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THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. Be seated.
All right. We're on the estate of simon Bernstein, 2012CP004391. We have a number of people here. After everyone makes their appearances, I'm going to have some preliminary instructions, and then we'll start the hearings.

So counsel, and then pro se's, make your appearances. Start that side.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Good afternoon, Your Honor, John Pankauski on behalf of Ted Bernstein.

MR. ROSE: Alan Rose on behalf of Ted Bernstein.

MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey here on behalf of Molly Simon, Alexander Bernstein, Eric Bernstein and Michael Bernstein.

MR. BROWN: Ben Brown, as curator of the estate.

MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman and Jeff Royer here on behalf of William Stansbury.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So last time
we were here we went through a list of what we're going to hear today. I think it's probably well known, we're going to start with the motion to disqualify counsel. Here are the following rules. And I'm setting these rules, and these rules will be enforced, because it seemed apparent from the other times you folks were before me, especially on UMC's, which are not structured, and are not evidentiary hearings, that it, at times, got to be a little bit of a free-for-all; people just spoke when they wanted to speak, and they raised matters that were not set for hearing. That has come to an end. If any one of you violates what $I$ say now, I'm going to stop the hearing at the moment I sense a violation, and, hopefully, it's not going to be the case, and then I'm going to deal with the violation right on the spot. So here are the rules: One, the rules of evidence apply to this hearing. If you don't know the rules of evidence, that's too bad. But you have to know them. Okay. If something is said, and you don't like the idea that's said, you have to make the objection. The objection should state objection and the legal grounds. There are no speaking objections allowed unless I tell you you can make a speaking
objection. If you don't know what that means, too bad. These are evidentiary hearings. So the moving party will go forward, present their evidence. If the other side wants to object, make an objection, as I've just indicated. Then there can be a response to the moving party's relief. And then there could be rebuttal. Just like it takes place in civil proceedings. There is no free-for-all. There is no just saying whatever you feel like saying no matter what.

Okay. I think the first motion is Eliot Bernstein's petition or motion to disqualify counsel.

You're up, Mr. Bernstein.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Can I make an opening statement?

THE COURT: You may.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. First thing I have, all my, what you would call, evidence has been submitted in pleadings as -- to the court -and served to all the people already. Do you want -- he asked me if $I$ wanted to submit this into evidence. It's up to you. I'm probably only going to use a few things of it. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Because you're
pro se, I'll say again, what I think the lawyers understood. Whatever you may have done may or may not comply with the rules of evidence.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: The hint is, it hasn't.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Do I --
THE COURT: So -- let me finish. I'm not going to give you any advisory opinions on how to proceed with the case because this is a, you know, a very hotly-contested hearing, and, you know, we're all going to be treated the same way by me. So you can't ask me if you have evidence in already -- because we haven't already started the hearing -- so the answer to it is, no. There is no evidence in this hearing yet. We haven't even started yet. We're starting it right now. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. THE COURT: Okay. So evidence can come in the form of a document, or a witness. You have to get it into evidence, though. You have to know how to do that. And so my bailiff is correct, if you want a document to come into evidence, then you need to mark it, stamp it, and then make sure the other side has a copy of it. A pleading is not evidence. Pleadings and evidence are two
different things.

Okay. Opening statement.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: First, I'd like to state for the record that $I, ~ E l i o t$ Bernstein, have never made a representation that I'd like to be the successor PR of the estate and trusts of my mother and father. Mr. Feaman and Mr. Stansbury have endorsed me in one of their pleadings as a candidate due to their perceived integrity of my actions thus far in the matters. And as the only beneficiary who has no involvement in any of the egregious acts of bad faith and violations of law that have taken place and been proven thus far in these matters.

And I thank them profusely for their support, but I decline due to, amongst other things, the conflicts of interest that are now inherent between the children of my parents, Ted included, me included, and our children. This is due to the fact that the beneficiaries may either be the children or the grandchildren, depending upon the court's final disposition on the dispositive document and which ones will prevail, that's due to the fraud that's taken place by the former $P R$,
co-trustees, and counsel that have resigned already and been removed, admits the fraud they created.

I was advised by counsel Christine Yates at Tripp Scott that $I$ was conflicted in these --

MR. ROSE: Objection.
THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Stop. Objection is made. You need to stop. Grounds?

MR. ROSE: Relevancy in relation to the first motion being heard.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Okay. Sustained.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: So, Mr. Bernstein, focus --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I mean --
THE COURT: No. No. Listen. Focus. I'm doing the motion to disqualify.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I did this for all of them.

THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, but, see, that's not a focus. So get -- it probably would be helpful for you to get your motion in front of you. Remember you have the burden of proof; you need to be able to prove what you plead and have a legal
basis for it. And I need -- can someone give me a courtesy copy of the motion to disqualify and any written responses. Because I have a bunch of papers and it will help me from not having to search.

MR. ROSE: May I approach? THE COURT: Sure. MR. ROSE: There were two motions, Your Honor. I think this is the second one; says motion to remove Alan B. Rose, Esq. I think the earlier one was an emergency one. I believe that's the correct one.

THE COURT: All right. So -- okay.
Mr. Bernstein, the motion that counsel handed me is called motion to remove Alan B. Rose, Esq. The certificate of service date is June 24, 2014, twenty-nine pages, plus an attachment. Is that the motion?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's one of the two. THE COURT: Okay. And the other one is... MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It's the emergency motion you said you denied there is an emergency to be heard.

THE COURT: All right. Let me see that one as well. Do you have an extra copy?

MR. ROSE: I thought the one replaced the other, $I$ don't know if $I$ have a copy.

THE COURT: He says it didn't, so I'm going --

MR. ROSE: I do have a copy of it.
THE COURT: Is this a clean copy?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Did you want that copy? THE COURT: No. No, I mean, if you are using it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah, I am. Sorry. THE COURT: Give it back. MR. ROSE: May I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ROSE: I believe this is the earlier one, the June 23rd.

THE COURT: Okay. Which one I denied as an emergency, but I think Mr. Bernstein is correct, it's allowed to proceed on a non-emergency basis, but we're doing now disqualification. Okay. So, Mr. Bernstein, let me -- time is of the essence, we need to accomplish a lot, focus in on the motion to disqualify. You want to -- I'll let you make a clean opening statement on the motion to disqualify.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I believe that

Alan Rose should be disqualified as counsel because he has worked intimately with the people who he's replacing as counsel in these matters from the beginning and onset to perpetrate a series of frauds that have been discovered on the court to change beneficiaries through a series of documents that were presented to the court, to counsel, Christine Yates, and others, all to advance that fraud. He's been hired and retained by those people. And he now is replacing the people you've let go for the fraud. And it is in everybody's best interests that all remnants of the fraud be removed from the court, and any parties involved in any advancement of such documents, or the actual fraud to change the beneficiaries and make distributions to improper parties. Mr. Rose has been involved, I believe, since day one of Tescher and Spallina that resigned, counsel who resigned for those frauds, et cetera.

That's my opening.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'll go now my right to left. Opening by Stansbury side.

MR. FEAMAN: No position on this motion. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Brown, curator.

MR. BROWN: No position on this motion. THE COURT: Mr. Rose or -- and/or

Mr. Pankauski, opening.

MR. ROSE: I think the motion is legally
insufficient and should be denied. And the facts
that you've just heard are not accurate. If you
want to start with the evidence, I think we should go to the evidentiary part.

THE COURT: All right.
Opening?
MR. MORRISSEY: I have no opening.
THE COURT: All right. Your first witness.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No witnesses.
THE COURT: Okay. You're moving into -- any
document into evidence?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: $I$ do want to call a
witness. Can I call Alan Rose?
THE COURT: Yeah. Mr. Rose, come up here.
MR. ROSE: Can I have a paper to make a note?
THE COURT: Yeah, sure.
MR. ROSE: Not that $I$ do, but my memory --
THE COURT: Witnesses are allowed to take notes.

THEREUPON,

ALAN B. ROSE, ESQ.,
a witness herein being of lawful age, and being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified on under oath as follows:

THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat. Go ahead. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Mr. Rose, could you tell us when you -- what brought you into this estate of Simon and Shirley, and by who?

A In which capacity?
Q In all your capacities.
A Okay. My first involvement in the matters was -- actually pre-dates any involvement in the estate. I was retained by Ted Bernstein and several companies to represent them in a civil action brought by William Stansbury. I was not directly involved in the estate proceedings at that time. There came a point in time later when there was some minor overlap in issues between the estate proceedings and the representation in the stansbury litigation, and so I had some limited contact with Mr. Tescher, Mr. Spallina because there were issues that were relevant to the Stansbury litigation. At some point in January 2009 we learned from a discussion that Mr. Tescher had with Ted Bernstein that there had been a problem with some
documents. And from that point forward, Ted Bernstein retained me to represent him in connection with these estate proceedings. I think I had attended some estate proceeding hearings, but not as Ted's counsel in these proceedings at the time.

THE COURT: Okay. But I'm a little confused. You say in January of 2009 you were hired by Ted in connection with the estate of Simon Bernstein? THE WITNESS: January 2014, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. I thought you said January of '09.

MR. ROSE: I meant to say January 9th of 2014, I'm sorry. THE COURT: Okay. That makes more sense. Go ahead. Next question.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Did you attend a Palm Beach County Sheriff investigation of Ted Bernstein in January of 2014 ?

A I attended an investigation as counsel for Ted Bernstein. As part of the investigation $I$ went with him --

THE COURT: So is the answer yes? THE WITNESS: I guess, yes.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Did you make statements to the sheriff on that

A I'm sure we spoke with him.
Q Who spoke with him?
A We had a -- the sheriff was doing an
investigation.
THE COURT: Okay. So listen to the question.
Answer the question asked. And there is no we
directed to you. You're you.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: Ted and I --
THE COURT: You're you. You're not Ted. He asked the question what statements did you make.

And you need to listen, Mr. Rose, to the question.
This isn't a tricky process if you listen.
THE WITNESS: I thought the question was who
made the statements.
THE COURT: No, what statements did you make to the sheriff?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Do you recall statements to the sheriff being made that your client had taken inappropriate, improper distributions of assets?

A No.
Q Are you aware that your client made statements
that he had never read the dispositive documents he was operating under?

A I don't believe that's accurate of what was said.

Is this hearsay, I mean?
THE COURT: Answer the question. No objection. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Can I object?
THE COURT: You could. Okay. You can object.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Are you objecting as your own pro se, counsel --

THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on. Hold it. I run the objection show, not you, Mr. Bernstein.

