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MR. FEAMAN: Alan, you're taking this deposition for the purpose of using it at the hearings that are going to take place on Friday before Judge Colin; and I'd like to stipulate that by this deposition today, I am not waiving -- I assume none of the other parties are waiving their right to take the deposition of Mr. Tescher at some point in the future concerning any issues that are not before the court on Friday.

MR. BLOCK: What's before the court on Friday?

MR. FEAMAN: Before the court on Friday, according to an order entered by Judge Colin --

MR. BLOCK: What date is Friday?
MR. FEAMAN: Friday is the 11th.

MR. BLOCK: Okay. Good enough.
MR. FEAMAN: And the four things that this deposition -- I understand -- is being taken for is, No. 1, Elliot Bernstein's motion to disqualify Alan Rose and the Mrachek law firm and John Pankauski and the Pankauski law firm; No. 2, the various motions/petitions filed in connection with an appointment of a successor personal representative for the estate of Simon Bernstein; No. 3, the various motions and petitions filed in connection with the removal of Ted Bernstein as trustee of the Simon Bernstein Revocable Trust; and the determination of the applicability of the attorney/client privilege regarding an email sent by Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein; and that, by our asking questions of Mr. Tescher today, we do not waive the right to take Mr. Tescher's deposition, if necessary, at some point in the future concerning any other issues that may or may not arise in connection with these matters.

MR. ROSE: I have no objection to your stipulation. In fact, $I$ think it's very obvious that this deposition should be limited to four very narrow issues. One of them has nothing to do with Mr. Tescher -- which will be the privileged email.

I agree wholeheartedly.
I would actually express in advance some concern that your exhibits would seem to go far afield of those issues. But subject to that, I am fine with your stipulation. And I would like to -I think the witness should be sworn in.

MR. MORRISSEY: This is John Morrissey. The only addition that $I$ would have to the stipulation is Mr. Feaman made a couple of references to the use of this deposition only at the hearing on the 11th.

My understanding is we have a kind of a pour-over hearing on the 16th. So I would add to that stipulation that this deposition could be used on the 16 th to the extent necessary as well.

MR. FEAMAN: Well, my stipulation doesn't involve use. It involves a waiver on the part of my client to -- if -- that somehow he would not be allowed or anybody else would be allowed to take Mr. Tescher's deposition again because it's already been taken. And the point is, there may be issues that arise in the future in which Mr. Tescher is involved -- either as a witness or in some other capacity -- and, therefore, today's deposition would not be a waiver of any parties' right to take
his deposition in the future for other matters.
MR. ROSE: Let me take over for a second. This is Alan Rose. Mr. Block, as counsel for Don Tescher, do you agree he can be deposed again in the future?

MR. BLOCK: Well --
MR. FEAMAN: Subject to the limitation and nobody would ask him the same questions we're going to ask him today.

MR. BLOCK: What I agreed to is the stipulation decided by Peter, with the additional of the date of the 16 th by John Morrissey. That's what I agree to.

MR. ROSE: And for the record, the deposition is going to be used for whatever purposes a deposition can be used under the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure with no limitation.

You can swear in the witness.
DONALD R. TESCHER, having
satisfactorily been identified by
the production of a driver's license, and being first duly sworn by the Notary Public, was examined and testified as follows to interrogatories

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Would you state your full name for the recovered?
A. Donald R. Tescher.
Q. And are you an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Florida; currently a partner of the law firm Tescher \& Spallina?
A. Yes; and yes.
Q. Where are you physically located today?
A. Right now I'm sitting in Plymouth, Massachusetts.
Q. Is your plan to spend the summer in Massachusetts?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have plans to be in Palm Beach county or July 11th or July 16th of this year?
A. No.
Q. Is -- is your current location more than 100 miles from the courthouse?
A. Your courthouse; right -- or our courthouse, I should say, in Florida --
Q. Is your --
A. -- certainly it's about 1,500 miles.
Q. Is your location more than 100 miles from the Palm Beach County courthouses?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. You have in front of you something called "Affidavit of Donald Tescher"?
A. I don't. (Witness reviews documents.)

I do.
MR. ROSE: I'd like to mark that as
Exhibit 1 to your deposition.
(Discussion off the record.)
(Tescher A, Affidavit of Donald R.
Tescher.)
Q. Are you familiar with Exhibit A, Mr.

Tescher?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is this an affidavit you prepared some time ago?
A. Yes.
Q. And signed under oath on March 4th, 2014?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you reviewed the affidavit recently?
A. Yes.
Q. And had you reviewed the affidavit and had a role in editing it prior to the time that you signed it in March of 2014?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. If I asked you questions that would elicit the information that you put in your affidavit in

March, would you give me the same answers today as you wrote in your affidavit?
A. I believe so.
Q. Now, attached to the affidavit there are five documents that have been marked in the affidavit as A, B, C, D, and E.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you have those in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. The first document -- which is Exhibit A to your affidavit -- is entitled "Will of Shirley Bernstein."

Are you familiar with the will of Shirley Bernstein?
A. This is the will that was executed on May 20, 2008.
Q. And the original of this will was held in your safe deposit box and ultimately was filed with the court?
A. That is correct.
Q. Exhibit B is the Shirley Bernstein Trust Agreement, also dated May 20, 2008.

Are you familiar with that document?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Was your law firm responsible for drafting
the will and the trust for Shirley Bernstein?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. If you look at Exhibit C, there's a document called "First Amendment to Shirley Bernstein Trust Agreement."

Are you familiar with that document?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is Exhibit $C$ a true and accurate copy of the first amendment to the Shirley Bernstein Trust Agreement?
A. The only thing that's unusual about the copy I'm looking at here is there's no date inserted on the top of the first page; and I believe that document, as I recall, was -- was dated. It's dated, obviously, on the page 2.
Q. As far as you know, is the document attached to the affidavit an accurate copy of what would have been signed by Shirley Bernstein on or about November 18, 2008?
A. Yes.
Q. Other than the three documents -- $A, B$, and C -- are you aware of any other operative documents that would have -- that would have been signed by Shirley Bernstein while she was alive?
A. No.

MR. FEAMAN: Objection to the form.
Q. I'll ask a different question: As far as you know, are Exhibits A, B, and C, the will, and the trust, and the amendment and -- the only amendment that you're aware of to the Shirley Bernstein Trust?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, Exhibit D is the will of Simon Bernstein.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And this is a -- not original document, but it appears to be dated on July 25, 2012.
A. It appears to be a conformed copy of a will that was executed, apparently, on that date.
Q. And this will would have been held in your safe deposit box in the original files with the court upon Mr. Bernstein's death?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And as far as you know, is this the last will of Simon L. Bernstein?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. The last exhibit, Exhibit E, is the Simon L. Bernstein Amended and Restated Trust Agreement, which is dated July 25, 2012.

Are you familiar with this document?
A. Yes.
Q. As far as you know, is this the final version of a -- or the last version of any trust document that Simon Bernstein signed prior to his death?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Are you familiar with the prior versions of Simon's will and trust from 2008?
A. Generally.
Q. In the 2012 document, were you and Robert Spallina designated as the successor cotrustees upon the death of Simon Bernstein?
A. Yes, we were.
Q. And do you recall who had been listed as a successor cotrustee in the 2008 version?
A. My -- my recollection -- and I don't specifically recall -- that it might have been Mr. Stansbury.
Q. And are you aware of a decision by Simon Bernstein to remove Mr . Stansbury as a successor trustee under his 2012 trust?
A. Yes, indirectly.
Q. Did you have any discussions with Simon about that decision?
A. I did not have discussions directly with Simon regarding that decision.
Q. Upon Mr. Spallina's resignation as trustee, at some point in time you were the sole remaining trustee of the Simon L. Bernstein Amended and Restated Trust Agreement; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir, for one day.
Q. And did the trust document give you any powers with regard to deciding who would be your successor?
A. The provision of the trust document provides first that if there is none named, that the last surviving trustee can designate the successor trustee.
Q. And did you make a decision in your position who should be the successor to you?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And who did you select?
A. I selected Theodore.
Q. And could you tell the court why you selected Mr. Bernstein -- Mr. Ted Bernstein?
A. I concluded that he was the logical choice for a variety of reasons, including the fact that he -- among all of the children, probably had the most knowledge of his -- his mother and father's
matters. He was then serving as successor -personal representative and successor trustee for Shirley after Simon had died. He had, you know, direct knowledge of the litigation that was ongoing with William Stansbury. He's not a beneficiary under any of those documents, other than dividing up tangible personal property; and I believe him to be a competent person and a competent businessman.
Q. Did you give any consideration to selecting Eliot Bernstein for that role?
A. Not at all.
Q. Do you think that Simon Bernstein would want Eliot Bernstein to have any fiduciary role in connection with his will or his trust?
A. I do not.
Q. And can you tell us why?
A. There has been --

MR. FEAMAN: Objection to the form.
Q. You can answer, sir.
A. Over -- over the years it was made apparent to us by members of the Bernstein family that Eliot -- Eliot suffers from certain impediments and impairments that would affect his judgment and ability to act in an impartial fashion and to handle the affairs that would be necessary
to be handled.
Eliot and his family -- particularly his siblings -- did not enjoy a -- a wonderful relationship. It's my understanding that he, at times, threatened -- I'm not sure if he actually sued -- but he certainly threatened to sue certain members of the family.

