

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH
JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR
PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

IN RE:

Case No.: 50 2012 CP 004391 SB
JUDGE MARTIN COLIN

ESTATE OF SIMON
BERNSTEIN,

Deceased.

Division: IY

**RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO THE APPOINTMENT
OF TED BERNSTEIN AS SUCCESSOR PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE
AND MOTION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT
THIRD PARTY AS BOTH SUCCESSOR PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE AND
TRUSTEE OF THE SIMON BERNSTEIN TRUST AGREEMENT**

COMES NOW Petitioner, William E. Stansbury (“Stansbury”), a creditor and “Interested Person,” pursuant to the §731.201(23) Fla. Stat. (2013), by and through his undersigned counsel, and files this Response in Opposition to the Motion for Appointment of Ted Bernstein as Successor Personal Representative and Motion for the Appointment of an Independent Third Party as Successor Personal Representative and Successor Trustee of the Simon L. Bernstein Amended and Restated Trust Agreement dated July 25, 2014 (the “Revocable Trust.”). In support, Petitioner states as follows:

I. Stansbury has standing to bring this Response and Motion

1. When removal of a Personal Representative is at issue, Fla. Prob. R. 5.440 specifically provides that, “... **any interested person, by petition**, may commence a proceeding to remove a personal representative. ...” (Emphasis added.) By logical extension an “interested person” would also have standing to petition the court for, and to participate in the proceedings involving, the appointment of a successor fiduciary.

2. The provisions of §731.201(23), Fla. Stat. (2013) define an “interested person” as:

(23) “Interested person” means any person who may reasonably be expected to be affected by the outcome of the particular proceeding involved...”

3. Stansbury has filed a claim against the Estate of Simon Bernstein (the "Estate") and has sued the Estate in a separate lawsuit styled *William E. Stansbury v. Ted Bernstein, et al*, Case. No. 50 2012 CA 013933 MB AA, Palm Beach County, Florida (the "Stansbury Lawsuit.") A copy of the Statement of Claim is attached as Exhibit "A." A copy of the Second Amended Complaint by Interlineation which forms the basis of the Statement of Claim is attached hereto as Exhibit "B."

4. Stansbury, as a claimant of the Estate, has an interest in ensuring that the successor fiduciary ultimately appointed will act without bias and in the best interests of the creditors and devisees of the Estate. The Fourth District Court of Appeal has recognized that a claimant to an estate is an "interested person" and has standing in a proceeding to approve the personal representative's final accounting and petition for discharge. *See, Arzuman v. Estate of Prince Bander BIN Saud Bin, etc.*, 879 So.2d 675 (Fla. 4th DCA 2004).

II. Ted Bernstein should not be appointed as Successor Personal Representative

A. Misconduct in the Shirley Bernstein Estate

5. There are serious allegations of fraud and forgery in the Shirley Bernstein Estate where Ted Bernstein is now the Personal Representative. Documents were submitted to the Court bearing notarized signatures of Simon Bernstein, alleged signatures by him, but on a date after he had passed away.

6. This Court was apprised of these allegations in a hearing conducted September 13, 2013 wherein the Court questioned whether the potential parties involved should be read their Miranda Rights. (*See* Transcript of Proceedings, pages 15 and 16, attached as Exhibit "C.")

7. This Court should not appoint Ted Bernstein to serve as Personal Representative in the Estate of Simon Bernstein under circumstances where allegations of fraud and wrongdoing

are unresolved and arise out of the performance of his fiduciary duties in the estate of his mother, Shirley Bernstein.

B. The "lost" Insurance Trust

8. At the time of Simon Bernstein's death, it was determined that there existed a life insurance policy issued by Heritage Mutual Insurance Company ("Heritage") allegedly payable to the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust as beneficiary (the "Insurance Trust"). According to an SS-4 Application for EIN form submitted to the IRS on June 21, 1995, Shirley Bernstein was represented as Trustee of the Insurance Trust. (*See* SS-4 Application for EIN as Exhibit "D.")

9. Notwithstanding the earlier SS-4 EIN form, on November 1, 2012, Robert Spallina, one of the resigning Co-Personal Representatives of this Estate, submitted a claim form to Heritage on behalf of the Insurance Trust for the benefit of the grown children of Simon Bernstein. In doing so, Spallina represented that he was the Trustee of the Insurance Trust. (*See* Exhibit "E") Spallina made this representation despite having informed Heritage by letter shortly thereafter that he was "unable to locate the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust dated June 1, 1995." (*See* Exhibit "F" attached.) If the Trust instrument cannot be found, the insurance proceeds would be payable to the Simon Bernstein Estate, and as such, could be available to pay creditors of the Estate such as Stansbury.

10. Spallina, with the knowledge of Ted Bernstein, represented that he was "Trustee" of the Insurance Trust in an effort to collect the insurance proceeds on behalf the Insurance Trust and for the benefit of the grown children of Simon Bernstein, so as to circumvent the Simon Bernstein Estate.

11. Thereafter, Heritage refused to pay the life insurance proceeds to anyone without a court order. The alleged Insurance Trust then sued Heritage in the Circuit Court of Cook

County, Illinois (the case has since been removed to Federal Court). In paragraph 2 of the Complaint, the Plaintiff, the Insurance Trust, although apparently still “lost,” alleges that Ted Bernstein is the “trustee” of the Insurance Trust. Yet, there exists no trust document establishing the continued existence of the Insurance Trust, let alone that Ted is the Trustee. As a result, Ted’s representation, like that of Spallina, appears plainly false and should disqualify him from serving as a fiduciary in the Estate.

C. Ted Bernstein has Conflicts of Interest ---

(a) The Insurance Litigation in Chicago

12. Ted Bernstein, as well as his siblings (other than Eliot Bernstein) - Lisa Sue Friedstein, Pamela Beth Simon, and Jill Iantoni - have a conflict of interest precluding them from faithfully executing the duties of fiduciary on behalf of the Estate.

13. One of the considerations for removal of a Personal Representative as set forth in §733.504(9) (2013) is, “**(9) Holding or acquiring conflicting or adverse interests against the estate that will or may interfere with the administration of the estate as a whole.**”

14. A trail of e-mails indicates that Ted Bernstein, Lisa Sue Friedstein, Pamela Beth Simon and Jill Iantoni were advocating and scheming to keep the proceeds from the Heritage life insurance policy, as described above in paragraphs 8 thru 11 from being paid to the Estate. The stated purpose of this scheme was to avoid making the life insurance proceeds available to pay creditors of the Estate such as Stansbury. (*See*, selected e-mail messages, attached hereto as Composite Exhibit “G”.) The residuary beneficiaries of the Will, that is, the grandchildren of Simon Bernstein, would also be prejudiced by such a determination.

15. Section 733.602(1), Fla. Stat. (2013), expressly provides that “. . . A personal representative shall use the authority conferred by this code, the authority in the will, if any, and

the authority of any order of the court, **for the best interests of interested persons, including creditors.**” (Emphasis added.)

16. While the ultimate outcome of the adjudication of the issues surrounding the Heritage life insurance proceeds is uncertain, what is clear is that each of the children of Simon Bernstein, other than Eliot Bernstein, have advocated, and continue to advocate a position that is contrary to the best interests of the Estate, its creditors and beneficiaries. These two conflicting and contrary positions between the interests of the children of Simon Bernstein (other than Eliot) and the duty of the successor fiduciary to act in the best interests of the Estate, including the creditors and beneficiaries, render Ted Bernstein, Lisa Sue Friedstein, Pamela Beth Simon and Jill Iantoni unqualified to serve as successor fiduciaries. *See Estate of Bell v. Johnson*, 573 So.2d 57 (Fla. 1st DCA, 1990) (conflict between personal representative, in that capacity, and as power of attorney, necessitated removal as personal representative).

(b) Stansbury’s Lawsuit Against the Estate

17. The Stansbury Lawsuit filed against the Estate also named as Defendants Ted Bernstein individually and several entities with which Stansbury, Ted Bernstein and Simon Bernstein were associated. On June 9, 2014, through a mediation agreed upon by the parties, Stansbury settled with Ted and some entity Defendants.

18. Allegations of fraud are made against both Ted Bernstein and Simon Bernstein. The remaining Defendant of significance in the case is the Estate. As a consequence, Ted would have absolutely no objectivity serving as Personal Representative of the Estate when evaluating the Stansbury lawsuit.

D. The Ted Bernstein and Eliot Bernstein Litigation

19. The animus and “bad blood” that has surfaced between Ted Bernstein and Eliot Bernstein, and to a lesser extent the other Bernstein siblings, makes the selection of any of the

Bernstein siblings as successor Personal Representative ill-advised. Such an appointment would virtually guarantee that the Court's docket and courtroom will be continuously inundated with motions and other activities initiated by the warring factions, all to the detriment of the beneficiaries and creditors of the Estate such as Stansbury.


E. The Court Should Appoint an Independent Successor Personal Representative.

20. Stansbury moves this Court for the appointment of an independent, third party Successor Personal Representative that will administer the Estate in an objective, unbiased and fair manner, as set forth in § 733.5061, Fla. Stat. (2013) and in accordance with the procedure set forth in §733.501, Fla. Stat. (2013). Additionally, Stansbury moves this Court to appoint the same independent Successor Personal Representative to be Successor Trustee of the Simon Bernstein Revocable Trust as well.

21. In connection therewith, Stansbury offers the following individuals that have expressed a willingness to serve as both Successor Personal Representative and Trustee of the Revocable Trust:

- (a) Brian O'Connell, Esq.
- (b) Michael Mopsick, Esq.

22. The resumes setting forth the experience and qualifications of the aforementioned individuals are attached hereto as Exhibits "H" and "I".



