	tonight. Please delete the email immediately		25	MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'll notify	
			-		
		51			53
1	without reading it and confirm that deletion by		1	everybody though.	
2	email. The communication was attorney-client		2	THE COURT: Go and take a look at the rule	
3	protected and you are not entitled to read or		3	and just do what the rule says.	
4	possess the email due to the accidental		4	MR. ROSE: And it's not to be posted on	
5	transmission. Thank you in advance. And if		5	social media.	
6	you fail to comply with this request we'll be		6	THE COURT: You see, I'm not allowed to	
7	forced to take corrective action with the		7	have dialogue on that now. Other than signing	
1					

- court." Signed by me sent to the same email address that --
- THE COURT: Okay. All right. So the rule says, to Eliot, he sent that to you, Rule 1.285, Subsection B tells you what you're
- supposed to do. MR. BERNSTEIN: I haven't seen it yet.
- THE COURT: Okay. MR. BERNSTEIN: He's saying he sent it after Ted's email. The last email I read was Ted's email. So I haven't seen it. THE COURT: So open that email --MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. And do what the rule says. MR. BERNSTEIN: Don't send it to anybody else.

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

the order, hearing over. Thank you. 9 (Whereupon the hearing is concluded at 10:00 a.m.) 

	Ę	54
1	CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER	
2		
3	I, JULIE ANDOLPHO, do hereby certify that	
	the foregoing transcript of the proceedings, consisting of pages numbered 1 through 54,	
	inclusive, is a true and correct transcript of the	
	proceedings taken by me before the Honorable MARTIN	
	COLIN, on May 23, 2014.	
9	I further certify that I am not a relative	
10	or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the	
11	parties, nor a relative or employee of such attorney	
	or counsel, or financially interested, directly or	
	indirectly, in this action.	
14	The certification does not apply to any	
	reproduction of the same by any means unless under	
	direct control and/or direction or the reporter.	
17	Dated this 27th day of May, 2014.	
18		
19 20	Julie Andolpho	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 1 of 11

33:14 47:18

54 54:5 \$ \$1,000-an-hourguy 43:6 6 **\$1.7** 6:9 14:2 6 33:6 \$12,000 43:8 625 2:18 **\$700,000** 33:6 9 9 2:5 1 1 37:20 54:5 9:00 1:13 **1.285** 4:11,21 48:24 49:13 Α 51:12 **a.m** 1:13 53:9 10 49:23 **ability** 43:18 10:00 1:13 53:9 able 22:9 24:14 29:4 34:15 10:12 47:5 50:24 40:20 41:2 **11:07** 50:21 43:18 13 28:25 above-styled 3:3 absolutely 26:1 2 42:11 2 37:21 acceptable 26:7 2,000 4:16 47:17 accident 47:7,9 200 3:5 accidental 51:4 2012 46:9 accidentally 4:22 2014 1:12 3:7 50:23 50:21 54:8,17 accidently 4:6 **213** 2:14 according 6:16 22 50:21 7:17 17:6 23 1:12 54:8 account 45:6 23rd 3:7 accountant 45:5 27th 54:17 accounting 44:23 45:16,19,25 accused 27:17,18 3 3 37:21 acquire 45:6 30 4:4 act 15:5 330 2:14 action 7:5 8:13 9:22 14:9 15:12 33401 2:10,14,18 17:22 35:25 33436 2:6 36:8 51:7 54:13 350 41:25 actions 15:19,20 3695 2:5 active 22:4 23:1 29:20 4 actively 13:18 401 2:18 actually 6:17 44 45:3 26:21 48:4 49:23 ad 5:23 6:3 7:3 5 13:24 22:7,16 502012CP004391XXX 27:10 28:14 XSB 1:2 44:17

505 2:10

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 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 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

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 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 6:5 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 argument 36:12

