IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA FOURTH DISTRICT, 1525 PALM BEACH LAKES BLVD., WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401

CASE NO.: 4D16-0222

L.T. No.: 502014CP003698XXXXNB;

L.T. No.: 2011CP000653 XXXXSB

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN v. Ted Bernstein, acting as alleged Trustee of

the Shirley Bernstein Trust, et al

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Appellant / Petitioner(s) Appellee / Respondent(s)

**APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR REHEARING, CLARIFICATION, WRITTEN DECISION AND CERTIFICATION UNDER FLORIDA RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 9.330**

COMES NOW Eliot Bernstein, Appellant Pro se, who respectfully pleads and prays before this Court as follows:

1. I am the Appellant pro se and file this motion for Rehearing, clarification, for a written decision and to certify this matter to the Florida Supreme Court.
2. Respectfully, this Court has overlooked or misapprehended material facts and misapplied the law to the case and the Per Curiam Affirmance must now be reversed and the Final Judgment vacated and remanded to the Lower Tribunal for further proceedings including a New Trial.
3. There are multiple key facts overlooked by this Court and rehearing must be granted.
4. The mere fact that “missing Witness” Donald Tescher who was one lead Estate Planning Partner and drafter in both Shirley and Simon’s Estate and Trust cases and also was Co-Trustee and Co-Pr of the Estate and Trust of Simon until removed after admissions of fraud and forgery by their law firm was not available, never had a proper pre-trial Deposition but who further authored a resignation Letter claiming the Shirley Trust was not what was presented during the Trial by Appellees made Tescher an indispensable Witness and the fact that the pre-determined artificial “limit” to a one day Trial did not provide adequate time for this Witness to be called necessitates a New trial. See, Jan. 2014 Tescher Spallina Resignation Letter, ROA \_\_\_. ( **Note: Lower Tribunal Judge Scher has now issued an Order of April 27, 2017 showing Appellant as a “Beneficiary” in the Simon Bernstein Estate making the entire Validity Trial proceedings subject to being vacated under fraud and misconduct standards as well due to Appellee and Attorney Alan Rose conduct before Judge Phillips in the proceedings Scheduling the Validity Trial).**
5. Courts should not countenance or tolerate actions during litigation that are not  
   forthright and that are designed to delay and obfuscate the discovery process. See,  
   Bainter v. League of Women Voters of Fla., 150 So. 3d 1115, 1129 (Fla. 2014).  
   An orderly trial is most likely to occur when the judge enforces discovery and  
   pretrial orders strictly and requires each party to make full and proper disclosure  
   before trial. **The Record on Appeal in this case shows repeated denial of Discovery to Appellant spanning years.**
6. The Fourth District Court of Appeal in Central Square Tarragon LLC v. Great  
   Divide Insurance Company, reiterated the need to “strictly enforce” provisions of  
   pretrial stipulations. This prevents last minute gamesmanship, and makes   
   disruption of the trial and error on appeal less likely. Generally, last-minute  
   additions of witnesses and substantial changes to testimony should not be  
   admissible at trial. Failure to exclude such testimony prejudices the opposing party  
   and constitutes reversible error.
7. In this case, there was no Orderly pre-trial procedures which were abandoned in  
   their entirety by the lower tribunal who Ordered a Trial in a case not even Noticed  
   for Case Management.
8. There was no inspection of evidence pre-trial despite last minute “originals” offered by Alan Rose See (ROA2 Pages #001560 - #001577 -Motion for Continuance and Stay.)
9. With fraud shown in dispositive documents by fiduciaries and no Originals being made available the Court abused its discretion in formulating improper pre-trial truth seeking procedures, failing to determine outstanding discovery and records and the need for Experts and pre-trial Depositions.
10. Appellees never produced several of the Trusts expressly named in the Shirley Trust such as the Family Trust, Marital Trust and Eliot Family Trust which have never been produced to this day. Clearly these documents were relevant to determine the overall Estate planning scheme and validity of the main document itself.