Peter M. Feaman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished to parties listed on the attached Service list by U.S. Mail and via e-mail service at arose@mrachek-law.com and mchandler@mrachek-law.com to Alan Rose, Esq., PAGE, MRACHEK, Attorneys for Defendants, Ted Bernstein, 505 So. Flagler Drive, Suite 600, West Palm Beach, FL 33401, and at courtfilings@pankauskilawfirm.com to John J. Pankauski, Esq., PANKAUSKI LAW FIRM, 120 South Olive Avenue, Suite 701, West Palm Beach, FL 33401; Eliot Bernstein, 2753 NW 34th Street, Boca Raton, FL 33434, iviewit@iviewit.tv; and William H. Glasko, Esq., Golden Cowan, P.A., PALMETTO BAY LAW CENTER, 17345 S. Dixie Highway, Palmetto Bay, FL 33157, bill@palmettobaylaw.com; Benjamin P. Brown, Esq., Matwiczuk & Brown, LLP, 625 N. Flagler Drive, Suite 401, West Palm Beach, FL 33401, bbrown@matbrolaw.com; John P. Morrissey, Esq., 330 Clematis Street, Suite 213, West Palm Beach, FL 33401, john@jmorrisseylaw.com, Irwin J. Block, Esq., 700 S. Federal Hwy., Suite 200, Boca Raton, FL 33432, ijb@ijblegal.com, on this 27th day of June, 2014.

PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A.
3615 W. Boynton Beach Blvd.
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
Tel: 561-734-5552
Fax: 561-734-5554
Service: service@feamanlaw.com
mkoskey@feamanlaw.com

By: _____


Peter M. Feaman
Florida Bar No.: 0260347

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH
JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR
PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

IN RE: Case No. 502012CP004391 SB

ESTATE OF SIMON
BERNSTEIN,
Deceased.

Division: IZ

COPY
SOUTH COUNTY BRANCH OFFICE
ORIGINAL RECEIVED

NOV 06 2012


SHARON R. BOCK
CLERK & COMPTROLLER
PALM BEACH COUNTY

STATEMENT OF CLAIM BY WILLIAM E. STANSBURY

The undersigned hereby presents for filing against the above estate this Statement of Claim and alleges:


1. The basis for the claim is the action pending in Palm Beach County, Florida, *Stansbury v. Bernstein, et. al*, Case No. 502012CA 013933XXXX MB (the "Pending Action"). A true and correct copy of the Complaint filed by claimant that initiated the Pending Action is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and is hereby incorporated by reference herein (the "Complaint").
2. The name and address of the claimant are William E. Stansbury, 6920 Caviro Lane, Boynton Beach, Florida 33437, and the name and address of the claimant's attorney is set forth below.
3. The amount of the claim is in excess of \$2.5 million dollars, which the Claimant is entitled to recover under the claims set forth in the Complaint, which amount the Claimant believes is now due.
4. The claim is contingent or unliquidated and uncertain to the extent that the Claimant's claim is dependent on the outcome of the Pending Action. The specific amount of Claimant's claim will be determined in Pending Action and the Claimant expects to recover in excess of \$2.5 million dollars in damages, as well as, but not limited to, treble damages, pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, and costs.
5. The claim is not secured.

[Signature page follows this page]




Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have read the foregoing, and the facts alleged are true, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed on November 6, 2012.


William E. Stansbury, Claimant

Attorneys for Claimant


Peter M. Feaman, Esq.
Florida Bar No.: 260347
PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A.
3615 West Boynton Beach Blvd.
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
Phone: (561) 734-5552
Facsimile: (561) 734-5554
Primary Electronic Mail Address:
pfeaman@feamanlaw.com

Copy mailed to attorney for Personal
Representative on _____
2012.

MUST BE FILED IN DUPLICATE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
15TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR
PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

WILLIAM E. STANSBURY,
Plaintiff,

CASE NO: 50 2012 CA 013933 MB AA


v.

TED S. BERNSTEIN; DONALD TESCHER and
ROBERT SPALLINA, as co-personal
representatives of the ESTATE OF SIMON L.
BERNSTEIN and as co-trustees of the SHIRLEY
BERNSTEIN TRUST AGREEMENT dated
May 20, 2008; LIC HOLDINGS, INC.;
ARBITRAGE INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT, LLC,
f/k/a ARBITRAGE INTERNATIONAL
HOLDINGS, LLC; BERNSTEIN FAMILY
REALTY, LLC,
Defendants.

SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT BY INTERLINEATION

WILLIAM E. STANSBURY, by and through undersigned counsel, sues the Defendants
and states:

1. This is an action for money damages in excess of \$15,000, and for equitable relief.
2. Plaintiff (hereinafter referred to as "STANSBURY") is *sui juris*, and a resident of Palm Beach County, Florida.
3. Defendant TED S. BERNSTEIN ("TED BERNSTEIN"), is *sui juris*, and a resident of Palm Beach County, Florida.
4. SIMON L. BERNSTEIN ("SIMON BERNSTEIN") died on or about September 13, 2012, after the filing of the initial Complaint in this action. At the time of his death, SIMON BERNSTEIN was *sui juris*, and was a resident of Palm Beach County, Florida. Defendants



Donald R. Tescher and Robert L. Spallina are serving as co-personal representatives of the ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN (the "ESTATE") which ESTATE is presently open and pending in the Palm Beach County Circuit Court, *In re: Estate of Simon L. Bernstein*, Case No. 502012CP004391XXXXSB (the "Estate Proceeding"). In accordance with Section 733.705, Florida Statutes, STANSBURY hereby brings this independent action against the ESTATE with respect to his Statement of Claim that was filed and objected to in the Estate Proceeding.

5. Defendant, LIC HOLDINGS, INC. ("LIC Holdings") is a Florida corporation with its principal place of business in Palm Beach County, Florida.

6. Defendant, ARBITRAGE INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT, LLC, formerly known as ARBITRAGE INTERNATIONAL HOLDINGS, LLC, ("ARBITRAGE") is a Florida limited liability company with its principal place of business in Palm Beach County, Florida.

7. Defendant, BERNSTEIN FAMILY REALTY, LLC is a Florida limited liability company doing business in Palm Beach County.

8. Defendant, the SHIRLEY BERNSTEIN TRUST AGREEMENT dated May 20, 2008 ("SHIRLEY'S TRUST"), owns real property in Palm Beach County, Florida. Based upon information and belief, Donald R. Tescher and Robert L. Spallina are serving as co-trustees of SHIRLEY'S TRUST. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the trustees and the beneficiaries of SHIRLEY'S TRUST under Section 736.0202, Florida Statutes, as the principal place of administration of SHIRLEY'S TRUST is in Palm Beach County, Florida. This court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under Section 736.0203, Florida Statutes. Venue is proper in Palm Beach County, Florida, under Section 736.0204, Florida Statutes, as the principal place of administration of SHIRLEY'S TRUST is in Palm Beach County, Florida and one or more of the beneficiaries of SHIRLEY'S TRUST reside in Palm Beach County, Florida.

9. The acts and incidents giving rise to the causes of action alleged herein arose in Palm Beach County, Florida.

General Allegations

10. STANSBURY has worked in the insurance industry for virtually all of his adult life. After 30 years, he had become well-known and highly regarded by major insurance companies, their principals and others throughout the insurance industry, at all levels thereof, as well as by professionals, including attorneys, CPA's, financial advisors, wealth managers and others who were involved in serving, or otherwise dealing with insurers, insurance brokers and life insurance products.

11. SIMON BERNSTEIN dealt at sophisticated levels of the insurance industry and specialized in developing and marketing insurance concepts suitable for persons of high net worth to incorporate into their wealth management and estate planning.

12. TED BERNSTEIN, the son of SIMON BERNSTEIN, was also actively involved in selling life insurance products in conjunction with attorneys, CPAs and other professionals, to be incorporated into high net worth individuals' financial and estate planning.

13. TED BERNSTEIN, acting on his behalf and on behalf of, and in concert with, SIMON BERNSTEIN, approached STANSBURY in 2003, urging STANSBURY to spearhead the marketing of a unique insurance concept, newly developed by a prominent law firm, which was designed for use in the financial and estate planning of high net worth individuals.

14. TED BERNSTEIN told STANSBURY that he knew of STANSBURY's expertise and reputation in the insurance and related industries and that STANSBURY was skilled at and accustomed to speaking and marketing insurance products to groups of professionals. He realized that STANSBURY, because of his knowledge, reputation and abilities, would be well suited to market this concept nationwide through prominent and experienced professionals.

15. In 2006, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN (collectively, "BERNSTEIN" or the "BERNSTEINS") formed, as sole shareholders, Defendants LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE for the purpose of marketing and selling certain life insurance products to high net worth individuals for their wealth management and estate planning needs.

16. STANSBURY agreed to become an employee of LIC Holdings, Inc. and ARBITRAGE and agreed to a salary of 15% of net retained commissions received on all products sold, including renewals. STANSBURY at this time was responsible for, among other duties, calculating, on a monthly basis, the commissions due him in connection with new business generated in the current year and renewals on business generated in previous years.

17. STANSBURY worked with diligence and skill, traveling throughout the United States, generating ever-increasing sales and generating very large commissions. By 2006, nationwide sales were resulting in substantial commissions on new policies and renewal commissions.

18. Also in 2006, SIMON BERNSTEIN, acting on his behalf and on behalf of, and in concert with, TED BERNSTEIN, told STANSBURY that STANSBURY was being rewarded for his efforts and the explosive growth of the business, such that he would receive a 10% ownership interest in LIC Holdings, Inc. SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, collectively, were majority shareholders while STANSBURY was a minority shareholder in LIC Holdings, Inc.

19. STANSBURY has sued both LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE because the BERNSTEINS represented that his employment relationship was with LIC Holdings, the company in which he owned a 10% interest, but STANSBURY'S W-2 statements were issued by ARBITRAGE as his employer.