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

Adam 19:11,18

Page 2 of 11

```
40:11 50:11
arrangement 14:19
assert 13:8 16:24
  49:22
asserting 13:6,8
  18:8 20:2
assertion 49:25
  52:10
asset 6:19,24 8:1
assets 7:1 8:1
  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
assuming 26:16
assurances 39:9
Atlantic 3:5
attached 11:17
  16:3,4 21:7
  44:25
attachments 45:9
attacking 5:5
attempted 16:1
attorney 34:24
  42:4,5,6
  54:10,11
attorney-client
  4:8,18 51:2
attorneys 14:11
attorney's 12:20
available 14:1
Avenue 3:5
award 12:20 14:11
aware 7:24 26:23
away 40:6
       в
backseat 44:17
bad 40:1 44:21
banks 36:3
Banner 37:15
base 52:22
based 8:18 46:16
basically 22:2
  30:1 31:10 32:6
  35:14 38:19
```

```
44:16
basics 35:23
battle 19:20 20:1
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
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
  43:11
behind 20:7
believe 8:14 11:4
  36:2
Ben 3:21 23:14
  26:7
beneficial 31:5
beneficiaries
  7:15
  9:11,14,16,25
  16:25 27:15
  30:20 45:20
beneficiary
  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
  31:22 32:21
  36:4,16,23
  37:3,8,17 40:10
benefit 6:9 10:17
  14:23 16:14
  17:7 19:13
  35:7,8,10
BENJAMIN 2:17
Bernstein 1:6
  2:8,21
  3:11,13,20
  4:5,7,9,10,11,1
  5,23,25
  5:2,6,7,9,10,12
  6:18 7:19,21
  9:3,10,19 11:20
  12:21 13:6
  17:1,11 19:9,11
  20:6,19
```

```
25:2 29:23
  30:22 32:22
  40:9 44:19
 47:3,16,23,25
 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
better 34:6
beyond 40:22
bill 43:8 44:6
bills 29:7 40:20
 43:12
bit 48:5
bizarre 5:5
Blanc 29:21
blank 19:7
Blvd 2:5
bona 39:25
Boynton 2:5,6
breath 49:12
bring 10:12 14:17
broad 52:21
brother 5:3 19:12
 27:20 48:8,19
Brown 2:17 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
  32:5,13
  33:4,10,13,18,2
 5 34:14 36:25
 37:24 38:2,25
 40:14,21
 41:7,9,12,16,23
 42:1,10,16
 43:1,10
  44:12,16
  45:3,12
  46:4,6,18
Brown's 21:7
  34:23
bunch 4:22 21:24
burden 8:19
busv 48:4
buts 33:5
buy 48:18
```

С **care** 31:2 **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 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 certain 15:9,13,18 certainly 15:19 37:18 **CERTIFICATE** 54:1 certification 54:14 **certify** 54:3,9 challenge 34:2 52:10 **chance** 43:12 charge 32:3 Chicago 9:2 10:11 17:21 19:10 22:20 29:6,7 41:3 42:3,5,6,23 44:6 children 9:9,11,18,23 17:19 18:23 19:16,21,25 children's 20:25 CIRCUIT 1:1 City 3:6 **claim** 11:4 12:3,18 14:24 15:17 18:9,11,23 20:11,13 29:24 30:19 38:6 42:10 44:4 claimant 15:6,8,12,16 22:6,25 32:11 claimed 16:20

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

21:3,5,11,13

Page 3 of 11

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

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 2:10,18 due 24:17 51:4 duties 31:7,10 duty 10:20 27:19 32:24 Е 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 13:20 **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 1:1 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

Page 5 of 11

finally 10:14 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 Flagler 2:10,18 Florida 1:1 3:7 28.17 forced 51:7 foregoing 54:4 forensic 45:5 form 30:12 former 7:6 8:6 formerly 8:22 forms 11:25 37:3,4 frankly 28:4,9 fraudulent 20:11 free 30:7 Friday 3:7 friends 48:2 front 29:21 31:4 39:12 **fund** 22:18 25:18,19 26:10 37:15 funded 25:13 funding 23:2 38:19 funds 8:9 13:19,21 14:1 18:5 19:20 20:2 37:19 40:13 43:19 G gets 50:14 given 27:7 34:7 gone 13:14 20:7 grandchildren

2:12 3:18

9:13,17,24 17:5

18:15,21 27:21 34:21 35:9 granted 18:4 guy 43:2 guys 41:14 н handed 20:21 handled 42:13 **happen** 52:13 happened 49:19 happens 37:16 41:11 hard 30:5 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 33:8,10 34:22 heading 30:10 hear 10:4 14:21 24:24 31:16 38:7 heard 14:4 24:18 50:11 hearing 10:25 24:6 29:17,18 30:14 36:13 41:8 53:8,9 hears 36:15 He'd 14:7 he'll 13:25 34:8,15 help 29:7 41:5 hereby 54:3 Heritage 7:17 he's 4:17 15:6,10,11,20 21:16 25:8,9,18,22 26:16 30:24 32:9,11,16 34:9,10,12 38:8,23 39:22 42:22 43:2,3,5 47:21 51:16 hey 41:3 high 8:14,19