11. There are alleged subtrusts that are alleged beneficiaries of the Simon Bernstein Trust dated 9/13/2012 for 10 grandchildren that neither the Simon Bernstein Trust dated 9/13/2012 has never been produced nor were produced at the Validity Hearing, nor any subtrusts for the alleged beneficiaries. Thus, more “missing documents” and “missing evidence”, “missing Discovery” which was clearly relevant at Trial and a new Trial must be ordered. ( Note: Appellee’s Attorney Alan Rose has now filed recent documents in the Lower Tribunal claiming the Trusts were of a DIFFERENT DATE, 7/25/12, NOT 9/13/12 but have not disclosed either set ).
12. That Eliot Bernstein was sued as the Trustee of the Simon Bernstein Trust dated 9/13/2012 as Trustee of trusts for his children in the Shirley Bernstein Trust action before this Court and to date this Simon Bernstein Trust and the children’s subtrusts that are alleged beneficiaries of the Shirley Bernstein IRREVOCABLE Trust were never produced to the Lower Court at the Validity Trial and to date have never been produced.
13. Lacking the Simon Bernstein Trust dated 9/13/2012 that Eliot Bernstein and his children were sued under the Lower Court and this Court lack jurisdiction over the parties sued in this matter.
14. The true and proper beneficiaries of the Shirley Bernstein Trust were not sued in the action, namely, Eliot Bernstein, Lisa Friedstein and Jill Iantoni as so defined in the alleged “Valid” trust on record with the Court.
15. Appellant’s May 2013 Emergency Motion was sufficient to be deemed a Petition  
    to revoke probate Admin in both the Shirley and Simon Estate cases. The vast  
    majority of the motion having never been addressed by the lower tribunals was not  
    only an abuse of Discretion but also in violation of the State Court fraud policy  
    rendering the Judgement void and should be vacated and reversed. See (ROA1  
    Pages 000560 - # - #001040 Emergency Motion and Statewide Court Fraud Policy  
    already exhibited herein.)
16. As this Court has already made clear, “While the complaint at issue is not a model  
    of clarity, we find that it adequately constituted a will contest. “A petition for  
    revocation of probate shall state the interest of the petitioner in the estate and the  
    facts constituting the grounds on which revocation is demanded.” Fla. Prob. R.  
    5.270(a). “All technical forms of pleadings are abolished” and “[n]o defect of  
    forms impairs substantial rights.” Fla. Prob. R. 5.020(a). Though the complaint  
    does not specifically identify the 2005 will, count I challenges the validity of all  
    testamentary documents executed after 2000[, thus by implication challenging the  
    2005 will] . . . Additionally, the complaint was filed in response to the notice of  
    administration of the 2005 will, wherein the decedent completely revoked the  
    Pasquales’ interest in the trust.Compare Feather v. Sanko’s Estate, 390 So.2d 746,  
    747 (Fla. 5th DCA 1980) (interpreting older version of probate code, finding that  
    pleading filed by decedent’s disinherited child, entitled “Notice of Appearance,”  
    was sufficient to contest will where pleading stated that she had interest in estate,  
    and the will at issue disinherited her, making it clear that she opposed it)”. . . .See,  
    Pasquale v. Loving (Fla. 4th DCA March 21, 2012)
17. Non-Existent Entities were Sued such as Trusts allegedly created Sept. 13, 2012 on the date Simon Bernstein passed away, trusts which have never to this day been disclosed or produced.
18. There were Missing Indispensable Parties such as Minor children Beneficiaries which violated procedural and substantive due process and improper Notice making the Trial a “surprise” to such an extent the Judgement must be reversed entirely.
19. Ted Bernstein sued entities which do not exist, have never existed and thus  
    lacked the capacity to be sued such as suing Eliot as Trustee of Trusts dated  
    9/13/12 which never existed and were never turned over and never shown to  
    Appellant.
20. Ted Bernstein also failed to sue indispensable parties such as Appellant’s minor and adult children and the Court further abused its discretion in denying counsel for such Parties.
21. Generally, beneficiaries are necessary parties to a suit by or against a trustee  
    relating to the trust or its property. In those cases where the issue is whether or not  
    the trust instrument is valid, the law is clear in Florida that the beneficiaries are  
    proper and necessary parties but here, the Minor children were not only not properly named but had no Representation at Trial and the Trial court abused its discretion in denying a Continuance for attorney Schwager to be admitted pro hac vice.