20. In February of 2008, SIMON BERNSTEIN, acting on his behalf and on behalf of, and in concert with TED BERNSTEIN, approached STANSBURY and told him his time would

be better spent building the business rather than performing monthly calculations of income. The plan proposed was that, rather than STANSBURY performing computations on a monthly basis as to how much should be paid to him based upon 15% of the net retained commissions derived from both new policies sold and renewals from previous years, the BERNSTEINS and STANSBURY all would forego monthly payouts and defer compensation until the end of 2008, when year-end computations could be made. It was represented that in December, year-end computations would be made and salaries would be paid in December 2008 or January of 2009. It was specifically represented to STANSBURY that:

a) neither SIMON BERNSTEIN, TED BERNSTEIN nor STANSBURY would take any compensation during fiscal year 2008 but rather they all would wait until the year-end accounting was performed in December of 2008 or January, 2009;

b) SIMON BERNSTEIN, TED BERNSTEIN, and STANSBURY would each be paid a minimum salary of \$1,000,000 at year end, and STANSBURY'S salary was to be applied against his earned commissions of 15%. Any compensation due STANSBURY over and above the \$1,000,000 would be paid as a distribution on his stock ownership interest in LIC Holdings.

21. In January of 2008, STANSBURY was paid \$420,018 for commissions earned on some 2007 sales. However, STANSBURY was not, and has never been, paid the commissions due him on sales in 2008 and thereafter, and he was not and has never been paid the renewal commissions due him on sales made in previous years that were paid to LIC Holdings or ARBITRAGE in 2008 and thereafter, other than a nominal payment of \$30,000 made in 2010.

22. When STANSBURY was not paid as agreed in late 2008/2009 and thereafter, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, on behalf of and in concert with each other, stated to STANSBURY that salary and ownership distributions due and owing to SIMON BERNSTEIN, TED BERNSTEIN and STANSBURY would be deferred to a future time. This

deferral of payment was represented to be important because, as a result of the virtual collapse of the capital lending markets in 2008, it was necessary to retain the funds in the corporate bank accounts to demonstrate to potential lenders the financial stability of the companies.

23. The false statements set forth in paragraphs 18 through 21, above, were made by SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, in concert with each other, with knowledge of their falsity and with the intention of never to fulfilling such promises.

24. Despite the representations to STANSBURY set forth above to the contrary, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, as officers and majority shareholders of LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE, authorized LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE to pay themselves \$3,756,229.00 and \$5,225,825.00, respectively, in 2008. Contrary to the representations made as set forth in paragraph 20, STANSBURY received no compensation for first year commissions and renewal commissions due him in 2008.

25. The net retained commissions by LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE, not including renewals, for 2008 were approximately \$13,442,549.00. As such, STANSBURY was entitled to, at the very minimum, 15% of \$13,442,549.00, or \$2,016,382.35.

26. Beginning late in 2007 or early in 2008, and continuing through at least 2012, LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE became the alter ego of SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, as officers and majority shareholders, in that they disregarded corporate structure and wrongfully diverted, converted and depleted corporate assets of LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE for their own personal benefit and the benefit of Bernstein family trusts and other entities as more specifically set forth below. Those trusts have since invested some of these wrongfully diverted and converted corporate assets in real estate, also as more particularly set forth below. The wrongful action of SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN in diverting and converting corporate assets rendered LIC Holdings, and possibly ARBITRAGE, insolvent.

27. Throughout 2009, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN continued to make false statements to STANSBURY to hide the fact that LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE was their alter ego, in that they converted corporate property and corporate assets of LIC and/or ARBITRAGE for their own personal benefit in 2008, 2009 and thereafter, all to the exclusion and financial detriment of STANSBURY, all the while fraudulently representing to STANSBURY that no money was being paid as salary or distributions to SIMON BERNSTEIN, TED BERNSTEIN or STANSBURY because it was necessary to hold the funds in the corporate bank accounts to show to potential lenders the financial stability of the company.

28. STANSBURY relied upon these continuing misrepresentations of Defendants to his detriment. Because STANSBURY was told that potential funding sources for the business needed to see that capital of the company was available, he took no action when he did not receive any compensation for 2009 and was paid only \$30,000 in 2010.

29. In order to continue their scheme to defraud, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN failed and refused to account for renewal commissions and failed to supply any financial information to STANSBURY concerning LIC Holdings or ARBITRAGE.

30. In furtherance of their scheme to deprive STANSBURY of salary he had earned and shareholder distributions to which he was entitled, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN intercepted mail addressed to STANSBURY, removing commission checks representing commissions due to STANSBURY, deposited the funds into their own accounts and otherwise converted the funds. SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN also opened STANSBURY's mail containing checks payable to him which were unrelated to them and the businesses.

31. In December, 2011 STANSBURY had been battling a painful and debilitating disease that could only be managed through the administration of potentially harmful

prescription medications. On December 22, 2011, the Defendants BERNSTEIN, with knowledge of STANSBURY's health issues and his debilitated condition, decided to take advantage of and deceive STANSBURY further. STANSBURY had for years been given K-1 statements reflecting his 10% ownership of LIC Holdings. At that time, TED BERNSTEIN told STANSBURY that the company accountant had discovered a potential significant taxable event which could cause STANSBURY, as one of the owners of LIC Holdings to pay taxes on phantom income. TED BERNSTEIN promised that if STANSBURY would sign a paper ceding his 10% interest in LIC Holdings, he would not have to pay the tax if in fact the tax was due. TED BERNSTEIN promised he would hold the paper, promising it would not become operative until STANSBURY and the Defendants BERNSTEIN discussed the situation further in the first quarter of 2012.

32. Because of the misrepresentations, willful concealments of material facts, duplicity and deceit practiced by Defendants upon STANSBURY, STANSBURY reasonably believed that Defendants had complied, or intended to comply with their obligations to STANSBURY under the contract between them. STANSBURY, therefore, was prevented from knowing for a period of years that the causes of action asserted herein existed.

33. By the second quarter of 2012, STANSBURY developed the belief that the BERNSTEINS' representations over the years were wholly false and he sought legal counsel.

34. STANSBURY has retained the law firm of Peter M. Feaman, P.A. and has agreed to pay it a reasonable fee for its services rendered herein.

COUNT I - ACCOUNTING
(Against LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE, for Accounting)

35. STANSBURY hereby reiterates and incorporates herein by reference, as if fully restated herein, preceding paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive.

36. The relationship between STANSBURY and the Defendants, particularly as affected by Defendants' acts described in preceding paragraphs 19 through 27 created a situation where Defendants had sole access to receipts generated by STANSBURY's efforts, and to books and records reflecting said receipts and the other information from which can be calculated all moneys due to STANSBURY under his arrangement with Defendants.

37. The period of time during which STANSBURY has been deprived of monies due him spans approximately four and a half years. The various sources of revenue to Defendants of monies from which the amounts due STANSBURY may be calculated, the manner in which STANSBURY was to be paid, and the amount due STANSBURY all involve extensive and complicated accounts, and STANSBURY's remedy at law cannot be as full, adequate and expeditious as it is in equity.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff STANSBURY prays for an adjudication of Plaintiff's right to a full and complete accounting from Defendants, LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE, and for such orders of Court as will require such Defendants to provide STANSBURY with all records and copies of documents from January 1, 2006 to the present, in order to reveal his right to, and the amount of all sums: (a) received as commissions to which STANSBURY was entitled to a share; (b) due to STANSBURY, whether paid or not; (c) paid to STANSBURY, whether for commissions, salary, distributions, expenses or any other reason; (d) paid to each of the BERNSTEIN Defendants out of monies received as commissions; (e) deposits of any and all moneys received as commissions by any Defendants to any accounts, including the name of the entity whose account was involved, the number(s) of each such account; the address of the branch or other facility through which any Defendant dealt with such entity; (f) calculations as to moneys paid, to be paid, or not to be paid to STANSBURY, together with an award of court costs and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT II - BREACH OF ORAL CONTRACT
(Against LIC Holdings, Inc., ARBITRAGE, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN)

38. Plaintiff hereby reiterates and incorporates herein by reference, as if fully restated herein, preceding paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive.

39. The arrangement between STANSBURY and Defendants, as described in paragraphs 13 through 28 above, constituted a contract between them.

40. An express term of that contract involved the commitment of LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE to calculate and pay to STANSBURY all sums due to him under the contract, whether as commissions, salary, distributions, expenses or any other reason.

41. The Defendants initially performed the duties required of them under said contract.

42. However, Defendants breached their contract with STANSBURY by withholding from STANSBURY monies due him under the contract for renewal commissions earned in 2007 and commissions and renewal commissions earned in 2008 and thereafter.

43. The withholding of such monies constitutes a material breach of the contract between STANSBURY and LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE.

44. STANSBURY has sued both LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE because the BERNSTEINS represented that his employment relationship was with LIC Holdings, the company in which he owned a 10% interest, but STANSBURY'S W-2 statements were issued by ARBITRAGE as his employer.

45. SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN are personally liable, jointly and severally, for the material breach of the oral employment contract with STANSBURY as LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE were the alter ego of SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED

BERNSTEIN in that the BERNSTEINS depleted corporate assets for their personal benefit by causing the corporation or corporations to make exorbitant and inappropriate distributions to themselves, family members, and BERNSTEIN family trusts and other entities, at the expense of corporate creditors such as STANSBURY, to wit:

- a) SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN caused LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE to pay to them at least \$3,756,229.00 and \$5,225,825.00, respectively, in fiscal 2008 during which time STANSBURY, other than the amount referenced in paragraph 21, was paid nothing;
- b) According to Palm Beach County public records, in December of 2007 TED BERNSTEIN purchased a property at 880 Berkeley Street, Boca Raton, Florida 33487, for \$4,400,000;
- c) According to Palm Beach County public records, on December 28, 2008, TED BERNSTEIN paid off the mortgage in the amount of \$486,400.00 on a property he owned at 15807 Menton Bay Court, Saturnia Isles, Delray Beach, Florida 33446;
- d) According to Palm Beach County public records, SIMON BERNSTEIN paid off the mortgage on property he and his wife owned, and subsequently transferred by quitclaim deed on May 20, 2008 to the trustee of SHIRLEY'S TRUST, at 7020 Lions Head Lane, Boca Raton, Florida, 33496. The amount of the mortgage pay-off is unknown, but in 2013 the property was listed for sale at \$2,399,000;
- e) According to Palm Beach County public records, on June 18, 2008, BERNSTEIN FAMILY REALTY, LLC acquired a property located at 2753 N.W. 34 Street, Boca Madera Unit 2, Boca Raton, Florida 33432 (the "Boca Madera Property). On July 8, 2008, SIMON BERNSTEIN loaned \$365,000 to BERNSTEIN FAMILY REALTY, LLC. The specific

purpose of the loan is unknown, but SIMON BERNSTEIN received a mortgage on the Boca Madera Property to secure the loan;

f) According to Palm Beach County public records, on May 20, 2008 SIMON BERNSTEIN and his wife transferred by quitclaim deed to the trustee of SHIRLEY'S TRUST a 4,220 square foot oceanfront condominium unit in a complex known as "The Aragon" in Boca Raton, located at 2494 South Ocean Boulevard, Boca Raton, Florida. The mortgage on that property was paid off on September 27, 2010.

g) The legal descriptions for each of the above referenced properties are attached hereto as Exhibit "B."

46. There is due to STANSBURY from such Defendants all amounts due under said contract, together with prejudgment and post-judgment interest on said amounts.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN declaring that Defendants, LIC Holdings, Inc. and ARBITRAGE INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT, LLC, are or were the alter ego of SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN such that the corporate veil of LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE should be pierced; for judgment against Defendants, LIC Holdings, Inc., ARBITRAGE INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT, LLC, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, jointly and severally, in excess of \$1,500,000.00 for the amounts due to Plaintiff under the terms of their contract, together with prejudgment and post-judgment interest; for his court costs herein expended and for such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT III - FRAUD IN THE INDUCEMENT- EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT
(Against SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN)

47. Plaintiff hereby reiterates and incorporates herein by reference, as if fully restated herein, preceding paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive.

48. At all material times hereto, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN were officers and majority shareholders of LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE.

49. The statements set forth in paragraphs 18 through 24, above, made by SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, on behalf of and in concert with each other, and as officers and majority shareholders of LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE, were false statements of material fact that SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN knew to be false at the time they were made, as SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN never intended to authorize LIC Holdings or ARBITRAGE to pay to STANSBURY the amounts due him as evidenced by the fact that the accountant for LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE prepared financial worksheets for 2008 showing that the BERNSTEINS would receive compensation, but STANSBURY would not, for fiscal 2008, in direct contravention to their statements and promises to STANSBURY.

50. SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN intended for STANSBURY to rely on such statements that he would be ultimately be paid for his productivity in order to induce him into continuing his productive and revenue-generating sales activity as an employee of LIC Holding and/or ARBITRAGE and fraudulently created for STANSBURY the false expectation that STANSBURY would be paid as agreed.

51. STANSBURY in fact relied to his detriment on these false statements and was induced thereby to remain in his employment relationship with LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE as he continued to sell, with the expectation of payment, products and generate revenue for LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE until 2012, and was further induced not to pursue from LIC Holdings and/ARBITRAGE his right to payment of all amounts due him until after SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN had diverted and converted corporate assets for their personal benefit, rendering LIC Holdings, and possibly ARBITRAGE, insolvent.

52. STANSBURY was injured thereby as he was not and has not been compensated for his revenue-generating sales and other performance, and did not seek alternative employment, as a proximate result of his detrimental reliance on these false statements.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, jointly and severally, for damages in excess of \$1,500,000.00 together with prejudgment and post-judgment interest; for the imposition of an equitable lien and constructive trust on the Bernstein real estate described in paragraph 45 and Exhibit "B" as more fully set forth in Counts VII and VIII of this Second Amended Complaint; for his court costs herein expended; and for such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper. STANSBURY reserves the right to move to amend to request punitive damages in accordance with Florida Law.

COUNT IV - FRAUD IN THE INDUCEMENT -
CEDING OF LIC HOLDINGS OWNERSHIP INTEREST
(Against Ted Bernstein and LIC Holdings, Inc.)

53. Plaintiff hereby reiterates and incorporates herein by reference, as if fully restated herein, preceding paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive.

54. In the fourth quarter of 2011, TED BERNSTEIN embarked upon a plan to defraud from STANSBURY his 10% ownership interest in LIC Holdings, Inc. As set forth in paragraph 31 above, Defendant TED BERNSTEIN fraudulently induced STANSBURY to prepare and sign a document giving up his 10% interest in and to LIC Holdings, Inc.

55. The ceding of his shares in LIC Holdings, Inc. was procured by fraud and STANSBURY relied upon the representations made by BERNSTEIN with regard to signing the document apparently ceding his stock.

56. It was reasonable for STANSBURY to rely on the representations made by BERNSTEIN because at that time STANSBURY was unaware of the breaches of fiduciary duty and breaches of the oral contract that had taken place.

57. As a result of STANSBURY's reliance, STANSBURY has been damaged by the loss of 10% of the shares of LIC Holdings and the rights and remedies to a shareholder related thereto.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for a judgment for damages against Defendants BERNSTEIN and LIC Holdings, Inc. for the damages caused by the fraudulent conduct of BERNSTEIN as described herein, together with reasonable costs, pre-judgment interest and any other relief this Court deems just and proper.

COUNT V - CIVIL CONSPIRACY
(Against Simon Bernstein and Ted Bernstein)

58. Plaintiff hereby reiterates and incorporates herein by reference, as if fully restated herein, preceding paragraphs 1 through 34, and Counts III and IV, paragraphs 47 through 57, inclusive.

59. SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, individually and as officers and majority shareholders of LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE, knowingly, willfully, intentionally, and maliciously conspired, agreed, combined and confederated with each other to make fraudulent, false and misleading statements to STANSBURY intended to induce STANSBURY to continue his employment relationship with LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE during 2008 and thereafter, without ever intending to authorize payment to STANSBURY for the amounts he was due, a relationship that generated substantial revenue for LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE and, ultimately, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN.

60. SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, individually and as officers and majority shareholders of LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE, knowingly, willfully, intentionally, and maliciously conspired, agreed, combined and confederated with each other to make fraudulent, false and misleading statements to STANSBURY intended to induce STANSBURY to delay pursuing his right to payment for all amounts due him until such time after SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN had converted and diverted corporate assets rendering LIC Holdings, and possibly ARBITRAGE, insolvent and uncollectible.

61. SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, individually and as officers and majority shareholders of LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE, knowingly, willfully, intentionally, and maliciously conspired, agreed, combined and confederated with each other to fraudulently induce STANSBURY, through false and misleading statements, to surrender and cede, without fair value payment, his 10% interest in LIC Holdings.

62. The numerous fraudulent, false and misleading statements made by SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN were all overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy.

63. STANSBURY was injured thereby in that, as a proximate result of the conspiratorial conduct of SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, he continued in his employment with LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE, without payment of the compensation due him, he delayed pursuit of his right to collect the amounts due him, and ceded his 10% interest in LIC Holdings.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, jointly and severally, for damages in excess of \$1,500,000.00 together with prejudgment and post-judgment interest; for the imposition of an equitable lien and constructive trust on the Bernstein real estate described in paragraph 45 and Exhibit "B" as more fully set forth in Counts VII and VIII of this Second Amended Complaint;

for his court costs herein expended; and for such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper. STANSBURY reserves the right to move to amend to request punitive damages in accordance with Florida Law.

COUNT VI - CIVIL THEFT
(AGAINST ARBITRAGE INTERNATIONAL MARKETING, LLC)

64. Plaintiff hereby reiterates and incorporates herein by reference, as if fully restated herein, preceding paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive.

65. This is an action for Civil Theft under Chapter 772, Florida Statutes, more specifically §772.11, Fla.Stat.

66. In February, 2012 and March, 2012, Defendant ARBITRAGE intercepted two separate checks made payable to William STANSBURY intended as payment to STANSBURY for matters arising wholly outside his business transactions with the BERNSTEINS, LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE.

67. Notwithstanding that the checks made payable to William STANSBURY was for sums due STANSBURY by a third party not in connection with the aforesaid business transactions, ARBITRAGE and/or someone acting on its behalf, caused the negotiation of STANSBURY's checks, wrongfully endorsing the checks and retaining the sums that should have been payable to STANSBURY.

68. As a result of the foregoing, Defendant ARBITRAGE has been guilty of criminal theft by conversion with the criminal intent to steal his money and deprive STANSBURY of his possession and use thereof.

69. Written demand for payment of all amounts due STANSBURY has been made to Defendants, more than 30 days preceding the filing of this Complaint, to no avail. A copy of the demand letter is attached hereto as Exhibit "A."

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant, ARBITRAGE for three times the full amount of the checks made payable to STANSBURY, together with pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest, attorneys' fees, court costs and any other relief this Court deems just and proper.

COUNT VII - CONVERSION

70. Plaintiff hereby reiterates and incorporates herein by reference, as if fully restated herein, preceding paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive.

71. Further, during 2012, Defendants TED BERNSTEIN, SIMON BERNSTEIN, LIC Holdings, Inc., ARBITRAGE, or someone acting on their behalves, received and cashed in excess of \$30,000.00 worth of commission checks otherwise payable to Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for damages against Defendant, ABRITRAGE, SIMON BERNSTEIN, LIC Holdings, Inc. and TED BERNSTEIN, together with pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest, court costs and any other relief this Court deems just and proper.

