

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

IN RE: THE ESTATE OF
SIMON LEON BERNSTEIN,
Deceased

CASE NO. 502012CP004391XXXXSB

HON. JUDGE MARTIN H. COLIN

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE
PETITIONER,

V.

TESCHER & SPALLINA, P.A., (AND ALL PARTNERS,
ASSOCIATES AND OF COUNSEL);
ROBERT L. SPALLINA, ESQ., PERSONALLY;
ROBERT L. SPALLINA, ESQ., PROFESSIONALLY;
DONALD R. TESCHER, ESQ., PERSONALLY;
DONALD R. TESCHER, ESQ., PROFESSIONALLY;
THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN, INDIVIDUALLY;
THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN, AS ALLEGED PERSONAL
REPRESENTATIVE;
THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN, AS ALLEGED TRUSTEE
AND SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE PERSONALLY;
THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN, AS ALLEGED TRUSTEE
AND SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE, PROFESSIONALLY;
THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN, AS TRUSTEE FOR HIS
CHILDREN;
LISA SUE FRIEDSTEIN, INDIVIDUALLY AS A BENEFICIARY;
LISA SUE FRIEDSTEIN, AS TRUSTEE FOR HER CHILDREN;
JILL MARLA IANTONI, INDIVIDUALLY AS A BENEFICIARY;
JILL MARLA IANTONI, AS TRUSTEE FOR HER CHILDREN;
PAMELA BETH SIMON, INDIVIDUALLY;
PAMELA BETH SIMON, AS TRUSTEE FOR HER CHILDREN;
MARK MANCERI, ESQ., PERSONALLY;
MARK MANCERI, ESQ., PROFESSIONALLY;
MARK R. MANCERI, P.A. (AND ALL PARTNERS,
ASSOCIATES AND OF COUNSEL);
JOSHUA ENNIO ZANDER BERNSTEIN (ELIOT
MINOR CHILD);
JACOB NOAH ARCHIE BERNSTEIN (ELIOT
MINOR CHILD);
DANIEL ELIJSHA ABE OTTOMO BERNSTEIN
(ELIOT MINOR CHILD);
ALEXANDRA BERNSTEIN (TED ADULT CHILD);
ERIC BERNSTEIN (TED ADULT CHILD);

ELIOT BERNSTEIN COMPLAINEE WITH COURT ORDER
Monday, August 4, 2014
EXHIBITS

MICHAEL BERNSTEIN (TED ADULT CHILD);
MATTHEW LOGAN (TED'S SPOUSE ADULT
CHILD);
MOLLY NORAH SIMON (PAMELA ADULT
CHILD);
JULIA IANTONI – JILL MINOR CHILD;
MAX FRIEDSTEIN – LISA MINOR CHILD;
CARLY FRIEDSTEIN – LISA MINOR CHILD;
PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD & ROSE, P.A.
(AND ALL PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES AND OF
COUNSEL);
ALAN B. ROSE, ESQ. – PERSONALLY;
ALAN B. ROSE, ESQ. – PROFESSIONALLY;
PANKAUSKI LAW FIRM PLLC, (AND ALL
PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES AND OF COUNSEL);
JOHN J. PANKAUSKI, ESQ. – PERSONALLY;
JOHN J. PANKAUSKI, ESQ. – PROFESSIONALLY;
KIMBERLY FRANCIS MORAN – PERSONALLY;
KIMBERLY FRANCIS MORAN –
PROFESSIONALLY;
LINDSAY BAXLEY AKA LINDSAY GILES –
PERSONALLY;
LINDSAY BAXLEY AKA LINDSAY GILES –
PROFESSIONALLY;
THE ALLEGED “SIMON L. BERNSTEIN AMENDED
AND RESTATED TRUST AGREEMENT” DATED
JULY 25, 2012;
JOHN AND JANE DOE'S (1-5000).

ELIOT BERNSTEIN COMPLAINE WITH COURT ORDER

COMES NOW, Eliot Ivan Bernstein (“Eliot”) or (“Petitioner”), PRO SE, as
Beneficiary and Interested Party both for himself personally and Guardian for his three minor
children (who may also be Beneficiaries and Interested Parties of the Estates and Trusts of
Simon Bernstein (“Simon”) and Shirley Bernstein (“Shirley”)), and hereby files this “**ELIOT
BERNSTEIN COMPLAINE WITH COURT ORDER**” and in support thereof states, on
information and belief, as follows:

ELIOT BERNSTEIN COMPLAINE WITH COURT ORDER
Monday, August 4, 2014
EXHIBITS

1. That upon Order of this Court, Eliot files this compliance with the Court Order dated July 18, 2014 titled, "ORDER ON TED S. BERNSTEIN'S, AS SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE OF THE SIMON L. BERNSTEIN TRUST, MOTION TO COMPEL ELIOT BERNSTEIN TO COMPLY WITH RULE 1.285" and hereby submits proof that he has complied with the Court Order in Exhibit 1.
2. That Eliot believes he has deleted and destroyed copies of the email, however since Eliot posted this on social media and deleted those posts, he remains unclear as to how many of his thousands of "friends" may have downloaded the email while it was posted.

Filed on Monday, August 4, 2014,

Eliot Bernstein, Pro Se, Individually and as
legal guardian on behalf of his minor three
children.

X

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of
the foregoing has been furnished by email to all parties on the following Service List, Monday,
August 4, 2014

Eliot Bernstein, Pro Se, Individually and as
legal guardian on behalf of his minor three
children.

X

ELIOT BERNSTEIN COMPLAINE WITH COURT ORDER
Monday, August 4, 2014
EXHIBITS

SERVICE LIST

<p>RESPONDENT PERSONALLY, PROFESSIONALLY, AS A GUARDIAN AND TRUSTEE FOR MINOR/ADULT CHILDREN, AS AN ALLEGED TRUSTEE AND ALLEGED PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE</p> <p>Theodore Stuart Bernstein Life Insurance Concepts 950 Peninsula Corporate Circle, Suite 3010 Boca Raton, Florida 33487 tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENT INDIVIDUALLY, PROFESSIONALLY AND LAW FIRM and COUNSEL TO THEODORE BERNSTEIN IN VARIOUS CAPACITIES</p> <p>Alan B. Rose, Esq. Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald & Rose, P.A. 505 South Flagler Drive, Suite 600 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401 (561) 355-6991 arose@pm-law.com and arose@mrachek-law.com mhandler@mrachek-law.com cklein@mrachek-law.com lmrachek@mrachek-law.com rfitzgerald@mrachek-law.com skonopka@mrachek-law.com dthomas@mrachek-law.com gweiss@mrachek-law.com jbaker@mrachek-law.com mhandler@mrachek-law.com lchristian@mrachek-law.com tclarke@mrachek-law.com gdavies@mrachek-law.com pgillman@mrachek-law.com dkelly@mrachek-law.com cklein@mrachek-law.com lwilliamson@mrachek-law.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENT INDIVIDUALLY, PROFESSIONALLY AND LAW FIRM and COUNSEL TO THEODORE BERNSTEIN IN VARIOUS CAPACITIES</p> <p>John J. Pankauski, Esq. Pankauski Law Firm PLLC 120 South Olive Avenue 7th Floor West Palm Beach, FL 33401 (561) 514-0900 courtfilings@pankauskilawfirm.com john@pankauskilawfirm.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENT INDIVIDUALLY, PROFESSIONALLY AND LAW FIRM AND AS FORMER COUNSEL TO THEODORE BERNSTEIN IN VARIOUS CAPACITIES</p> <p>Robert L. Spallina, Esq., Tescher & Spallina, P.A. Boca Village Corporate Center I 4855 Technology Way Suite 720 Boca Raton, FL 33431 rspallina@tescherspallina.com kmoran@tescherspallina.com ddustin@tescherspallina.com</p>
--	---	--	---