THE WITNESS: I recalled the discussion where Mr -- I think it was Detective Miller had asked about -- well, see, $I$ think it's --

THE COURT: Just answer the question as best as you can, but listen to what the question is. You want the question read back? THE WITNESS: Sure.

THE COURT: Hold on. Mr. Reporter, please read the question back.

> (Record read)

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. ELIOT BERNStein: Okay. Can I have him read that into the record?

THE COURT: Read what into the record?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Part of the Palm Beach County Sheriff Office report.

THE COURT: Right now you're questioning him.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I ask him to read this statement from the sheriff's report?

THE COURT: I don't - since I don't know what you have or what you want to do, I can't really answer you. You can ask him a question.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I --
THE COURT: You can approach the witness.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.

## BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Can you read that?
A Objection, hearsay, authenticity,
materiality.
THE COURT: He can show you a document for the purposes of refreshing your recollection. Why don't you read what -- don't speak about it -read what he's showing you, and then tell me when you're done reading it.

THE WITNESS: I've read it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Now, take it back. Now you ask a

1
clean question.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Did that refresh your memory about making statements to the Palm Beach County Sheriff's?

A It refreshed my memory that we made statements.

THE COURT: There is no we. You. THE WITNESS: That I made a statement.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Because it says --
THE COURT: Can't read it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I can't?
THE COURT: No. You can ask him a question,
but you just can't read it.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Okay. Did you read the part where it says - THE COURT: No, you can ask him a question. Can't read the document. It's not in evidence. BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Okay.
THE COURT: You can say did you say this.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Has Eliot Bernstein notified you that he will
be filing actions, both civil and criminal, against you?
A Eliot Bernstein has sent me a lot of e-mails.

He's actually sent e-mails to every single member of my firm, secretary, legal assistant, paralegal,
threatening --

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Rose, that's not the question.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Threatening what?

THE COURT: No. No. Stop, you two. You're heading in the wrong direction. Listen to the question. If it's not objected to, answer the question.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Are you aware that Robert Spallina fabricated documents, trust documents?

A I'm aware that Robert Spallina --
THE COURT: Yes or no, then you can explain.

THE WITNESS: Yes. Robert Spallina
fabricated a document. And that document was
brought to our attention, and we've taken
corrective action immediately with regard to it.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q What corrective actions?

A We demanded that $M r$-- well, first of all, when we first learned about it was on a Friday
afternoon in January. Mr. Bernstein contacted -- Ted Bernstein contacted me. And I met with Ted Bernstein Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. And on Sunday we retained new counsel, Mr. Pankauski. I spoke to Mr. Tescher. I advised him that in light of his revelation they would need to immediately withdraw, that he should put his carrier on notice, and that we were going to be taking action as we deemed appropriate to rectify the problems. I spoke to Mr . Tescher on the Monday morning. Mr. Bernstein and I contacted the Florida Bar and we were advised there was some investigation pending. Since that date, we have had numerous discussions working through with professionals, the malpractice carrier for Tescher \& Spallina, to determine if there was a way to resolve issues in the Shirley side of this because everything that happened with them is the Shirley side, not the Simon side.

THE COURT: Next question.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Have you -- from your statements just now, it became apparent that you are claiming that you have worked with Don Tescher, Robert Spallina, and Ted in preparation of their statements for the Palm Beach County Sheriff's investigation?

24 Tescher regarding the fraudulent documents?
25 A Absolutely, I have.

Q Okay. Good. Have you notified your insurance carrier that you've been -- that allegations of fraud and forgery and your involvement in all that have been made against you?

A Objection, relevancy.
THE COURT: Sustained. It's not relevant to a motion to disqualify, whether he notified his carrier.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It isn't? Wouldn't it show his character and fitness to follow the rules?

THE COURT: Okay. I ruled. So,
Mr. Bernstein, don't question my ruling.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Got you. No, I'm --
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Have you notified the beneficiaries of the Bar actions and all these other actions you've taken?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Objection to form.
THE COURT: Sustained. You need to -- you're vague.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Who objected?
THE COURT: Mr. Pankauski.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Are you representing him?

PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK \& MARSAA

THE COURT: No. No. Stop. Stop. You violated my instruction. We're taking a recess. I'm going to sanction you. I warned you don't do that.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Do what?
THE COURT: You don't have conversation, only with me. You don't ask him who he represents.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: That's outside the rules of civility and professionalism, even though you're pro se. You're becoming over the line of what's proper. Okay. Listen to me carefully. Discipline yourself. One more time, you're done.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: As well as everybody else who violates my rules.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I didn't understand that, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you understand it now, what the rules are?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Kind of.
THE COURT: Well, you need to.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. So I can't
ask --

THE COURT: You can ask questions and they'll answer, but you can't start having dialogue with lawyers. You can ask me, if you want. But they're making an objection, but you can't say -you can't question the person who makes the objection. Let me rule. That's my job.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Go ahead.

## BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Have you spoken to Ted Bernstein about his position --

MR. PANKAUSKI: Objection.
THE COURT: Hold on. Stop. That's not proper because he has to finish the question in its entirety. So before you answer, though, but, Mr. Bernstein, Eliot, I'm saying Eliot because there is more than one Bernstein, you can finish your question. Go ahead.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Well, I'll change that question. Are you aware that at the Palm Beach County Sheriff interrogation that your client was claimed as to have taken improper distributions against the advice of his counsel?

A Objection, hearsay.

THE COURT: You can say yes or no without violating hearsay rules.

THE WITNESS: I don't believe that's accurate.

THE COURT: Next question.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Did the altered document change anything with the beneficiaries of the estate and trusts?

A That's a question --
THE COURT: Let me caution you again. We're only dealing now with motions directed in the Simon Bernstein case. And you're only moving to disqualify him as to the simon case.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, Simon --
THE COURT: No, remember. Okay. No, I'm not inviting dialogue.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Your motion is filed in Simon -stop. I talk, you listen. Your motion is filed in Simon's case. And your motion to disqualify Mr. Rose is in Simon's case. Next question. BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Did Simon execute documents that allegedly changed beneficiaries in his wife's estate? A No.

Q Did Robert Spallina alter documents for Simon that affected Shirley's estate?

A I don't think -- I think the answer to that is, no, but if $I$ can explain --

THE COURT: No, is the answer. Next
question.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Are you aware of any documents that try to change the beneficiaries that were made by Simon after Shirley's death?

A Can I explain the answer?
THE COURT: You can answer if you are aware, and then explain.

THE WITNESS: I don't think that's an accurate statement, but if $I$ can explain.

THE COURT: Go ahead. You're allowed to. THE WITNESS: So Simon was given a power of appointment in the Shirley trust. Simon exercised that power of appointment in the Shirley trust in a way that was consistent with Simon's wishes. I believe after Simon died, all Simon's documents remained intact and are proper. There is a legal question that someone raised whether Simon had the power to exercise the power of appointment in the manner in which he did, and whether or not -- and
that's an issue that's going to have to be decided in a trust construction action.

THE COURT: Okay. Next question.

## BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q I notified you that you were respondents and sent you documents with the new docket sheet where we inserted you as a respondent. Are you aware that I've attempted to put you in as a respondent in the simon estate?

A I'm aware that you have done something that I don't understand because it's not a process I'm familiar with legally, but he's tried to make me a respondent in some case, but I'm -- I don't understand. I'm just a lawyer representing a party and I don't think I'm properly a respondent, nor do I think that anything has been done that is of any legal validity. THE COURT: Okay. Next question. BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Are you represented by counsel in those capacities that I listed you as a respondent?

A I don't recognize that I'm a respondent in anything, but -- so I can't -- I don't know how to answer the question.

Q Would you like to see the court docket? Can I show --

24 or misrepresentation in these matters?
THE COURT: The question of whether he's represented by counsel is irrelevant to disqualification of him.

## BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Okay. So I'm just going to stick with are you a -- you know you're a respondent that's been added to the court docket?

A I don't believe I'm a respondent in this case. And, I believe, that you -- may I, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may. You can complete your answer. that if you try to join people in a case, then you can use it as basis to disqualify them. And I believe you've done that consistently over the years of your long litigation practice.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Objection. I think
it's speculation and --
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Stop your answer. Next question. BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Have you knowingly assisted, engaged, in any conduct involving the perpetration of any frauds, deceit,

A No.

THE WITNESS: I believe that you have learned

13 BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

14 Q Okay. Are you - do you have any business

18 BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Can you tell us about your relationship with

## Ted Bernstein?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Object. Objection,
attorney-client privilege. Relevance.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q How did you meet Ted Bernstein?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Objection, attorney-client
privilege. Relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: What's that mean, ask
the next question?

THE COURT: Yes.
dealings with Ted Bernstein?
MR. PANKAUSKI: Objection, attorney-client privilege.

Q Other than attorney-client?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Relevance.

THE COURT: Well, is that a ground for your
motion for removal?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes. THE COURT: Is it in the motion? MR. PANKAUSKI: I don't believe business
relations are. Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. So your motion is long, do you know where it is in the motion?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'll strike the question.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. Go ahead.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'm done. THE COURT: Okay. All right.

CROSS - EXAMINATION

BY MR. PANKAUSKI

Q Mr. Rose, in the Simon estate, who do you
represent?
A Within the Simon estate, I represent Ted Bernstein as successor trustee of the Simon Bernstein trust.

Q Have you ever represented anybody else?
A Not in particular -- I guess in this particular estate $I$ do represent Ted on the Shirley side as well.

Q But in the Simon, you've never represented Mr. Spallina?

A Absolutely not.
Q You've never represented Mr. Tescher?
A They're adverse parties. Absolutely not. MR. PANKAUSKI: Okay. Thank you. No further
questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any redirect on those questions? Doesn't mean you have it, you just have a right to if you think of something. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No. THE COURT: Anyone else have any questions? Okay. Have a seat. Your next witness. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: None. MR. ROSE: Move for involuntary -THE COURT: Hold on. Wait. Wait. MR. ROSE: Sorry. THE COURT: Okay. Any other evidence you want to submit?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, thank you. THE COURT: Motion to disqualify denied. Okay. What's the next motion -- and that's the -- formally the motion to remove Alan Rose, that's the heading of that one. And let me just get to this. It's a long style. It was called emergency motion to remove Alan Rose, et cetera. I'll give you the certificate of services.

MR. ROSE: Would you like an order, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on. Just let me
finish. The emergency motion certificate of service, I think, is June 23, 2014. And the other motion to remove is June 24 th. So both of those motions are denied. The grounds are, there is insufficient evidence to disqualify Mr. Rose pursuant to the law.

