



conflict with rules, Decisions and Opinions of other Florida District Courts of Appeal.

Dated: July 05, 2017

**/s/ Eliot Ivan Bernstein**

Eliot Ivan Bernstein, PRO SE

2753 NW 34th St.

Boca Raton, FL 33434

561-245-8588

[iviewit@iviewit.tv](mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished to parties listed on attached Service List by E-mail Electronic Transmission; Court ECF; this 5th day of July, 2017.

**/s/ Eliot Ivan Bernstein**

Eliot Ivan Bernstein, PRO SE

2753 NW 34th St.

Boca Raton, FL

33434

561-245-8588

[iviewit@iviewit.tv](mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv)

**SERVICE LIST LOWER CASES DEFENDANTS, RESPONDENTS,  
COUNTER DEFENDANTS**

<p>Pamela Beth Simon 950 N. Michigan Avenue</p> <p>Apartment 2603 Chicago, IL 60611 psimon@stpcorp.com</p>	<p>Alan B. Rose, Esq. Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald &amp; 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 mchandler@mrachek-law.com</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>Robert L. Spallina, Esq., Tescher &amp; 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>	<p>Lisa Friedstein 2142 Churchill Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 Lisa@friedsteins.com lisa.friedstein@gmail.com lisa@friedsteins.com</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>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>Donald Tescher, Esq., Tescher &amp; 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>Jill Iantoni 2101 Magnolia Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 jilliantoni@gmail.com</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>Kimberly Moran kmoran@tescherspallina.com</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>Carley &amp; 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>Lindsay Baxley aka Lindsay Giles lindsay@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com</p>	<p>Brian M. O'Connell, Esq. Joielle A. Foglietta, Esq. Ciklin Lubitz Martens &amp; 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</p>
--	---	--

<p>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 (john@jmoiTisseylaw.com)</p>	<p>Gary R. Shendell, Esq. Kenneth S. Pollock, Esq. Shendell &amp; 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</p>
<p>Theodore Stuart Bernstein 880 Berkeley Boca Raton, FL 33487 tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com</p>	<p>Counter Defendant TESCHER &amp; SPALLINA, P.A.. Wells Fargo Plaza 925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500 Boca Raton, Florida 33432 dtescher@tescherspallina.com</p>
<p>Theodore Stuart Bernstein Life Insurance Concepts, Inc. 950 Peninsula Corporate Circle Suite 3010 Boca Raton, FL 33487 tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com</p>	<p>Counter Defendant Alan B. Rose, Esq. PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD, ROSE, KONOPKA, THOMAS &amp; 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</p>

<p>Pamela Beth Simon  950 N. Michigan Avenue  Apartment 2603  Chicago, IL 60611  psimon@stpcorp.com</p>	<p>Counter Defendant  L. Louis Mrachek, Esq.  PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD, ROSE,  KONOPKA, THOMAS &amp; WEISS, P.A.  505 South Flagler Drive, Suite 600  West Palm Beach, Florida 33401  561-355-6991  lmrachek@mrachek-law.com</p>
<p>Jill Iantoni  2101 Magnolia Lane  Highland Park, IL 60035  jilliantoni@gmail.com</p>	<p>Counter Defendant  Pankauski Law Firm PLLC  120 South Olive Avenue  7th Floor  West Palm Beach, FL 33401</p>
<p>Lisa Sue Friedstein  2142 Churchill Lane  Highland Park, IL 60035  lisa.friedstein@gmail.com  lisa@friedsteins.com</p>	<p>Dennis McNamara  Executive Vice President and General Counsel   Oppenheimer &amp; Co. Inc.  Corporate Headquarters  125 Broad Street  New York, NY 10004  800-221-5588  Dennis.mcnamara@opco.com  info@opco.com</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Hunt Worth, Esq.  President  Oppenheimer Trust Company of Delaware  405 Silverside Road  Wilmington, DE 19809  302-792-3500  hunt.worth@opco.com</p>
<p>James Dimon  Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer  JP Morgan Chase &amp; CO.  270 Park Ave. New York, NY 10017-2070  Jamie.dimon@jpmchase.com</p>	<p>Neil Wolfson  President &amp; Chief Executive Officer  Wilmington Trust Company  1100 North Market Street  Wilmington, DE 19890-0001  nwolfson@wilmingtontrust.com</p>
<p>William McCabe  Oppenheimer &amp; Co., Inc.  85 Broad St Fl 25  New York, NY 10004</p>	<p>STP Enterprises, Inc.  303 East Wacker Drive  Suite 210  Chicago IL 60601-5210</p>