ELIOT BERNSTEIN COMPLIANCE WITH COURT ORDER
Monday, August 4, 2014
EXHIBITS

<p>RESPONDENT INDIVIDUALLY AND AS GUARDIAN AND TRUSTEE OF HER MINOR CHILD</p> <p>Pamela Beth Simon 950 N. Michigan Avenue Apartment 2603 Chicago, IL 60611 psimon@stpcorp.com</p>	<p>COUNSEL FOR LIMITED APPEARANCE representing Mr. Tescher in connection with his Petition for Designation and Discharge as Co-Personal Representative of the Estate of Simon L. Bernstein, deceased.</p> <p>Irwin J. Block, Esq. The Law Office of Irwin J. Block PL 700 South Federal Highway Suite 200 Boca Raton, Florida 33432 ijb@ijblegal.com martin@kolawyers.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENT INDIVIDUALLY, PROFESSIONALLY AND LAW FIRM and FORMER WITHDRAWN COUNSEL TO THEODORE BERNSTEIN IN VARIOUS CAPACITIES, NO NOTICES OF APPEARANCES</p> <p>Mark R. Manceri, Esq., and Mark R. Manceri, P.A., 2929 East Commercial Boulevard Suite 702 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308 mrmlaw@comcast.net mrmlaw1@gmail.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENT INDIVIDUALLY, PROFESSIONALLY AND LAW FIRM AND AS FORMER COUNSEL TO THEODORE BERNSTEIN IN VARIOUS CAPACITIES</p> <p>Donald Tescher, Esq., Tescher & Spallina, P.A. Boca Village Corporate Center I 4855 Technology Way Suite 720 Boca Raton, FL 33431 dtescher@tescherspallina.com dtescher@tescherspallina.com ddustin@tescherspallina.com kmoran@tescherspallina.com</p>
<p>RESPONDENT INDIVIDUALLY AND AS GUARDIAN AND TRUSTEE OF HER MINOR CHILD</p> <p>Jill Iantoni 2101 Magnolia Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 jilliantoni@gmail.com</p>	<p>COUNSEL TO CREDITOR WILLIAM STANSBURY</p> <p>Peter Feaman, Esquire Peter M. Feaman, P.A. 3615 Boynton Beach Blvd. Boynton Beach, FL 33436 pfeaman@feamanlaw.com service@feamanlaw.com mkoskey@feamanlaw.com</p>	<p>COURT APPROVED CURATOR TO REPLACE THE REMOVED FORMER PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVES/CO-TRUSTEES/COUNSEL TO THEMSELVES AS FIDUCIARIES TESCHER AND SPALLINA</p> <p>Benjamin Brown, Esq., Thomton B Henry, Esq., and Peter Matwiczuk Matwiczuk & Brown, LLP 625 No. Flagler Drive Suite 401 West Palm Beach, FL 33401 bbrown@matbrolaw.com attorneys@matbrolaw.com bhenry@matbrolaw.com pma@matwiczuk@matbrolaw.com</p>	<p>COUNSEL FOR JILL IANTONI and LISA FRIEDSTEIN</p> <p>William M. Pearson, Esq. P.O. Box 1076 Miami, FL 33149 wpearsonlaw@bellsouth.net</p>

ELIOT BERNSTEIN COMPLAINT WITH COURT ORDER
Monday, August 4, 2014
EXHIBITS

<p>RESPONDENT INDIVIDUALLY AND AS GUARDIAN AND TRUSTEE OF HER MINOR CHILD</p> <p>Lisa Friedstein 2142 Churchill Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 Lisa@friedsteins.com lisa.friedstein@gmail.com lisa@friedsteins.com</p>	<p>COUNSEL FOR JILL IANTONI and LISA FRIEDSTEIN</p> <p>William H. Glasko, Esq. Golden Cowan, P.A. 1734 South Dixie Highway Palmetto Bay, FL 33157 bill@palmettobaylaw.com eservice@palmettobaylaw.com mmealy@gcprobate.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENT -- ADULT CHILD</p> <p>Alexandra Bernstein 3000 Washington Blvd, Apt 424 Arlington, VA, 22201 alb07c@gmail.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENT/ARRESTED AND CONVICTED OF FRAUD AND ADMITTED TO FORGERY OF SIX SIGNATURES. INCLUDING POST MORTEM FOR SIMON/HAS HAD NOTARY PUBLIC LICENSE REVOKED BY FLORIDA GOVERNOR RICK SCOTT NOTARY PUBLIC DIVISION. *See notes</p> <p>Kimberly Moran kmoran@tescherspallina.com</p>
<p>RESPONDENT - ADULT CHILD</p> <p>Eric Bernstein 2231 Bloods Grove Circle Delray Beach, FL 33445 ebenstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com edb07@fsu.edu edb07fsu@gmail.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENT - INITIALLY MINOR CHILD AND NOW ADULT CHILD</p> <p>Michael Bernstein 2231 Bloods Grove Circle Delray Beach, FL 33445 mchl_bernstein@yahoo.com</p>		<p>COUNSEL TO ALEXANDRA, ERIC AND MICHAEL BERNSTEIN AND MOLLY SIMON</p> <p>John P Morrissey, Esq. John P. Morrissey, P.A. 330 Clematis Street Suite 213 West Palm Beach, FL 33401 john@jmorrisseylaw.com</p>
<p>RESPONDENT - ADULT STEPSON TO THEODORE</p> <p>Matt Logan 2231 Bloods Grove Circle Delray Beach, FL 33445 matl89@aol.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENTS - MINOR CHILDREN OF PETITIONER Joshua, Jacob and Daniel Bernstein, Minors c/o Eliot and Candice Bernstein, Parents and Natural Guardians 2753 NW 34th Street Boca Raton, FL 33434 iviewit@iviewit.tv</p>	<p>RESPONDENT - MINOR CHILD</p> <p>Julia Iantoni, a Minor c/o Guy and Jill Iantoni, Her Parents and Natural Guardians 210 I Magnolia Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 jilliantoni@gmail.com</p>	
<p>RESPONDENT/REPRIMANDED BY FLORIDA GOVERNOR RICK SCOTT NOTARY PUBLIC DIVISION FOR FAILING TO NOTARIZE AN ALLEGED 2012 WILL AND TRUST OF SIMON AND SIGNING NOTARY UNDER FALSE NAME</p> <p>Lindsay Baxley aka Lindsay Giles lindsay@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENT MINOR CHILDREN</p> <p>Carley & Max Friedstein, Minors c/o Jeffrey and Lisa Friedstein Parents and Natural Guardians 2142 Churchill Lane Highland Park, IL 6003 Lisa@friedsteins.com lisa.friedstein@gmail.com</p>	<p>RESPONDENT - MINOR CHILD INITIALLY NOW ADULT CHILD</p> <p>Molly Simon 1731 N. Old Pueblo Drive Tucson, AZ 85745 molly.simon1203@gmail.com</p>	



 ELIOT BERNSTEIN COMPLAINEE WITH COURT ORDER
 Monday, August 4, 2014
 EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT 1 – PROOF OF COMPLIANCE

ELIOT BERNSTEIN COMPLIANCE WITH COURT ORDER
Monday, August 4, 2014
EXHIBITS



Eliot Ivan Bernstein

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein <iviewit@iviewit.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 5:39 PM
To: Maritza Rivera Puccio (maritza_puccio@yahoo.com)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS
Attachments: 20140718 Order Regarding Privilege.pdf

Hi, in furtherance to my email below regarding a message sent to you regarding an alleged privileged document, after a hearing regarding the matter the Court ordered that it was privileged and that I notice all recipients to not distribute that letter and delete it, please take this email as my compliance with that Order. Attached is a copy of the Order. The alleged privileged email header that was sent to you is in the prior email below. While I know many of you thought this email was not privileged and that it was threatening and contained information that Ted was breaching his fiduciary duties and misusing trust assets to "protect" himself, even against the advice of counsel, bad decisions by Judge's do happen. It appears the judge subjectively determined what the contents meant and determined that a letter from Ted to me was somehow inadvertent disclosure of a privileged document, despite the fact that it was never privileged in the first place since it was never sent by Ted to his counsel, the ruling may be precedent setting and wholly invalidate the meaning of attorney client privileged communications to a subjective term depending on what the judge thinks people's intent are and not the law? Ted's threats to use trust funds to seek my children's school records to use against them and threats to deposition and legally harass anyone who may be helping me were also ignored by the judge. I may appeal so I am not sure what you are supposed to do in the meantime with your copies, please consult counsel.