In fact, my recollection is that there is an agreement that Si Bernstein had Eliot and his wife execute regarding his ceasing that activity, in exchange for which -- I believe that there were payments to be made to Eliot Bernstein in connection with helping to support him.
Q. Now, do you recall Mr . Stansbury also being named as the successor personal representative under Simon's 2008 document?
A. I don't specifically recall, but I think that was the case.
Q. And in the documents that were signed July 25th, Mr. Stansbury is not named in any capacity; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you know what happened between or around July of 2012 that would have caused Simon Bernstein to want to remove William Stansbury from
having any role or say in his affairs?
MR. FEAMAN: Objection to the form.
A. Well, I -- I believe -- although I'm not a hundred percent certain -- that litigation had already commenced by Mr. Stansbury against Mr. Bernstein -- Simon Bernstein -- as well as the Life Insurance Concepts and other entities around that time.
Q. Did you have personal knowledge of Simon's reaction to being sued by William Stansbury?
A. Unfortunately, no, I do not.
Q. Okay. That's fine.

Now, in connection with the estate planning, did Simon take any extra precautions or special arraignments in dealing with assets that were being provided to or set aside for Eliot Bernstein?
A. Yeah. And, again, this was not -- this was not a matter that our firm was involved in creating or structuring.

Simon Bernstein had trusts created for Eliot Bernstein's three children. He had those trusts become the members -- sole members of a limited liability company. He provided the financing and the monies to acquire their current
residence, which is owned in that limited liability company; and, in essence, owned by those three trusts for Eliot Bernstein's children.
Q. And were those elaborate estate plans designed and created so that Eliot would not have any assets in his individual name or control?
A. I believe that that was part of the rationale.
Q. Prior to the time that you resigned, Ted was not playing any role in the Simon estate or the Simon trust; is that accurate?
A. I'm sorry? Who wasn't?
Q. Ted was not involved --
A. Ted?
Q. -- in a fiduciary capacity for the Simon estate or for the Simon trust prior to your resignation; is that accurate?
A. That is correct.

MR. FEAMAN: Objection to form.
MR. ROSE: What's the objection?
MR. FEAMAN: No predicate. Overly broad.
Q. Now, was Ted at that same time serving in a fiduciary capacity as the successor trustee of the Shirley Bernstein Trust and the successor PR of the Shirley Bernstein estate?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And was your law firm representing him in his capacity as a fiduciary on the Shirley side?
A. Yes, we were.
Q. During the time that Ted was being represented by you, did there come -- from time to time -- situations where you would give advice of what -- what action should be taken in a given circumstance?
A. Our firm did; yes.
Q. Did Ted generally follow your advice?
A. Yes.
Q. Were there any times when Ted specifically refused to follow your advice?
A. No.
Q. Now, there was -- this is on the Shirley side --
A. Well, I take that --
Q. -- not especially relevant, but it relates to Ted's ability and capacity to serve as a fiduciary on the Simon side -- but was there a time when there was a sale of a large asset on the Shirley side?
A. Yes. One of the --

MR. FEAMAN: Objection.
A. -- one of the residences was sold.
Q. And were there discussions concerning whether to make an interim distribution at that time?
A. Yes, there were.
Q. And at the end of the -- at the end of the day, after whatever discussions occurred, did your firm ever advise Ted that it would be improper for him, as trustee, to make an interim distribution?
A. We never advised him that it was improper. We advised him to be cautious about making distributions, because at that time the Shirley trust was a named defendant in the Stansbury litigation.
Q. And with respect to that -- so long as there was sufficient funds left over to cover whatever claim there was, there would be no problem with an interim distribution; is that accurate?
A. Assumedly.

MR. FEAMAN: Objection to form.
Q. Now, Stansbury's claim has been against the estate of Shirley Bernstein or the Shirley Bernstein Trust have been dismissed with prejudice; are you aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Back at the time when an interim distribution was being considered, what were your thoughts as to the merits of the lawsuit by Mr. Stansbury against the Shirley Bernstein estate or the Shirley Bernstein Trust?

MR. FEAMAN: Objection to the form.
A. I thought it was ludicrous, frankly.

They continued to keep naming Mr. Spallina and myself as the trustees of that trust, which we never were in -- in all of the pleadings.

That trust had -- Shirley never owned any interest in the business. And I could see no reason why Mr. Stansbury was attempting to reach into that trust, other than the fact that it had some assets.
Q. Now, there is an issue -- there is an issue on the Shirley side about whether the distribution should have been made to all 10 grandchildren or to only six.

Were you aware at the time of the interim distribution that there was a question about distributions to six versus 10 ?
A. Not at that time; no.
Q. As far as you know, was Ted aware of the issue of six versus 10 ?

MR. FEAMAN: Objection to the form.
A. To the best of my knowledge, I don't think he was at that time.
Q. One second, please.

Do you recall when the Shirley Bernstein Trust sold the condominium that, among the contents of the condominium would be property that would have then been owned by the estate of Simon Bernstein?
A. Well, under -- under Shirley's documents, all the tangible personal property passed to Simon.
Q. I thought -- at the time that Shirley's condo was sold, whatever contents were in it would have been owned by Simon's estate.
A. Correct.
Q. At the time you were the personal representative or copersonal representative of Simon's estate; is that correct?
A. At the time that the sale occurred; yes.
Q. Did you and the other copersonal representative agree that the -- that the property should be sold with the condominium; and that if there was ever a time in the future when there needed to be some allocation, it could be handled in the future, rather than either interfering with
the sale of the condo, or requiring the furniture to be to be removed from the condo?

MR. FEAMAN: Objection to the form.
A. I don't recall if $I$ was directly involved in that discussion.
Q. Does it make sense to you that if the beneficiaries of the Shirley trust are the same as the beneficiaries of the Simon estate should not undergo an expense to move furniture or undertake an allocation if the money is going to the same people?
A. Correct.
Q. And if at some later point in time it makes a difference, couldn't somebody then go back and allocate some portion of the purchase price from the Shirley condo and give the money to the Simon estate for the value of the -- of his personal property that was included in the sale?
A. Yes, it could true up.
Q. Does that make more sense to you, that an estate with limited resources -- to true it up at the end, if it matters, rather than undertake that expense at the time of the sale?

## MR. FEAMAN: Form.

A. From a practical standpoint, given the
fact that these estates were not going to be subject to federal estate tax liabilities; yes.
Q. As you sit here today, do you have any reason you would advise Judge Colin or any hesitancy in suggesting that Ted would be a proper candidate and could -- and competent and capable of doing the job if the judge were to appoint Ted as the successor personal representative of his father's estate?

MR. FEAMAN: Objection to the form.
A. I would have no object -- I would have no problem in recommending Mr. Ted Bernstein to serve in the fiduciary capacity requested.

MR. ROSE: That's the end of my examination. I'd like mine ordered on an expedited basis. And I have no further questions; and turn him over to cross-examination by whomever wishes to do so.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay if I go next with everybody?

THE WITNESS: Is that Peter?
MR. FEAMAN: Yeah.
THE WITNESS: All right. Let me just get the other set of exhibits there.

MR. FEAMAN: Alan Rose, I'm going to
object to the admission of the affidavit. So I want to give you the opportunity to ask more questions concerning what's contained in the affidavit so you don't feel like I am sandbagging you in any way.

So if you have further questions concerning what's contained in the affidavit of this witness, I want to give you the opportunity to ask.

MR. ROSE: That's fine.
My -- and just for the record, I believe that once the affidavit is tendered by the witness during a deposition and is subject to cross-examination by all parties, that the affidavit is fully admissible, regardless of whether I asked him every question. But I will also go through -- while you're questioning him -and decide if there are any other questions I wish to ask as a protective measure.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay. Very good.
MR. MORRISSEY: This is John Morrissey.
Just for the record, by allowing Mr. Feaman to ask questions today, I'm certainly not agreeing and -and don't waive any objection to -- to a standing argument.

That is to say, his standing to make argument at the upcoming hearings.

MR. ROSE: This is Alan Rose. I concur in that, but $I$ also think we need to let him get moving.

MR. MORRISSEY: Sure. I just want to make that point or argument for the record.

EXAMINATION
BY MR. FEAMAN:
Q. All right. Mr. Tescher, this is Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I'd first like to draw your attention to one of the exhibits to the affidavit; and I believe that it was Exhibit $E$ that you discussed in direct examination for Mr. Rose, which is the Simon Bernstein Amended and Restated Trust Agreement?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you --
A. I have that in front of me.
Q. -- have that in front of you. Okay.

I'd like to -- now, you said that you appointed or exercised the power of appointment of a successor trustee under this document; and you appointed Ted Bernstein.

Can you find that provision in the trust which allows you to do that?
A. Page 16, paragraph 3 -- subparagraph 2 -no, subparagraph 3(a).
Q. Okay. And is it fair to say that under paragraph (b) (1) on page 15 , the bottom of page 15, you and Mr. Spallina were the successor cotrustees --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- before you have exercised your power of appointment?
A. That's correct.
Q. And when did Mr. Spallina resign as successor cotrustee?
A. The day before me.
Q. Did he do that in the form of a letter --
A. He executed --
Q. -- or how did he do that?
A. He executed a resignation form, as I recall.
Q. All right. Do you know what day that -what the date of that was?
A. I don't have any of those documents in front of me. I can't tell you.
Q. Okay. And do you have a copy of the
resignation form?
A. I believe it exists; and I believe it's included somewhere in all the discovery that, you know, you all have from our files.
Q. So then you do have it in your files at some point?
A. I believe that we do. I know it exists. I saw it.
Q. Did you excise -- or excuse me -- execute a resignation?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Do you recall the date of your resignation?
A. No. I do not, other than to reference it the day after Mr. Spallina's resignation.
Q. All right. Now, in your exercise of what you term your "appointment of a successor trustee," what form did that exercise take?