William.McCabe@opco.com	psimon@stpcorp.com
<p>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</p>	<p>Ralph S. Janvey  Krage &amp; Janvey, L.L.P.  Federal Court Appointed Receiver  Stanford Financial Group  2100 Ross Ave, Dallas, TX 75201  rjanvey@kjllp.com</p>
<p>Kimberly Moran  Tescher &amp; Spallina, P.A.  Wells Fargo Plaza  925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500  Boca Raton, Florida 33432  kmoran@tescherspallina.com</p>	<p>Lindsay Baxley aka Lindsay Giles  Life Insurance Concepts  950 Peninsula Corporate Circle  Suite 3010  Boca Raton, FL 33487  lindsay@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com</p>
<p>Gerald R. Lewin  CBIZ MHM, LLC  1675 N Military Trail  Fifth Floor  Boca Raton, FL 33486</p>	<p>CBIZ MHM, LLC  General Counsel  6480 Rockside Woods Blvd. South  Suite 330  Cleveland, OH 44131  ATTN: General Counsel  generalcounsel@cbiz.com  (216)447-9000</p>
<p>Albert Gortz, Esq.  Proskauer Rose LLP  One Boca Place  2255 Glades Road  Suite 421 Atrium  Boca Raton, FL 33431-7360  agortz@proskauer.com</p>	<p>Heritage Union Life Insurance Company  A member of WiltonRe Group of Companies  187 Danbury Road  Wilton, CT 06897  estroup@wiltonre.com</p>
<p>Estate of Simon Bernstein  Brian M O'Connell Pa  515 N Flagler Drive  West Palm Beach, FL 33401  boconnell@ciklinlubitz.com</p>	<p>Counter Defendant  Steven Lessne, Esq.  Gray Robinson, PA  225 NE Mizner Blvd #500  Boca Raton, FL 33432  steven.lessne@gray-robinson.com</p>

<p>Byrd F. "Biff" Marshall, Jr.  President &amp; Managing Director  Gray Robinson, PA  225 NE Mizner Blvd #500  Boca Raton, FL 33432  biff.marshall@gray-robinson.com</p>	<p>Steven A. Lessne, Esq.  Gunster, Yoakley &amp; 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</p>
<p>T&amp;S Registered Agents, LLC  Wells Fargo Plaza  925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500  Boca Raton, Florida 33432  dtescher@tescherspallina.com</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>Joseph M. Leccese  Chairman  Proskauer Rose LLP  Eleven Times Square  New York, NY 10036  jleccese@proskauer.com</p>	<p>Brian Moynihan  Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer  100 N Tryon St #170, Charlotte, NC 28202  Phone:(980) 335-3561</p>
<p>ADR &amp; 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)</p>	

EXHIBIT 1 - April 27, 2017 Order



IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,  
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA  
PROBATE DIVISION "IH"

Case No. 50 2012-CP-4391 XXXX NB

IN RE: THE ESTATE OF:  
**SIMON BERNSTEIN,**  
Deceased.