Thanks, eb

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein [mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 1:41 PM
To: Maritza Rivera Puccio (maritza_puccio@yahoo.com)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

I have been notified by counsel for Theodore Bernstein that there was an email that was not supposed to be sent by me as they claim it was privileged and transmitted by mistake to me, although I am the only recipient. The email in questions title was "Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS" and had a letter that started "Alan -..." I do not think I can retransmit it to show you which one but the letter appears to be from Alan Rose to Theodore Bernstein. I am obligated under law to make contact with those I sent it to so that they may retrieve the email but I am not sure if that extends any obligation on the receiving party. Anyhoot, as the email threatens my family it appears and others I detest having to request it back but please do whatever you feel the law requires, as cited below;

RULE 1.285.

INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE OF PRIVILEGED MATERIALS

(a)

Assertion of Privilege as to Inadvertently Disclosed Materials.

Any party, person, or entity, after inadvertent disclosure of any materials pursuant to these rules, may thereafter assert any privilege recognized by law as to those materials. This right exists without regard to whether the disclosure was made pursuant to formal demand or informal request. In order to assert the privilege, the party, person, or entity, shall,

within 10 days of actually discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve written notice of the assertion of privilege on the party to whom the materials were disclosed. The notice shall specify with particularity the materials as to which the privilege is asserted, the nature of the privilege asserted, and the date on which the inadvertent disclosure was actually discovered.

(b)
Duty of the Party Receiving Notice of an Assertion of Privilege. A party receiving notice of an assertion of privilege under subdivision (a) shall promptly return, sequester, or destroy the materials specified in the notice, as well as any copies of the material. The party receiving the notice shall also promptly notify any other party, person, or entity to whom it has disclosed the materials of the fact that the notice has been served and of the effect of this rule. That party shall also take reasonable steps to retrieve the materials disclosed. Nothing herein affects any obligation pursuant to R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4

4.4(b).

(c)
Right to Challenge Assertion of Privilege.
Any party receiving a notice made under subdivision (a) has the right to challenge the assertion of privilege. The grounds for the challenge may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) The materials in question are not privileged.
- (2) The disclosing party, person, or entity lacks standing to assert the privilege.
- (3) The disclosing party, person, or entity has failed to serve timely notice under this rule.
- (4) The circumstances surrounding the production or disclosure of the materials warrant a finding that the disclosing party, person, or entity has waived its assertion that the material is protected by a privilege. April 17, 2014 Florida Rules of Civil Procedure

57
Any party seeking to challenge the assertion of privilege shall do so by serving notice of its challenge on the party, person, or entity asserting the privilege. Notice of the challenge shall be served within 20 days of service of the original notice given by the disclosing party, person, or entity. The notice of the recipient's challenge shall specify the grounds for the challenge. Failure to serve timely notice of challenge is a waiver of the right to challenge.

(d)
Effect of Determination that Privilege Applies. When an order is entered determining that materials are privileged or that the right to challenge the privilege has been waived, the court shall direct what shall be done with the materials and any copies so as to preserve all rights of appellate review. The recipient of the materials shall also give prompt notice of the court's determination to any other party, person, or entity to whom it had disclosed the materials.

From: Ted Bernstein [<mailto:tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 10:52 PM

To: Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Subject: Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Alan - I

df>



Eliot Ivan Bernstein

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein <iviewit@iviewit.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 5:39 PM
To: Crystal L Cox (savvybroker@yahoo.com); Crystal L. Cox @ Liquidating Trustee (Crystal@CrystalCox.com)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS
Attachments: 20140718 Order Regarding Privilege.pdf

Hi, in furtherance to my email below regarding a message sent to you regarding an alleged privileged document, after a hearing regarding the matter the Court ordered that it was privileged and that I notice all recipients to not distribute that letter and delete it, please take this email as my compliance with that Order. Attached is a copy of the Order. The alleged privileged email header that was sent to you is in the prior email below. While I know many of you thought this email was not privileged and that it was threatening and contained information that Ted was breaching his fiduciary duties and misusing trust assets to "protect" himself, even against the advice of counsel, bad decisions by Judge's do happen. It appears the judge subjectively determined what the contents meant and determined that a letter from Ted to me was somehow inadvertent disclosure of a privileged document, despite the fact that it was never privileged in the first place since it was never sent by Ted to his counsel, the ruling may be precedent setting and wholly invalidate the meaning of attorney client privileged communications to a subjective term depending on what the judge thinks people's intent are and not the law? Ted's threats to use trust funds to seek my children's school records to use against them and threats to deposition and legally harass anyone who may be helping me were also ignored by the judge. I may appeal so I am not sure what you are supposed to do in the meantime with your copies, please consult counsel.

Thanks, eb

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein [mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 1:41 PM
To: Crystal L Cox (savvybroker@yahoo.com); Crystal L. Cox @ Liquidating Trustee (Crystal@CrystalCox.com)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

I have been notified by counsel for Theodore Bernstein that there was an email that was not supposed to be sent by me as they claim it was privileged and transmitted by mistake to me, although I am the only recipient. The email in questions title was "Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS" and had a letter that started "Alan -..." I do not think I can retransmit it to show you which one but the letter appears to be from Alan Rose to Theodore Bernstein. I am obligated under law to make contact with those I sent it to so that they may retrieve the email but I am not sure if that extends any obligation on the receiving party. Anyhoot, as the email threatens my family it appears and others I detest having to request it back but please do whatever you feel the law requires, as cited below;

RULE 1.285.

INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE OF PRIVILEGED MATERIALS

(a)

Assertion of Privilege as to Inadvertently Disclosed Materials.

Any party, person, or entity, after inadvertent disclosure of any materials pursuant to these rules, may thereafter assert any privilege recognized by law as to those materials. This right exists without regard to whether the disclosure was

made pursuant to formal demand or informal request. In order to assert the privilege, the party, person, or entity, shall, within 10 days of actually discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve written notice of the assertion of privilege on the party to whom the materials were disclosed. The notice shall specify with particularity the materials as to which the privilege is asserted, the nature of the privilege asserted, and the date on which the inadvertent disclosure was actually discovered.

(b)

Duty of the Party Receiving Notice of an Assertion of Privilege. A party receiving notice of an assertion of privilege under subdivision (a) shall promptly return, sequester, or destroy the materials specified in the notice, as well as any copies of the material. The party receiving the notice shall also promptly notify any other party, person, or entity to whom it has disclosed the materials of the fact that the notice has been served and of the effect of this rule. That party shall also take reasonable steps to retrieve the materials disclosed. Nothing herein affects any obligation pursuant to R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4

4.4(b).

(c)

Right to Challenge Assertion of Privilege.

Any party receiving a notice made under subdivision (a) has the right to challenge the assertion of privilege. The grounds for the challenge may include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) The materials in question are not privileged.

(2) The disclosing party, person, or entity lacks standing to assert the privilege.