Did you write a letter? Or what did you do?
A. It's a written form. It's "Resignation as Successor Trustee and Appointment of Successor," I believe.

Again, I don't have the benefit of having the document in front of me, sir, so I'm at a
little bit of a loss.
But it was a standard document that we would use in our office to have somebody resign and appoint a successor.
Q. Okay, 'cause I have not seen such a document that you describe.

MR. ROSE: I think they've been produced. If you want me to email you a copy, Peter, I'll be glad to do it.

MR. FEAMAN: Sure. That will be fine.
MR. ROSE: Okay.
Q. All right. Now, the -- I'd like to draw your attention to the paragraph that you brought me to, which is paragraph 3 on page 16.
A. Yes.
Q. It says that -- it's the last paragraph of page 16 -- "A trustee appointed under this paragraph shall not be a related or subordinate party of the trust."

Do you see that?
A. Yeah, but I --
Q. Okay.
A. Go ahead. I'm sorry.
Q. Is Mr. Bernstein -- Ted Bernstein -- a related or subordinate party of the trust?
A. Not for purposes of paragraph 3(b) -- not for purposes of paragraph 3(a).

For purposes of paragraph 3(b), he would be.
Q. And where does $3(a)$ start?
A. "The remaining trustees, if any."
Q. All right. And did you not tell me that you exercised your power of appointment pursuant to the sentence that is actually two lines above that?
A. Well, you probably didn't -- what I said to you was that, if the remaining trustee is the one who's making the appointment, the "flush" language dealing with "related or subordinate party" is not material.

It's only material if a beneficiary of the trust picks a related or subordinate person to serve as their trustee.
Q. Let me draw your attention, if I could, to the definitional section of this document, which is -- I believe begins at page 5, paragraph E.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Would you go there, please?
A. Okay.
Q. And this is the definitional section of the trust; is that correct?
A. This is a definition provision.
Q. All right. And under paragraph E, let me call your attention to paragraph 7, which appears on page 7.
A. Correct.
Q. It says "A related or subordinate party to a trust describes --" could you read that into the record?
A. Yes, sir. 7: "Related or subordinate party: A related or subordinate party to a trust describes a beneficiary of the subject trust or a related or subordinate party to a beneficiary of the trust as the terms 'related or subordinate party' are defined under code section $672(c) . "$
Q. And have you reviewed the code section referred to there as to how it's defined?
A. I'm generally familiar with $672(c)$, although $I$ don't have in front of me.
Q. And does it define a related or subordinate party as a child or issue of a grantor?
A. I would not want to comment without having the code provision in front of me.
Q. Okay. So as you sit here today, you don't -- you don't know one way or the other whether a related party under that code section would include
a child of the grantor; is that correct?
A. They would be related to the grantor.
Q. Is the grantor in this case under this trust Simon Bernstein?
A. He was the grantor. He died.
Q. And is it your understanding that Ted Bernstein is an issue of the grantor --
A. He certainly is.
Q. -- as used in the code section referred to in your document 672?
A. Yes.
Q. I also want to direct your attention to -under the definition section, (e) (1).

Do you see where it says "Children, Lineal Decedents"?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Now, that definition paragraph bleeds over on the top of page 6.

Could you turn there?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. Could you read the last sentence of paragraph (e) (1), beginning with "Notwithstanding."
A. "Notwithstanding the foregoing, for all purposes of this trust and the dispositions made
hereunder, my children, Ted S. Bernstein, Pamela B. Simon, Eliot Bernstein, Jill Iantoni, and Lisa S. Friedstein shall be deemed to have predeceased me, as I have adequately provided for them during my lifetime."
Q. All right. Does -- does that provision apply, in your opinion, to the appointment of a successor trustee?
A. No. "Dispositions hereunder," sir.
Q. Okay. Now, it says "Notwithstanding the foregoing," it says "for all purposes of this trust."

Are you limiting "for all purposes of this trust" to answer that question?
A. Am I limiting the "Notwithstanding the foregoing"?
Q. Yeah. What does "for all purposes of this trust" mean if it doesn't also include the children as eligible to be appointed as a successor trustee?
A. This definition is intended solely for purposes of determining whether they are beneficiaries under the trust.
Q. So when you said, "for all purposes of this trust," you didn't really mean all purposes of this trust; is that what you're saying?
A. I think you have to read it in context of the entire document.
Q. And "for all purposes of this trust," you wrote that the children of the grantor are predeceased. So for all purposes of this trust, if the children have predeceased, then wouldn't that mean that Ted Bernstein, as one of the children, would not then be eligible to be appointed by you as a successor trustee?
A. One could make that tortured argument, if you'd like.
Q. Okay. All right. Now, I wanted to ask you a question about your affidavit.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I want to draw your attention to paragraph 5.
A. Yes.
Q. You state in the second sentence of paragraph 5, quote, "None of the five children were involved in the estate planning process, nor did any of them attend any meetings with myself as counsel."

Did I read that correctly?
A. You read it correctly.
Q. When you refer to "estate planning
process," are you talking about the 2008 estate planning process that you did for the Bernsteins or the 2012 estate planning process that you allegedly did for Simon Bernstein?
A. Well, I clearly was referring first to the 2008 process.

With regard to the subsequent process, I did not attend any meetings as counsel in connection with the 2012 planning.
Q. So you then have no personal knowledge as to --
A. Just my understanding; that's correct.
Q. -- the intent -- if I could finish my question -- you then have no personal knowledge as to the intent of Simon Bernstein when he allegedly changed his trust and will in 2012; is that correct?
A. I believe that I did not have direct knowledge -- hearing it from his lips; that would be correct.
Q. Now, I want to turn to some of the exhibits that I sent to the court reporter in advance.
A. Yes, sir.

MR. FEAMAN: Alan, I believe you have
these as well. I apologize to the others on this call, but due to the nature of this deposition, I wasn't able to provide copies for everybody.
Q. Can you please take a look at what's been premarked as Exhibit 2 --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- to this deposition.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Does this appear to be a true and correct copy of the three pages of your website for Tescher \& Spallina, PA?
A. To be honest with you, I haven't looked at that in so long, I'm not sure. But...
Q. All right. Well, let's see if we can verify some of the information contained on it.
A. Sure.
Q. It shows the address of Tescher \& Spallina as 925 South Federal Highway, Suite 500; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. How long has Tescher \& Spallina been located at that address?
A. March 1, 2014.
Q. All right. So then this was at least updated within the last couple of months; is that
fair to say?
A. Yeah, obviously.
Q. Okay.
A. At least the address was updated, sir.
Q. All right. And you represent there in your website that your attorneys -- which I assume would include you -- have extensive expertise in certain areas, including "Wealth transfer planning for high-net-worth individuals and families"; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. "Business succession planning"; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. "Life insurance planning"; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. "Probate administration"; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Now, assisting you, it shows -there's a picture of you on the second page, Mr . Spallina, and then, on the third page, Ms. Galvani --
A. Correct.
Q. -- is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you the managing partner of the firm?
A. I don't know if $I$ still am.

I guess I am right now; yes.
Q. Okay. And for how long have you been managing partner of Tescher \& Spallina?
A. Since its inception in -- would be a little over six years.
Q. So you began Tescher \& Spallina in 2008; is that correct?
A. We began January 1, 2008; yes. January 1, 2008.
Q. Okay. And what firm were you with before that?
A. Tescher, Gutter, Chaves, Josepher, Rubin, Ruffin \& Forman, PA.
Q. How long were you with that firm?
A. From its inception, going back to 1990. The name changed --
Q. By the way, I forgot to ask you a question concerning the Amended and Restated Trust Agreement. Could you go back to that document for a second?
A. Yes, sir. I've got it.
Q. Okay. It appears that the -- this was
dated July 25th, 2012; is that correct?
A. July 25, 2012 is the date $I$ see on it.
Q. Okay. And if it was signed by Mr.