COUNT VIII - UNJUST ENRICHMENT **(LIC HOLDINGS, ARBITRAGE, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN)**

72. Plaintiff hereby reiterates and incorporates herein by reference, as if fully restated herein, paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive, and the allegations of Count III.

73. STANSBURY conferred a benefit on LIC Holdings, ARBITRAGE, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN by continuing his employment relationship with LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE as a direct and proximate result of the fraudulent representations of SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, as more fully set forth in Count III herein.

74. STANSBURY's continued employment resulted in the generation of substantial revenue for LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE, which was then diverted and converted by the BERNSTEINS for their own personal use to the financial detriment of STANSBURY.

75. LIC Holdings, ARBITRAGE, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, as officers and majority shareholders of LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE, had knowledge of the benefit of STANSBURY's continued employment with LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE as they fraudulently induced STANSBURY to continue his productive employment activity while never intending to pay him the compensation he was due.

76. LIC Holdings, ARBITRAGE, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN accepted the revenues generated by STANSBURY in his capacity as employee.

77. There exists no adequate remedy at law as the conduct of the BERNSTEINS in diverting and converting the corporate assets of LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE has resulted in the insolvency of LIC Holdings and possibly ARBITRAGE.

78. The circumstances are such that it would be inequitable for LIC Holdings, ARBITRAGE, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN to retain the benefits of the STANSBURY's productive revenue-generating labor without paying fair value for it.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, LIC Holdings, Inc., ARBITRAGE INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT, LLC, SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN, jointly and severally, in an amount in excess of \$1,500,000.00 which the evidence shows Plaintiff is entitled for the fair value of the services Plaintiff provided to LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE, together with prejudgment and post-judgment interest; for his court costs herein expended and for such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT IX - EQUITABLE LIEN
(AS TO SIMON BERNSTEIN, TED BERNSTEIN, BERNSTEIN FAMILY REALTY, LLC and SHIRLEY BERNSTEIN TRUST AGREEMENT)

79. Plaintiff hereby reiterates and incorporates herein by reference, as if fully restated herein, the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 34, paragraph 45 and Counts III and VII, above.

80. STANSBURY has alleged essential facts in his General Allegations and Count III that show that SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN committed fraud by fraudulently inducing STANSBURY to continue in an employment relationship that proved to be highly lucrative for SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN.

81. STANSBURY has alleged essential facts in his General Allegations and Count VII that show that SIMON BERNSTEIN and TED BERNSTEIN were unjustly enriched by STANSBURY's uncompensated continued employment with LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE.

82. The conduct of the BERNSTEINS in depleting the corporate assets of LIC Holdings and ARBITRAGE for their personal benefit by causing the corporation or corporations to make exorbitant and inappropriate distributions to themselves, family members, and BERNSTEIN FAMILY REALTY, LLC and SHIRLEY BERNSTEIN TRUST AGREEMENT, at the expense of corporate creditors such as STANSBURY, rendered LIC Holdings and possibly ARBITRAGE insolvent. Therefore STANSBURY has no adequate remedy at law.

83. BERNSTEIN FAMILY REALTY, LLC and SHIRLEY BERNSTEIN TRUST AGREEMENT were the transferees of some of the corporate assets of LIC Holdings and/or ARBITRAGE wrongfully diverted and converted by the BERNSTEIN and thus are proper parties to this action and this Count.

84. An equitable lien on the real estate described in paragraph 45 herein and Exhibit "B" attached hereto is justified as an equitable remedy for the wrongful conduct of the BERNSTEINS.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the Court to declare and establish an equitable lien in favor of Plaintiff in an amount equal to the funds wrongfully diverted, on the property described in paragraph 45 and Exhibit "B" attached hereto, and on all other assets of the Defendants named in this Count IX, or third parties as yet unknown, which assets have been purchased wholly or in part, improved or benefitted by the diverted funds due Plaintiff, together with his costs herein expended, and such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT X - CONSTRUCTIVE TRUST
(AS TO SIMON BERNSTEIN, TED BERNSTEIN, BERNSTEIN FAMILY
REALTY, LLC and SHIRLEY BERNSTEIN TRUST AGREEMENT)

85. Plaintiff hereby reiterates and incorporates herein by reference, as if fully restated herein, preceding paragraphs 79 through 84 above.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the Court to declare and establish a constructive trust in favor of Plaintiff on the property described in paragraph 45 and Exhibit "B" attached hereto in an amount equal to the funds wrongfully diverted and on all assets of Defendants or third parties as yet unknown, which assets have been purchased wholly or partly, improved or mortgaged by the diversion of said funds due Plaintiff. Plaintiff further prays for an award of court costs and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

86. Plaintiff reiterates his demand for trial by jury on all issues so triable.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that the above and foregoing has been forwarded via e-mail service at mrmlaw@comcast.net; and mrmlaw1@gmail.com to Mark R. Manceri, Esq., Mark R. Manceri, P.A., *Attorney for Donald Tescher and Robert Spallina as Co-Personal Representatives*, 2929 E. Commercial Blvd., Suite 702, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308; at arose@pm-law.com and mchandler@pm-law.com to Alan Rose, Esq., PAGE, MRACHEK, *Attorneys for Defendants, Ted Bernstein, LIC Holdings, Inc. and Arbitrage International Management, LLC*, 505 So. Flagler Drive, Suite 600, West Palm Beach, FL 33401, on this 20 day of November, 2013.

PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A.
3615 W. Boynton Beach Blvd.
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
Telephone: (561) 734-5552
Facsimile: (561) 734-5554
pfeaman@feamanlaw.com

By: _____



Peter M. Feaman
Florida Bar No. 0260347

00001

1 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 15TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
2 IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA
3 PROBATE/GUARDIANSHIP DIVISION IY
CASE NO.: 502011CP000653XXXXSB

4 IN RE: THE ESTATE OF:
5 SHIRLEY BERNSTEIN,
Deceased

6 ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE,
Petitioner,

7 vs.

8 TESCHER & SPALLINA, P.A., (AND ALL PARTNERS,
9 ASSOCIATES AND OF COUNSEL); ROBERT L. SPALLINA
10 (BOTH PERSONALLY & PROFESSIONALLY); DONALD
11 R. TESCHER (BOTH PERSONALLY & PROFESSIONALLY);
THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN (AS ALLEGED PERSONAL
REPRESENTATIVE, TRUSTEE, SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE) (BOTH
PERSONALLY & PROFESSIONALLY); AND JOHN AND JANE
DOE'S (1-5000),
Respondents.

12 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13 BEFORE
14 THE HONORABLE MARTIN H. COLIN

15 South County Courthouse
16 200 West Atlantic Avenue, Courtroom 8
17 Delray Beach, Florida 33344


18 Friday, September 13, 2013
19 1:30 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.

20
21
22
23
24 Stenographically Reported By:
JESSICA THIBAUT

25
♀
00002

1 APPEARANCES

2
3 On Behalf of the Petitioner:
4 ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE
2753 NW 34th Street
5 Boca Raton, Florida 33434
6



In Re_ The Estate of Shirley Bernstein.txt

7
8 MR. MANCERI: That's when the order was
9 signed, yes, your Honor.

10 THE COURT: He filed it, physically came
11 to court.

12 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Oh.

13 THE COURT: So let me see when he actually
14 filed it and signed the paperwork. November.
15 What date did your dad die?

16 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: September. It's
17 hard to get through. He does a lot of things
18 when he's dead.

19 THE COURT: I have all of these waivers by
20 Simon in November. He tells me Simon was dead
21 at the time.

22 MR. MANCERI: Simon was dead at the time,
23 your Honor. The waivers that you're talking
24 about are waivers from the beneficiaries, I
25 believe.

THE COURT: No, it's waivers of

♀
00026
1 accountings.

2 MR. MANCERI: Right, by the beneficiaries.

3 THE COURT: Discharge waiver of service of
4 discharge by Simon, Simon asked that he not
5 have to serve the petition for discharge.

6 MR. MANCERI: Right, that was in his
7 petition. When was the petition served?

8 THE COURT: November 21st.

9 MR. SPALLINA: Yeah, it was after his date
10 of death.

11 THE COURT: Well, how could that happen
12 legally? How could Simon --

13 MR. MANCERI: Who signed that?

14 THE COURT: -- ask to close and not serve
15 a petition after he's dead?

16 MR. MANCERI: Your Honor, what happened
17 was is the documents were submitted with the
18 waivers originally, and this goes to
19 Mr. Bernstein's fraud allegation. As you know,
20 your Honor, you have a rule that you have to
21 have your waivers notarized. And the original
22 waivers that were submitted were not notarized,
23 so they were kicked back by the clerk. They
24 were then notarized by a staff person from
25 Tescher and Spallina admittedly in error. They

♀
00027

1 In Re_ The Estate of Shirley Bernstein.txt
2 should not have been notarized in the absentia
3 of the people who purportedly signed them. And
4 I'll give you the names of the other siblings,
5 that would be Pamela, Lisa, Jill, and Ted
6 Bernstein.

7 THE COURT: So let me tell you because I'm
8 going to stop all of you folks because I think
9 you need to be read your Miranda warnings.

10 MR. MANCERI: I need to be read my Miranda
11 warnings?

12 THE COURT: Everyone of you might have to
13 be.

14 MR. MANCERI: Okay.

15 THE COURT: Because I'm looking at a
16 formal document filed here April 9, 2012,
17 signed by Simon Bernstein, a signature for him.

18 MR. MANCERI: April 9th, right.

19 THE COURT: April 9th, signed by him, and
20 notarized on that same date by Kimberly. It's
21 a waiver and it's not filed with The Court
22 until November 19th, so the filing of it, and
23 it says to The Court on November 19th, the
24 undersigned, Simon Bernstein, does this, this,
25 and this. Signed and notarized on April 9,
2012. The notary said that she witnessed Simon

♀
00028

1 sign it then, and then for some reason it's not
2 filed with The Court until after his date of
3 death with no notice that he was dead at the
4 time that this was filed.