(3) The disclosing party, person, or entity has failed to serve timely notice under this rule.

(4) The circumstances surrounding the production or disclosure of the materials warrant a finding that the disclosing party, person, or entity has waived its assertion that the material is protected by a privilege. April 17, 2014 Florida Rules of Civil Procedure

57

Any party seeking to challenge the assertion of privilege shall do so by serving notice of its challenge on the party, person, or entity asserting the privilege. Notice of the challenge shall be served within 20 days of service of the original notice given by the disclosing party, person, or entity. The notice of the recipient's challenge shall specify the grounds for the challenge. Failure to serve timely notice of challenge is a waiver of the right to challenge.

(d)

Effect of Determination that Privilege Applies. When an order is entered determining that materials are privileged or that the right to challenge the privilege has been waived, the court shall direct what shall be done with the materials and any copies so as to preserve all rights of appellate review. The recipient of the materials shall also give prompt notice of the court's determination to any other party, person, or entity to whom it had disclosed the materials.

From: Ted Bernstein [<mailto:tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 10:52 PM

To: Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Subject: Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Alan - I

df>

Eliot Ivan Bernstein

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein <iviewit@iviewit.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 5:39 PM
To: Richard and Barbara Naclerio
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS
Attachments: 20140718 Order Regarding Privilege.pdf

Hi, in furtherance to my email below regarding a message sent to you regarding an alleged privileged document, after a hearing regarding the matter the Court ordered that it was privileged and that I notice all recipients to not distribute that letter and delete it, please take this email as my compliance with that Order. Attached is a copy of the Order. The alleged privileged email header that was sent to you is in the prior email below. While I know many of you thought this email was not privileged and that it was threatening and contained information that Ted was breaching his fiduciary duties and misusing trust assets to "protect" himself, even against the advice of counsel, bad decisions by Judge's do happen. It appears the judge subjectively determined what the contents meant and determined that a letter from Ted to me was somehow inadvertent disclosure of a privileged document, despite the fact that it was never privileged in the first place since it was never sent by Ted to his counsel, the ruling may be precedent setting and wholly invalidate the meaning of attorney client privileged communications to a subjective term depending on what the judge thinks people's intent are and not the law? Ted's threats to use trust funds to seek my children's school records to use against them and threats to deposition and legally harass anyone who may be helping me were also ignored by the judge. I may appeal so I am not sure what you are supposed to do in the meantime with your copies, please consult counsel.

Thanks, eb

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein [mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 1:39 PM
To: Richard and Barbara Naclerio
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

I have been notified by counsel for Theodore Bernstein that there was an email that was not supposed to be sent by me as they claim it was privileged and transmitted by mistake to me, although I am the only recipient. The email in questions title was "Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS" and had a letter that started "Alan -..." I do not think I can retransmit it to show you which one but the letter appears to be from Alan Rose to Theodore Bernstein. I am obligated under law to make contact with those I sent it to so that they may retrieve the email but I am not sure if that extends any obligation on the receiving party. Anyhoot, as the email threatens my family it appears and others I detest having to request it back but please do whatever you feel the law requires, as cited below;

RULE 1.285.

INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE OF PRIVILEGED MATERIALS

(a)

Assertion of Privilege as to Inadvertently Disclosed Materials.

Any party, person, or entity, after inadvertent disclosure of any materials pursuant to these rules, may thereafter assert any privilege recognized by law as to those materials. This right exists without regard to whether the disclosure was made pursuant to formal demand or informal request. In order to assert the privilege, the party, person, or entity, shall, within 10 days of actually discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve written notice of the assertion of privilege on the

party to whom the materials were disclosed. The notice shall specify with particularity the materials as to which the privilege is asserted, the nature of the privilege asserted, and the date on which the inadvertent disclosure was actually discovered.

(b)

Duty of the Party Receiving Notice of an Assertion of Privilege. A party receiving notice of an assertion of privilege under subdivision (a) shall promptly return, sequester, or destroy the materials specified in the notice, as well as any copies of the material. The party receiving the notice shall also promptly notify any other party, person, or entity to whom it has disclosed the materials of the fact that the notice has been served and of the effect of this rule. That party shall also take reasonable steps to retrieve the materials disclosed. Nothing herein affects any obligation pursuant to R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4

4.4(b).

(c)

Right to Challenge Assertion of Privilege.

Any party receiving a notice made under subdivision (a) has the right to challenge the assertion of privilege. The grounds for the challenge may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) The materials in question are not privileged.
- (2) The disclosing party, person, or entity lacks standing to assert the privilege.
- (3) The disclosing party, person, or entity has failed to serve timely notice under this rule.
- (4) The circumstances surrounding the production or disclosure of the materials warrant a finding that the disclosing party, person, or entity has waived its assertion that the material is protected by a privilege. April 17, 2014 Florida Rules of Civil Procedure

57

Any party seeking to challenge the assertion of privilege shall do so by serving notice of its challenge on the party, person, or entity asserting the privilege. Notice of the challenge shall be served within 20 days of service of the original notice given by the disclosing party, person, or entity. The notice of the recipient's challenge shall specify the grounds for the challenge. Failure to serve timely notice of challenge is a waiver of the right to challenge.

(d)

Effect of Determination that Privilege Applies. When an order is entered determining that materials are privileged or that the right to challenge the privilege has been waived, the court shall direct what shall be done with the materials and any copies so as to preserve all rights of appellate review. The recipient of the materials shall also give prompt notice of the court's determination to any other party, person, or entity to whom it had disclosed the materials.

From: Ted Bernstein [<mailto:tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 10:52 PM

To: Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Subject: Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Alan - I

df>



Eliot Ivan Bernstein

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein <iviewit@iviewit.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 5:39 PM
To: Walt Sahm (pjpaws@embarqmail.com)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS
Attachments: 20140718 Order Regarding Privilege.pdf

Hi, in furtherance to my email below regarding a message sent to you regarding an alleged privileged document, after a hearing regarding the matter the Court ordered that it was privileged and that I notice all recipients to not distribute that letter and delete it, please take this email as my compliance with that Order. Attached is a copy of the Order. The alleged privileged email header that was sent to you is in the prior email below. While I know many of you thought this email was not privileged and that it was threatening and contained information that Ted was breaching his fiduciary duties and misusing trust assets to "protect" himself, even against the advice of counsel, bad decisions by Judge's do happen. It appears the judge subjectively determined what the contents meant and determined that a letter from Ted to me was somehow inadvertent disclosure of a privileged document, despite the fact that it was never privileged in the first place since it was never sent by Ted to his counsel, the ruling may be precedent setting and wholly invalidate the meaning of attorney client privileged communications to a subjective term depending on what the judge thinks people's intent are and not the law? Ted's threats to use trust funds to seek my children's school records to use against them and threats to deposition and legally harass anyone who may be helping me were also ignored by the judge. I may appeal so I am not sure what you are supposed to do in the meantime with your copies, please consult counsel.

Thanks, eb

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein [mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 1:39 PM
To: Walt Sahm (pjpaws@embarqmail.com)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

I have been notified by counsel for Theodore Bernstein that there was an email that was not supposed to be sent by me as they claim it was privileged and transmitted by mistake to me, although I am the only recipient. The email in questions title was "Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS" and had a letter that started "Alan -..." I do not think I can retransmit it to show you which one but the letter appears to be from Alan Rose to Theodore Bernstein. I am obligated under law to make contact with those I sent it to so that they may retrieve the email but I am not sure if that extends any obligation on the receiving party. Anyhoot, as the email threatens my family it appears and others I detest having to request it back but please do whatever you feel the law requires, as cited below;

RULE 1.285.

INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE OF PRIVILEGED MATERIALS

(a)

Assertion of Privilege as to Inadvertently Disclosed Materials.