Okay. All right. So the next motion is the petition by -- hold on. Help me out, Mr. Bernstein, because I think it's your pleading; deals with the successor PR.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Yeah. We can go with that.

THE COURT: I was told that is being heard in conjunction with the petition to remove Ted Bernstein as trustee.

MR. FEAMAN: There is an order that Your Honor entered --

THE COURT: Okay. Can I have that?
MR. FEAMAN: -- that specifically sets forth the order and what they are. May I approach?

THE COURT: Okay. Good. Thanks. Okay. So now we're dealing with the -- with the motions concerning the appointment of successor PR.

MR. FEAMAN: Well, actually --
THE COURT: That's number two.

MR. FEAMAN: Just so the record is clear, under number one, it also mentions Mr. Pankauski. THE COURT: Well, I denied the motion. The heading is the heading, but the entire motion is denied, whatever --

MR. FEAMAN: Good. I mean, thank you.
THE COURT: All right. So is it orderly -let me ask a question. It seems like the next motion in line is Eliot's motion, but maybe it's more than just Eliot, to -- for the appointment of a successor $P R$ of the estate. Is that the next one?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And Ben Brown and -right. All those.

THE COURT: Ben Brown is curator.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: He put in a motion for PR, I think.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So --
MR. FEAMAN: Actually three motions, all dealing with the same thing, which is to get a successor personal representative.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So Eliot Bernstein has a motion to accomplish that?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Right.
THE COURT: Does Ted Bernstein through you,

Mr. Rose?
MR. ROSE: Yes, Mr. Bernstein has the first petition to -- he filed a petition to be appointed as the first successor personal representative in his father's estate.

THE COURT: Is there -- you said there's three.

MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Mr. Stansbury's motion to appoint an independent, non-related party as successor personal representative.

THE COURT: Okay. So the three parties, I understand who. The task is to appoint a successor $P R$. And so let me ask a couple of questions preliminary to this, I'll make a note to myself. Okay. So as we sit here today, am I correct that there's no $P R$ and that $M r$. Brown is the curator of the Simon Bernstein estate?

MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. True?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: All right. So in order to probably bring out the issues a little better and actually help you, Eliot, because you're pro se, I'm going to let Mr. Rose start. You'll be able to fully deal with your motion as well.

All right. You're up. So let me get a brief opening. Here's what I want to know. On your client, Ted Bernstein's, motion to appoint successor $P R$, who does he want to have appointed?

MR. ROSE: Ted Bernstein would like to be -suggested he was the appropriate candidate to be appointed as successor PR.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Stansbury, who is it that you want -- I mean, Mr. Feaman, on behalf of Mr. Stansbury.

MR. FEAMAN: We have put forth in our pleadings, Your Honor, and attached the resumes of Brian O'Connell and Michael Mopsick. I believe Mr. O'Connell is in the courtroom today.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MORRISSEY: Judge, for the record, my clients have an objection to their petition. We don't believe that they have standing as a claimant.

THE COURT: So now announce who your clients are.

MR. MORRISSEY: My clients are three grandchildren; Molly, Simon, Alexander Bernstein, Michael Bernstein and Eric Bernstein.

THE COURT: So you say the creditor has no standing.

MR. MORRISSEY: He's not a creditor, he's just a claimant.

THE COURT: Okay. Got it. And Eliot, who are you seeking to have, in your moving papers, to be the successor $P R$ of Simon's estate?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I have -- I'm going to possibly join with Peter and I would just recommend anybody like a Ben Brown who's an honest, independent third party.

THE COURT: Okay. So you want a non-relative of what we're kind of calling an independent lawyer to be PR, and it could be Brian O'Connell or Mike Mopsick or somebody else that fits that category?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Anybody other than my --

THE COURT: Other than you and Ted?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: -- any of my siblings.
MR. ROSE: Just a brief opening?
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. ROSE: This is a relatively small estate. There's, I think, under a million dollars left in the estate. There are issues and they are
relevant to some degree in the Shirley side, which we'll talk briefly about what's going on in the Shirley side. But in the Shirley side of it, Ted was chosen by his mother to be her successor $P R$, her successor trustee, after her husband passed away. So she died first, although, she was expected to outlive him. In her documents, Ted would have been -- after her husband died, Ted is successor PR. And he's serving in that role and will tell you the job -- what he's doing in that role, although it's difficult.

THE COURT: Let me get a question answered.
In Simon's estate, he died testate?
MR. ROSE: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. So tell me what his will says about PR.

MR. ROSE: His will says that Donald Tescher and Robert Spallina are his personal representatives -- co-personal representatives.

THE COURT: Hold on.
Okay. Go ahead.
MR. ROSE: And that was changed in 2012 from
William Stansbury; I think was previously named.
THE COURT: Okay. So let -- in the last will, who is named in the will as $P R$ sequentially?

MR. ROSE: Solely -- there is solely one selection, Robert Spallina, Donald Tescher as co-personal representatives. That's in the last will of Simon L. Bernstein.

THE COURT: All right. So does everyone seem to agree, clearly, they're not going to do it, correct?

MR. ROSE: Well, they were doing it.
THE COURT: Now, though, to be -- I mean, they're not successor, they were the original PR's, correct?

MR. ROSE: Correct.
THE COURT: Were they ever appointed?
MR. ROSE: They were. They were appointed and serving.

THE COURT: And removed?
MR. ROSE: They resigned as a result of conflict of interest.

THE COURT: Is anybody asking that they be reappointed as successor?

MR. ROSE: No, sir.
THE COURT: All right. So here's my next question. The will then is silent as a replacement?

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So what statute or rule do I look at that instructs the court as to who becomes the successor PR?

MR. PANKAUSKI: You could -- you could consider a majority in interest of the beneficiaries.

THE COURT: What's the name of the statute I look at?

MR. PANKAUSKI: 733.301.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. So this is a testate estate. That statute says that there is an order of preference for the $P R$ or his successor nominated by the will, or pursuant to a power.

We're passed that point, is that true? Because it's not going to be Tescher and Spallina. Everyone agree with that?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The next order of preference is a person selected by a majority in interest of the persons entitled to the estate. All right. so to try to move this along a little bit, and I'll start on my left and go to my right. Who does those representing Ted say falls within that category, if anyone?

MR. PANKAUSKI: No one falls into that category. They --

THE COURT: No. No, I'm not saying why.
Okay. What do you say to that -- hold on -- I may have someone on Court Call I didn't know about.

MR. ROSE: He's important.
THE COURT: Okay. Who's that?
MR. ROSE: That's Mr. Bill Glasko. He represents a group of the other beneficiaries.
the Court: We'll get him on. Irwin Block, who does he represent?

MR. ROSE: He represents Tescher and Spallina.

THE COURT: I wasn't aware anyone was on Court Call, let's get them.

MR. ROSE: He just represents Mr. Tescher, not both of them.

THE COURT: Okay.
Okay. Mr. Block?
MR. BLOCK: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Sorry, didn't know you were on Court Call. And we're in the middle of the second hearing set today, which is the hearing dealing with the appointment of a successor PR of Simon's estate. And so I already ruled on the motion to
disqualify, which was denied. And so that's where we are now. Okay. So -- yes.

MR. ROSE: I'm sorry.
MR. BLOCK: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: I had asked Mr. Pankauski, do you
want to speak on that issue?
MR. ROSE: Under the order of preference
under 733.301?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ROSE: I think there's no majority in
interest that we were aware of at this point. THE COURT: All right. So --

MR. ROSE: Under 3, though --
THE COURT: Hold on. I'm going to do this one at a time. Okay. Mr. Feaman, do you have a position on whether $733.3011(a)(2)$ applies?

MR. FEAMAN: Agreed, it does not apply. THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't know the statute, one more time on it real quick. THE COURT: The number or what it says? MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: What it says. THE COURT: It says that there's a schedule of order of preferences. And the second one is the person selected by a majority in interest of
the persons entitled to the estate.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Yeah. No.
THE COURT: No. Okay. So everyone agrees that doesn't apply.

The next order of preference is a devisee under the will. If more than one devisee, the court may select the one best qualified.

MR. ROSE: There is one devisee under the will, and the devisee under the will is the simon Bernstein trust.

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on. So can a trust be a PR?

MR. ROSE: Well, the personal representative of the trust -- the successor -- I'm sorry, the successor trustee of the Simon Bernstein trust is Ted Bernstein.

THE COURT: That's not my question. Can I appoint a trust as a PR? MR. ROSE: No, I think you need to appoint -THE COURT: An individual. MR. ROSE: -- an individual or, theoretically, you might be able to appoint a corporate fiduciary, but we don't have one of those.

THE COURT: Okay. So you say number three
doesn't apply?
MR. ROSE: I say number three, the devisee is the trustee. In fact, the trust is the sole beneficiary of the estate. Even if you go back to number two -- I hadn't thought of it this way. Back up to number two. The only beneficiary of the estate is the trust. And the trustee of the trust is in favor of Ted being the personal representative.

THE COURT: So you say that either on two or three grounds under the statute, Ted Bernstein being trustee of the simon Bernstein trust, should be the $P R$ because that's the Simon Bernstein -the trust is the only devisee under the will?

MR. ROSE: The --

MR. MORRISSEY: Judge, yeah, Mr. Rose --
those are two grounds, a possible third is the following. The beneficiaries of the trust are the ten grandchildren. I represent four of those grandchildren, all four of whom would support Mr. Ted Bernstein.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MORRISSEY: As the personal
representative. So we might want to pool the ten grandchildren.

THE COURT: All right. $I$ got that part. Mr. Feaman, what do you -- do you say there is a devisee under the will that is eligible for appointment?

MR. FEAMAN: The devisee has not applied, that would be the trust. The person that applied is Ted Bernstein in his individual capacity. THE COURT: Okay. Is that factually true? MR. ROSE: I think factually. THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. FEAMAN: In addition, we suggest to the court, that Mr. Bernstein is statutorily not qualified as a result of a conflict of an interest.

THE COURT: Okay. We're not at that level. We're only dealing with order of preference.

MR. FEAMAN: All right. So, therefore, if
(a) (1) (2) or (3) does not apply, then we would default to Subsection 3, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll get to there in a second. So do you have a legal position on that?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I do.
THE COURT: What's that?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: We might actually have to go back to (1), the will having a devisee.