Bernstein, it would have -- can it be assumed then that it was signed by him on that day?
A. One could assume that. I think there's a related will that was signed on the same day also.
Q. Okay. That would be July 25th, 2012?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. It's witnessed by Mr. Spallina and Ms. Moran?
A. That's correct.
Q. You were not present when this was signed; is that correct?
A. I was not present when that was signed. I was ensconced on Cape Cod.
Q. Now, do you know when that lawsuit that you referred to in your direct examination was filed by Mr. Stansbury?
A. I said I wasn't sure whether it was before or after that date.
Q. So then, when you testified that you believe the litigation had been filed at the time that these new documents were executed, you don't really know if that's true or not; do you?
A. I'm not certain as to whether, in fact, litigation had commenced.
Q. Okay. Now, on your web page you show support staff of Kimberly Moran; correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And what is her position at the firm -- or was her position at the firm?
A. She is a legal secretary.
Q. Does she still work there?
A. She still works there.
Q. Okay. And was she recently accused and pled guilty to a crime in connection with work she performed while at your firm involving the Bernstein estate?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was that crime?
A. She misused her notary seal in notarizing certain documents regarding the Shirley Bernstein estate.
Q. Do you know the statute that she was accused of violating and whether it was a felony or a misdemeanor?
A. I don't -- I don't know precisely how it ended. I know that she did not and has not served time in jail; that she is apparently currently on
probation. And that's all I know.
Q. Is she still a notary?
A. No.
Q. And what document was she accused of notarizing falsely?
A. In the Shirley Bernstein estate, when it came time to basically close the probate administration, she sent out to the five children -- and I think to -- to Simon at that time too -waivers, consents, and joinders to the petition for distribution and discharge; and they all came back; everybody signed off -- including Eliot Bernstein; those documents were then filed in the court; and the clerk's office bounced those documents because Judge Colin's division requires that that particular document be signed and notarized; and they had not been notarized.
Q. Okay. And so did she subsequently notarize them?
A. She subsequently prepared new ones, and signed them, and notarized them.
Q. And when she prepared the new ones, that included a form signed by Simon Bernstein; correct?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. And Simon --

MR. ROSE: Just for the record -- this is Alan Rose -- I could -- there's no issue for Friday with regard to the document.

MR. FEAMAN: Yeah, there is. Yeah, there is.

MR. ROSE: There's no issue.
MR. FEAMAN: I'm going to tie it in in a minute if you let me finish.

MR. ROSE: There's also no issue in the case that the document wasn't properly -- was not properly --

MR. FEAMAN: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Unless you object to my question, okay, this -- this statement on your part is improper in the middle of my examination.

MR. ROSE: Well, I'm not -- the witness answered the question. I'm putting on the record I think this is an irrelevant line of questioning and you are wasting our time on --

MR. FEAMAN: And you have no right to interrupt the spontaneity of my examination by making a statement like this at this time. And I would respectfully request that you not do that. And I'd like to finish this line of questioning. I'm almost done.
Q. My question, isn't it true that Ms. -- is it Morin or Moran?
A. Moran.
Q. -- that Ms. Moran notarized Simon

Bernstein's signature at a time after he had, in fact, passed away; is that correct?
A. In connection with the Shirley Bernstein estate closing.
Q. Okay.
A. I believe I --
Q. And at that time the successor personal representative of the Shirley Bernstein estate was Ted Bernstein; is that correct?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. Okay. And at that time the successor trustee to the Shirley Bernstein Trust was Ted Bernstein; is that correct?
A. That would be correct.
Q. All right. Now, Diane Dustin, what does she do at the firm? Is she still there?
A. She is still with me. She is a legal assistant.
Q. And then there's Sue Anne Tescher?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that a relative of yours?
A. Happens to be a very close relative of mine. She's my wife.
Q. All right. And what does she do at the firm?
A. She manages the firm accounts and books, pays the bills.
Q. Kind of like a -- in the bookkeeper side of the office?
A. In the bookkeeper side of the office. She has nothing to do with the legal side of the office.
Q. So she oversees the checks that come into the firm; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. All right.

Now, how long, Mr. Tescher, have you known the Bernstein family -- either professionally or personally?
A. I think -- my recollection would be 2007. And when you say "The Bernstein family," that would have -- that would be Ted Bernstein, Simon Bernstein, and Shirley Bernstein.

I don't think that $I$ had contact with the other Bernstein family members until subsequent to that.
Q. All right. Oh, I forgot.

Now, when it came to light that Ms. Moran
had notarized a signature of a deceased person -namely Simon Bernstein -- did you at that time resign as the copersonal representative of the Simon Bernstein estate?
A. Not at that time.

What we did was we filed -- because -because the court proceedings were tainted in terms of the documents that had been -- in fact, the estate had been closed. And we -- we moved to have the estate reopened so that the record could be cleaned. And we petitioned the court to reopen the estate, allow us to obtain correct, untainted waivers from those who could give them, and attempted to expunge the -- what were tainted documents.
Q. And when were those documents -- was it just one document that was criminally notarized, or were there others?
A. There was one -- to the best of my recollection, there was one document -- one form document -- the waiver -- I think the waiver, consent, and joinder, if I'm not mistaken; and I think that only related to the five children and no
one else. I don't think that -- I mean, Si was the personal -- you know, had been the personal representative of the estate.
Q. And how did this come to light?
A. My recollection is that Eliot Bernstein apparently found the discrepancy -- or what he thought appeared to be a discrepancy in the court documents when he reviewed the court files -again, this is supposition on my part; I don't know, you know, for a fact that that was the case.

He filed a complaint with the governor's office which administers notary publics in the State of Florida. And apparently they filed -they sent Ms. Moran a -- an inquiry letter asking for, you know, an explanation, etcetera, of what had occurred.
Q. And do you know when -- about -- that was?
A. I don't recall exact dates.
Q. Was that in the year 2013?
A. I believe that it was in the year 2013.
Q. Okay. Was it in the summer of 2013?
A. It might have been -- 'cause in the summer -- if it was the summer, I was not in town. I would have been up here on Cape Cod.
Q. Certainly you didn't bring it to light,
nor did Mr. Spallina bring it to the attention of anybody; is that --
A. We couldn't, because we weren't aware of it.
Q. Okay. And when you became aware of it in 2013, did you think it appropriate at that time to resign as copersonal representative from the estate of Simon Bernstein?
A. No.
Q. Now, did there come a time, however, when you did resign -- you and Mr. Spallina -- as copersonal representatives of the Simon Bernstein estate; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you recall when that was?
A. January of 2014.
Q. And what was the incident at that time that then caused you to resign as copersonal representatives of the estate of Simon Bernstein?
A. It came to light -- it was brought to my attention that the -- there was an amendment -there was an altered document altering the amendment to Shirley Bernstein's revocable trust, which document had been forwarded to Christine Yates, who was then serving as counsel to Eliot

Bernstein's children; and that document added a provision.
Q. All right. And how did that document come to light -- the altered document?
A. It was brought to my attention by someone in my office.
Q. Okay. Now, the -- you identified the altered document as what again -- the Shirley Bernstein Trust?
A. The Amendment to Shirley Bernstein's Revocable Trust Agreement.
Q. Okay. And who in your office brought that to your attention?
A. Our associate.
Q. And who is that?
A. Lauren Galvani.
Q. And when did that take place?
A. January 2013.
Q. Okay. And there is a document that's attached to your affidavit, which is the -- I believe an amendment to the Shirley Bernstein Trust; is that correct?
A. Hold on one moment. Let me get to that.
Q. Is that Exhibit C?
A. I believe that's C, if I'm not mistaken.

Hold on one moment.
(Witness reviews document.) Yeah. That's Exhibit C.
Q. Okay. All right.

Now, Exhibit C, is that the altered document or the unaltered document?
A. That is the unaltered document.
Q. And what did the altered first amendment to the Shirley Bernstein trust say?
A. I don't have it in front of me, but essentially what it did was there was a -- you see how it's numbered now 1 and 3? There were -- you know, somebody had messed up when it had been originally prepared, and it got numbered -paragraph No. 1, paragraph No. 3.

A paragraph No. 2 was inserted between 1 and 3.
Q. And when did that take place?
A. I don't know.
Q. Was it -- did it take place sometime in 2012?
A. I don't know.
Q. Did it take -- well, how did your associate suddenly come across it in January of 2014?
A. You'll have to ask her.
Q. Did you ever ask her how she came across it that then subsequently caused you to resign as copersonal representative?
A. She noticed that the amendment that had been included in the letter to Christine Yates was different than Exhibit -- the exhibit that's here attached to my affidavit.
Q. And in that letter to Christine Yates, what was the date of that letter?
A. I think it was January of 2013 -- I think.
Q. Okay. And so that was after the death of Simon Bernstein; correct?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. So then that altered document contained in a document dated January 11,2013 could very well have been prepared while Ted Bernstein was the successor personal representative and successor trustee to the Shirley Bernstein estate and trust; correct?
A. No. Probably -- well...

Probably -- I'm not sure, to be honest, Peter. I'm not a hundred percent certain on the timing.
Q. Okay. And how did a year go by between
the time of the January 11th, 2013 letter in which the altered document was produced to the attorneys for Eliot Bernstein and then the discovery that it was, in fact, an altered document? What happened in that 12-month time that caused you, or your associate, or your office to discover that, in fact, what had been supplied to counsel for Eliot Bernstein was, in fact, a forged document or altered document?
A. I can't answer that question, actually -'cause I don't know.
Q. All right. And -- and who in your firm would be in the best position to know that -- if it's not the general manager -- the managing partner of the firm?
A. Mr. Spallina or Ms. Galvani.
Q. You were the managing partner at that time still; correct?
A. I was the president.
Q. Okay. And what did the altered document say in paragraph 2?
A. I told you that I don't have that in front of me.
Q. And the one attached to your affidavit?
A. I told you that I don't have that in front
of me.
Q. I apologize if I'm being repetitive on that score.
A. Yeah, I don't have --
Q. Your best recollection.
A. Yeah. Peter, I don't have it here.

It dealt with the definition of children and lineals.

MR. ROSE: Peter, I don't want to ruin your momentum that you're building up, but I need to take a bathroom break. Could we take -- we've been going at it for a little more than an hour. Can we take like a five-minute break?

MR. FEAMAN: Sure. I'm moving on to the next item anyway.

MR. ROSE: No more than five -- maybe as little as two minutes. I'll be right back.