---

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO VACATE**  
**AND**  
**DENYING MOTION TO DISQUALIFY FOR INAPPROPRIATE JURISDICTION,**  
**ALTERNATIVELY, DENYING ON ITS MERITS, AND**  
**ORDER DENYING APPOINTMENT OF TED BERNSTEIN AS ADMINISTRATOR AD**  
**LITEM**

**THIS MATTER** came before the Court February 16, 2017, March 2, 2017, and March 16, 2017 on the following matters:

1. October 7, 2016, D.E. 496, Stansbury's Motion to Vacate in Part the Court's Ruling on September 7, 2016, and/or Any Subsequent Order, Permitting the Estate of Simon Bernstein to Retain Alan Rose and Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald, Rose, Konopka, Thomas & Weiss, P.A. as Legal Counsel and Motion for Evidentiary Hearing to Determine Whether Rose and Page, Mrachek are Disqualified from Representing the Estate Due to an Inherent Conflict of Interest.
2. November 28, 2016, D.E. 507, Stansbury's Motion to Disqualify Alan Rose and Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald, Rose, Konopka, Thomas & Weiss, P.A.<sup>1</sup> as Legal Counsel for the Estate of Simon Bernstein Due to an Inherent Conflict of Interest.
3. Evidentiary Hearing on Trustee's Motion to Approve Retention of Counsel and to Appoint Ted S. Bernstein as Administrator Ad Litem to Defend Claim Against the Estate by William Stansbury, D.E. 471, Objection to Trustee's Motion to Appoint Ted S. Bernstein as Administrator Ad Litem to Defend Claim Against Estate by William Stansbury, D.E. 475, and Order Granting Retention of Counsel and Deferring on Administrator Ad Litem, D.E. 495

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter, "Mrachek Firm" unless quoted separately from an Order or document.

Present before the Court were Peter Feaman, Esquire on behalf of William Stansbury (hereafter “Stansbury”); Alan Rose, Esquire on behalf of Ted Bernstein, Trustee, Brian O’Connell as Personal Representative of the Estate of Simon Bernstein, Eliot Bernstein as interested party. The parties presented their testimony and evidence. Thereafter, pursuant to the Court’s March 3, 2017 Order, the parties were to submit written closing arguments and proposed orders no later than March 9, 2017<sup>2</sup>.

The Court carefully evaluated and weighed the testimony presented, considering the intelligence, frankness, credibility, plausibility, character, and competence of each witness, all the while being cognizant of the interests of the parties in the outcome of the case. Based on the forgoing, giving the evidence and testimony the weight it deserves, the Court has resolved any conflicts in the evidence. After evaluating the witnesses’ testimony, exhibits, and the applicable law, and being otherwise informed in the premises, the Court makes the following findings of fact:

1. On July 24, 2014, “the parties having agreed to the appointment,” this Court entered an Order Appointing Successor Personal Representative, Brian M. O’Connell, Esquire, D.E. 219. The letters issued on July 24, 2014 give Brian O’Connell, as the Personal Representative of the Estate of Simon Bernstein, the “full power to administer the estate according to law; to ask, demand, sue for, recover . . . .”
2. Pursuant to Fl. Stat. 733.612(19), *without court order*, a personal representative acting reasonably for the benefit of the interested persons may properly employ persons, including, but not limited to, attorneys. Moreover, pursuant to 733.612(20) the Personal Representative, *without court order*, has the power to prosecute or defend claims or

---

<sup>2</sup> On March 10, 2017 Eliot Bernstein filed a motion to accept a late filing in excess of the given page limit. While the Court acknowledges the late filing and will give it the weight appropriate, this Court will not condone or excuse violations of its Order.

proceedings in any jurisdiction for the protection of the estate and of the personal representative.

3. On September 1, 2016 the parties presented to the Court on Successor Trustee's [Brian O'Connell's] Motion to Approve Retention of Counsel AND, to Appoint Ted S. Bernstein as Administrator Ad Litem to Defend Claim Against Estate by William Stansbury.
4. On September 29, 2016, D.E. 495, this Court entered its Order Approving Retention of Counsel and Deferring Ruling on Appointment of Ted S. Bernstein as Administrator Ad Litem to Defend Claim Against Estate by William Stansbury. This Order states, "The Court, having reviewed the Motion and the record, *having been advised in the Motion that the PR and the beneficiaries of the Estate believe this relief will result in a benefit to the Estate, having been advised that William Stansbury has filed a written objection to Ted S. Bernstein serving as Administrator. . . .*" (emphasis added).
5. Notwithstanding the Personal Representative's statutory right to retain counsel without court approval, the September 29, 2016 Order then grants in part and defers in part, stating as follows:

2. The Court approves the retention of the law firm Mrachek, Fitzgerald, Rose, Konopka, Thomas & Weiss, P.A. ("Mrachek-Law") to serve as counsel for Brian O'Connell, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Simon L. Bernstein, for the purpose of defending the Estate in an independent action brought by William Stansbury. The reasonable costs and attorneys' fees incurred by Mrachek-Law in defending the claim shall be paid by the Estate.

3. Unless Stansbury withdraws his objection, the Court will need to conduct an evidentiary hearing on that portion of the motion which seeks the appointment of an administrator

ad litem. The Court will determine at the evidentiary hearing whether to appoint Ted S. Bernstein as administrator ad litem under Rule 5.120, which provides that when necessity arises, "the court may appoint an administrator ad litem . . . without bond or notice for that particular proceeding."

Until the evidentiary hearing, the Court defers ruling on the administrator ad litem issues.

6. Noteworthy is the fact that in the Court's Order appointing the Mrachek Firm, no objection from Stansbury was noted; the only objection noted is to appointment of Ted as administrator ad litem to which an evidentiary hearing would be required.
7. The 2012 independent action brought by William Stansbury referenced in the Court's Order cited above is a 2012 case pending in the Civil Division, 50-2012-CA-013933, Division AN, wherein Stansbury seeks to recover in excess of \$2.5 million from the Estate of Simon Bernstein based upon alleged misconduct of Simon Bernstein. (After Simon's death the Personal Representative of the Estate was substituted as the real party in interest.)
8. Stansbury's claims arise from Stansbury's part ownership and employment with LIC Holdings, Inc. ("LIC") and Arbitrage International Management, LLC ("AIM"), two companies founded by Simon and Ted Bernstein. Stansbury has asserted claims against the Estate of Simon Bernstein for breach of contract, fraudulent inducement, conspiracy, equitable lien, and constructive trust. Stansbury is a claimant, not a creditor, against the Estate. On June 23, 2014 in the independent civil case, 50-2012-CA-013933, the Court entered an Order of Dismissal with Prejudice of Certain Parties and Claims; specifically, the Court dismissed Defendants, Ted S. Bernstein, individually, LIC Holdings, Inc., Arbitrage International Management, LLC, f/k/a Arbitrage International Holdings, LLC and the Shirley Bernstein Trust Agreement dated May 20, 2008, D.E. 214.
9. Pending ending in Illinois is the case of *Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust Dtd. 6/21/95, Ted Bernstein, et al. v. Heritage Union Life Insurance Company, et al.*, Case No. 13

CV 3643, United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (the “Insurance Litigation”). This case commenced after Simon’s death and seeks to have the Court determine the rightful owners of Simon’s 1.7 million dollar life insurance death benefit proceeds. Ted Bernstein, individually, and as an alleged Trustee of a purported lost trust document, and his siblings, Pamela Simon, Jill Iantoni, and Lisa Friedstein, as Plaintiffs, seek to recover the \$1.7 million dollar life insurance proceeds for the ultimate benefit of Simon Bernstein’s adult children.