THE COURT: No. No, that's -- (3) is a devisee.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: Mr. Rose says the devisee under the will is Simon's trust and Ted Bernstein as trustee.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, the named person under the will. The number (1), where it's a named person under the will.

THE COURT: The PR nominated by Simon?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Right, in the document.
In the will. The problem $I$ have is that we're working off a document -- this is part of what you're going to have to rule on further. These are 2012 documents my dad allegedly signed.

THE COURT: Well, those are the ones -- that right now is what I'm probating. I'm probating that will.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I just want to put on the record that the Governor Rick Scott's office --

THE COURT: No. No. If you start going there, you're done.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: They are improperly notarized.

THE COURT: I'm not asking you about that. You can't give me evidence on that, I'm not asking for evidence. I'm asking for your position. You can't tell me about Rick Scott in your position.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. In the 2008 wills and trusts --

THE COURT: Okay. But are those being probated?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: They may be.
THE COURT: Okay. But they're not. I'm dealing with the 2012. I got your position.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I got it. Okay.

THE COURT: So -- okay. So the 731.201, subparagraph 11, defines a devisee as a person designated in the will to receive a devise. It also says that in the case -- in the case of a devise to an existing trust or trustee, or to a trust or trustee of a trust described in the will, the trust or trustee, rather than the beneficiaries, is the devisee.

So if someone published to me the exact wording that you say the will that's subject to probate contains dealing with the subject of who is a devisee under the will. So if someone has to read me word for word what the will
says.
MR. ROSE: Article I, tangible personal property, says personal property goes in accordance with the separate read memorandum. I don't think that's at issue. Article II is the exercise of power of appointment. Article III says residue of my estate. Make sure $I$ have the right one, Your Honor. I give all the residue of my estate, including my homestead, to the trustee then serving under my revocable trust agreement dated May 20, 2008, as amended and restated from time to time, and on even dates herewith, the existing trust, as trustee without bond, but I don't exercise any powers of appointment held by me, except as provided in Article II above, and in the later paragraph titled death costs. The residue shall be added to and become a part of the existing trust and shall be held under the provisions of said agreement in effect at my death, or if this is not permitted by applicable law, or the existing trust is not then in existence under the provisions of said agreement as existing today, if necessary to give effect to this gift, but not otherwise said agreement as existing today is incorporated herein by
reference.

THE COURT: Okay. So who is the trustee under that revocable trust?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Don Tescher.

MR. ROSE: Under the amended and restated trust agreement, there were two named trustees, they were to serve together, Donald and Robert, and the document -- Donald Tescher and Robert Spallina -- and the document provides that upon -it does not have a successor named in the simon trust, and it says that the last serving trustee has the right to appoint the successor trustee. And Donald Tescher is the last serving trustee appointed Ted Bernstein. We've taken Mr. Tescher's deposition, and he can explain to you by deposition the reasons why he appointed Ted as a successor trustee.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: Sometime, I think, February, Ted has been serving as the successor trustee.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Since what time?

THE COURT: You can repeat what you said.

MR. ROSE: There's documents -- they were circulated to all the parties -- I think it was sometime in February of this year.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me look at something else. And has Ted Bernstein, in his capacity as trustee or successor trustee of Simon's estate, made an application to be the $P R$ of Simon's estate?

MR. ROSE: I believe --
THE COURT: That's yes or no. It can't be either one -- those are the only two choices. MR. PANKAUSKI: Hold on one second, Your Honor. That's his petition for appointment as PR. THE COURT: In his capacity as trustee? MR. PANKAUSKI: No. No.

THE COURT: Okay. The answer is no?
MR. PANKAUSKI: Yeah, Ted Bernstein has asked Your Honor to appoint him as PR. The petition was not filed by Ted Bernstein as trustee of his dad's rev trust.

MR. ROSE: The petition does recite, Your Honor, that Ted Bernstein has been appointed to and accepted the appointment to serve as the successor trustee of the Simon Bernstein trust into which the estate's assets pour over. THE COURT: Okay. All right. No. 730 -I'm ruling -- 733.031, subsection (1) (a) is a pecking order of preferences. The only one that
could apply, based upon what everyone's told me to the Simon Bernstein estate is if there is a devisee under the will, and the devisee under Simon Bernstein's will is a trustee -- includes a trustee under his revocable trust, it then -- and that trustee in the will is Simon -- I'm sorry, Tescher and Spallina. Subsection (3) says, if no application is made by any of the persons described in subsection (1), the court may appoint a capable person. So the will, four corners of it, only allows, as far as the devisee, which is the trustee under the revocable trust, that is only Spallina's group, Tescher and Spallina, and Ted has made an application only in his individual name. Hold on. Let me look at something else.

Okay. I'm going to appoint a capable person. That's my ruling. So if you folks had a position to determine who a capable person would be?

MR. PANKAUSKI: No one filed that petition. THE COURT: That could be, but $I$ can still do that --

MR. FEAMAN: ExCuse me, the petition that was filed by -- the motion filed by Mr. Stansbury specifically references two capable people, and
attaches their resumes.
THE COURT: All right. So - -
MR. FEAMAN: That was done weeks ago.
MR. ROSE: I think Mr. Ted Bernstein in his petition to be -- he's a capable person.

THE COURT: I'm not saying he's not. He could -- everyone -- anyone is open in that category.

MR. ROSE: That's fine. That's what we prepared to try today.

THE COURT: So here's my question. Listen carefully, and then I'll let you folks tell me whether you think this is fruitful or not. If you all -- the material people here can agree upon who that capable person is, then, you know, you have a good shot of getting me to agree and appoint that person. If you can't agree, then I have to have a hearing to determine between the various potential capable people who to appoint, assuming all those people are qualified. So everyone using their best judgment and thinking hats, and given what I was told, which is only that the estate doesn't have a whole lot of money, do you folks want to litigate over who's going to be the PR of the estate, or you want -- do you think you can spend a few moments and talk to each other and come up with an agreement?

MR. ROSE: I mean, we don't want to litigate the issue, but we've seen what's happened with a curator. And I do think that we stand by the position that the most logical person is Ted who --

THE COURT: I'm not looking for logic, I'm looking for resolution. Because if you tell me the estate doesn't have a lot of money and you start litigating some of these issues, you wind up in a position that may not be favorable to the estate and the ultimate beneficiaries.

So remember that in deciding a capable person, if there is someone who fits that description, $I$ am then allowed to deal with, depending upon who it is, and whether they agree, an issue such as limiting compensation, so that I can preserve more money for the estate and less by way of lawyer fees -- no offense -- and other expenses. So, you know, you all need to make a best interest of the estate decision. The beneficiaries of the estate, you tell me, is the Simon Bernstein trust, of which there is ten grandchildren
eligible to receive the money. The more we use up on administrative and legal expenses, the less available to them. Plus, I guess, Mr. Stansbury's a creditor and he probably has something to do with that.

MR. FEAMAN: If I could have 60 seconds of the court's time to suggest --

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. FEAMAN: -- why the court -- without even getting into any conduct -- why the court can't even consider Ted Bernstein.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. FEAMAN: I would like to offer that.
Your Honor may recall that you permitted Ben Brown to hire counsel in Chicago to file a motion to intervene in that action on behalf of the estate to attempt to collect life insurance proceeds where the estate was not being represented. Counsel was hired. Mr. Stansbury has fronted the cost for that, as Your Honor said. And he filed a petition to intervene. The plaintiffs in that action then filed an opposition to the estate's motion to intervene. And that opposition, which was filed about a week ago, Your Honor, in opposition -- direct opposition to the estate of

Simon Bernstein's motion, was filed by -- comes now the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust by Ted Bernstein, as trustee. And Ted Bernstein, individually. So he has set himself up in direct conflict with the position that this estate is taking in Chicago. I suggest to the court, that that's the end of the inquiry with regard to Ted Bernstein.

THE COURT: Well, it's not the end, it's a part of it. But it's not. I mean, there is no one single thing until $I$ rule that means more than anything else. So I wasn't sure where you were getting at, that's kind of a little bit - - a little bit out of turn because, I mean, it's obvious what I'm trying to suggest. It sounds like it's helpful to this estate, given the amount of litigation -- litigation costs time, effort, animosity, et cetera -- to see if there's areas that we can reach agreements to the benefit of the estate.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Hold on. I'm not, you know - - I mean, you all know better whether something can happen to get someone's pocket picked. I don't want that to happen.

So -- I'll tell you what, I'm going to take a five-minute recess, you'll talk to each other. It's a little easier to talk outside my presence.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Well, no, we're in recess and you all can talk. Go ahead.

> (Brief recess)

THE COURT: Okay. Keep your seats. Thanks. Okay.

MR. ROSE: Can I just -- may be out of order -- can I just say it's not overly -- it won't take long -- but this is our position. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROSE: We believe -- I believe that in this case with unique circumstances, and we've just lived six months of having a curator who is -- will be in the same role as another neutral. And through the curatorship and the bombarding of the curator by Eliot, we've run up a lot of money in fees. We do not have any ill will toward Eliot. I know when a judge sees people sniping, you think it's mutual. We don't have any ill will towards Eliot. He's done a lot of things that I think are wrong and are meanspirited and harmful,
but all we want to do in this is get the case to the finish line.

THE COURT: Okay. So, stop. Because here's what I want to know. Simple. You folks have an agreement? If not, I'm going to proceed and let you litigate this. Maybe you'll spend all the money in the estate over this, and maybe you'll be accountable to the beneficiaries once that happens. So do you have an agreement or not? MR. ROSE: And on that point -THE COURT: You either have an agreement or not. Otherwise, we're going to litigate this entire issue. And I'm going to keep track of how much the fees that are spent on this issue. MR. ROSE: Well --

THE COURT: So you either have an agreement or you don't. It's up to you. I'm going to rule on it based on the law and facts.

MR. ROSE: But my understanding is when we were here, $I$ don't think it's going to be litigated much more.

THE COURT: Maybe, yes. If not today, it's next week. If not next week, the next day. We've got to get passed this point. Okay. This is not an exact science and -- but it's a matter of using
good judgment.
MR. ROSE: I understand. I'm not --
THE COURT: And here's the point, candidly. Ted could possibly do a good job as a PR, but he's a hot blood. Okay. The moment Ted serves Eliot and/or others are going to respond a certain way. Okay. So we know that. And so, you know, if you just think of that alone, which obviously I see, one thing you think about is, for the small estate, the simple estate, to get this thing over with, is to put someone who is neutral, and I can deal with the issue of costs. And I can deal with the issue of Eliot, because I'm aware of what that is, and in a way that benefits the estate.