MR. FEAMAN: No problem.
(Recess was taken.)
Q. Mr. Tescher, I'd like you to take a look at what's been premarked as Exhibit 3.

MR. FEAMAN: Madam Court Reporter, would you hand that to the witness.

COURT REPORTER: Okay.
MR. FEAMAN: Thank you.
Q. Now, just to have closure on the subject we were talking about about the altered Shirley Bernstein Trust, Exhibit 3 appears to be a true and correct -- is it a true and correct copy of the letter you wrote on January 14th, 2014 to Ted Bernstein, Eliot Bernstein, Lisa Friedstein, Jill Iantoni, and Pam Simon announcing your resignation as personal representative of the estate of Simon Bernstein?
A. Announcing our intent to resign; yes, sir.
Q. Your intent to resign.

And at that point had -- well, let me back up and lay a predicate.

You hired Mr. Manceri as an attorney to represent the Simon Bernstein estate; correct?
A. Mr. Manceri was hired -- was brought in by Ted Bernstein -- no, we hired him -- we hired him to assist with regard to the litigation with Stansbury as it related to the estate of Simon Bernstein.
Q. All right. And now, as -- do you recall as of January 14th, 2014, whether Mr. Manceri had withdrawn as attorney for the estate in that litigation at this point?
A. I do not recall when he specifically
withdrew.
Q. I guess we'd have to refer to the court records for that; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. ROSE: Peter, we're here trying to get to the truth. Why don't we just agree it was probably Friday, January the 11th, 2014 when Mr. Manceri filed papers -- that you and I both received -- withdrawing from the case; and ask your next question.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay. Good. Thank you for that.
Q. I assume that representation is correct?
A. I have no knowledge.

MR. ROSE: To the best of my knowledge, that's correct.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay. Very well.
MR. ROSE: Because shortly after that, I got a phone call that -- that Mr. Tescher had spoken with Ted Bernstein. So that's my frame of reference.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay.
Q. And up until now, had you recommended Ted Bernstein to be successor personal representative?
A. I don't recall when I recommended anything

```
to anybody --
```

Q. Okay.
A. -- after -- after January 14 th.
Q. All right. Now, the -- the documents -subsequent to your resignation, you turned over documents to Mr. Brown, the administrator ad litem -- or I should say the curator appointed by the court; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And Mr. Brown received about -- what -700 pages of documents -- or thousands?
A. I have no idea how many pages he received. I know that we completely copied onto disks all of our files.
Q. All right. Did you keep copies of what you produced to Mr . Brown?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Do you have originals of any documents in your possession?
A. I'm not sure if we have originals of any wills and trusts, for example. Those would have been all turned over or filed in the court.
Q. 'Cause I have a copy of the Simon Bernstein last will and testament that appoints Mr. Stansbury as a copersonal representative after

Shirley or successor personal representative after Shirley, but I don't have a copy of the original or the original -- nor have I seen one -- I only have a conformed copy.

Do you have the original of that document?
A. The original will is sitting in the court.
Q. No, 2008.
A. Oh. I'm sorry. I thought you were referring to the current document.
Q. I'm sorry if I was not clear.
A. Yeah. I don't know that we had it. If it was there, it got copied.
Q. Right. But do you have the original of the 2008 will and trust of Mr . Simon Bernstein?
A. If it was there -- I -- I don't know.
Q. Okay.
A. I don't have my --
Q. Do you keep those in a safe deposit box or a vault?
A. Not if they're old documents that have been superseded.
Q. Okay. And one more question on this, and then I'm going to move on: When Mr. Bernstein allegedly executed his 2012 documents, was that in your office; if you know?
A. No, sir; it was not.
Q. Where did that execution take place?
A. In Simon Bernstein's office.
Q. Okay. And have you been told -- since you obviously weren't there -- who was present when those documents were executed?
A. Well, the only -- the only thing that $I$ know who was present -- and there may have been others present -- is by the executions on the will and trust that were signed that day. And present --
Q. Right. But you don't know anything more than $I$ might know by looking at the documents; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. Now, you said that you first met some members of the Bernstein family in 2007.

Who did you meet first, Ted or Si?
A. I think I met Ted before 2007; and we had -- we've had dealings over the years with mutual clients. I think that our first dealings with Ted Bernstein also involved his sister's company up in Chicago. They were doing a -- a life insurance arbitrage program that was kind of interesting; and we -- we had some mutual clients there.
Q. So you had a professional relationship with Mr. Ted Bernstein before you did with Mr. Simon Bernstein; is that correct?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. Did you also have a business relationship with Mr. Ted Bernstein?
A. In what sense?
Q. In any sense.
A. Well, tell me what businesses. I mean, we had -- we had mutual clients.

There were clients who I brought to Ted Bernstein for life insurance needs. There were clients that Ted Bernstein referred to us.
Q. Okay. Were there any businesses in which you and Ted were both owners?
A. No.
Q. All right. I'd like to draw your attention to Exhibit 6, if I could.
A. Okay. Hold on a moment. (Witness reviews documents.)

Okay.
Q. Now, Exhibit 6 is a copy of a printout we got from the Florida Department of State, Division of Corporations. This makes reference to a "Bernstein Family Realty, LLC."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, it shows the registered agent as "T \& S Registered Agents."

Are you familiar with that company?
A. Yes.
Q. What is that company?
A. That is a shell company that we typically use to serve as registered agent for entities that we form for clients.
Q. Okay. And the address of $T \& S$ Registered Agents, is that 925 South Federal Highway, Suite 500?
A. It is now. It was the address that's on the Exhibit 6 up until March.
Q. Right. That's your law firm?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Was your law firm at 4855 Technology Way, Suite 720?
A. 7 -- yes, it was.
Q. Okay. Now, it shows that the mailing address of the Bernstein Family Realty, LLC was changed -- it looks like -- in 2013 to the Oppenheimer Trust Company.

Do you see that on Exhibit 6?
A. (Witness reviews document.) I see Oppenheimer listed there; yeah.
Q. And what was your involvement in the change?
A. I didn't have any involvement in the change.
Q. Okay. And did you organize the Bernstein Family Realty, LLC, as the attorney?
A. I didn't -- as the attorney.
Q. You did or you did not?
A. I might have filed the articles of organization. I don't recall. I think I was originally named as the registered agent. This was done back in February of '08. At that time it -when I -- when I first withdrew from my prior firm, Peter, we actually shared office space for a year with my former partners -- just, you know, we just continued using our office. It was a friendly -friendly division.

And when this company was formed, it was formed February of '08, which would have been roughly a month after -- a little over a month after Robert Spallina and I had set up Tescher \& Spallina. We probably didn't even have a new registered agent entity set up yet.
Q. All right. And the documents on Exhibit 6 shows that the previous mailing address in 2012 was 950 Peninsula Corporate Circle, Suite 3010.

What address is that?
A. I think that was LIC's office.
Q. All right. And LIC was the business owned by Simon Bernstein and Ted Bernstein by majority?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. And if you look at the third page --
A. Yes.
Q. -- it shows that the managing member was Simon Bernstein.
A. Correct.
Q. As of January 2012; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, you are knowledgeable in trust and estates and succession planning, like you said and shown on your website.

Once Mr. Bernstein passes away, does the estate then become the managing member?
A. No, the estate does not become the managing member.
Q. Okay. Well, who then would have been responsible for changing the mailing address of the

Bernstein Family Realty, LLC from the offices of LIC -- LIC to Oppenheimer, if it wasn't somebody acting on behalf of the estate?
A. I can't answer that question.
Q. All right. And is Bernstein Family Realty listed as an asset of the Simon Bernstein estate?
A. No. He didn't own any equity interest in it, other than a mortgage -- a note and mortgage.
Q. Okay. And so normally, as an expert in this field, if a person is the only member of an LLC, and that person passes away, what is your standard operating procedure as to how the operations of that LLC are carried out after the passing of the only manager?
A. Mr. Feaman --

MR. ROSE: Objection to form.
A. Mr. Feaman, I'm assuming you meant to say, "manager" and not "member"?

Do you want to restate your question?
Q. No, because the electronic signature of page 3 of Exhibit 6 is signed by Simon Bernstein, as the managing member manager?
A. No, "manager," not "managing member." "Manager," sir.
Q. Okay. Do you know -- as the registered
agent, do you know where the books and records of the Bernstein Family Realty, LLC are maintained?
A. I personally don't know.
Q. Has your office ever maintained them?
A. I don't think so. Remember that the members -- the members of this entity, sir, are three trusts, of which Oppenheimer until recently -- or maybe still is; I don't know -- was the trustee.
Q. And what -- what are those three trusts?
A. They are trusts -- irrevocable trusts created in 2006 by Simon Bernstein for the benefit of Eliot Bernstein's three children.
Q. Okay. Did you create those trusts?
A. No, we did not.
Q. Who did?
A. I don't -- I don't know.
Q. All right.
A. Their prior counsel obviously, not us.
Q. And as copersonal representative of the estate of Simon Bernstein, would you have any fiduciary responsibility to carry out the intent of Mr . Simon Bernstein with regard to the management of Bernstein Family Realty?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Who were the trustees of those three trusts that you mentioned that owned it?
A. Oppenheimer.
Q. And who were the trustees before Oppenheimer?
A. Stanford.
Q. Stanford?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And where are those trusts -copies of those trusts located?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you have possession of the original?
A. Why would I?
Q. I don't know.