5 MR. MANCERI: Okay.

6 THE COURT: All right, so stop, that's
7 enough to give you Miranda warnings. Not you
8 personally --

9 MR. MANCERI: Okay.

10 THE COURT: Are you involved? Just tell
11 me yes or no.

12 MR. SPALLINA: I'm sorry?

13 THE COURT: Are you involved in the
14 transaction?

15 MR. SPALLINA: I was involved as the
16 lawyer for the estate, yes. It did not come to
17 my attention until Kimberly Moran came to me
18 after she received a letter from the Governor's
19 Office stating that they were investigating
20 some fraudulent signatures on some waivers that
21 were signed in connection with the closing of

10/22/95
65-0178116

Form **SS-4**
(Rev. August 1989)
Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Application for Employer Identification Number

(For use by employers and others. Please read the attached instructions before completing this form.) Please type or print clearly.

OMB No. 1545-0043
Expires 7-31-91

1 Name of applicant (True legal name) (See instructions.)
Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust

2 Trade name of business, if different from name in line 1
Shirley Bernstein

3 Executor, trustee, "care of name"
Shirley Bernstein

4a Mailing address (street address) (room, apt., or suite no.)
7020 Lions Head

4b City, state, and ZIP code
Boca Raton, FL 33496

5a Address of business (See instructions.)

5b City, state, and ZIP code

6 County and state where principal business is located

7 Name of principal officer, greater, or general partner (See instructions.)
Simon Bernstein, Sec. 371-32-5211

8a Type of entity (Check only one box.) (See instructions.)

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual SSN | <input type="checkbox"/> Estate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trust |
| <input type="checkbox"/> RESMIC | <input type="checkbox"/> PMA administrator SSN | <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State/local government | <input type="checkbox"/> Personal service corp. | <input type="checkbox"/> Farmers' cooperative |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other nonprofit organization (specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> National guard | <input type="checkbox"/> Church or church controlled organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) <u>></u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Other corporation (specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> Federal government/military |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Church or church controlled organization |

If nonprofit organization enter GEN (if applicable)

9a If a corporation, give name of foreign country (if applicable) or state in the U.S. where incorporated > Foreign country State

8 Reason for applying (Check only one box)

| | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Started new business | <input type="checkbox"/> Changed type of organization (specify) <u>></u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hired employees | <input type="checkbox"/> Purchased going business |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Created a pension plan (specify type) <u>></u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Created a trust (specify) <u>Insurance Trust</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Banking purpose (specify) <u>></u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) <u>></u> |

10 Date business started or acquired (Mo., day, year) (See instructions.) June 1, 1995

11 Enter closing month of accounting year. (See instructions.) December 31

12 First date wages or annuities were paid or will be paid (Mo., day, year). Note: If applicant is a withholding agent, enter date income will first be paid to nonresident alien. (Mo., day, year).

13 Enter highest number of employees expected in the next 12 months. Note: If the applicant does not expect to have any employees during the period, enter "0."

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------|
| Nonagricultural | Agricultural | Household |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------|

14 Does the applicant operate more than one place of business?
If "Yes," enter name of business. >

Yes No

15 Principal activity or service (See instructions.) >

16 Is the principal business activity manufacturing?
If "Yes," principal product and raw material used >

Yes No

17 To whom are most of the products or services sold? Please check the appropriate box.

Public (retail) Other (specify) > Business (wholesale)

18a Has the applicant ever applied for an identification number for this or any other business?
Note: If "Yes," please complete lines 18b and 18c.

Yes No

18b If you checked the "Yes" box in line 18a, give applicant's true name and trade name, if different than name shown on prior application.

True name > Trade name >

19c Enter approximate date, city, and state where the application was filed and the previous employer identification number if known.

Approximate date when filed (Mo., day, year) City and state where filed Previous EIN

Under penalty of perjury, I declare that I have examined this application, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is true, correct, and complete.


Name and title (Please type or print clearly) Shirley Bernstein, Trustee Telephone number (include area code) 407-477-9991

Signature X Date June 21, 1995

Please leave blank > > > > > >

Use for applying

For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see attached instructions.



BT000104

CLAIMANT STATEMENT

DECEASED INFORMATION

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Name of Deceased (Last, First Middle) Bernstein, Simon Leon | | 2. Last 4 digits of Deceased's Social Security No. 5221 | |
| 3. If the Deceased was known by any other names, such as maiden name, hyphenated name, nickname, derivative form of first and/or middle name or an alias, please provide them below: | | | |
| 4. Policy Number(s) 1009208 | | 5. If policy is lost or not available, please explain: unable to locate, policy is 30 years old | |
| 6. Deceased's Date of Death 09/13/12 | | 7. Cause of Death natural causes | |
| 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural <input type="checkbox"/> Accidental <input type="checkbox"/> Suicide <input type="checkbox"/> Homicide <input type="checkbox"/> Pending | | | |


CLAIMANT INFORMATION

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| 9. Claimant Name (Last, First, Middle) If trust, please list trust name and complete Trustee Certification section. Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust | | | |
| 10. Street Address | | 11. City | |
| | | 12. State and Zip | |
| | | 13. Daytime Phone Number | |
| 14. Date of Birth | | 15. Social Security or Tax ID Number | |
| | | 65-617 8916 | |
| 16. Relationship to Deceased | | | |
| 17. I am filing this claim as: <input type="checkbox"/> an individual who is named as a beneficiary under the policy <input type="checkbox"/> a Trustee of a Trust which is named as a beneficiary under the policy <input type="checkbox"/> an Executor of Estate which is named as a beneficiary under the policy <input type="checkbox"/> Other | | | |
| 18. Are you a U.S. Citizen? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If "No" please list country of citizenship | | | |
| 19. Policies subject to Viatical / Life Settlement transactions - Are you a viatical settlement provider, life settlement provider, the receiver or conservator of viatical or life settlement company, a viatical or life financing entity, trustee, agent, securities intermediary or other representative of a viatical or life settlement provider, or an individual or entity which invested in this policy as a viatical or life settlement? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | | |

CLAIMANT INFORMATION (to be completed by 2nd claimant if any)

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| 20. Claimant Name (Last, First, Middle) If trust, please list trust name and complete Trustee Certification section. | | | |
| 21. Street Address | | 22. City | |
| | | 23. State and Zip | |
| | | 24. Daytime Phone Number | |
| 25. Date of Birth | | 26. Social Security or Tax ID Number | |
| | | | |
| 27. Relationship to Deceased | | | |
| 28. I am filing this claim as: <input type="checkbox"/> an individual who is named as a beneficiary under the policy <input type="checkbox"/> a Trustee of a Trust which is named as a beneficiary under the policy <input type="checkbox"/> an Executor of Estate which is named as a beneficiary under the policy <input type="checkbox"/> Other | | | |
| 29. Are you a U.S. Citizen? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If "No" please list country of citizenship | | | |
| 30. Policies subject to Viatical / Life Settlement transactions - Are you a viatical settlement provider, life settlement provider, the receiver or conservator of viatical or life settlement company, a viatical or life financing entity, trustee, agent, securities intermediary or other representative of a viatical or life settlement provider, or an individual or entity which invested in this policy as a viatical or life settlement? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | | |

YOUR SIGNATURE IS REQUIRED ON THE NEXT PAGE.



BT000100

CLAIMANT STATEMENT

SETTLEMENT OPTIONS

The policy may contain one or more settlement options, such as Interest Payments, Installments for a Specified Amount, Life Annuity, Life Annuity with Period Certain, and/or Joint Life and Survivorship Annuity. You may choose to receive a lump sum payment or another settlement option available in the policy under which a claim is made. For more information, refer to the optional methods of policy settlement provision in the policy or contact us at the mailing address noted on the front of the claim form.

If you wish to select a settlement option, please indicate your settlement selection by name (not by number) on the line below after you have carefully reviewed the options available in the policy. Availability of settlement options are subject to the terms of the policy. If you do not choose a settlement option, we will send a lump sum settlement to you.

Name of Settlement Option from Policy _____

Important Information About the USA PATRIOT Act

To help fight the funding of terrorism and money-laundering activities, the U.S. government has passed the USA PATRIOT Act, which requires banks, including our processing agent bank, to obtain, verify and record information that identifies persons who engage in certain transactions with or through a bank. This means that we will need to verify the name, residential or street address (no P.O. Boxes), date of birth and social security number or other tax identification number of all account owners.

SUBSTITUTE FOR IRS FORM W-9

This information is being collected on this form versus IRS form W-9 and will be used for supplying information to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Under penalty of perjury, I certify that 1) the tax ID number above is correct (or I am waiting for a number to be issued to me), 2) I am not subject to backup withholding because (a) I am exempt from backup withholding, or (b) I have not been notified by the IRS that I am subject to backup withholding as a result of a failure to report all interest or dividends, or (c) the IRS has notified me that I am no longer subject to backup withholding, and 3) I am a U.S. person (including a U.S. resident alien). Please cross through item 2 if you have been notified by the IRS that you are subject to backup withholding because you have failed to report all interest and dividends on your tax return.

SIGNATURES

I/We do hereby make claim to said insurance, declare that the answers recorded above are complete and true, and agree that the furnishing of this and any supplemental forms do not constitute an admission by the Company that there was any insurance in force on the life in question, nor a waiver of its rights or defenses.

For Residents of New York: Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud my insurance company or other person files an application for insurance or statement of claim containing any materially false information, or conceals for the purpose of misleading, information concerning any fact material thereto, commits a fraudulent insurance act, which is a crime, and shall also be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed five thousand dollars and the stated value of the claim for each such violation.