Any party, person, or entity, after inadvertent disclosure of any materials pursuant to these rules, may thereafter assert any privilege recognized by law as to those materials. This right exists without regard to whether the disclosure was made pursuant to formal demand or informal request. In order to assert the privilege, the party, person, or entity, shall, within 10 days of actually discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve written notice of the assertion of privilege on the

party to whom the materials were disclosed. The notice shall specify with particularity the materials as to which the privilege is asserted, the nature of the privilege asserted, and the date on which the inadvertent disclosure was actually discovered.

(b)

Duty of the Party Receiving Notice of an Assertion of Privilege. A party receiving notice of an assertion of privilege under subdivision (a) shall promptly return, sequester, or destroy the materials specified in the notice, as well as any copies of the material. The party receiving the notice shall also promptly notify any other party, person, or entity to whom it has disclosed the materials of the fact that the notice has been served and of the effect of this rule. That party shall also take reasonable steps to retrieve the materials disclosed. Nothing herein affects any obligation pursuant to R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4

-

4.4(b).

(c)

Right to Challenge Assertion of Privilege.

Any party receiving a notice made under subdivision (a) has the right to challenge the assertion of privilege. The grounds for the challenge may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) The materials in question are not privileged.
- (2) The disclosing party, person, or entity lacks standing to assert the privilege.
- (3) The disclosing party, person, or entity has failed to serve timely notice under this rule.
- (4) The circumstances surrounding the production or disclosure of the materials warrant a finding that the disclosing party, person, or entity has waived its assertion that the material is protected by a privilege. April 17, 2014 Florida Rules of Civil Procedure

57

Any party seeking to challenge the assertion of privilege shall do so by serving notice of its challenge on the party, person, or entity asserting the privilege. Notice of the challenge shall be served within 20 days of service of the original notice given by the disclosing party, person, or entity. The notice of the recipient's challenge shall specify the grounds for the challenge. Failure to serve timely notice of challenge is a waiver of the right to challenge.

(d)

Effect of Determination that Privilege Applies. When an order is entered determining that materials are privileged or that the right to challenge the privilege has been waived, the court shall direct what shall be done with the materials and any copies so as to preserve all rights of appellate review. The recipient of the materials shall also give prompt notice of the court's determination to any other party, person, or entity to whom it had disclosed the materials.

From: Ted Bernstein [<mailto:tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 10:52 PM

To: Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Subject: Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Alan - I

df>



Eliot Ivan Bernstein

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein <iviewit@iviewit.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 5:39 PM
To: Andrew R. Dietz @ Rock It Cargo USA
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS
Attachments: 20140718 Order Regarding Privilege.pdf

Hi, in furtherance to my email below regarding a message sent to you regarding an alleged privileged document, after a hearing regarding the matter the Court ordered that it was privileged and that I notice all recipients to not distribute that letter and delete it, please take this email as my compliance with that Order. Attached is a copy of the Order. The alleged privileged email header that was sent to you is in the prior email below. While I know many of you thought this email was not privileged and that it was threatening and contained information that Ted was breaching his fiduciary duties and misusing trust assets to "protect" himself, even against the advice of counsel, bad decisions by Judge's do happen. It appears the judge subjectively determined what the contents meant and determined that a letter from Ted to me was somehow inadvertent disclosure of a privileged document, despite the fact that it was never privileged in the first place since it was never sent by Ted to his counsel, the ruling may be precedent setting and wholly invalidate the meaning of attorney client privileged communications to a subjective term depending on what the judge thinks people's intent are and not the law? Ted's threats to use trust funds to seek my children's school records to use against them and threats to deposition and legally harass anyone who may be helping me were also ignored by the judge. I may appeal so I am not sure what you are supposed to do in the meantime with your copies, please consult counsel.

Thanks, eb

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein [mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 1:38 PM
To: Andrew R. Dietz @ Rock It Cargo USA; Donna B. Dietz @ Air Apparent
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

I have been notified by counsel for Theodore Bernstein that there was an email that was not supposed to be sent by me as they claim it was privileged and transmitted by mistake to me, although I am the only recipient. The email in questions title was "Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS" and had a letter that started "Alan -..." I do not think I can retransmit it to show you which one but the letter appears to be from Alan Rose to Theodore Bernstein. I am obligated under law to make contact with those I sent it to so that they may retrieve the email but I am not sure if that extends any obligation on the receiving party. Anyhoot, as the email threatens my family it appears and others I detest having to request it back but please do whatever you feel the law requires, as cited below;

RULE 1.285.

INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE OF PRIVILEGED MATERIALS

(a)

Assertion of Privilege as to Inadvertently Disclosed Materials.

Any party, person, or entity, after inadvertent disclosure of any materials pursuant to these rules, may thereafter assert any privilege recognized by law as to those materials. This right exists without regard to whether the disclosure was made pursuant to formal demand or informal request. In order to assert the privilege, the party, person, or entity, shall, within 10 days of actually discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve written notice of the assertion of privilege on the

party to whom the materials were disclosed. The notice shall specify with particularity the materials as to which the privilege is asserted, the nature of the privilege asserted, and the date on which the inadvertent disclosure was actually discovered.

(b)

Duty of the Party Receiving Notice of an Assertion of Privilege. A party receiving notice of an assertion of privilege under subdivision (a) shall promptly return, sequester, or destroy the materials specified in the notice, as well as any copies of the material. The party receiving the notice shall also promptly notify any other party, person, or entity to whom it has disclosed the materials of the fact that the notice has been served and of the effect of this rule. That party shall also take reasonable steps to retrieve the materials disclosed. Nothing herein affects any obligation pursuant to R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4

4.4(b).

(c)

Right to Challenge Assertion of Privilege.

Any party receiving a notice made under subdivision (a) has the right to challenge the assertion of privilege. The grounds for the challenge may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) The materials in question are not privileged.
- (2) The disclosing party, person, or entity lacks standing to assert the privilege.
- (3) The disclosing party, person, or entity has failed to serve timely notice under this rule.
- (4) The circumstances surrounding the production or disclosure of the materials warrant a finding that the disclosing party, person, or entity has waived its assertion that the material is protected by a privilege. April 17, 2014 Florida Rules of Civil Procedure

57

Any party seeking to challenge the assertion of privilege shall do so by serving notice of its challenge on the party, person, or entity asserting the privilege. Notice of the challenge shall be served within 20 days of service of the original notice given by the disclosing party, person, or entity. The notice of the recipient's challenge shall specify the grounds for the challenge. Failure to serve timely notice of challenge is a waiver of the right to challenge.

(d)

Effect of Determination that Privilege Applies. When an order is entered determining that materials are privileged or that the right to challenge the privilege has been waived, the court shall direct what shall be done with the materials and any copies so as to preserve all rights of appellate review. The recipient of the materials shall also give prompt notice of the court's determination to any other party, person, or entity to whom it had disclosed the materials.

From: Ted Bernstein [<mailto:tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 10:52 PM

To: Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Subject: Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Alan - I

df>



Eliot Ivan Bernstein

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein <iviewit@iviewit.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 5:39 PM
To: Scott Banks, President @ Telenet Systems, Inc. (TSI) (sbanks@telenetsystems.us)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Attachments: 20140718 Order Regarding Privilege.pdf

Hi, in furtherance to my email below regarding a message sent to you regarding an alleged privileged document, after a hearing regarding the matter the Court ordered that it was privileged and that I notice all recipients to not distribute that letter and delete it, please take this email as my compliance with that Order. Attached is a copy of the Order. The alleged privileged email header that was sent to you is in the prior email below. While I know many of you thought this email was not privileged and that it was threatening and contained information that Ted was breaching his fiduciary duties and misusing trust assets to "protect" himself, even against the advice of counsel, bad decisions by Judge's do happen. It appears the judge subjectively determined what the contents meant and determined that a letter from Ted to me was somehow inadvertent disclosure of a privileged document, despite the fact that it was never privileged in the first place since it was never sent by Ted to his counsel, the ruling may be precedent setting and wholly invalidate the meaning of attorney client privileged communications to a subjective term depending on what the judge thinks people's intent are and not the law? Ted's threats to use trust funds to seek my children's school records to use against them and threats to deposition and legally harass anyone who may be helping me were also ignored by the judge. I may appeal so I am not sure what you are supposed to do in the meantime with your copies, please consult counsel.