MR. ROSE: And I object to this line of questioning as completely irrelevant and immaterial, since the estate has no interest in this, other than the mortgage, which has been unpaid and for which Mr. Eliot Bernstein has been living in the residence without paying any rent, or mortgage, or interest for two years.

But other than that, I think this whole line of questioning is wholly irrelevant; and you're wasting valuable time.
Q. Let me ask a follow-up question: What
conversations have you had with Ted Bernstein concerning the Bernstein Family Realty, LLC, since the passing of Simon Bernstein?

MR. BLOCK: Well, I ask a question as to whether or not there's a privilege. I have no idea of what you're talking, but just want to throw that out.

THE WITNESS: Well, I'm mulling that in my head, Irwin, as to whether it is a privilege issue.
Q. Okay. Let me --

MR. ROSE: The question is, have you had a discussion? And if the -- the answer is either yes or no; and then we can deal with the privilege issue.

MR. FEAMAN: Yeah. Right.
A. Yeah. I think tangentially there has been -- there had been discussion regarding Bernstein Family Realty.
Q. Between you and Mr. Ted Bernstein; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And has there been email traffic between you and Mr. Ted Bernstein concerning Bernstein Family Realty, LLC?
A. Not me, I don't believe.
Q. I mean, to your knowledge, on paper Mr. Ted Bernstein has no involvement with Bernstein Family Realty, LLC; correct?
A. Well, he has no direct involvement in Bernstein Family Realty, LLC. He does have -- or potentially has involvement vis-a-vis -- no, he does not have involvement; that's correct.
Q. Okay. And so --
A. That I'm aware of.
Q. Therefore, what would the nature of any -why would you be having any correspondence or conversation with Mr. Ted Bernstein concerning Bernstein Family Realty if he has no apparent involvement in that entity?
A. Well, Bernstein Family Realty -- if I'm not mistaken -- was also named as a defendant in the Stansbury litigation.
Q. Okay.
A. And certainly in that regard there was discussion.
Q. Okay. Is Bernstein Family Realty still a defendant in the Stansbury litigation?
A. Is it still? I don't know. I -- those are issues that I'm not necessarily privy to.
Q. All right. Let me draw your attention to
premarked Exhibit 7 --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- for the deposition --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- which is a --

MR. ROSE: Is it still a defendant in the
lawsuit, Peter, since it's your lawsuit?
MR. FEAMAN: Yes, it is.
Q. Marked as Exhibit 7 is a copy of Articles of Incorporation for Bernstein Holdings, LLC.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You are shown as the registered agent of Bernstein Holdings, LLC; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. And the manager is shown as Simon Bernstein under article 5 on page 2; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, the -- this looks like a different address altogether than the ones we identified before under article 4. It shows an address for you of 2101 Corporate Boulevard, Suite 107.

Do you know what was located at that address at that time?
A. Yes. That was in the first year of our --
of our firm. Starting January 1 of '08, that was our office address.
Q. Okay. Very good.

And it shows a manager as Simon Bernstein;
is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. There's also a signature of a member, Robert Spallina.

Do you know what his involvement in the corporation was or is?
A. He didn't sign as a member. He signed as an authorized representative of a member.

MR. ROSE: Object to form.
Q. All right. Well, let me draw your attention to page 3 of Exhibit 7, document dated by the Secretary of State April 12th, 2013. It shows the manager as Robert Spallina.

That would be your law partner; correct?
A. That is -- yes, he is my law partner.
Q. Okay. And how did your law partner, Mr. Spallina, come to be the manager of Bernstein Holdings, LLC?
A. The manager died.
Q. Okay.
A. The interest in this entity was owned by,

I believe, the Shirley Bernstein Trust and the Simon Bernstein Trust. They owned a majority interest -- those two trusts -- in Bernstein Holdings, LLC, which was the general partner of a limited partnership.
Q. All right. So the manager died. And somehow Robert Spallina became manager.

But you told me with regard to Bernstein Family Realty, Exhibit 6, we identified Simon Bernstein as the manager. But then you said nobody became the manager after that as far as you knew.

How did Mr. Spallina become the manager of Bernstein Holdings, LLC?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Who are the members -- did you say -- of Bernstein Holdings, LLC?
A. I don't have those documents in front of me, Peter. But I believe that it would have been the Simon Bernstein Trust and the Shirley Bernstein Trust; and there may have been some minor interest held for other family members. I'm not certain.
Q. Which trusts would you be referring to -'cause we've identified a number of trusts here today?
A. The 2012 -- July 25, 2012 Simon Bernstein

Amended and Restated Trust Agreement and --
Q. Okay. And that's -- go ahead.
A. -- and assumedly the family trust under -that was established for the benefit of Simon after Shirley's death under the Shirley Bernstein Trust Agreement from '08.
Q. Okay. And the members designated you, as the managing member --
A. They didn't designate me, Peter.
Q. I mean -- sorry -- designated Mr. Spallina as the managing member. And the members were acting through Ted Bernstein as the successor trustee; is that right?

MR. ROSE: Object to the form.
A. I --
Q. Do you remember --
A. I have no personal knowledge.
Q. Okay. Who would know?
A. Mr. Spallina --
Q. Okay.
A. -- or perhaps Mr. Bernstein. I don't know.
Q. Let's take a look at Exhibit 8, if we could.
A. Okay. Yes, sir.
Q. Exhibit 8 is a copy of a Certificate of Limited Partnership for the Bernstein Family Investments, LLLP.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, you're shown as the registered agent for that entity; is that correct?
A. Yes. Again, February of 2008; that's correct.
Q. Okay. And the general partner is shown as Bernstein Holdings, LLC.

Is that the entity we just identified --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- that Mr. Spallina is now the managing partner of?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And your shell company that you created is now the registered agent for that company rather than you individually; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And 950 Peninsula Corporate Circle, Suite 3010, what's located at that address?
A. I presume that to be what was Simon Bernstein's office.
Q. And now I guess Ted Bernstein's office; right?
A. I guess; yes.
Q. Okay. All right.

Let's take a look at Exhibit 9, if we
could.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, this is a copy of Articles of Incorporation for the Shirley Bernstein Family Foundation, Inc.?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. You're shown as, again, the registered agent. Did you -- are you the one that created this entity?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And what is the purpose or the business of the Shirley Bernstein Family Foundation, Inc.?
A. It has no purpose today. It's an inactive entity, as far as $I$ know.

It was formed back in 2008 at a time when Shirley had -- Bernstein had expressed an interest in setting up a foundation to carry on some of her charitable desires.
Q. All right. Let me draw your attention to Exhibit 10.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Exhibit 10 is a printout from the Florida Department of State Division of Corporation for an entity known as "Two Oaks --"

MR. FEAMAN: That's O-a-k-s, Madam Court Reporter, T -w-o, Oaks -- oh, you have it there in front of you --
Q. "-- Consulting, LLC."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. It shows it's currently inactive, but it was apparently active from 2006 through 2011.

What is your understanding of what Two Oaks Consulting, LLC is?
A. Geeze. I'm trying to remember now.

I set this up for -- principally for my wife and I to use for purposes of trying to develop some additional consulting business on our own.
Q. What kind of consulting?
A. All types of business consulting.

She is a pretty good bookkeeper. You know, we could provide -- looking to provide, like,
bookkeeping services and office administration services.
Q. All right. And 2600 Whispering Oaks Lane, is that your home address?
A. Yes, it is, sir.
Q. All right. And your wife Sue Anne, that's -- she's shown -- is she the only -- was she the only manager?
A. She was the manager.
Q. Okay. And did Two Oaks Consulting do any business for any entities owned or controlled by the Bernsteins?
A. I believe that it might have. I don't recall. I'm looking at your Exhibit 11-A for the first time. So obviously there were some payments that were made to Two Oaks.
Q. Okay. Let's take a look at Exhibit 11-A. It's a copy of a reconciliation detail report for Arbitrage International Management, LLC.

First, what is your understanding of what Arbitrage International Management, LLC is?
A. I'm not 100 percent certain. It was one -- it was part of the overall insurance business of the Bernsteins.
Q. So is it fair to say, though, you do
understand that this company is -- was or is owned and controlled by majority by Simon and Ted Bernstein?
A. I believe I do understand that.
Q. Okay. Now, Simon's ownership interest in Arbitrage International Management, LLC, did that exist at the time of Mr . Bernstein's death in 2012?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you know if his ownership interest in this company is shown on the inventory of the estate?
A. I don't recall it being listed on the inventory of the estate, because if it were owned still, it might have been owned through his trust and not through his -- him individually.
Q. Okay. I guess we have to do further discovery on that. But you would agree that both Ted and Simon Bernstein controlled that entity; correct?
A. My knowledge -- to the best of my knowledge.
Q. Yeah. That's all I can ask is to the best of your knowledge. Yeah. Yeah.

Okay. Let me draw your attention to page 1 of Exhibit 11-A, to about two-thirds of the way
down the page.
There's a check that's listed there dated
11/1/2006, No. 2047.
Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And it's a check payable to Two Oaks Consulting for $\$ 55,000$.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And what work was performed by Two Oaks Consulting that caused a delivery of that payment from Arbitrage International Management to Two Oaks for $\$ 55,000$ at or around October or November of 2006?
A. This is seven-and-a-half years ago. To be honest with you, I don't know, without going back and trying to find out.

I don't have any immediate knowledge.
Q. All right. Then just below that is an entry for 11/1/2006 --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- check No. 2046 for Tescher Gutter.