For Residents of All Other States: See the Fraud Information section of this claim form.

The Internal Revenue Service does not require your consent to any provision of this document other than the certifications required to avoid backup withholding.

Signature of Claimant and Title _____

Date _____

Signature of Second Claimant, if any, and Title _____

Date _____

CLAIMANT STATEMENT

TRUSTEE CERTIFICATION

TRUSTEE CERTIFICATION (to be completed only by trusts claiming benefits)

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF A TRUST IS CLAIMING BENEFITS

Please include a copy of the trust agreement, including the signature page(s) and any amendments.

I/We, the undersigned trustee(s), represent and warrant that the copy of the trust agreement, which we will provide you pursuant to this certification, is a true and exact copy of said agreement, that said agreement is in full force and effect, and that we have the authority to make this certification.

Generation Skipping Transfer Tax Information - THIS MUST BE COMPLETED FOR PAYMENT

I/We the undersigned, on oath, deposes and states as follows with respect to the possible application of the Generation Skipping Transfer (GST) tax to the death benefit payment (Mark the appropriate item):

- 1 The GST tax does not apply because the death benefit is not included in the decedent's estate for federal estate tax purposes.
- 2 The GST tax does not apply because the GST tax exemption will offset the GST tax.
- 3 The GST tax does not apply because at least one of the trust beneficiaries is not a "skipped" person.
- 4 The GST tax does not apply because of the reasons set forth in the attached document (Please attach document setting forth the reasons why you believe the GST tax does not apply.)
- 5 The GST tax may apply. As a result, the death benefit payment IS subject to withholding of the applicable GST tax. Enclosed is the completed Schedule R-1 (Form 706) for submission to the Internal Revenue Service.

Name of Trust

Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust

Date of Trust Agreement

06/01/1995

Date of all Amendments

Trust Tax ID Number

65-6178916

Printed Name of Trustee(s)

Signature(s)

a

b

c

d

[Handwritten signature]

Robert L. Spallina

LAW OFFICES
TESCHER & SPALLINA, P.A.

BOCA VILLAGE CORPORATE CENTER I
4855 TECHNOLOGY WAY, SUITE 720
BOCA RATON, FLORIDA 33431

ATTORNEYS
DONALD R. TESCHER
ROBERT L. SPALLINA
LAUREN A. GALVANI

TEL. 561-997-7008
FAX 561-997-7308
TOLL FREE: 888-997-7008
WWW.TESCHERSPALLINA.COM

SUPPORT STAFF
DIANE DUSTIN
KIMBERLY MORAN
SUANN TESCHER

December 6, 2012

VIA FACSIMILE: 803-333-4936

Attn: Bree
Claims Department
Heritage Union Life Insurance Company
1275 Sandusky Road
Jacksonville, IL 62651

Re: **Insured: Simon L. Bernstein**
Contract No.: 1009208

Dear Bree:

As per our earlier telephone conversation:

- We are unable to locate the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust dated June 1, 1995, which we have spent much time searching for.
- Mrs. Shirley Bernstein was the initial beneficiary of the 1995 trust, but predeceased Mr. Bernstein.
- The Bernstein children are the secondary beneficiaries of the 1995 trust.
- We are submitting the Letters of Administration for the Estate of Simon Bernstein showing that we are the named Personal Representatives of the Estate.
- We would like to have the proceeds from the Heritage policy released to our firm's trust account so that we can make distributions amongst the five Bernstein children.
- If necessary, we will prepare for Heritage an Agreement and Mutual Release amongst all the children.
- We are enclosing the SS4 signed by Mr. Bernstein in 1995 to obtain the EIN number for the 1995 trust.


If you have any questions with regard to the foregoing, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Spallina/km
ROBERT L. SPALLINA

RLS/km

Enclosures



BT000083

Robert Spallina

From: Christine Yates [cty@TrippScott.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2013 6:17 AM
To: Robert Spallina
Cc: 'Eliot Ivan Bernstein'
Subject: RE: Bernstein - E/O Shirley Bernstein & E/O Leon Bernstein: Heritage Policy

Robert, after discussions with my client, he is not in agreement with the plan proposed below. A more formal letter will follow.

From: Robert Spallina [mailto:rspallina@tescherspallina.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2013 11:43 AM
To: Ted Bernstein; Lisa Friedstein; Pam Simon; Jill Iantoni; Christine Yates
Cc: Kimberly Moran
Subject: RE: Bernstein - E/O Shirley Bernstein & E/O Leon Bernstein: Heritage Policy

I am following up on our telephone conference from last week. Ted has contacted me about circulating a draft of the settlement agreement that would be presented to the court. Again, prior to preparing an agreement, I want to make sure that you are ALL in agreement that the proceeds do not come to the estate. I can tell you that your father planned his estate intending and believing that the five children would split the proceeds equally. We would like to see his wishes carried out and not have the proceeds paid to the estate where they could be subject to creditor claims prior to being split in equal shares among the grandchildren. Please advise if you are in agreement to move forward to petition the court for an order that would split the proceeds equally among the five of you.

Robert L. Spallina, Esq.
TESCHER & SPALLINA, P.A.
4855 Technology Way, Suite 720
Boca Raton, Florida 33431
Telephone: 561-997-7008
Facsimile: 561-997-7308
E-mail: rspallina@tescherspallina.com

If you would like to learn more about TESCHER & SPALLINA, P.A., please visit our website at www.tescherspallina.com


The information contained in this message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by e-mail or telephone. Thank you.

From: Robert Spallina
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 1:14 PM
To: Ted Bernstein
Cc: Lisa Friedstein; Pam Simon; Jill Iantoni; Christine Yates; Kimberly Moran
Subject: Re: Heritage Policy

Kim will send.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 23, 2013, at 1:11 PM, "Ted Bernstein" <tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com> wrote:



Robert Spallina

From: Jill Iantoni [jilliantoni@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2013 3:39 PM
To: Robert Spallina
Subject: Re: Heritage Policy

Thanks

Jill Iantoni
jill@ne.bah.com
Recruiting Services
Booz | Allen | Hamilton

On Jan 29, 2013, at 2:03 PM, "Robert Spallina" <rspallina@tescherspallina.com> wrote:

The claim could be open for a long time but if it is cleared up then the money would be free from creditor claims. I do not know if there is a time frame for a pay out but if the proceeds are paid to the estate then your father's intent is not carried out.

From: Jill Iantoni [<mailto:jilliantoni@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2013 12:45 PM
To: Robert Spallina
Cc: Jill Iantoni
Subject: Re: Heritage Policy

Hi Robert,

If the money stays at the insurance company until the Bill S. claim is cleared up, can we then decide if ALL five are in agreement and if not, wouldn't that money be free from creditors at that point? Is there a time fram that the money has to leave the insurance company and be paid out?

Thanks.
Jill

On Tue, Jan 29, 2013 at 10:42 AM, Robert Spallina <rspallina@tescherspallina.com> wrote:

I am following up on our telephone conference from last week. Ted has contacted me about circulating a draft of the settlement agreement that would be presented to the court. Again, prior to preparing an agreement, I want to make sure that you are ALL in agreement that the proceeds do not come to the estate. I can tell you that your father planned his estate intending and believing that the five children would split the proceeds equally. We would like to see his wishes carried out and not have the proceeds paid to the estate where they could be subject to creditor claims prior to being split in equal shares among the grandchildren. Please advise if you are in agreement to move forward to petition the court for an order that would split the proceeds equally among the five of you.

From: Jill Iantoni [mailto:jilli_ni@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 3:12 PM
To: Robert Spallina
Cc: Jill Iantoni
Subject: Bernstein Estate 1/24/2013

Hi Robert,

thanks for todays call. Three questions.

One, if the 5 kids do NOT all agree that we should split the insurance proceeds amongst the 5 of us, what happens to the insurance proceeds? Can 4 out of 5 (or whatever the number is) over rule and move forward with the court hearing requesting that the insurance proceeds get paid out to the 5 children? If that is a NO, do the proceeds go directly to the estate? If the answer is the 10 grandchildren, will that be subject to creditors or would that money get paid out quickly (just as it would to the 5 of us) and avoid any potential law suit/creditors?

Two, if any of the 5 children have personal counsel representing them, are they allowed to have their bills sent to you/Estate for payment? If yes, is there a provision that the others can put in place that regulates the amount/or a provision that states it come out of their child(ren) portion of the estate?

Can you also clarify, that based on the conversation today, there is a chance that Bill S. case will be null and void and even if it is not, it is not towards Si Bernstein or his estate? Did I understand that correctly?

Thanks so much,

Jill

Robert Spallina

From: Ted Bernstein [tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2013 1:34 PM
To: Robert Spallina; Lisa Friedstein; Pam Simon; Jill Iantoni; Christine Yates
Cc: Kimberly Moran
Subject: RE: Heritage Policy

Robert,

We are in the midst of arranging a phone call between myself, Pam, Eliot, Christine Yates, Jill and Lisa. We were hoping to have that call today but Christine cannot make it until Thursday. I think it is imperative for this call to occur prior to anything else being done, including your call with their legal department. This way, we can establish whether there is going to be an agreement among the 5 of us, or not.

I completely agree with your assessment below of the options available here.

Please feel free to call me to discuss.

Ted

From: Robert Spallina [mailto:rspallina@tescherspallina.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2013 12:16 PM
To: Ted Bernstein; Lisa Friedstein; Pam Simon; Jill Iantoni; Christine Yates
Cc: Kimberly Moran
Subject: Heritage Policy

I received a letter from the company requesting a court order to make the distribution of the proceeds consistent with what we discussed. I have traded calls with their legal department to see if I can convince them otherwise. I am not optimistic given how long it has taken them to make a decision. Either way I would like to have a fifteen minute call to discuss this with all of you this week. There are really only two options: spend the money on getting a court order to have the proceeds distributed among the five of you (not guaranteed but most likely probable), or have the proceeds distributed to the estate and have the money added to the grandchildren's shares. As none of us can be sure exactly what the 1995 trust said (although an educated guess would point to children in light of the document prepared by Al Gortz in 2000), I think it is important that we discuss further prior to spending more money to pursue this option. Hopefully I will have spoken with their legal department by Thursday. I would propose a 10:30 call on Thursday EST. Please advise if this works for all of you.