22. Yet all of these facts have been overlooked by this Court or disregarded.
23. “Florida has long followed the rule that the beneficiaries of a trust are indispensable parties to a suit having the termination of the beneficiaries’ interest  
    as its ultimate goal.” Fulmer v. N. Cent. Bank, 386 So. 2d 856, 858 (Fla. 2d DCA  
    1980) (citing Byers v. Beddow, 142 So. 894, 896 (Fla. 1932), which held that a  
    court called upon “to dissolve or terminate a trust . . . must decline to act when  
    there are, or may be, persons interested in the trust who are not before the court”).  
    “Indispensable parties are necessary parties so essential to a suit that no final  
    decision can be rendered without their joinder.” Sudhoff v. Fed. Nat’l Mortgage  
    Ass’n, 942 So. 2d 425, 427 (Fla. 5th DCA 2006)…Crescenze v. Bothe, et al, 34 Fla.L.Weekly D284a (Fla.2nd DCA Case 2D08-2202, February 4, 2009)/
24. There was sufficient proof in the Record existed to Raise Undue Influence at least in the Simon Bernstein case and it was error to not shift the burden and further  
    error to deny proper pre-trial procedures and limit the Trial to “one day”.
25. F.S. §733.107(2) specifically mandates that the “presumption of undue influence  
    implements public policy . . . and is therefore a presumption shifting the burden of  
    proof under ss. 90.301–90.304.” Accordingly, when the presumption of undue  
    influence arises, the alleged wrongdoer bears the burden of proving there was no  
    undue influence.
26. Undue influence is rarely susceptible of direct proof because of secret or private  
    dealings between the decedent and the alleged wrongdoer; the latter typically  
    testifies that he did nothing wrong, and the decedent never testifies to the contrary.  
    Self-serving testimony of the alleged wrongdoer is inherently suspect, but is often  
    difficult to overcome for lack of more compelling direct evidence.
27. The April 9, 2012 document alone shows facial undue influence of Simon  
    Bernstein as assuming arguendo this was his signature, it was clearly done  
    fraudulently as Simon knew the Waivers had not been signed for the Petition for  
    Discharge. See ROA1 \_\_\_ .
28. Further is the very need for the “May 2012” family meeting and Simon’s fiduciary Spallina communicating confidential information to Pam Simon about being cut out of the Wills and Trusts which presumably was communicated to Ted Bernstein who had a long standing business relationship with Spallina and brought Spallina and Tescher into Simon’s life.
29. Further, if Simon was truly so “poor” as Ted Bernstein would suggest while the Appellee and Estate have failed to account for literally millions of dollars of assets documented, this would be reflective of undue influence on Simon as well and so is the alleged “absence” of all of Simon’s records reflective of undue influence that should have been fully heard and a new trial is needed.
30. The face of the Records such as the April 9, 2012 Petition for Discharge in the Shirley Bernstein Estate case, clearly fraudulent document signed by Fiduciary Spallina and allegedly signed by Simon Bernstein created sufficient presumption of undue influence on Simon prior to any alleged changed to his Will and Trust in July 2012. Ted Bernstein did not rebut said undue influence nor was one day sufficient for such a trial. The missing mail, missing records, missing discovery, missing account statements and missing millions are sufficient to support and bolster the undue influence Simon Bernstein was under rendering any changes to his Will and Trust in 2012 invalid. The Court abused its discretion by not applying adverse inferences against Ted Bernstein for missing and spoliation of evidence and records and failure to call the other witnesses at Trial.
31. The Court abused its discretion by not structuring pre-trial procedures to establish  
    this challenge to the Wills and Trusts and by limiting the Trial to one day.
32. Moreover, for Shirley to allegedly have made Ted a “trustee” when otherwise  
    making him “pre-deceased” is reflective of some improper influence particularly  
    where Simon’s 2008 documents named William Stansbury to all fiduciary  
    positions and the documents were supposed to “mirror” each other. A new trial  
    must be ordered.