hire 22:20 31:14 4:12,24 50:25 32:4 38:1 42:23 43:5 45:5 hires 43:7 history 4:17 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 32:5 33:4,18 38:16 41:16 44:12 47:23 52:20 Honorable 1:9 3:4 54:7 hourly 41:24 hovering 25:1 hypothetically 32:18 т **I'd** 4:20 14:21 38:7 **ID** 12:5,6 I'll 23:15 31:6 42:10 46:6 52:8,15,25 Illinois 6:7 7:5,22 8:3 9:22 12:10,17,25 13:3 15:12 19:14,15 22:1 24:4 27:11 28:18 30:11 34:13,24 35:25 36:2,5,6 38:1,3 42:11,19 **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 32:12,25 33:8 35:8 39:10,13 40:25 41:6 42:22 43:13,14 44:20 47:19 48:22 49:14 50:9,10 53:6 13:10 16:25

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 indemnification 12.19 indemnify 14:8 23:3 independent 22:20 indicate 16:6 indirectly 54:13 individual 21:13,16 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 inherit 9:23 inherited 9:20 initially 26:10 **input** 26:11,14 38:22 instance 44:23 instances 29:25 49:8 institutions 45:7 instruct 4:20 instructions 21:8 44:13 45:1,10 instrument 8:16 insurance 6:7,15,17,19 7:9,11,12,13,16 ,17,21,24 8:4,7,20,23,24 9:5,8,21,24 11:5,10,12,18,2 1,24 12:2,4

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

immediately

higher 43:5

Page 6 of 11

```
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
 32:16,17 34:7
 39:4,25
 45:21 46:15
  54:12
interesting 6:13
Interestingly
 8:19 9:10
interests 20:25
 25:23,25
internal 6:16
internet 4:18
```

27:13,18 30:2,8

interested 5:21

**interim** 27:25

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 7:20 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

л. 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

т. 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

jurisdiction 9:25

justify 8:8

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

lawvered 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 36:7

limited 13:21

**line** 39:11

27:25 45:14

**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 8:10 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 М 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 20:15 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

Page 7 of 11

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 Morrissev's 18:13 motion 6:15 10:5,7 44:18,25 45:1,8,9 46:7,8 motions 11:18 28:24 44:12 move 26:3 28:15 MRACHEK 2:9 multilevel 40:8 multiple 22:25

29:25 Ν 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 54:11 Northern 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

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 Р 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

29:15 32:13

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 22:20 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 8:21 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 561/833.7811

okay 17:23 19:15

27:5 28:12,21

Page 8 of 11

please 5:19 50:25 **pledge** 43:20 **pockets** 34:23 **point** 6:23 14:14 15:4 18:13 19:7 27:1 28:2 40:23 pointing 30:3 **policy** 6:7,16,20 7:9 8:12 11:5,10 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 18:14,17,20 25:2 26:4 45:24 49:16 possess 51:4 possible 36:3 posted 53:4 posting 4:17 potential 14:15 potentially 35:2 pour-over 9:14 pours 27:14 **PR** 29:13,19 31:1,2 33:22 practical 43:2 precious 12:16 premature 44:8 prepared 49:1 **present** 30:17 36:22 presently 8:2 preserve 26:17 preserving 22:22,23 pretty 10:24 23:22 28:16 42:13 48:9 prevailing 12:20 primarily 33:2 **prior** 11:4,13 privilege 22:22 26:23,24 27:4 46:19,21 49:22,25

privileged 4:8,13,19 49:17 52:11 privy 15:8,9,13,15,17 23:11 pro 2:20 3:13 18:12 23:22 probability 8:14 probably 18:2 34:12 probate 12:23 20:13 problem 7:11 24:20 procedure 46:17 50:3 proceed 29:9 proceedings 1:9 3:3 54:4,7 proceeds 6:20,22 7:25 9:21,23 12:25 13:5 17:1 18:9 process 24:17 38:22 promised 27:7 proposal 25:12 propose 42:1 proposing 20:15 protected 25:21 51:3 prove 14:22 provided 14:22 52:11 provision 9:15 **PRs** 11:4 publicizing 47:18 purify 30:5 purported 21:20 30:8 purpose 6:4 30:23 purposes 16:22 22:8 pursuant 49:13 pursue 13:20 0 question 18:19 19:5,7 22:6