Thanks, eb

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein [mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 1:36 PM
To: Scott Banks, President @ Telenet Systems, Inc. (TSI) (sbanks@telenetsystems.us)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

I have been notified by counsel for Theodore Bernstein that there was an email that was not supposed to be sent by me as they claim it was privileged and transmitted by mistake to me, although I am the only recipient. The email in questions title was "Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS" and had a letter that started "Alan -..." I do not think I can retransmit it to show you which one but the letter appears to be from Alan Rose to Theodore Bernstein. I am obligated under law to make contact with those I sent it to so that they may retrieve the email but I am not sure if that extends any obligation on the receiving party. Anyhoot, as the email threatens my family it appears and others I detest having to request it back but please do whatever you feel the law requires, as cited below;

RULE 1.285.

INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE OF PRIVILEGED MATERIALS

(a)

Assertion of Privilege as to Inadvertently Disclosed Materials.

Any party, person, or entity, after inadvertent disclosure of any materials pursuant to these rules, may thereafter assert any privilege recognized by law as to those materials. This right exists without regard to whether the disclosure was made pursuant to formal demand or informal request. In order to assert the privilege, the party, person, or entity, shall, within 10 days of actually discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve written notice of the assertion of privilege on the

party to whom the materials were disclosed. The notice shall specify with particularity the materials as to which the privilege is asserted, the nature of the privilege asserted, and the date on which the inadvertent disclosure was actually discovered.

(b)

Duty of the Party Receiving Notice of an Assertion of Privilege. A party receiving notice of an assertion of privilege under subdivision (a) shall promptly return, sequester, or destroy the materials specified in the notice, as well as any copies of the material. The party receiving the notice shall also promptly notify any other party, person, or entity to whom it has disclosed the materials of the fact that the notice has been served and of the effect of this rule. That party shall also take reasonable steps to retrieve the materials disclosed. Nothing herein affects any obligation pursuant to R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4

4.4(b).

(c)

Right to Challenge Assertion of Privilege.

Any party receiving a notice made under subdivision (a) has the right to challenge the assertion of privilege. The grounds for the challenge may include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) The materials in question are not privileged.

(2) The disclosing party, person, or entity lacks standing to assert the privilege.

(3) The disclosing party, person, or entity has failed to serve timely notice under this rule.

(4) The circumstances surrounding the production or disclosure of the materials warrant a finding that the disclosing party, person, or entity has waived its assertion that the material is protected by a privilege. April 17, 2014 Florida Rules of Civil Procedure

57

Any party seeking to challenge the assertion of privilege shall do so by serving notice of its challenge on the party, person, or entity asserting the privilege. Notice of the challenge shall be served within 20 days of service of the original notice given by the disclosing party, person, or entity. The notice of the recipient's challenge shall specify the grounds for the challenge. Failure to serve timely notice of challenge is a waiver of the right to challenge.

(d)

Effect of Determination that Privilege Applies. When an order is entered determining that materials are privileged or that the right to challenge the privilege has been waived, the court shall direct what shall be done with the materials and any copies so as to preserve all rights of appellate review. The recipient of the materials shall also give prompt notice of the court's determination to any other party, person, or entity to whom it had disclosed the materials.

From: Ted Bernstein [<mailto:tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 10:52 PM

To: Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Subject: Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Alan - I

df>



Eliot Ivan Bernstein

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein <iviewit@iviewit.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 5:44 PM
To: Caroline Prochotska Rogers Esq. (caroline@cprogers.com); Michele M. Mulrooney ~ Partner @ Venable LLP (mmulrooney@Venable.com); Marc R. Garber Esq. @ Flaster Greenberg P.C. (marcgarber@verizon.net); Marc R. Garber Esq. (marcgarber@gmail.com); Marc R. Garber Esq. @ Flaster Greenberg P.C. (marc.garber@flastergreenberg.com); Andrew R. Dietz @ Rock It Cargo USA; 'tourcandy@gmail.com' (tourcandy@gmail.com); 'Eliot Bernstein (iviewit@iviewit.tv)'
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS
Attachments: 20140718 Order Regarding Privilege.pdf

Hi, in furtherance to my email below regarding a message sent to you regarding an alleged privileged document, after a hearing regarding the matter the Court ordered that it was privileged and that I notice all recipients to not distribute that letter and delete it, please take this email as my compliance with that Order. Attached is a copy of the Order. The alleged privileged email header that was sent to you is in the prior email below. While I know many of you thought this email was not privileged and that it was threatening and contained information that Ted was breaching his fiduciary duties and misusing trust assets to "protect" himself, even against the advice of counsel, bad decisions by Judge's do happen. It appears the judge subjectively determined what the contents meant and determined that a letter from Ted to me was somehow inadvertent disclosure of a privileged document, despite the fact that it was never privileged in the first place since it was never sent by Ted to his counsel, the ruling may be precedent setting and wholly invalidate the meaning of attorney client privileged communications to a subjective term depending on what the judge thinks people's intent are and not the law? Ted's threats to use trust funds to seek my children's school records to use against them and threats to deposition and legally harass anyone who may be helping me were also ignored by the judge. I may appeal so I am not sure what you are supposed to do in the meantime with your copies, please consult counsel.

Thanks, eb

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein [mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 1:44 PM
To: Caroline Prochotska Rogers Esq. (caroline@cprogers.com); Michele M. Mulrooney ~ Partner @ Venable LLP (mmulrooney@Venable.com); Marc R. Garber Esq. @ Flaster Greenberg P.C. (marc.garber@flastergreenberg.com); Marc R. Garber Esq. @ Flaster Greenberg P.C. (marcgarber@verizon.net); Marc R. Garber Esq. @ Flaster Greenberg P.C. (marcgarber@verizon.net); Andrew R. Dietz @ Rock It Cargo USA; "tourcandy@gmail.com" (tourcandy@gmail.com); Eliot I. Bernstein, Inventor ~ Iviewit Technologies, Inc.
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

I have been notified by counsel for Theodore Bernstein that there was an email that was not supposed to be sent by me as they claim it was privileged and transmitted by mistake to me, although I am the only recipient. The email in questions title was "Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS" and had a letter that started "Alan -..." I do not think I can retransmit it to show you which one but the letter appears to be from Alan Rose to Theodore Bernstein. I am obligated under law to make contact with those I sent it to so that they may retrieve the email but I am not sure if that extends any obligation on the receiving party. Anyhoot, as the

email threatens my family it appears and others I detest having to request it back but please do whatever you feel the law requires (including challenging it if you so desire) as cited below;

RULE 1.285.

INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE OF PRIVILEGED MATERIALS

(a)

Assertion of Privilege as to Inadvertently Disclosed Materials.

Any party, person, or entity, after inadvertent disclosure of any materials pursuant to these rules, may thereafter assert any privilege recognized by law as to those materials. This right exists without regard to whether the disclosure was made pursuant to formal demand or informal request. In order to assert the privilege, the party, person, or entity, shall, within 10 days of actually discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve written notice of the assertion of privilege on the party to whom the materials were disclosed. The notice shall specify with particularity the materials as to which the privilege is asserted, the nature of the privilege asserted, and the date on which the inadvertent disclosure was actually discovered.