That's your firm before Tescher \&
Spallina; correct?
A. That is correct, sir.
Q. That's the Chaves firm I guess you referred to.

Now, there's a check for $\$ 45,000$ on the same day, which totaled a payment of $\$ 100,000$ on November 1st, 2006.

Do you recall what that was for?
A. Again, no, I'm not a hundred percent certain. But, obviously, if it's paid -- the payment -- I'm -- no, I do not know without checking.
Q. All right. Well, let me draw your attention to the next page --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- which is a reconciliation detail.

And about a quarter of the way down -also on 11/1/2006 -- this is marked as Exhibit $11-\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{by}$ the way --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. There's a check by -- a different check number, 2045, payable to Two Oaks Consulting for the same amount, $\$ 55,000$.

Do you know what that was for?
A. No. This looks like a duplication of 11-A, frankly. I mean, I --
Q. Yeah. That's what I thought too, except
that it's a different check number.
A. Yeah, I can't explain it. Obviously, it's not my reconciliation. But it certainly looks like the same things here.
Q. Yeah. Okay. And then, finally, on page 11-C --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- there's a check in 2007 -- January 22nd, 2007 -- payable to your wife's company from Arbitrage International Management for $\$ 30,000$-check No. 2247.

Do you know what that was for?
A. No, sir, not without, you know, trying to go back and see if I can find it -- find out what it was.
Q. As you sit here today, any idea whatsoever?
A. No.
Q. All right, sir.

Now, the -- when you do estate planning documents for clients, I assume that you also ask them about life insurance?
A. Generally, we would ask them about --
Q. As part of your due diligence; is that correct?
A. Yes, we would generally ask them about life insurance. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And when you did your estate planning for Simon Bernstein and Shirley Bernstein in 2008, I assume then you asked them about life insurance; is that correct?
A. I would presume that we did.
Q. Okay. And are you aware that there's presently pending in Chicago litigation concerning a life insurance trust?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And are you aware that the litigation makes reference to a lost life insurance trust instrument?
A. Yes. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Have you ever seen it -- or a copy of it?
A. No, sir.
Q. Ever?
A. No, sir.
Q. All right. Do you know if Shirley Bernstein was ever a trustee of that document that you've never seen?
A. It's my understanding but -- at some point that she was, but I -- I could not tell you for
sure.
Q. All right. And do you know who would be the alleged trustee of the alleged trust is today?
A. I believe that -- that it is Ted Bernstein.
Q. Okay. And --
A. Now, you --
Q. And what's the basis of your belief that Ted Bernstein is the trustee of the trust that you have never seen?
A. Just, you know, information related to us, either from Pam Simon, or her husband, or Ted Bernstein, or the insurance companies.
Q. So --
A. And you understand -- you understand that the policy itself was owned by Simon Bernstein.
Q. Yes.
A. The alleged trust was only the alleged beneficiary.
Q. Okay. Now, I'm not an expert in this area, but if Simon Bernstein was the owner of the trust --
A. Owner of the policy, sir.
Q. I mean -- of the policy -- would that make that a potential asset of the estate if the

## beneficiary can't be located?

A. You're -- you're mixing -- you're mixing ownership and beneficiary.
Q. Right.
A. The fact that he was an owner only means that, at least for federal estate tax purposes, the life insurance proceeds would be includable as part of his federal gross estate.
Q. Okay. Now, other than what Pam might have told you or Pam's husband, do you have any other reason why you say you believe that Mr. Ted Bernstein is currently the successor trustee?
A. My recollection -- and, again, this is without the benefit of looking at documents -- at one point in time the -- Simon and Shirley Bernstein were being represented by the Proskauer firm in Boca. And Al Gortz, in that firm --G-o-r-t-z -- was doing some legal work for them; and I believe he prepared -- it may be a 2000 trust; I don't remember precisely.

He had prepared a new life -- irrevocable life insurance trust, I believe. And I think -- I think my understanding is -- and I could be wrong -- was that he was -- he had prepared that to have Simon transfer the ownership of the policy into
this trust so as to keep it out of his estate for estate tax purposes.

I don't know that to be 100 percent. You know, that's just what my understandings are. And I don't have specific knowledge. But that would -would make some sense and --
Q. To your knowledge, that was never done; correct?
A. That was never done as far as I know. And we --
Q. Now, did your law partner, Mr. Spallina, represent that, in fact, he was the cotrustee -- I mean, successor trustee of that trust at one point?
A. I -- I find that -- I can't -- I saw some document somewhere in all of the minutia of paperwork that has occurred in the last six months here where supposedly he signed something as a trustee.

I don't think he ever represented himself to anybody really as being a trustee of a trust that was to receive the proceeds of that $\$ 1.6$ million policy.
Q. Well, take a look at Exhibit 14, if you would.
A. Yeah. No. I said there is a document
floating around; and I didn't know what -- what documents you -- I hadn't seen these in advance, so I wasn't sure.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay. I'm looking at 14 now.
Q. Yeah. It's a composite exhibit?
A. Right.
Q. And it's a letter dated under your letterhead of Tescher \& Spallina dated December 6, 2012.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's directed to the claims department of Heritage Union Life Insurance Company; is that correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. He states that he wants -- under the fifth bullet point -- the proceeds from the policy released so that, quote, "We can make distributions amongst the five Bernstein children," unquote.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Have you ever seen the Heritage policy itself?
A. I'm not a hundred percent certain that I
have.
Q. Do you know if it exists?
A. I have no direct knowledge. I presume it exists. Somebody paid 1.6 million into the registry of the court. So there's some life insurance policy that existed.
Q. Well, maybe they should have paid 2.6 million.
A. Well...
Q. Has a request ever been made, to your knowledge -- either on behalf of the state or otherwise -- to get a copy of the policy?
A. I'm not aware.
Q. Did you and Mr. Spallina have discussions at or about the time that this letter dated December 6, 2012, marked as Exhibit 14 was written about under what authority Mr . Spallina made the demands that the proceeds should be paid to the five Bernstein children?
A. It doesn't really read like a demand. But, you know, if you want to characterize it that way...

I'm seeing this letter for the first time.
Q. Did you have discussions with Mr. Spallina concerning the request made by him that he would
like the distributions amongst the five Bernstein children?
A. Well, my conversations with Robert Spallina included relating conversations he had had with Simon Bernstein regarding the policy and the overall plan that Simon Bernstein wished to have occur upon his demise.
Q. Are there emails between Mr. Bernstein -Simon -- and your office concerning any expressions of intent about the distribution of insurance proceeds upon his demise?
A. I'm not certain. Again, we provided all of that documentation to everybody. There may have been notes. There may have been file notes.

MR. ROSE: For the record, Peter, before you ask your next question -- and I hate to break your momentum -- but it's 4:30 p.m.

There are a number of other people that might have questions. And you are, in my view, taking discovery in a case that you're not involved in that Mr. Stansbury has counsel, and is representing, as administrator ad litem, the interests of the estate in unrelated litigation; and I think this is far afield of the issues we have Friday. And I think you're being a little
unfair to the other participants.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Perfectly fine.
This is Eliot Bernstein; and it's relevant to the matters at hand as to the qualifications of Ted and the qualifications of Mr. Tescher.
Q. Did Mr. Spallina, to your knowledge, have the consent of Mr . Eliot Bernstein to request that the distributions of the life insurance policy be made to him instead of the estate?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Do you recall that there were two other life insurance policies that were, in fact, paid to the Simon Bernstein estate?
A. Yes, I believe so. I don't recall. They were relatively modest policies, if I'm not mistaken.
Q. Would you agree with me that, if the lost trust instrument cannot be established, that the proceeds of the insurance policy would be then payable to the estate of Simon Bernstein?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. Beyond the witness's knowledge, scope, information. Irrelevant. Immaterial. And improper question for the purposes of this deposition.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Are you representing Don Tescher?

MR. ROSE: No. He's representing Ted Bernstein.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Are you putting that objection on for Ted or...

MR. FEAMAN: Don Tescher is represented by --

THE WITNESS: Irwin Block.
MR. FEAMAN: -- Mr. Irwin Block, a very well-respected attorney here in Palm Beach County.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Is he making the objections for Mr. Tescher?

MR. ROSE: No. He's making the objections on behalf of Mr. Ted Bernstein, which he has the right to do.