42:8 47:1 questions 44:22 45:4 quickly 28:16 quite 19:4 20:22 R 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 44:8 really 10:8 13:17 16:18 28:10 34:4,5 36:11 37:6,11 reason 15:25 39:20 reasonable 43:4 52:6 reasonableness 34:2 reasons 33:24 **receive** 9:23 received 50:22 recent 21:7 recently 6:14 recipient 48:11 recognize 18:13 **record** 11:13 19:1 records 6:16 7:14 **recoverv** 13:25 35:5,14,15 references 12:7 regard 26:8,23 46:7 registry 8:3 18:6 reimbursed 10:16 reimbursement 38:6 **related** 42:18 **relative** 54:9,11 relief 6:1 **rely** 42:11

remaining 12:16 remember 5:16 33:8 **REMEMBERED** 3:2 reminded 22:15 **remote** 16:22 replied 4:6 **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 28:1,3,6,11 30:22 33:19 representatives 7:6 8:5 represented 8:13,23 19:10,16 21:17 35:25 representing 17:20 20:24 21:14 25:10 38:15 represents 24:1 44:1 reproduction 54:15 request 4:20 29:18 43:24 51:6 requested 5:25 8:4 requests 44:20 require 13:11 required 23:3 residual 9:13 resolved 12:9 resort 36:9 **respect** 45:15 respond 34:20 result 9:14 14:10 40:12 retain 42:3 retained 33:14 retaining 43:10

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

28:20 29:12

Page 9 of 11

retrieve 52:7 return 4:12 52:2 **review** 29:6 revocable 27:15,16 ridiculous 36:17 **Robert** 20:10 **rocket** 29:1 **role** 13:23 46:11 room 30:1 **Rose** 2:9 3:19,25 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 47:11,16 48:14,24 49:13,20 50:4,9,13,17,21 52:18 53:4 Royer 2:4 3:16 **rule** 4:10,21 16:22 44:7 46:1 48:22 49:13 50:12,15 51:10,11,21 52:12 53:2,3 rules 46:17 47:22 49:5 **ruling** 46:10 run 28:15 34:9,10 running 29:4 S **satisfy** 15:17 scared 48:5 scheduled 5:15 scheme 20:15 **school** 38:10 se 2:20 3:13 18:12 23:22 second 7:18 27:6 48:22 seconds 4:4 sections 16:5

seeing 7:1 seek 13:23 35:15,17 **seem** 10:9,16 30:20 42:2 seems 25:4 28:14 31:20 48:9 seen 51:14,18 send 47:11 51:23 sending 48:4,20 49:8 sends 44:19 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 separate 37:12,25 42:20 **serve** 49:24 **several** 49:7,9 **sheets** 42:21 shorthand 11:21,25 shorthanded 11:22 21:9 showed 20:20 **shy** 40:6 sign 37:4 **Signed** 51:8 signing 53:7 **Simon** 1:6 6:8,18 7:19,20 9:9,18 11:20 12:21 17:11 19:9,11,12,13,1 8 21:3,5,11,17 25:2 27:7,19 30:21,22 32:22 Simon's 27:20 simple 10:24 simplest 30:11 sincerity 43:16 single 37:7 sir 42:14 49:20 50:18**sister** 19:13

situation 30:7 49:12 so-called 8:20 9:8 social 53:5 **sole** 6:4 **solely** 50:23 somebody 11:22 17:21 22:17 somehow 20:19 someone 18:3 23:15 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 sounds 28:25 30:9 31:5 Southern 28:16 Spallina 8:21 11:3 20:10 44:24 45:17 Spangled 37:14 **speak** 41:2 speaking 16:11 48:21 specify 50:2 **spend** 12:15 28:6 52:13 spends 37:25 **spent** 13:18 squarely 27:3 stage 33:22 **stand** 19:2 standard 16:10 standing 15:23 **stands** 19:13 Stansbury 2:3 3:15 5:21 6:3 13:7,14 14:15 15:4 16:19,24 22:17,18,24 23:5,10 25:17 26:8 27:9 29:3,20 31:3