(b)

Duty of the Party Receiving Notice of an Assertion of Privilege. A party receiving notice of an assertion of privilege under subdivision (a) shall promptly return, sequester, or destroy the materials specified in the notice, as well as any copies of the material. The party receiving the notice shall also promptly notify any other party, person, or entity to whom it has disclosed the materials of the fact that the notice has been served and of the effect of this rule. That party shall also take reasonable steps to retrieve the materials disclosed. Nothing herein affects any obligation pursuant to R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4

-

4.4(b).

(c)

Right to Challenge Assertion of Privilege.

Any party receiving a notice made under subdivision (a) has the right to challenge the assertion of privilege. The grounds for the challenge may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) The materials in question are not privileged.
- (2) The disclosing party, person, or entity lacks standing to assert the privilege.
- (3) The disclosing party, person, or entity has failed to serve timely notice under this rule.
- (4) The circumstances surrounding the production or disclosure of the materials warrant a finding that the disclosing party, person, or entity has waived its assertion that the material is protected by a privilege. April 17, 2014 Florida Rules of Civil Procedure

57

Any party seeking to challenge the assertion of privilege shall do so by serving notice of its challenge on the party, person, or entity asserting the privilege. Notice of the challenge shall be served within 20 days of service of the original notice given by the disclosing party, person, or entity. The notice of the recipient's challenge shall specify the grounds for the challenge. Failure to serve timely notice of challenge is a waiver of the right to challenge.

(d)

Effect of Determination that Privilege Applies. When an order is entered determining that materials are privileged or that the right to challenge the privilege has been waived, the court shall direct what shall be done with the materials and any copies so as to preserve all rights of appellate review. The recipient of the materials shall also give prompt notice of the court's determination to any other party, person, or entity to whom it had disclosed the materials.

From: Ted Bernstein [<mailto:tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 10:52 PM

To: Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Subject: Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS



Alan - I

df>



Eliot Ivan Bernstein

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein <iviewit@iviewit.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 5:44 PM
To: Alison Klimek (alison.lacal@gmail.com)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS
Attachments: 20140718 Order Regarding Privilege.pdf

Hi, in furtherance to my email below regarding a message sent to you regarding an alleged privileged document, after a hearing regarding the matter the Court ordered that it was privileged and that I notice all recipients to not distribute that letter and delete it, please take this email as my compliance with that Order. Attached is a copy of the Order. The alleged privileged email header that was sent to you is in the prior email below. While I know many of you thought this email was not privileged and that it was threatening and contained information that Ted was breaching his fiduciary duties and misusing trust assets to "protect" himself, even against the advice of counsel, bad decisions by Judge's do happen. It appears the judge subjectively determined what the contents meant and determined that a letter from Ted to me was somehow inadvertent disclosure of a privileged document, despite the fact that it was never privileged in the first place since it was never sent by Ted to his counsel, the ruling may be precedent setting and wholly invalidate the meaning of attorney client privileged communications to a subjective term depending on what the judge thinks people's intent are and not the law? Ted's threats to use trust funds to seek my children's school records to use against them and threats to deposition and legally harass anyone who may be helping me were also ignored by the judge. I may appeal so I am not sure what you are supposed to do in the meantime with your copies, please consult counsel.

Thanks, eb

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein [mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 1:44 PM
To: Alison Klimek (alison.lacal@gmail.com)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

I have been notified by counsel for Theodore Bernstein that there was an email that was not supposed to be sent by me as they claim it was privileged and transmitted by mistake to me, although I am the only recipient. The email in questions title was "Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS" and had a letter that started "Alan -..." I do not think I can retransmit it to show you which one but the letter appears to be from Alan Rose to Theodore Bernstein. I am obligated under law to make contact with those I sent it to so that they may retrieve the email but I am not sure if that extends any obligation on the receiving party. Anyhoot, as the email threatens my family it appears and others I detest having to request it back but please do whatever you feel the law requires (including challenging it if you so desire) as cited below;

RULE 1.285.
INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE OF PRIVILEGED MATERIALS
(a)

Assertion of Privilege as to Inadvertently Disclosed Materials.

Any party, person, or entity, after inadvertent disclosure of any materials pursuant to these rules, may thereafter assert any privilege recognized by law as to those materials. This right exists without regard to whether the disclosure was made pursuant to formal demand or informal request. In order to assert the privilege, the party, person, or entity, shall,

within 10 days of actually discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve written notice of the assertion of privilege on the party to whom the materials were disclosed. The notice shall specify with particularity the materials as to which the privilege is asserted, the nature of the privilege asserted, and the date on which the inadvertent disclosure was actually discovered.

(b)

Duty of the Party Receiving Notice of an Assertion of Privilege. A party receiving notice of an assertion of privilege under subdivision (a) shall promptly return, sequester, or destroy the materials specified in the notice, as well as any copies of the material. The party receiving the notice shall also promptly notify any other party, person, or entity to whom it has disclosed the materials of the fact that the notice has been served and of the effect of this rule. That party shall also take reasonable steps to retrieve the materials disclosed. Nothing herein affects any obligation pursuant to R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4

4.4(b).

(c)

Right to Challenge Assertion of Privilege.

Any party receiving a notice made under subdivision (a) has the right to challenge the assertion of privilege. The grounds for the challenge may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) The materials in question are not privileged.
- (2) The disclosing party, person, or entity lacks standing to assert the privilege.
- (3) The disclosing party, person, or entity has failed to serve timely notice under this rule.
- (4) The circumstances surrounding the production or disclosure of the materials warrant a finding that the disclosing party, person, or entity has waived its assertion that the material is protected by a privilege. April 17, 2014 Florida Rules of Civil Procedure

57

Any party seeking to challenge the assertion of privilege shall do so by serving notice of its challenge on the party, person, or entity asserting the privilege. Notice of the challenge shall be served within 20 days of service of the original notice given by the disclosing party, person, or entity. The notice of the recipient's challenge shall specify the grounds for the challenge. Failure to serve timely notice of challenge is a waiver of the right to challenge.

(d)

Effect of Determination that Privilege Applies. When an order is entered determining that materials are privileged or that the right to challenge the privilege has been waived, the court shall direct what shall be done with the materials and any copies so as to preserve all rights of appellate review. The recipient of the materials shall also give prompt notice of the court's determination to any other party, person, or entity to whom it had disclosed the materials.

From: Ted Bernstein [<mailto:tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 10:52 PM

To: Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Subject: Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Alan - I

df>



Eliot Ivan Bernstein

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein <iviewit@iviewit.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 5:44 PM
To: William "Bill" Stansbury (wesgator@msn.com); William "Bill" Stansbury (wesclu@aol.com); Peter Feaman, Esq. ~ Attorney at Law @ Peter M. Feaman, P.A. (pfeaman@feamanlaw.com)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS
Attachments: 20140718 Order Regarding Privilege.pdf

Hi, in furtherance to my email below regarding a message sent to you regarding an alleged privileged document, after a hearing regarding the matter the Court ordered that it was privileged and that I notice all recipients to not distribute that letter and delete it, please take this email as my compliance with that Order. Attached is a copy of the Order. The alleged privileged email header that was sent to you is in the prior email below. While I know many of you thought this email was not privileged and that it was threatening and contained information that Ted was breaching his fiduciary duties and misusing trust assets to "protect" himself, even against the advice of counsel, bad decisions by Judge's do happen. It appears the judge subjectively determined what the contents meant and determined that a letter from Ted to me was somehow inadvertent disclosure of a privileged document, despite the fact that it was never privileged in the first place since it was never sent by Ted to his counsel, the ruling may be precedent setting and wholly invalidate the meaning of attorney client privileged communications to a subjective term depending on what the judge thinks people's intent are and not the law? Ted's threats to use trust funds to seek my children's school records to use against them and threats to deposition and legally harass anyone who may be helping me were also ignored by the judge. I may appeal so I am not sure what you are supposed to do in the meantime with your copies, please consult counsel.