Because $I$ can put some control over that. I mean, that's why I started this hearing differently than I allowed perhaps the other UMCs, which I think started to get a little uncomfortable for everybody. I mean, our days of free-for-all are over with. Okay. I'm going to be controlling the UMCs. I'm going to be controlling the pleadings. So -- and I agree with you, you don't want there to be a, what you call, a neutral PR that has to wind up spending a lot of money. But if Ted is PR, Eliot's going to still file stuff until
someone stops him from doing that. And, you know, he's going to -- Ted is going to bill as a PR, perhaps, and his lawyers have a right to bill, but this is really doable. Okay.

MR. PANKAUSKI: May I?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ROSE: Just have 30 seconds?
THE COURT: Sure.
(Off the record)
MR. ROSE: Okay. We would accept either Mr. Mopsick or Mr. O'Connell. We think you should cap their fees -- we have a cap with Mr. Brown -and we exceeded the cap regularly. You know, I think there should be a cap. And if he needs additional things to be done, come forward. There are some basic estate administration things that probably need to be done as well, which certainly someone should get paid for, or hire an accountant, if there is things that need to be done.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So let's try to make some progress. Only because of the two people -- Mr. O'Connell is here. So Mr. O'Connell, come up. MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you know everybody who's in play here?

MR. O'CONNELL: Not everyone, Your Honor. A number of people, yes.

THE COURT: So, you know Eliot Bernstein?
MR. O'CONNELL: I don't.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: We just shook hands.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. So because I think everyone knows Mr. O'Connell, perhaps other than Eliot -- is that true?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: You know him?
MR. FEAMAN: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. All right. So Eliot, he's like Mr. Brown -- who disappeared.

MR. BROWN: I'm right here.
THE COURT: Sorry. I mean, he's at the top of the list of qualified people. But, you know, if you're willing to do this, that's appreciated, and I think the parties would appreciate it. But you have to do it under a little bit of different circumstance. Part of this is going to be because -- you've probably been sitting here and have heard it's a small estate with a lot of
potential activity. And Mr. Brown, as curator, has been telling me a great deal of how he is getting involved, from a curator point of view in the case, under times and circumstances that he's uncomfortable with from a duty and responsibility point of view, but just can't ignore it. And so he comes to me for instructions as to whether to do things or not. But every time someone comes to court it costs money. So if you are willing to take this assignment, and it's going to have to be under some compromised financial circumstances, which you'll either say yes or no to, and it's totally up to you, if you're willing to do it, that will enable us to move along immediately. So why don't you do this. What I'd like is, so I'm not directly involved, I'll again, you know, walk outside for a second, to the extent that the parties would like to reach out to Mr . O'Connell and have him agree to two things: One, would be to a financial program that would be -- you think is fair -- allowing him if something extraordinary comes, to make application to the court. I think you can agree to that. And then I will -- if he's selected, I will empower him as to what to deal with any matters that are outside of what's
appropriate in the course of the probate case that could otherwise artificially raise his fees, that we'll make sure it doesn't happen. You willing to entertain that?

MR. O'CONNELL: Sure.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and talk to them.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: What are we doing?
THE COURT: You're going to talk to him about how little to pay him.

MR. ROSE: May I ask one question, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ROSE: After we get through this, there are still two other matters.

THE COURT: We're going to keep on going.
MR. ROSE: Okay. That's what I wanted to know. Thank you, sir. (Brief recess)

MR. ROSE: I think the parties are in agreement for Mr . O'Connell to be the -- appointed the PR. He's willing to accept the job. And there was some discussion about his fee arrangement, and I think there's talk about a blended rate that would not exceed maybe 350 an hour, but realizing that his time might be more,
his legal assistants might be less, but the blended rate wouldn't exceed 350 an hour. I don't -- I wouldn't envision he would be billing paralegals at 350 , just the average blended rate would not exceed 350 .

THE COURT: Well, usually what I would do is -- and Mr. O'Connell knows -- I allow him a lawyer fee of 350 , or less, depending upon who the individuals are, and a paralegal rate of up to 125. That's standard, correct? MR. O'CONNELL: Right, that's standard, Your Honor .

THE COURT: All right. So you don't need a blended. That would be the rate.

MR. ROSE: We have no objection --
THE COURT: I just kind of anticipate that --
I mean, the way their office works, because I see it because he's, you know, he's frequently here. The paralegal at the 125 does a good deal of the administrative work, saves the money of the lawyer rate, and only if there is something that, you know, he needs to do, is it at the lawyer rate. MR. O'CONNELL: That's correct. THE COURT: That's the way they work it. So it's a little bit of an advantage over having a
lawyer/curator who only bills at a lawyer rate, because administrative work is done at the paralegal rate, and he has skilled paralegals.

MR. ROSE: We agree. And we appreciate Your
Honor looking in with Mr. Brown; I understand we've at least learned a little bit, and, hopefully, we won't run into the same problems. THE COURT: All right. So everyone agree? MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir. MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MORRISSEY: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Okay. Appointed. No bond required. Letters shall issue.

All right. And, you know, what I'd like, obviously, is some orderly fashion, you folks don't bombard him, but, you know, give him an idea of what he has to do next.

Okay. So -- all right. The next two things that $I$ had for this afternoon that we can hear would be to deal with the request to remove Ted as successor trustee -- or trustee -- of the Simon Bernstein.

So everyone thank Mr. Brown, because I do, especially for his services.

MR. BROWN: Well, Judge, actually I'm going to go ahead and file an accounting.

THE COURT: Sure. You need to wrap it up.
MR. BROWN: I will do that. But I had one matter and then I was going to ask you to be excused today.

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. BROWN: You recall that I had asked that -- to liquidate the IRA?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. BROWN: There was some discussion at the hearing that the money should not leave the account, which is 5007 at JP Morgan. JP Morgan, who's -- I won't say that thought. JP Morgan, when I said can you please start liquidating the account, said, okay, but we have to move all of assets over to a new account called 8004. They told me that after the --

THE COURT: Just a new number.
MR. BROWN: A new number. Actually, it's a new account. So they started moving the money to the new account. So to try to strictly comply with the order, I said, well, let's just amend the order to all the parties and --

THE COURT: The answer is yes.

MR. BROWN: I sent you a letter --
THE COURT: I didn't get it, but the answer is yes. You want an order entered on that?

MR. BROWN: I have -- I have the orders.
THE COURT: It's just a different account number.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: But we don't have any of the account information.

THE COURT: He's going to file an accounting.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, but JP Morgan was supposed to have already provided us information, and they're now, all of a sudden -- this could get lost, there's evidence.

THE COURT: Now, you have -- Mr. Brown's going to do an accounting.

MR. BROWN: I have the account statements.
THE COURT: He can have those, yeah. I mean, Eliot, it's not -- let's not go there if we don't have to.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
MR. BROWN: This is the amended order. This is the -- this is the order that $I$ circulated.

MR. ROSE: Are you going to actually liquidate the securities like -- give the order to liquidate the securities?

THE COURT: They're already doing it.
MR. BROWN: Yeah.
MR. ROSE: Rather than wait for
Mr. O'Connell --
THE COURT: No, we're not missing a beat.
MR. ROSE: Thank you, sir. This was delayed a little bit because of the order.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Brown.
MR. BROWN: Thank you very much. May I be excused for today?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ROSE: Thanks, Mr. Brown.
THE COURT: He still has a little work to do, he's not retiring. He's not going to Cleveland.

Okay. So thanks, Mr. Brown. Of the two remaining matters, one dealt with the removal of Ted as trustee and the other one dealt with the inadvertent disclosure issue. Is there -let me get time frames to see which --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I ask to postpone those for a minute? I've -- I've engaged counsel that I've paid to review the files. One is Fowler White \& Boggs. I don't know if you know who they are here in Florida. They're a very respectful, old line, Civil War type group of guys. And

Buchanan Ingersoll out of Pittsburgh. Both outstanding reputations. They need some time to get their hands around things -- I think now that we've cleared to a PR, a little break here wouldn't hurt any of us, and, you know, give them --

THE COURT: When you say you've hired them --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I engaged them to review the files.

THE COURT: For the purpose of potentially making an appearance?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir. And their names -- they told me $I$ could give you his name, you can call him. Robert Olson is the shareholder at Fowler White \& Boggs; is the main guy on it.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You'll be much happier with me represented.

THE COURT: On the inadvertent disclosure issue, who is the purported aggrieved party? MR. PANKAUSKI: Mr. Ted Bernstein and Mr. Rose.

THE COURT: Mr. Rose. MR. PANKAUSKI: Speaking about the e-mail, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, that was an e-mail
between Mr. Rose and his client, Ted Bernstein.
THE COURT: Okay. But --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's untrue, Your Honor .

THE COURT: Hold on. Stop. Remember the rules, Eliot? You're not doing that any more.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Sorry.
THE COURT: Okay. Okay. But -- so whatever happened, happened, correct --

MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- already? And what is the
issue that $I$ would be asked to decide?
MR. ROSE: Okay. Briefly, Your Honor. We had inadvertent e-mail, requests to recall it, and then an objection by Mr. Bernstein. So under Rule 1.2850 this triggered a need for you to decide whether the e-mail was, in fact, privileged. The only urgency are two-fold: One, Mr. Eliot Bernstein continues to use the e-mail by republishing it in various pleadings. I mean, continuing --

THE COURT: Give me one second. Sit down. Go ahead.

MR. ROSE: I mean, including the motions to remove people and various motions -- keeps republishing parts of it to all the lawyers, and, you know, all the parties. So, you know, it keeps getting republished and republished. That's my only concern, but...

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: That's the issue.
THE COURT: I got that part. That kind of was my recollection. All right. And so --

MR. ROSE: May I? Would you mind, sir?
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. ROSE: If you would enter an order -- you have yet to enter an order under Rule 1.285 that orders Mr. Eliot Bernstein to sequester the document. But if you would enter an order and, therefore, if he violated the order, he would be in contempt. I would think it might make sense, if he's having lawyers come in, to defer the issue to when his lawyers come in because his lawyers might look at the issue, decide it's not necessary to have an evidentiary hearing over that issue. But so long as -- the rule does require him to sequester the e-mail and not use it. We have yet to ask you to enter a formal order that would have
some teeth behind it.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, can I speak?

THE COURT: No, not yet. I'm turning pages.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: I'm turning pages. Let me just
look for the rule.
What's the rule number one again?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: 1.285 .
THE COURT: 285.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And I think 90.502 might apply.