32:7 33:9,11

35:6 38:4,8,19

39:8,14,21 41:18,23 42:16 43:23 44:4 Stansbury's 5:22 16:20 29:24 31:12 43:8,19 Star 37:14 started 17:25 **starts** 48:13 state 3:6 30:15 36:4,6 statements 45:6 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 48:21 stopped 48:7 stranger 24:21,22 strategies 32:2 strategize 29:8 Street 2:14 **stuck** 44:6 stuff 40:16 48:2 style 17:14 18:8 21:2 subject 12:18 18:3 33:19 38:5 submitted 5:24 20:10 subparts 45:4 Subsection 49:15 51:12 subsequently 17:17 succeed 9:21 succeeds 10:14 success 8:14 successor 9:4 sued 20:6 suggest 25:4 **suit** 21:14 **Suite** 2:5,14,18 summary 13:11

Page 10 of 11

supplement 5:25 support 11:9 supporting 12:3 supposed 27:24,25 41:19 47:14 51:13 52:1,2,3 **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 system 11:22 22:23 Ψ taker 35:24 36:5,9,10 taking 10:6 33:20,22 talk 36:1 38:9 talking 34:22 37:1 tax 12:5,6 taxable 12:22 technically 17:24 19:25 23:21 Ted 2:8 3:19 4:5,9 5:6,9 9:3 21:13,22 29:22 47:4 50:22 Ted's 51:17,18 temporary 27:24 ten 9:12,17,24 testamentary 27:2,3 testimony 8:18 14:4 Tetra 11:3 44:24 45:17 Thank 51:5 53:8 that's 5:5 6:23 7:5 11:15,17,25 12:8,9 14:6 17:14 19:18 21:18,21 23:8,18,24 24:7,9,17 25:6,18 26:3,6,9 29:17 30:13,14 31:19,21 32:25 33:3 35:11 36:17 37:5,19

38:5 40:1,2 41:16 42:20,24 43:4 45:10,19,24 46:18 52:3 therefore 6:25 therefrom 6:20 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 33:5,22 35:12,13 36:4,12 38:19,20 39:11,22 40:8 42:3,4,8 43:14 45:25 46:1 49:16 50:3 52:17 they'll 37:10 39:6 **they're** 8:15 9:2 12:15 20:1 21:19 24:21 25:3 36:9,10 39:5 43:20 52:5 Thev've 12:25 43:19 third 23:4 27:22 third-party 45:7 thorough 45:13 thousands 49:10 thread 27:8 threatening 5:5 48:2,6,9 today 3:24 29:14,15 41:7 44:11 50:11 tonight 50:25 top 47:3 touched 22:14 tough 23:23 transcript 54:4,6 transmission 51:5 treating 30:22 trial 13:12 tried 33:14 tries 23:22 true 22:5 41:16 54:6

trust 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 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 40:10trustee 8:24 9:4 21:20,23 try 8:15 10:10,20 20:8 46:6 trying 27:9 46:11 47:11 50:9,10 twofold 13:17 type 24:4 32:1 38:20 types 30:15 U ultimately 24:15 33:21 underpinnings 45:18understand 32:5 33:4 37:23 43:22 52:18 understanding 18:3 undertake 38:9 unless 13:24 24:20,25 35:13 54:15 usual 5:4 v validity 46:9 **versus** 29:19 Vietnam 27:23 view 18:14 23:2 27:4 40:24 45:14 **voice** 24:16,22 30:25 31:5 volunteering 26:9

W waive 18:22,23,25 19:5 War 27:23 wasn't 36:6 wasting 27:12 week 20:21 weeks 20:21 we'll 5:14,16 9:1 51:6 we're 3:11 6:2,24 23:13 29:1 31:25 34:21 West 2:10,14,18 3:5 whatever 5:6 7:20 32:23 33:19 34:16 52:15,16 Whereupon 53:9 whether 23:16 37:11 Whoever 28:5 whoever's 48:16 **whole** 50:11 whom 9:25 50:1 whomever 29:5 who's 31:11 wife 48:7 William 2:3 3:15 5:20 willing 25:18 26:16 31:3,8 38:8 win 14:17 24:25 wit 3:8 work 8:25 9:2 29:5 31:16,17 46:2,5 worked 33:25 working 38:1 works 33:25 worried 43:13 worth 33:6 wound 35:12 written 49:25 50:7 wrong 42:3,4 49:14

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK & MARSAA 561/833.7811

vs 17:11 21:22

Y       Yet 9:5 14:5,13       51:14       You'll 40:19,20
<b>yet</b> 9:5 14:5,13 51:14
<b>yet</b> 9:5 14:5,13 51:14
<b>yet</b> 9:5 14:5,13 51:14
You'll 40:19,20