Robert L. Spallina, Esq.

TESCHER & SPALLINA, P.A.

4855 Technology Way, Suite 720

Boca Raton, Florida 33431

Telephone: 561-997-7008

**PROFESSIONAL RESUME
BRIAN M. O'CONNELL**

EDUCATION

University of Florida, Holland Law Center, Masters of Law in Taxation. Graduated December, 1980. Class Rank: First out of six.

University of Florida, Holland Law Center, Juris Doctor. Graduated August, 1979 with honors. Class Rank: Top 10%.

Florida State University, Bachelor of Science. Graduated June, 1976, Summa cum laude. Average 4.0 (A = 4.0). Major: Government. Minor: Communications.

ADMITTED TO PRACTICE

Florida, 1980. United States Tax Court, 1981. Colorado, 1997.

CERTIFICATIONS

Board certified by the Florida Bar in Wills, Trusts and Estates (1990 – Present).

RATINGS

AV. Martindale-Hubbell.

SPECIFIC AREAS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE

Litigation, including appeals, regarding Estates, Trusts and Guardianships.

Estate Planning; Administration of Estates, Trusts and Guardianships.


WORK EXPERIENCE

Partner, Ciklin Lubitz Martens & O'Connell, West Palm Beach, Florida. Probate, Guardianship, Business Law, Tax and Real Property Practice (October 1, 1985 - Present). Head of Wills, Trusts, Estates and Guardianships Department consisting of three associate attorneys, five paralegals, and two secretaries.

Shareholder, O'Connell & O'Connell, P.A., West Palm Beach, Florida. Probate, Tax, Real Property and Business Law practice (January, 1980 – October 1, 1985).

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS/ACTIVITIES

- American Bar Association (Member, Taxation and Real Property, Probate and Trust Law Sections).



Florida Bar

Member, Executive Council, Taxation Section (1984-1985).
Member, 15th Circuit Fee Arbitration Committee (1998-1999).
Member, Probate & Trust Litigation Committee (1991-1992; 1999-2010).
Member, Wills, Trusts and Estates Certification Committee (1997-2003).
Member, Guardianship Law & Powers of Attorney Committee (1992-Present).
Member, Probate Rules Committee (1989-1994; 2002-2005).

Palm Beach County Bar Association

Chairman, Probate and Guardianship CLE Committee (1988-2010; Vice-Chairman, 1986-87; Member 2010 -- Present).
Co-Chairman, Guardianship Education Committee (2012-Present).
Member, Probate and Guardianship Practice Committee (1985-Present).
Member, Mental Health Practice Committee (1994-1999).
Member, Probate-Marchman Act Subcommittee (1993-1994).

LEGAL PUBLICATIONS

Chapter Author, "Helping Clients Prepare for Future Trends and Challenges in Relation to Florida Estate Plans," Thomson Reuters/Aspatore (2012).
Chapter Author, "Casualty and Theft Losses," Matthew Bender Tax Service (1990).
Chapter Author, "Real Estate Valuation," Bender's Federal Tax Service, (1989).
Chapter Author, "Liquidation Distributions," Matthew Bender Florida Corporate Law and Practice (1985).
Article, "Keeping It All In the Family: The Use of Section 704(b)(2) Special Allocations and Family Partnerships to Control Estate Tax Valuation," 33 University of Florida Law Review 1 (1981) (co-author).
Article, "The Due on Sale Clause in Florida: A Potential Battleground for Borrowers and Lenders," 31 University of Florida Law Review 933 (1980).

LECTURES & SEMINARS

Acted as chair and panelist of numerous seminars and lectures, including, but not limited to:

2010 Estate Tax Legislation: Tips and Solutions, sponsored by Palm Beach County Bar Association, 28th Annual Estate and Probate Seminar, Part 2 (May 17, 2011);
Practicing Guardianship Law in the New Millennium, sponsored by Florida Bar Association (March, 2000);
Myths and Realities of Estate Planning and Probate, sponsored by Palm Beach County Bar Association (April 29, 1998);
Protecting Your Assets, sponsored by Mental Health Association of Palm Beach County (May, 1997);

Ten Commonly Asked Estate Planning Questions, sponsored by Palm Beach County Bar Association (April, 1997);

Don't Be a Victim, Navigating the Shoals of Serving as a Guardian ad Litem, sponsored by Florida Bar Association (February, 1997);

Estate Planning, sponsored by ABC, Channel 25 (February, 1996);

Probate for the 90's, sponsored by Palm Beach Post, St. Mary's and the Palm Beach County Bar (March, 1994);

Florida Probate - Beyond the Basics, sponsored by the National Business Institute (May, 1991);

Surviving Spouse Seminar, sponsored by The Miami Herald (June, 1989);

Ask a Lawyer, sponsored by WXEL - Public Television, Channel 34 (August, 1989).


EXPERT WITNESS TESTIMONY

Retained as expert on over forty (40) occasions in the areas of professional negligence, fee disputes, fiduciary liability issues, administration of estates, trusts and guardianships, and tax matters regarding estates and trusts.

MEDIATION

Served as a mediator on multiple occasions since 1996. Area of concentration is probate litigation. Experience also includes general civil litigation. Cases have included complex, multiple parties, and multi-day mediations.

**Michael D. Mopsick, Esq.
Shapiro, Blasi, Wasserman & Gora, P.A.**



Michael D. Mopsick has over 40 years of practice experience, having begun his legal career in New Jersey in 1972. He has been a member of the Florida Bar since 1984. Mr. Mopsick represents clients at all levels of trust, probate, and guardianship disputes, from advising and counseling beneficiaries and pursuing beneficiary claims to defending fiduciaries in complex trust and estate litigation. His experience also includes a broad range of business and commercial litigation, including breach of contract, fraud, construction, real estate, and corporate and partnership issues. He is a Florida Supreme Court Certified Circuit Civil Mediator.

Mr. Mopsick attended Rutgers College, New Brunswick, New Jersey, where he was valedictorian of his class and graduated with highest honors in 1969; he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa in his junior year. He received his J.D. degree from the University of Virginia School of Law in 1972.

Prior to joining Shapiro Blasi Wasserman & Gora as Of Counsel, Mr. Mopsick was a member of the firm of Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, where he served as Managing Partner of its Boca Raton office for many years and as Vice President of the firm and member of the firm's Board of Managers.

He has been recognized since 2007 as one of the Top Lawyers in South Florida by the *South Florida Legal Guide* and has been selected for inclusion in *Florida's Super Lawyers* as voted by his peers. His Martindale-Hubbell Peer Review Rating is "AV Preeminent," which is the highest possible rating in both legal ability and ethical standards as established by confidential opinions from members of the Bar. His AVVO rating is "10", "Superb".

Mr. Mopsick is Past President of the South Palm Beach County Bar Association and served on the Board of Directors of the Palm Beach County Bar Association. He is the immediate past Co-Chair of the Palm Beach County Bar Association's Professionalism Committee and serves as Chair of Florida Bar Grievance Committee "D" for Palm Beach County. He previously served on and was Chair of Grievance Committee "C". He is a member of the Palm Beach County Judicial Campaign Practices Commission, which hears and resolves complaints of improper conduct in judicial election campaigns. He serves as a Palm Beach County representative on the Joint Civility Committee, a project promoting the joint resolution of more than 40 voluntary bar associations and dozens of courts throughout Southern Florida advocating and fostering civility and professionalism among practicing attorneys. He is also a member of the Palm Beach County Bar's Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee.

While practicing in New Jersey, Mr. Mopsick was a member of the New Jersey State Bar Association and the Passaic County Bar Association (Trustee, 1985-86). He was



appointed by the Supreme Court of New Jersey to the District XI Ethics Committee for Passaic County and served as Vice Chair and Chair, 1984-1986.

Mr. Mopsick is honored to be a member of the Greater Boca Raton Estate Planning Council, one of the few litigators to be accepted as a member.

Mr. Mopsick has lectured on the topics of probate litigation and civility in litigation and mediation. Among his published articles are:

- "Managing Client Expectations: A Key to Successful Mediation," *Daily Business Review*, November 11, 2011.
- "Courtesy v. Clients' Rights: Drawing the Line," *Palm Beach County Bar Association Bulletin*, March, 2012.
- "Recent Case Gives Lesson in Navigating Florida's Homestead Laws," *Daily Business Review*, March 30, 2012 (with George Frank).
- "Civility in Mediation: The Mediator's Role," *Daily Business Review*, May 3, 2013.

Areas of Practice:

Probate Litigation
Trust Litigation
Guardianship Litigation
Commercial Litigation
Certified Circuit Civil Mediator

Current Position:

Of Counsel, Shapiro, Blasi, Wasserman & Gora, P.A.

Bar Admissions:

New Jersey, 1972
Florida, 1984
U.S. District Court:
District of New Jersey
Southern District of Florida
Northern District of Florida

Education:

Rutgers College, B.A. 1969
University of Virginia, J.D. 1972

Representative Appellate Cases:

Ligran, Inc. v. Medlawtel, Inc., 174 N.J. Super. 597 (App. Div. 1980), 86 N.J. 583, 432 A.2d 502 (N.J. 1981)
Aronson v. Aronson, 81 So. 3d 515 (Fla. 3d DCA 2012)
Aronson v. Aronson, 930 So. 2d 766 (Fla. 3d DCA 2006)