## Q. Okay. So you can answer.

A. Could you repeat the question, please? I'm sorry.

MR. FEAMAN: Sure. I would ask the court reporter to read it back.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
(Question read: Question: "Would you
agree with me that, if the lost trust instrument cannot be established, that the
proceeds of the insurance policy would be then payable to the estate of Simon Bernstein?")
A. I think it may depend upon the terms and conditions contained in the insurance policy. So I can't say absolutely that that would be the case.
Q. Okay. But it seems nobody can find the insurance policy. So in a default provision, wouldn't it, in fact, then go to the estate --
A. I --
Q. -- the -- Bernstein as the owner of the policy?
A. I -- I --

MR. ROSE: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. Beyond the scope of the witness's knowledge.
A. I don't have an answer.
Q. All right. Well, as the copersonal representative, what effort did you take to ascertain whether the proceeds of this policy should, in fact, be payable to the estate?
A. Well, the first -- what we attempted to first do was to go into court in Palm Beach County and have a declaratory action to establish a lost trust and appoint a successor trustee, which is a
-- you know, not an uncommon proceeding.
We, in fact, had drafted a pleading, which
is your Exhibit 12.
The family, for whatever reasons -- and
I'm not certain what all the reasons were --
decided that they wanted to remove the action to Federal District Court in Illinois. So the matter was removed to federal district court in Illinois.
Q. And --
A. We are not a party any longer in that proceeding and have not been involved in that for quite some time.
Q. Well as a PR, did you think you had any fiduciary obligations to creditors -- interested persons of the estate to marshall the assets of the estate for the benefit of not only the beneficiaries but the creditors too?
A. The best information that was given to us that we acted upon was to attempt to see if the '95 trust could either be located or reestablished through -- through appropriate testimony.
Q. All right. Let's get back, if we could, to Exhibit 14, and then we'll get to my Exhibit 12.
A. Okay. I've got 14. Okay.
Q. So you can identify the letter written by

Mr. Spallina; is that correct?
A. It is a letter that appears to have been written by Mr. Spallina.
Q. Now, let me draw your attention to the claimant's statement that is on page 2 of Exhibit 14 --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- do you see that?

Do you know who filled that out?
A. It looks to me like it is Mr. Spallina's signature for sure.
Q. Pardon me?
A. It looks to me like it is Mr. Spallina's signature for sure; that would be his signature.
Q. Okay.
A. And apparently he wrote "Personal rep and trustee."
Q. Did you and Mr. Spallina have discussion about this document at any time?
A. No, sir.
Q. Is it your understanding that he's representing himself to be the trustee of the lost insurance trust?
A. No. It's my understanding that he was representing himself to be the trustee of Simon's
trust and also personal representative of Simon's estate.
Q. Well, let's go to the next page, which is Bates stamped No. JCK 001273.
A. Yeah, I see it.
Q. Do you see that where it says "Name of

Trust: Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust," dated 6/1/95. And it looks like "Printed name of trustee: Robert Spallina."

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. Did you have any discussions with Mr. Spallina concerning his authority to represent himself to the insurance company as the trustee of the 1995 revocable trust?
A. No, sir. I'm seeing this document probably for the first time.
Q. Okay.

MR. ROSE: Object to the form of the last one.
Q. And then you mentioned the action that was then filed --
A. I didn't say it was filed. I said it was contemplated to be filed.
Q. No, in Illinois?
A. Oh. I'm sorry. Go ahead.
Q. Okay. Now, there -- are you aware that the trustee of the lost trust -- that Mr. Ted Bernstein represents himself as the successor trustee?

Are you aware of that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Do you know by what authority Mr. Bernstein represented himself as successor trustee?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware that there were discussions and email traffic between your office and counsel in Chicago concerning whether an action should be filed in Palm Beach County -- as you mentioned -or in Illinois?
A. I believe there was correspondence back and forth; and there were also telephone discussions.
Q. Are you aware that in that correspondence Mr. Spallina represented to counsel in Chicago that the life insurance proceeds were, in fact, an asset of the Simon Bernstein estate; therefore, it should be litigated in Palm Beach County?

MR. ROSE: Object to the form.
A. I don't recall.
Q. All right. And now, take a look at Exhibit 12.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. That's a draft of a complaint; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that prepared in your office?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And who prepared it?
A. I believe that I did.
Q. And this is a draft of a complaint prepared by you entitled "Declaratory Action to Establish a Lost Trust and Appoint a Successor Trustee"; correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You prepared that on behalf of Ted Bernstein; is that correct?
A. "Comes now Ted Bernstein, son of Simon Bernstein"; that's correct.
Q. Okay. So -- now, then you said earlier in your testimony that the family -- quote, "the family," close quote -- decided that it should be -- this action should be filed in Chicago?

Was Eliot Bernstein a member of the family that you referred to?
A. Eliot Bernstein is a member of the family.

As to whether Eliot Bernstein's opinion was elicited, I would seriously doubt.
Q. Okay. And, in fact, Eliot Bernstein is mentioned in paragraph 5 as one of the five surviving children of Simon Bernstein.
A. That is -- that is correct.
Q. Okay. And how did the decision come about that the action instead was filed in Chicago -- in Illinois state court, rather than in the county where the decedent resided, in Palm Beach County; if you know?
A. I don't know.
Q. And who would be most knowledgeable about that?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
Materiality. It's 4:42. You're trying the wrong case. The judge has already determined that Mr. Stansbury, at his own expense, can pursue the litigation in Illinois. And you're not supposed to use this deposition for discovery in that case. And, otherwise, everything you're asking is irrelevant and wasting the time of everyone, including the people that haven't yet had a chance to ask questions.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. This is Eliot

Bernstein. I'll put back on the record that it's very relevant to the qualifications of Mr. Tescher to act in any capacity on this.

THE WITNESS: I'm not being asked to act in any capacity, Mr. Bernstein.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Are you objecting on behalf of Ted or on behalf of --
Q. I mean, I'm laying a predicate here, because my next question is, in recommending Ted Bernstein as successor personal representative to the estate of Simon Bernstein, what are you recommending what action Ted Bernstein takes -- if he's appointed by the court as successor personal representative -- to protect the estate in trying to obtain the assets -- excuse me -- the proceeds of this insurance policy?
A. I'm not your lawyer anymore.
Q. Well, you were never my lawyer.
A. Well, I'm no longer Ted Bernstein's lawyer either.
Q. And would you expect him to take action to protect the estate?

MR. ROSE: Objection to the form in light of Judge Colin's prior ruling.

I think you understand it's an improper
question, Peter, which is why you keep asking it. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't think it's improper at all.
A. I am --
Q. You are recommending, sir, Mr. Ted Bernstein, the PR, you're the previous PR. And since you're in the business of recommending, would you recommend to Ted Bernstein as successor personal representative to take assets -- to take steps necessary to try to get these insurance proceeds into the estate of Simon Bernstein, since the PR has a fiduciary obligation to all interested persons of an estate?
A. I think that Mr. Bernstein -- Ted Bernstein -- should do what he should do based upon his standing as a fiduciary; and if that means not taking a position -- if that means taking a position on behalf of the estate, if that means standing silent and letting the chips fall where they may, those are decisions that he will have to make.
Q. And what decision did you make as personal representative with regard to those estate assets?
A. We felt that they belonged to the '95 trust; that there was enough evidence around that
the trust, in fact, existed; and that it ought to be reestablished if it could be.

That was our determination. The family --
Q. Were you aware of the 2000 trust?
A. Yes, we were.
Q. Okay. And is that trust -- can that trust be found?
A. I think so, if I'm not mistaken.

I'm not 100 percent certain about that,
Peter.
Q. And is that also a life insurance trust?
A. I believe it is, in the sense that it was going to be the owner and beneficiary of the policy, I believe.
Q. And the --
A. The reason why -- let me just tell you.

The reason why Si never wanted to put the ownership out of his control was for the very reason that he wanted to be able to control where that policy was ultimately going.
Q. And the two other policies that were paid to the --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- estate --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- were they in a trust or owned by him personally?
A. Well, they were paid --
Q. Were they placed into a trust?
A. No. They were owned by him personally, and they were payable to the estate.
Q. Okay. Did Eliot Bernstein ever express to you his disagreement of -- regarding the estate -of Simon Bernstein's noninvolvement in the Illinois action?
A. He might have. I don't recall.
Q. You don't recall? And if he might have --
A. He --
Q. -- do you recall what you might have said? MR. BLOCK: I object to the form of that question.
A. I don't know how to respond to that question.
Q. Did your office have disagreements with Chicago counsel in emails about the filing of the action in Illinois?
A. We -- we did not necessarily totally agree with what they wanted to do.
Q. And were the -- some of the children of Mr . Simon Bernstein fearful that the claim of Mr.

Stansbury would consume the insurance proceeds and, therefore, wanted to keep those insurance proceeds that are the subject of the litigation in Illinois out of the estate at all costs?

MR. BLOCK: Peter, what does that have to do with the issue before the court? This is Block. You know, I'm trying to be quiet, but I think you're really going far afield here.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay. Fair -- fair comment.
Q. Let me ask one or two more questions: Did Ted Bernstein express to you -- either email or orally while you were personal representative -his desire to keep the insurance proceeds out of the estate of Simon Bernstein so that it would not be subject to the claim of Mr. Stansbury as a creditor?
A. I don't recall. I mean, obviously we all knew that, if the proceeds were payable to the estate --

MR. BLOCK: Don, did you hear my objection on privilege?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
MR. BLOCK: If you want to answer it, that's up to you.

MR. FEAMAN: Yeah. I'm asking that
question, Irwin, in his capacity as personal representative.

MR. BLOCK: Does that mean he wasn't a lawyer?

MR. FEAMAN: Well, when you're a personal representative --

MR. BLOCK: Go ahead, Peter.
A. I will answer it this way: We were all obviously aware -- everybody was aware that if the proceeds came into the estate they would be exposed to a successful prosecution of Mr. Stansbury's lawsuit if he got a judgment.
Q. Did you talk to Mr. Stansbury at any time about his claim -- or your attorney, Mr. Manceri?
A. I don't recall ever talking to Mr. Stansbury about it.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay. All right. I think that's all $I$ have at this point.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Peter.
MR. ROSE: Does anybody else wish to ask questions of Mr. Tescher?

MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey. I have no questions.

MR. ROSE: Anybody else?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: This is Eliot
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