33. Moreover, there being no basis legally to alter Shirley’s Trust after it became “irrevocable”, the great efforts of Ted and Spallina to allegedly due so through an alleged Power of Appointment is reflective of the undue influence on Simon.
34. Further, denial of proper discovery of all the missing records, mails,  
    accounts and monies improperly precluded this challenge to the Wills and Trusts.
35. Florida Rules of Civil Procedure 1.200 provides in part that, “PRETRIAL  
    PROCEDURE (a) Case Management Conference. At any time after responsive  
    pleadings or motions are due, the court may order, or a party, by serving a notice,  
    may convene, a case management conference. The matter to be considered shall  
    be specified in the order or notice setting the conference.” ( emphasis added ).
36. In this case, the lower tribunal clearly Ordered a Trial in a case that was not  
    noticed for Case-Management in violation of the Rules of Procedure, procedural  
    due process and then denying Appellant a fair opportunity to be heard to clarify the  
    matter violating substantive due process. See, (Appendix #14 - September 15th,  
    2015 Transcript.) See further, (APPENDIX #24 - Case-Management Notice in the  
    Simon Bernstein Estate case.)
37. “The goals of these procedural rules are "to eliminate surprise, to encourage  
    settlement, and to assist in arriving at the truth." Spencer v. Beverly, 307 So.2d  
    461, 462 (Fla. 4th DCA 1975) (Downey, J., concurring), cert. denied, 314 So.2d  
    590 (Fla. 1975). We recently reiterated those goals. “A search for truth and justice  
    can be accomplished only when all relevant facts are before the judicial tribunal.  
    Those relevant facts should be the determining factor rather than gamesmanship,  
    surprise, or superior trial tactics. Dodson v. Persell, 390 So.2d 704, 707 (Fla. 1980).” See, BINGER v. KING PEST CONTROL, 401 So.2d 1310 (1981).
38. As the Florida Supreme Court said in Dodson v. Persell, 390 So.2d 704, 707 (Fla.  
    1980), “The goals underlying discovery practice are readily apparent in Florida  
    Rules of Civil Procedure 1.200(c), which provides that a trial court's pretrial order  
    detailing the agreements made by the parties "shall control the subsequent course  
    of the action unless modified at the trial to prevent injustice." Consistent with this  
    rule, we now hold that a pretrial order directing the parties to exchange the names  
    of witnesses requires a listing or notification of all witnesses that the parties  
    reasonably foresee will be called to testify, whether for substantive, corroborative,  
    impeachment or rebuttal purposes. Obviously, a general reference to "any and all  
    necessary" impeachment or rebuttal witnesses, as was the case here, constitutes  
    inadequate disclosure.”
39. These procedures were lacking herein and the Final Judgement must now be  
    vacated and reversed on grounds of Due Process, violation of Procedural Rules, violation of standard 15th Judicial Pre Trial Order requirements, abusing discretion by denying lack of time for Necessary witnesses such as Donald Tescher, Traci Kratish, Kimberly Moran and others, failure to have Original documents or allow inspection, failure to have pre-trial depositions, failure to Name and serve Beneficiaries and indispensable parties.
40. The parties and public as a whole would benefit from a written decision and clarification on all of these matters.
41. The Decision herein directly conflicts with the mandates of the Florida Supreme Court in Dodson v. Persell, 390 So.2d 704, 707 (Fla. 1980).” and BINGER v. KING PEST CONTROL, 401 So.2d 1310 (1981) and the other District Courts of Appeal such as Vollmer v, Key Dev. Props., 966 So.2d 1022, 1027 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2007) and ”K.G. v. Fla. Dep’t of Children & Families, 66 So. 3d 366 (Fla. 1st DCA 2011) and Fulmer v. N. Cent. Bank, 386 So. 2d 856, 858 (Fla. 2d DCA  
    1980) (citing Byers v. Beddow, 142 So. 894, 896 (Fla. 1932).
42. Thus, this case must otherwise be Certified for review to the Florida Supreme Court.   
    The Judgment must now be reversed and vacated.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully prayed for an Order granting the rehearing, reversing and vacating the Per Curiam affirmance and Final Judgment of the lower court, and remanding the case to the Lower Tribunal for further proceedings and new Trial or alternatively issuing a detailed written decision and clarification of the Order and certifying the matter to the Florida Supreme Court and for such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: May 27th, 2017