THE COURT: No, not yet. Okay. I got it.
All right. So because there's been assertion of privilege at a hearing, I would determine, what you tell me is, Eliot Bernstein challenged the assertion of privilege, correct?

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. And Eliot says I'm having that issue reviewed by some lawyers, is that what you --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, I can take that issue myself, I believe.

THE COURT: All right. So why don't we do that.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's fine.
THE COURT: Let's do that hearing and then we'll deal with the other one, if we have time, or defer it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. Same admonition. Rules apply. Okay.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Who's leading?
MR. FEAMAN: Your Honor, in the interests of my client's money, I would request that the court formally, that we do, in fact, postpone the hearing on Eliot's petition, which we have joined in, for removal of Ted Bernstein.

THE COURT: As a practical matter, given what Eliot said, given what you're just saying, given the time frame, I think the last thing we'll be able to do today is the privilege issues. So we won't have time on the other one for today. But I have hearing -- next week we have hearing time, true?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Next Wednesday.
THE COURT: So do we have other things
scheduled already for next Wednesday or was it just what we didn't finish today?

MR. FEAMAN: Just what we didn't finish
today.
THE COURT: All right. So let's talk about that real quickly. If we didn't hear the removal of Ted as trustee matter today, do you -- does anyone want to hear that next Wednesday as opposed to today?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor, we would like to hear it next Wednesday if you don't hear it today, but I think you can dispose of it today. THE COURT: I can only dispose of it if I start to hear it, so...

MR. PANKAUSKI: Understood.
THE COURT: I mean, we're kind of running out of time and I wanted to do this privilege issue. So -- all right. Well, let's -- I'll tell you what. Mr. Feaman, would you -- you want to just -- would you stay around -- I want to let you know what we're going to do next Wednesday as soon as we're done with this hearing. So just wait around for a little bit.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay. Thanks.
THE COURT: You're up Eliot.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I received an e-mail communication.

THE COURT: Do you want to testify now, or
not?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: What's that mean?
THE COURT: Give evidence.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No. Can I?
THE COURT: Well, yeah, if you want to, I'll put you under oath.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I submit the letter?

THE COURT: That's not evidence. You can submit it, but you have to move it into evidence and see if someone objects.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I move this letter into evidence?

THE COURT: Any objection, number one, for the hearing?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes.
THE COURT: This is the alleged --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Privileged document.
THE COURT: -- privileged document.
MR. ROSE: Well, I think for the purposes -I think he can mark for ID, but, you know, it should not go into the court file if it's privileged if ultimately --

THE COURT: Okay. That's the way to do it. ID Number 1. Let me have it. Okay. So we need a
stamp here, because I've never seen the document, so. All right. So for ID purposes, I've been given an e-mail from Ted to Eliot. That's the e-mail, correct, Mr. Rose?

MR. ROSE: Yes, Your Honor. If you look -it's sent to Eliot Bernstein, but if you look at the first dear, the first word of the e-mail is Dear Alan.

THE COURT: Doesn't say Dear Alan, says Alan. MR. ROSE: Okay.

THE COURT: So if we can, by way of opening then, this document, which is many pages, but most of them have, you know, certificate of service-type people. It's one -- the essence of the transmission is one page, correct? MR. ROSE: Can I see the actual Exhibit he moved in?

THE COURT: Yeah. MR. ROSE: Yes, sir. That's correct. THE COURT: It bears a date of May 22, 2014 at 10:52 p.m.

Okay. That's the one, correct?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And the substantive part of it is one page, the first page?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. So I think I was told previously that Ted made an assertion that this was an inadvertent disclosure. Correct, Mr. Rose? MR. ROSE: Correct, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And that Eliot was served with a copy of the notice of assertion of privilege and filed a challenge. So, procedurally, is that where we're at?

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. So I need to see the -did you, Mr. Rose, when you asserted privilege pursuant to subsection (a), did you do so in writing?

MR. ROSE: I did by e-mail, Your Honor. THE COURT: Could I see that? And that will be Number 2 for the hearing. MR. ROSE: And that's what I'm trying to find.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: For the hearing? MR. ROSE: Do you have a copy of the e-mail to you?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't. I might. MR. ROSE: I have a lot of papers. Apologize.

THE COURT: I'll let you look through it. And then, Mr. Eliot Bernstein, do you have your -MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.

THE COURT: I haven't finished it.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Sorry. And Alan might have a copy of that, I don't know.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a writing -- a writing that deals with your assertion of privilege? Did you do it in writing or are you going to tell it to me verbally?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I objected to the assertion.

THE COURT: Right. Right.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I did and I sent it to Mr. Rose.

THE COURT: Do you have a copy of your challenge?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't.
MR. ROSE: I would -- I would concede -- I
would concede he's made the challenge. He teed up the issue. I cannot find my --

THE COURT: All right. So then it says here in the rule the grounds for the challenge may include, but are not limited to, the following: The materials in question are not privileged. Is

there's been a waiver of an assertion that the material is protected by privilege.

Okay. You're up. Do you want to testify? Raise your right hand.

THEREUPON,
ELIOT BERNSTEIN,
a witness herein being of lawful age, and being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I testified that I got this e-mail directly from my brother. There were no lawyers copied on it, which was told to you twice now, with the prior hearing and today, that the communication was sent from Ted to his attorney, which it wasn't.

THE COURT: Okay. So hold on.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Make sure the record is clear.
In Exhibit Number 1 for ID only, the written data
is one page, but it says notice of service of court documents. Does that mean that the e-mail was sent -- Mr. Rose -- says it's sent by Ted.

That's not disputed, correct?
MR. ROSE: Yes, sir, Mr. Ted Bernstein sent it.

THE COURT: When he sent it, what's on Page 2, did the e-mail also have that?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, here's what happened. It looks like --

THE COURT: This is your document.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, it's their document.

THE COURT: You moved this into evidence.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It's Ted's e-mail to me. So Page 2 of Ted's e-mail is this service list. And the reason there is a service list there, was it appears that Ted was responding to my objection to the accounting and replied to me that this whole thing, you know, Dear Alan letter,

THE COURT: Let me back up. This is -because this is one document. On Page 2 of Exhibit 1 for ID only, it says May 22, 2014 at 5:01 p.m., Eliot Bernstein wrote, and then it has notice of service of court documents.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I served my objections to the accounting.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Ted was the recipient. THE COURT: Okay. You sent that -- among the people that you sent that to, all the people on this list, correct?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah.
THE COURT: All right. Why is that attached to what Ted wrote to you?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It's a reply. He replied to my service.

THE COURT: Okay. I follow you now.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. I got it.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. So, you know, I got a letter from my brother directly to me, no other people copied on it, no lawyers copied on it. Nothing. I get a thousand e-mails, as I've told you, that are people's letters to people, start out with Alan, Bob, Dave, or whatever you want. There is no privileged language on it like a lawyer/client, attorney privilege, don't read this if you are not the guy. So I read the letter. And it's got threatening language to me and my family and other people. It threatens the
use of force and aggression.
THE COURT: You're outside the scope of the rule.

We're dealing with the issues of privilege.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can you help me there?
THE COURT: Dealing with the issues of privilege.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's one of the most important rules that $I$ don't know if you touched on, that the Bar rules say that privilege can be broken when there is actual threats of force. I think it's 4.41 --

THE COURT: Hold on. Let me see -- try to make common sense out of this. This seems pretty easy to me. Tell me if this is the issue. If this e-mail was intended to go from Ted to Eliot, do you assert that as privileged?

MR. ROSE: If the e-mail was intended by Ted to go to Eliot, then we would agree that it would be an e-mail from Ted to Eliot. The reason --

THE COURT: No. No. Stop. Stop. I'm taking control. If this e-mail was inadvertently sent to Ted and was intended to be sent to Alan Rose, Ted's lawyer, would you agree that that
would be privileged?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: NO.
THE COURT: And why not?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, it loses its
privilege when he sends it to me.
THE COURT: No. No. Remember I said if it was inadvertently sent to you and was intended to go --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, that depends on his intent.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And his intent is questionable.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. There is no factual dispute that this was actually sent to Eliot, true?

MR. ROSE: True.
THE COURT: And it says that right on the document, to Eliot. All right. So let me look at the way this rule is worded. Okay. So Eliot, you've got to show as part of your challenge where this is -- why this is not privileged. And one reason you say is because it was sent to you. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, under 95.02 [sic].

THE COURT: 95 what? What's that mean?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: 90 point -- Florida statutes, I believe.

THE COURT: Florida statutes.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: 90.502.

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Only --
THE COURT: Hold on. If you cite something, I got to get to it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I was going to give you the subset.

THE COURT: Okay. Lawyer/client privilege.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: 4 (a) and (c)
particularly.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not sure if these are up to date.

THE COURT: I read that and see -- all right. But -- all right. I think that the little bit what you're getting at is a little bit of a sub issue because -- or maybe not. Okay. All right. So you are contending that the materials are not -- are not privileged, in essence, even if intended to go to Alan because they violate or -because of 90.502 , Subsection (4), that says
there's no lawyer/client privilege under the section when, and whatever subsection (a) or (c) says.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: If it were determined somehow it was privileged, yeah, those would apply then.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. Keep on going.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I think I'm done. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Any questions? MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I call witnesses? THE COURT: Yeah, but they still have a right to question you first. Then when you're done you can call witnesses.

MR. ROSE: Can I cross-examine him? THE COURT: Sure. Eliot have a seat up here. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Sure.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROSE
Q I'm going to hand him an exhibit, I'll mark it as Exhibit 2.

THE COURT: No, it will be your Number 1. Respondent's Number 1. MR. ROSE: Respondent's 1. May I approach? THE COURT: Yeah. 18 minutes --

BY MR. ROSE

BY MR. ROSE

BY MR. ROSE

Q I've handed you Respondent's 1, which is an e-mail from Alan Rose to $I$ view it at $I$ view it dot $p b$. Is that your e-mail address?

A Yes, it is.
Q Did you receive this e-mail on or about Thursday, May 22nd at 11:07 p.m.?

A It looks like that according to this copy. THE COURT: Moving it into evidence? MR. ROSE: Move it into evidence.

THE COURT: Number 1 for the respondent.

Q And that's less than an hour after you received the e-mail from Ted, is that correct?

A Well, according to the e-mail I've submitted into evidence, Ted sent me his e-mail at 10:52 and you were right on it -- let's see -- 8 minutes plus 7 is 15

THE COURT: So, Eliot, did you hear the question, it was so simple. THE WITNESS: NO, I was just doing the math. THE COURT: He said, is it within an hour? THE WITNESS: Oh, within an hour, was that the question?