Thanks, eb

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein [mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 1:42 PM
To: William "Bill" Stansbury (wesgator@msn.com); William "Bill" Stansbury (wesclu@aol.com); Peter Feaman, Esq. ~ Attorney at Law @ Peter M. Feaman, P.A. (pfeaman@feamanlaw.com)
Subject: FW: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

I have been notified by counsel for Theodore Bernstein that there was an email that was not supposed to be sent by me as they claim it was privileged and transmitted by mistake to me, although I am the only recipient. The email in questions title was "Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS" and had a letter that started "Alan -..." I do not think I can retransmit it to show you which one but the letter appears to be from Alan Rose to Theodore Bernstein. I am obligated under law to make contact with those I sent it to so that they may retrieve the email but I am not sure if that extends any obligation on the receiving party. Anyhoot, as the email threatens my family it appears and others I detest having to request it back but please do whatever you feel the law requires (including challenging it if you so desire) as cited below;

RULE 1.285.
INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE OF PRIVILEGED MATERIALS
(a)
Assertion of Privilege as to Inadvertently Disclosed Materials.



Any party, person, or entity, after inadvertent disclosure of any materials pursuant to these rules, may thereafter assert any privilege recognized by law as to those materials. This right exists without regard to whether the disclosure was made pursuant to formal demand or informal request. In order to assert the privilege, the party, person, or entity, shall, within 10 days of actually discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve written notice of the assertion of privilege on the party to whom the materials were disclosed. The notice shall specify with particularity the materials as to which the privilege is asserted, the nature of the privilege asserted, and the date on which the inadvertent disclosure was actually discovered.

(b)

Duty of the Party Receiving Notice of an Assertion of Privilege. A party receiving notice of an assertion of privilege under subdivision (a) shall promptly return, sequester, or destroy the materials specified in the notice, as well as any copies of the material. The party receiving the notice shall also promptly notify any other party, person, or entity to whom it has disclosed the materials of the fact that the notice has been served and of the effect of this rule. That party shall also take reasonable steps to retrieve the materials disclosed. Nothing herein affects any obligation pursuant to R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4

-

4.4(b).

(c)

Right to Challenge Assertion of Privilege.

Any party receiving a notice made under subdivision (a) has the right to challenge the assertion of privilege. The grounds for the challenge may include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) The materials in question are not privileged.

(2) The disclosing party, person, or entity lacks standing to assert the privilege.

(3) The disclosing party, person, or entity has failed to serve timely notice under this rule.

(4) The circumstances surrounding the production or disclosure of the materials warrant a finding that the disclosing party, person, or entity has waived its assertion that the material is protected by a privilege. April 17, 2014 Florida Rules of Civil Procedure

57

Any party seeking to challenge the assertion of privilege shall do so by serving notice of its challenge on the party, person, or entity asserting the privilege. Notice of the challenge shall be served within 20 days of service of the original notice given by the disclosing party, person, or entity. The notice of the recipient's challenge shall specify the grounds for the challenge. Failure to serve timely notice of challenge is a waiver of the right to challenge.

(d)

Effect of Determination that Privilege Applies. When an order is entered determining that materials are privileged or that the right to challenge the privilege has been waived, the court shall direct what shall be done with the materials and any copies so as to preserve all rights of appellate review. The recipient of the materials shall also give prompt notice of the court's determination to any other party, person, or entity to whom it had disclosed the materials.

From: Ted Bernstein [<mailto:tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2014 10:52 PM

To: Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Subject: Re: SERVICE OF COURT DOCUMENT - CASE NUMBER 502012CP004391XXXXSB - OBJECTION TO FINAL ACCOUNTING AND PETITION FOR FORMAL, DETAILED, AUDITED AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Alan - I

df>



Eliot Ivan Bernstein

From: Eliot Ivan Bernstein <iviewit@iviewit.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 6:02 PM
To: William "Bill" Stansbury (wesgator@msn.com); William "Bill" Stansbury (wesclu@aol.com)
Subject: Barbara Katz Silberman case re Tescher Chavez case again re distributions
Attachments: Barbara Katz Silberman Case.pdf

Interesting language here and interesting connection to Tescher's firm again.

Eliot I. Bernstein
Inventor
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL
2753 N.W. 34th St.
Boca Raton, Florida 33434-3459
(561) 245.8588 (o)
(561) 886.7628 (c)
(561) 245-8644 (f)
iviewit@iviewit.tv
<http://www.iviewit.tv>

NOTICE: Due to Presidential Executive Orders, the National Security Agency may have read this email without warning, warrant, or notice. They may do this without any judicial or legislative oversight and it can happen to ordinary Americans like you and me. You have no recourse nor protection save to vote against any incumbent endorsing such unlawful acts.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This message and any attachments are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 55 2510-2521. This e-mail message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message or call (561) 245-8588. If you are the intended recipient but do not wish to receive communications through this medium, please so advise the sender immediately.

*The Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 119 Sections 2510-2521 et seq., governs distribution of this "Message," including attachments. The originator intended this Message for the specified recipients only; it may contain the originator's confidential and proprietary information. The originator hereby notifies unintended recipients that they have received this Message in error, and strictly proscribes their Message review, dissemination, copying, and content-based actions. Recipients-in-error shall notify the originator immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message. Authorized carriers of this message shall expeditiously deliver this Message to intended recipients. See: Quon v. Arch. *Wireless Copyright Notice*. Federal and State laws govern copyrights to this Message. You must have the originator's full written consent to alter, copy, or use this Message. Originator acknowledges others' copyrighted content in this Message. Otherwise, Copyright © 2011 by originator Eliot Ivan Bernstein, iviewit@iviewit.tv and www.iviewit.tv. All Rights Reserved.



Candice M. Bernstein

From: Candice M. Bernstein
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 6:04 PM
To: 'tourcandy@gmail.com' (tourcandy@gmail.com)
Subject: barbara silberman case
Attachments: Barbara Katz Silberman Case.pdf

Eliot I. Bernstein
Inventor
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL
2753 N.W. 34th St.
Boca Raton, Florida 33434-3459
(561) 245.8588 (o)
(561) 886.7628 (c)
(561) 245-8644 (f)
iviewit@iviewit.tv
<http://www.iviewit.tv>

NOTICE: Due to Presidential Executive Orders, the National Security Agency may have read this email without warning, warrant, or notice. They may do this without any judicial or legislative oversight and it can happen to ordinary Americans like you and me. You have no recourse nor protection save to vote against any incumbent endorsing such unlawful acts.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This message and any attachments are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. SS 2510-2521. This e-mail message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message or call (561) 245-8588. If you are the intended recipient but do not wish to receive communications through this medium, please so advise the sender immediately.

*The Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 119 Sections 2510-2521 et seq., governs distribution of this "Message," including attachments. The originator intended this Message for the specified recipients only; it may contain the originator's confidential and proprietary information. The originator hereby notifies unintended recipients that they have received this Message in error, and strictly proscribes their Message review, dissemination, copying, and content-based actions. Recipients-in-error shall notify the originator immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message. Authorized carriers of this message shall expeditiously deliver this Message to intended recipients. See: Quon v. Arch.

Wireless Copyright Notice. Federal and State laws govern copyrights to this Message. You must have the originator's full written consent to alter, copy, or use this Message. Originator acknowledges others' copyrighted content in this Message. Otherwise, Copyright © 2011 by originator Eliot Ivan Bernstein, iviewit@iviewit.tv and www.iviewit.tv. All Rights Reserved.