**/s/ Eliot Ivan Bernstein**

Eliot Ivan Bernstein

2753 NW 34th St.

Boca Raton, FL 33434

561-245-8588

iviewit@iviewit.tv

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the within has been served upon all parties on

the attached Service List by E-Mail Electronic Transmission, Court ECF on this

27th day of May, 2017.

**/s/ Eliot Ivan Bernstein**

Eliot Ivan Bernstein

2753 NW 34th St.

Boca Raton, FL 33434

561-245-8588

iviewit@iviewit.tv

**SERVICE LIST**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| John P. Morrissey, Esq.  330 Clematis Street, Suite 213  West Palm Beach, FL 33401  (561) 833-0766-Telephone  (561) 833-0867 -Facsimile  Email: John P. Morrissey  (iohn@jrnoiTisseylaw.com) | Lisa Friedstein  2142 Churchill Lane Highland Park, IL 60035  lisa@friedsteins.com |
| Peter M. Feaman, Esq.  Peter M. Feaman, P.A.  3695 West Boynton Beach Blvd., Suite 9  Boynton Beach, FL 33436  (561) 734-5552 -Telephone  (561) 734-5554 -Facsimile  Email: service@feamanlaw.com:  mkoskey@feamanlaw.com | Jill Iantoni  2101 Magnolia Lane Highland Park, IL 60035  jilliantoni@gmail.com |
| Gary R. Shendell, Esq.  Kenneth S. Pollock, Esq.  Shendell & Pollock, P.L.  2700 N. Military Trail,  Suite 150  Boca Raton, FL 33431  (561)241-2323 - Telephone (561)241-2330-Facsimile  Email: gary@shendellpollock.com  ken@shendellpollock.com  estella@shendellpollock.com  britt@shendellpollock.com  grs@shendellpollock.com | Counter Defendant  Robert Spallina, Esq.  Donald Tescher, Esq.  Tescher & Spallina  925 South Federal Hwy., Suite 500  Boca Raton, Florida 33432 |
| Brian M. O'Connell, Esq.  Joielle A. Foglietta, Esq.  Ciklin Lubitz Martens & O'Connell  515 N. Flagler Dr., 20th Floor  West Palm Beach, FL 33401  561-832-5900-Telephone  561-833-4209 - Facsimile  Email: boconnell@ciklinlubitz.com;  ifoglietta@ciklinlubitz.com;  service@ciklinlubitz.com;  slobdell@ciklinliibitz.com | Counter Defendant  John J. Pankauski, Esq.  Pankauski Law Firm PLLC  120 South Olive Avenue  7th Floor  West Palm Beach, FL 33401  courtfilings@pankauskilawfirm.com  john@pankauskilawfirm.com |
| Counter Defendant  Mark R. Manceri, Esq., and  Mark R. Manceri, P.A.,  2929 East Commercial Boulevard  Suite 702  Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308  mrmlaw@comcast.net | Counter Defendant  Donald Tescher, Esq.,  Tescher & Spallina, P.A.  Wells Fargo Plaza  925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500  Boca Raton, Florida 33432  dtescher@tescherspallina.com |
| Theodore Stuart Bernstein  880 Berkeley  Boca Raton, FL 33487  tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com | Counter Defendant  TESCHER & SPALLINA, *P.A.*.  Wells Fargo Plaza  925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500  Boca Raton, Florida 33432  dtescher@tescherspallina.com |
| Theodore Stuart Bernstein  Life Insurance Concepts, Inc.  950 Peninsula Corporate Circle  Suite 3010  Boca Raton, FL 33487  tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com | Counter Defendant  Alan B. Rose, Esq.  PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD, ROSE, KONOPKA, THOMAS & WEISS, P.A.  505 South Flagler Drive, Suite 600  West Palm Beach, Florida 33401  561-355-6991  arose@pm-law.com  arose@mrachek-law.com |
| Pamela Beth Simon  950 N. Michigan Avenue  Apartment 2603  Chicago, IL 60611  psimon@stpcorp.com | Counter Defendant  L. Louis Mrachek, Esq.  PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD, ROSE, KONOPKA, THOMAS & WEISS, P.A.  505 South Flagler Drive, Suite 600  West Palm Beach, Florida 33401  561-355-6991  lmrachek@mrachek-law.com |
| Jill Iantoni  2101 Magnolia Lane  Highland Park, IL 60035  jilliantoni@gmail.com | Counter Defendant  Pankauski Law Firm PLLC  120 South Olive Avenue  7th Floor  West Palm Beach, FL 33401 |