17 Q And then you wrote me an e-mail that said that 18 you got back from the hearing and you would delete and 19 destroy the e-mail in accordance with the law?

20 A I said I would follow the law.
21 Q Okay.

23 objecting.
MR. ROSE: Exhibit 2, Respondent's Exhibit 2, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. ROSE

Q Is this an e-mail you sent to me, sir?
A I want to clarify. I did actually send to
everybody $I$ sent it to a letter stating what you had claimed privileged, and asking them to follow the law. And do as they see fit. I provided them both sections of the law that $I$ could see that were applicable. THE COURT: Okay. Eliot, next question. THE WITNESS: Okay.

BY MR. ROSE
Q Is this an e-mail you sent to me?
A Yes.

THE COURT: Number 2 in evidence?
MR. ROSE: Number 2 in evidence. Thank you.
BY MR. ROSE
Q And was one of the people you sent the privileged e-mail to Crystal Cox?

A Yes, it is.

Q And did she publish the e-mail on the Internet?
A I believe so.
Q And have you since republished what she's published in papers that you filed with Judge Colin?

A I've taken excerpts from her web sites and published them in papers to Judge Colin.

1

18 BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

24 hearing that was had the day of court?

25 A You told me that, yes.

Q Okay. And I told you I would go back and do what it was according to law, correct?

A You told me outside of the courtroom that you had already sent it to 2,000 people, and you would not retract it. Then we had a hearing. And what happened at the hearing is on the transcript.

Q Okay. And so I did inform you that I had sent it to several thousand people?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. Hold on one second. Are you aware that the e-mail was sent from Ted to Eliot only?

A Yes, I received an e-mail --
THE COURT: Okay. Yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Did you make prior statements to the court that the e-mail was sent to Ted -- or from Ted to Eliot, plus other attorneys?

A No, I think I said there was an e-mail that came from Eliot to Ted that had a pleading in it. Ted, while on an airplane, typed a reply -- he didn't type a reply. He typed something to me that accidently went as a reply to you. And then he told me about it and this is where we are.

Q Okay. And from your understanding of the law,

2

I have followed the rules of privilege regarding notifying you that $I$ was challenging this?

A Absolutely not. You've not followed the rules.

Q I haven't notified you that I was objecting to this because I thought you had admitted that to the court already.

A You notified me that you were going to challenge our assertion to privilege, but you didn't comply with the rule.

Q Okay. That was the part -- you can make that claim later. But once again, just to get it clear for the record.

THE COURT: I got it.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You do. Okay. Great.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Okay. Is it typical that you're working at
11:07?
A It's very typical.
Q Okay.
A Unfortunately.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's all the
questions I have.
MR. ROSE: No redirect -- or no recross. THE COURT: Next witness, Eliot.

24 to -- to invoke a strategy of force and aggression 25 against Eliot Bernstein?

A I don't know. Can I see the e-mail, please? THE COURT: That's fair.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Sure.
THE COURT: He's showing him a document. MR. ROSE: I was just cautioning him not to publish the --

THE COURT: It's still ID only. Go ahead. So you've shown him, Eliot, the document. What's your question?

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Did you say you were -- that you suggested using force and aggression with Eliot? MR. ROSE: Object to the form. THE COURT: Overruled. THE WITNESS: No.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Can you read that section into --
MR. ROSE: Objection to him reading it.
THE COURT: Well --
MR. ROSE: He can read it to himself.
THE COURT: Yeah, you can read it to yourself
and then ask a question. But you also need to
tell me what part you're reading.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Him being aggressive and forceful.

23 fiduciary? read? aggression.

THE COURT: Where -- what paragraph should I

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Like the fifth line -the first one, two, three, four --

THE COURT: Okay. Let me read it.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: -- sixth line where it starts --

THE COURT: Give me a chance. Ted and I will read at the same time.

Okay. I read it. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I've read it too.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Does that refresh your memory? Did you use -if you used the words --

A My answer is still no.
Q -- to be forceful and aggressive with Eliot?
A You asked if $I$ used the words force and

Q Okay. I'll ask it again. Did you use the words being aggressive and forceful?

A Yes, I did.
Q Okay. Are you aware of the qualifications of a

MR. ROSE: Objection, relevance.
THE COURT: What's the relevancy to this

13 BY MR. ROSE
issue?

A Yes. so...

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I was going to ask him
if he understood that being aggressive and
forceful is contrary to other fiduciary's
responsibilities to --
THE COURT: Okay. Sustained.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's all I have.
THE COURT: Any questions?
MR. ROSE: Just briefly.
THE COURT: Hold on, Ted.
MR. ROSE: Just like to move into evidence --CROSS-EXAMINATION

Q Did you send me an e-mail after you realized that you had sent the e-mail to Eliot?

THE COURT: That will be Number 3. MR. ROSE: I don't think it waives the privilege just to have --

THE COURT: No, this is a privileged hearing,

MR. ROSE: This is Number 3.
THE COURT: You can show it to him.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: This is a privileged
letter we just admitted?

11 BY MR. ROSE
12 Q It says sent to Eliot by mistake. Is that what

13 you wrote to me?

14 A Yes.

18 BY MR. ROSE

19 Q Could you just, very briefly, describe the 20 circumstances for how it came -- you sent the e-mail by 21 mistake?

22 A Yeah, I intended to send you an e-mail when I
23 was flying back home from a trip, and $I$ was using
24 software $I$ was unfamiliar with actually, and instead of

25 hitting opening up an e-mail to you, I hit forward by
mistake -- reply by mistake -- and it went to Eliot in reply rather than forwarding to you.

Q How long after you discovered that did you send me the e-mail?

A I did that immediately. Right away. As soon as I got off the plane.

Q Was the e-mail intended solely for me to discuss legal strategy?

A Yes.

Q Do you have any desire to harm your brother or hurt him?

A No, I don't.
MR. ROSE: Okay. Nothing further, Your
Honor .
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I?
THE COURT: Yes, redirect.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Redirect.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Ted, in the letter, did you say if John does not want to tangle with Eliot, remove John immediately? MR. ROSE: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Hold on. So he's just reading something of it, now you have to ask the question.

24 asking me.
A No.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Do you recall writing those words?
MR. ROSE: Objection, attorney-client
privilege.
THE COURT: No, it's in Exhibit Number 1 that's ID only. Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q What does the word tangle with Eliot refer to, if you have no hard feelings or animosity?

THE COURT: Well, you didn't ask about hard feelings and animosity. You asked whether he wanted to hurt you.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN

Q Well, okay, tangle. What does tangle mean?

A Engage.

Q Okay. Engage being aggressive and forceful, are those the words?

Q You didn't say those words as well in that same sentence, in that same paragraph, tangle with Eliot and then be aggressive and forceful?

A I don't understand the question you are

THE COURT: You covered that already. I got
it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN
Q Can you describe what you meant when you said if he -- I believe referring to John -- is not one hundred percent in support of me as trustee, including how I protected myself with trust assets, and will continue doing so as necessary? What were you referring

MR. ROSE: Objection, Your Honor. This is beyond --

THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Don't ask him that question?

THE COURT: Because I don't need to know his interpretation of what he means. That's not relevant.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'll let it go. I'm done.

THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat. Thanks.
Next witness, Eliot.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Nobody. Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: No witnesses, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Oh, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. One of the biggest problems $I$ have is that if you let it be privileged, and then we don't go to the Florida Bar rules, which say contains words like force and aggression against Eliot, yada, yada, yada, that we could be covering a document up here in privilege that $I$ can't --

THE COURT: You're arguing now. I'm not even at the argument stage.

Okay. I was reading.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Sorry.
THE COURT: Okay. So all right. I'm going to allow argument and $I$ heard Eliot's argument. So the essence of Eliot's argument is, if I determine that the materials are privileged, the rules say I'm to direct what should be done with the materials and any copies as to preserve all rights of the appellate review. The recipient of the materials shall also give prompt notice of my ruling to everyone else. That's the essence of it. Eliot seems to be raising that if $I$ do that, will that have some impact on a potential administrative proceeding with the Bar, is that
what your question is?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Not just that. I'd like to be submitting this to criminal authorities because I've already alleged extortion that they're doing on me and this fits in nicely with force and aggression threats. And I think we would be covering up a piece of evidence that could lead to me to getting harmed, especially where in this case my brother was already alleging my father was murdered, we haven't determined that all yet. But it's starting to look like the people that are involved in the fraud, and I'm a little nervous, Your Honor, that $I$ can't give this to a police officer.

THE COURT: Let me read something in 502 for a second.

Okay. All right. Okay. So listen to my ruling.

The rule is pretty clear on the procedure. And I think you folks have done substantially what the rule requires. So we're at the point where Eliot has challenged the assertion of privilege. It's uncontradicted that Ted wrote a letter -- an e-mail -- that actually went to Eliot. That's uncontradicted. One issue is
did Ted intend that letter to go not to Eliot but to Alan, meaning Alan Rose, his lawyer. That's a finding of fact that $I$ have to make. Ted said yes to that. There is no other testimonial evidence as to whom that letter was intended, but there is documentary evidence by looking at the content of the letter.

So I've read the letter and it's pretty easy to see that that letter was intended to go to Ted's lawyer, Alan. In the beginning of the letter it says, Alan. And then the discussion in the letter is clearly directed to that which is part of the subject of the letter, which is this case, it's either the Shirley or the Simon case.

So I make a finding of fact that this letter was intended to go to Alan.

That finding is supported easily by the fact that shortly before that letter was sent from Eliot -- from Ted to Eliot -- Eliot has sent a letter, or a document, by e-mail, to, among others, Ted. And so Ted's version is instead of sending a clean letter from him to Alan, he hit forward, I think he said, and it wound up -- or reply -- and it wound up getting
sent to Eliot. That is the essence of an inadvertent disclosure.

So I find that the matters were intended to go from Ted to Alan, his lawyer.

Eliot then says, not withstanding, the materials in question should not be deemed privileged because of Florida Statute 90.502, subsection 4, that basically stands for the proposition that even if there is a communication between a client and a lawyer, the lawyer-client privilege doesn't apply when the services of the lawyer are sought -- that is that Ted is seeking the services of the lawyer -- or obtained to enable or aid anyone to commit or plan to commit what the client -that's Ted in this case -- knew -- knew was a crime or fraud.