| Lisa Sue Friedstein  2142 Churchill Lane  Highland Park, IL 60035  lisa.friedstein@gmail.com  lisa@friedsteins.com | Dennis McNamara  Executive Vice President and General Counsel  Oppenheimer & Co. Inc.  Corporate Headquarters  125 Broad Street  New York, NY 10004  800-221-5588  Dennis.mcnamara@opco.com  info@opco.com |
| Dennis G. Bedley  Chairman of the Board, Director and Chief Executive Officer  Legacy Bank of Florida  Glades Twin Plaza  2300 Glades Road  Suite 120 West – Executive Office  Boca Raton, FL 33431  info@legacybankfl.com  DBedley@LegacyBankFL.com | Hunt Worth, Esq.  President  Oppenheimer Trust Company of Delaware  405 Silverside Road  Wilmington, DE 19809  302-792-3500  hunt.worth@opco.com |
| James Dimon  Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer  JP Morgan Chase & CO.  270 Park Ave. New York, NY 10017-2070  Jamie.dimon@jpmchase.com | Neil Wolfson  President & Chief Executive Officer  Wilmington Trust Company  1100 North Market Street  Wilmington, DE 19890-0001  nwolfson@wilmingtontrust.com |
| William McCabe  Oppenheimer & Co., Inc.  85 Broad St Fl 25  New York, NY 10004  William.McCabe@opco.com | STP Enterprises, Inc.  303 East Wacker Drive  Suite 210  Chicago IL 60601-5210  psimon@stpcorp.com |
| Charles D. Rubin  Managing Partner  Gutter Chaves Josepher Rubin Forman Fleisher Miller PA  Boca Corporate Center  2101 NW Corporate Blvd., Suite 107  Boca Raton, FL 33431-7343  crubin@floridatax.com | Ralph S. Janvey  Krage & Janvey, L.L.P.  Federal Court Appointed Receiver  Stanford Financial Group  2100 Ross Ave, Dallas, TX 75201  rjanvey@kjllp.com |
| Kimberly Moran  Tescher & Spallina, P.A.  Wells Fargo Plaza  925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500  Boca Raton, Florida 33432  kmoran@tescherspallina.com | Lindsay Baxley aka Lindsay Giles  Life Insurance Concepts  950 Peninsula Corporate Circle  Suite 3010  Boca Raton, FL 33487  lindsay@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com |
| Gerald R. Lewin  CBIZ MHM, LLC  1675 N Military Trail  Fifth Floor  Boca Raton, FL 33486 | CBIZ MHM, LLC  General Counsel  6480 Rockside Woods Blvd. South  Suite 330  Cleveland, OH 44131  ATTN: General Counsel  generalcounsel@cbiz.com  (216)447-9000 |
| Albert Gortz, Esq.  Proskauer Rose LLP  One Boca Place  2255 Glades Road  Suite 421 Atrium  Boca Raton, FL 33431-7360  agortz@proskauer.com | Heritage Union Life Insurance Company  A member of WiltonRe Group of Companies  187 Danbury Road  Wilton, CT 06897  cstroup@wiltonre.com |
| Estate of Simon Bernstein  Brian M O'Connell Pa  515 N Flagler Drive  West Palm Beach, FL 33401  boconnell@ciklinlubitz.com | Counter Defendant  Steven Lessne, Esq.  Gray Robinson, PA  225 NE Mizner Blvd #500  Boca Raton, FL 33432  steven.lessne@gray-robinson.com |
| Byrd F. "Biff" Marshall, Jr.  President & Managing Director  Gray Robinson, PA  225 NE Mizner Blvd #500  Boca Raton, FL 33432  biff.marshall@gray-robinson.com | Steven A. Lessne, Esq.  Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.  777 South Flagler Drive, Suite 500 East  West Palm Beach, FL 33401  Telephone: (561) 650-0545  Facsimile: (561) 655-5677  E-Mail Designations:  slessne@gunster.com  jhoppel@gunster.com  eservice@gunster.com |
| T&S Registered Agents, LLC  Wells Fargo Plaza  925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500  Boca Raton, Florida 33432  dtescher@tescherspallina.com | David Lanciotti  Executive VP and General Counsel  LaSalle National Trust NA  CHICAGO TITLE LAND TRUST COMPANY, as Successor  10 South LaSalle Street  Suite 2750  Chicago, IL 60603  David.Lanciotti@ctt.com |
| Joseph M. Leccese  Chairman  Proskauer Rose LLP  Eleven Times Square  New York, NY 10036  jleccese@proskauer.com | Brian Moynihan  Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer  100 N Tryon St #170, Charlotte, NC 28202  Phone:(980) 335-3561 |
| ADR & MEDIATIONS SERVICES, LLC  Diana Lewis  2765 Tecumseh Drive  West Palm Beach, FL 33409  (561) 758-3017 Telephone  Email: dzlewis@aol.com  (Fla. Bar No. 351350) |  |