The other assertion is as to subsection 4 (c) that this is -- that a privilege shouldn't apply because it's a communication relevant to an issue of breach of duty by the lawyer to the client. That is that it shouldn't be privileged or not allowed to be privileged because it deals with the subject for another hearing in which Ted would say that his lawyer
breached the duty to the client.
Okay. So 4 (c) clearly doesn't apply to this letter.

So Eliot's assertion is that words within this e-mail, in which Ted writes intended to Alan, that if John -- and I haven't heard who that is, but I assume that's John Pankauski, is his other lawyer -- does not want to tangle with Eliot. It then says he wants, that is Ted, wants John to be aggressive and forceful, if need be, with Eliot and remove him -- and remove him as counsel -- if not, remove him as counsel.

So the issue is, in reading that language, either on its four corners or through parol evidence, which I've heard a little bit about, are those words in which Ted is soliciting Alan to commit, or plan to commit, what Ted knew was a crime or fraud.

Eliot's assertion is that when Ted seeks of Alan assistance in compelling John, his other lawyer, to tangle with Eliot, as written, and to be aggressive and forceful, is that tantamount of Ted soliciting Alan to try to get Alan to, in essence, commit a crime -- which

Eliot says is a crime -- meaning, threatening him with some force or harm, or the like.

So the court has to make that decision in the context of the letter. And so when I read this letter, the question is, what do I read -because I have no other evidence about what was intended, other than what I heard so far, which really doesn't speak to this, is language from a client to one lawyer telling that lawyer that he wants to basically remove the other lawyer or consider removing him if that lawyer doesn't want to tangle with Eliot, and be aggressive with him. Does that mean that he is requesting the lawyer that he's writing to to be physically assaultive or batter -- or a batterer -- or is he telling his lawyer -- Ted telling Alan -- that he wants John, John Pankauski, to legally tangle with Eliot. And legally tangle -- legally be aggressive and forceful.

I rule it's clearly the latter.
I know, Eliot, that throughout many appearances before me -- and I wasn't sure what it was at first -- you've told me that you, your family, and others, are being threatened
with bodily harm, and I wasn't sure what the nature of that threat is. But if what is in the Paragraph 1 of Exhibit 1 is deemed by you to fall in that category, there's nothing that I can do about you reading it that way, but it's clearly not the case. I mean, that's -it's not necessarily standard language -- I don't know if there is such a thing as standard language -- but lawyers -- clients directing lawyers to toughen up, be aggressive, be forceful, be willing to tangle with the opponent, is common in litigation. And there is nothing in this writing that seems to indicate that that means physical, like beat you up on the street, because that's not the way this is written. It's clear that this is written in the context of the case.

Okay. So I find that the lawyer-client privilege does apply. Because this was not requesting perpetration of a crime of assault or battery against -- against Eliot.

So the next question then becomes whether there remains grounds to challenge the assertion of privilege. The court says no. This document was as privileged as could be.

And it's intended -- it is -- the court rules that it is allowed to be treated as an inadvertent disclosed document, to which privilege applies pursuant to the rule. And the remedy -- what's the specific remedy Mr. Rose -- because the way the rule reads, if I enter an order determining that the materials are privileged, which I'm finding. I'm not finding that the right to challenge was waived. I don't think Eliot waived it. He asserted it correctly. Then $I$ can direct what shall be done with the materials. So you folks are
telling me that things have happened already. What is it that you are seeking in the order I do about the materials, which $I$ assume is this one page -- hold on -- I'm asking Alan first, then I'll entertain you.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
MR. ROSE: I think you could find that he violated the rule because he did not sequester it. We're not here for that purpose. I would ask you that - -

THE COURT: I didn't even hear evidence on that yet, so I'm not going there yet. MR. ROSE: I would ask that he delete all copies, notify people --

THE COURT: Okay. Slow down. Hold on. Hold on. One -- you got to go slow.

One, delete all copies in his possession and control?

MR. ROSE: Correct. Including electronic.
THE COURT: Well, okay. Hold on. All right.

MR. ROSE: He should notify the recipients and then provide us with a copy of his notification to them, and request them --

THE COURT: Notify recipients of what?
MR. ROSE: The people that he forwarded the e-mail to. He should notify them of Your Honor's ruling and that he's been ordered to have them destroy all copies. And I would ask that he provide -- or file with the court -- proof that he's done that.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. ROSE: And then at this point, number three, $I$ would like you to order that he's not to ever use the privileged material, or republish it, even if he's republishing Crystal Cox's web site, where she published this --

THE COURT: I got it.

MR. ROSE: -- at his request.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: And then we would reserve ruling on any sanctions and, hopefully, we won't have to come back.

And then reserve on fees and sanctions for his violating the order.

THE COURT: Where is there a fee provision?

MR. ROSE: We would have to file a motion and that would be on the basis of his violating Rule 1.285. We have not filed that motion.

THE COURT: Where is there a -- where's the rule about fees?

MR. ROSE: 1.375. I mean, I don't have my
rule book -- the rule on sanctions for discovery violations and also the inherent authority of the court. But we haven't raised that motion yet because Your Honor just today ruled that the document was privileged.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Okay. So do you want to be heard on the scope of the order?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah.

THE COURT: What -- go ahead. First thing is that you be ordered to delete --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: NO, I've got all that. THE COURT: Well, that's what I'm getting at.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I wanted to oppose that.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. That's a purported remedy that I'm being asked to do.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: So what's your basis for opposing that?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I appreciate your interpretation of that letter. The word forceful is --

THE COURT: Again, you can't re-question -I've already ruled.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Here's the question. There's going to be an order entered.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: The wording of the order, is the way the rule is, is that $I$ have to determine and direct what shall be done with the materials, that's this e-mail. The first thing they want is an order that tells you, you, to delete this e-mail from anything that's -- any document, including any electronic storage place, that's in your possession and control.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I want to give it
to the police departments and --
THE COURT: Okay. Well, if you do that --
well, okay, so let's --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I mean, my life's in danger. I know you didn't --

THE COURT: All right. So --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: -- read that.
THE COURT: Listen to me carefully.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: I'm going to order you to delete.
Okay. I'm going to order you -- this is all appropriate -- to notify the recipient of everybody that you sent this to, of the ruling, meaning you're going to send them a copy of the order, and direct that they shall also delete and not transmit.

Listen to me carefully. I order you not to disseminate this document from this moment forward to anybody. If you violate my order, you're going to be in contempt of court. Anybody, any agency, no one, because it's privileged. And there is a rule that says you're not allowed to do that. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Do I have the right to appeal this decision?

THE COURT: Yeah. Sure.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: But you have to obey my decision pending the appeal.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah.
THE COURT: Sure, you can do that. All
right. Write it up.
MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: If you want to write that up now you can, or you can get my transcript and write that up.

MR. ROSE: I would prefer to get the transcript and write it up from the transcript, Your Honor, for clarity.

THE COURT: Mr. Eliot, pending me writing the written order, because electronics move quickly, okay, this order is binding on you as of right now.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I got it.
THE COURT: So play by the rules.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I will.
THE COURT: Okay. You have a right to appeal. If the appellate court disagrees with me, you and I will both do what they say.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. So now for Wednesday, Eliot's request is we defer on having hearings on the issue of Ted as successor trustee and -- so he can talk to his lawyers and see whether there's some way of dealing with that subject. I'll start on this side. What do you say about that?

MR. ROSE: We're fine with that, Your Honor.
MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Okay. I'll
cancel the hearing in view of that.
Okay. Now, what $I$ need you to do is at some point, because, Eliot, the way this is going to be triggered, is no one is going to know what you're doing on your end. You and/or your lawyers should say to the other side, you know, if you hire the lawyer and they engage, they can make an appearance and start to tell them we're the spokespersons for you. Because they either talk to you or they talk to your lawyer, but to make that decision they need a notice of appearance or something from the lawyer. Okay.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And they've explained that to me.

THE COURT: Okay. And so -- but at some point you can have a status check if you need to have this reset.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Meaning, if you don't agree upon or work out this issue, just come back in at an 8:45, and if you need another hearing, I'll give you another hearing date.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Beautiful.
Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: Hold on. Mr. Feaman gave you -there's something else here.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Is the court going to retain a copy of this once $I$ destroy it, just in case we are --

THE COURT: Okay. So that's a good question.
All right. So $I$ have it for ID purposes. All right. And Eliot is correct, to preserve the integrity of this, I'm going to keep it, and I'm going to put it in a sealed envelope in the court file subject to being reopened by the court pursuant to order.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And I can tell the appeal court that?

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Got it.
THE COURT: Yeah, that's fair. Okay. And then this says -- the next thing was status conference to discuss other pending motions and petitions, including Eliot's petition for construction of trust and accounting.

Are we going --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Put it off.
THE COURT: -- to defer on that until the lawyers can deal with that?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah.
MR. ROSE: Just as a heads up, we're going to be filing a trust construction action in the Shirley side. He's filed a trust construction on this side, but that will be moot when we file our action and serve it on everybody. That will be its own adversary proceeding.
the Court: Okay. Fine. I'll wait to sign the order. And no hearing subject to what you folks tell me is going on next. Somebody will send me up orders and letters on Mr. O'Connell.

Go ahead.
MR. O'CONNELL: I will, Your Honor.
MR. ROSE: I have two orders from the
first -- the motion to disqualify orders.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll deal with those. Go ahead, while I'm signing, you can speak.

MR. FEAMAN: I have an order on Ted Bernstein's petition for appointment of successor personal representative. It says denied. MR. ROSE: Technically withdrawn, I think. THE COURT: Hold on. Let me just see. Are these the same that you just gave me? MR. ROSE: One is for Mr. Pankauski and one is from my firm.

THE COURT: Let me just do this first. Hold on. I'll make some copies of this. All right. Let me see the order that you want.

MR. ROSE: We don't think it was denied, we believe it was withdrawn.

THE COURT: It was withdrawn. Because you folks comprised, so $I$ didn't actually make a ruling on the merits. Okay. So that's fair.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay. There is envelopes.
THE COURT: No, I'm going to make the copies and let you --

MR. FEAMAN: All right. Very good. We'll save the stamp.

THE COURT: All right. So, folks, final
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word, you made progress when you cooperated. So use that as a bell weather to try to achieve just what you did. Listen to me, everyone. Eliot, you too. You know, when you go outside here, you did some things that I think are good for the estate. Let's not only wait for you to come to court to be able to do that, accomplish that on your own. Okay. That's the whole idea.

Okay. Thanks. Court is in recess. Wait for copies.
(Thereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 4:22 p.m.)
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