10. The Simon Trust is the primary beneficiary of the Estate via a pour over will. The beneficiaries of the Trust are Simon’s ten grandchildren. Initially, the Estate was not a party to the Insurance Litigation. The Illinois Court denied Stansbury the right to intervene in the Insurance Litigation. Subsequently, the Estate, at the request of Stansbury in the instant probate litigation, intervened. Stansbury is funding the Estate’s costs and fees in the Illinois litigation based on this Court’s dated May 23, 2014. Clearly, Stansbury, as a claimant of the Estate, seeks to benefit from the Estate’s collection of the insurance proceeds *if* Stansbury prevails in his civil independent action against the Estate.
11. Stansbury argues that Mrachek Firm represented Ted in his deposition in the Insurance Litigation in Illinois. Illinois counsel for Ted as the Plaintiff attended the deposition. Apparently, O’Connell agreed not to attend the trial to save money. Mrachek Firm never filed a notice of appearance in the Illinois Court. It is undisputed that Elliot and Stansbury were present during that deposition. Ted was examined extensively by counsel for the Estate. Mrachek Firm objected approximately four times. The deposition was taken prior to the trial in Palm Beach County to determine the validity of the will and trusts. There is no indication that Mrachek Firm was acting in any capacity other than on behalf of Ted as Trustee in an effort to protect any interests in the validity dispute.

12. On October 7, 2016, D.E. 496, in the instant probate action Stansbury filed his Motion to Vacate in Part the Court's Ruling on September 7, 2016, and/or Any Subsequent Order, Permitting the Estate of Simon Bernstein to Retain Alan Rose and Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald, Rose, Konopka, Thomas & Weiss, P.A. as Legal Counsel and Motion for Evidentiary Hearing to Determine Whether Rose and Page, Mrachek are Disqualified from Representing the Estate Due to an Inherent Conflict of Interest.

13. In D.E. 496, Stansbury's Motion to Vacate, Stansbury states as follows:

1. Stansbury filed a lawsuit styled *William E. Stansbury v. Ted Bernstein, et al*, Case No. 50 2012 CA 013933 MB AA, Palm Beach County, Florida against Simon Bernstein ("Simon"), Ted Bernstein ("Ted") and several corporate defendants in August of 2012 to collect compensation, and other damages due Stansbury arising out of an insurance business in which Stansbury, SIMON and TED were principals. Stansbury asserted claims against Simon and Ted both as agents of the corporate defendants and in their individual capacities (the claims against TED and the companies have settled). The Shirley Bernstein Trust was dropped as a Party.

14. After Simon died, the Estate was substituted into the lawsuit; Ted Bernstein serves as Trustee of the July 25, 2012 "Simon Trust". It is undisputed that Stansbury has settled the claims against Ted, individually, and as to the corporate defendants. It is undisputed that Mrachek Firm represented some of the dismissed corporate defendants in the civil independent lawsuit set forth above.

15. Mrachek Firm represents Ted Bernstein, as Trustee of the Simon Trust, the sole residuary beneficiary of the Estate with the exception of certain personal property, in the current probate litigation involving the Estate of Simon, 50-2012-CP-4391. The Simon Trust is a pour over trust and Simon's ten grandchildren are the beneficiaries of the Simon Trust.

16. On November 28, 2016, D.E. 507, Stansbury filed his Motion to Disqualify Alan Rose and Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald, Rose, Konopka, Thomas & Weiss, P.A. as Legal Counsel for the Estate of Simon Bernstein Due to an Inherent Conflict of Interest.
17. Elliot Bernstein joins Stansbury's opposition to the appointment of Mrachek Firm. Elliot is a residuary beneficiary of any tangible property of the Estate. All other beneficiaries (Trust Beneficiaries) approve the retention of the Mrachek Firm.
18. Stansbury's Motion to Vacate, D.E. 496, and Stansbury's Motion to Disqualify, D.E. 507, are *not* based on perceived conflict arising out of the Mrachek Firm and alleged association or representation of William Stansbury, Plaintiff in the civil suit. ***It is undisputed that the Mrachek Firm never represented Stansbury, obtained any confidential information from Stansbury, or attempted to use, obtained, or are in possession of privileged information regarding Stansbury and now must be disqualified.*** In fact, there was no evidence that Mrachek has obtained or used any information that would prejudice a current or former client.
19. Stansbury is objecting to the Personal Representative's choice of counsel for the Estate based on a perceived conflict from Mrachek's Firm's representation of Ted as Trustee of the Simon Trust.
20. With regard to the Motion to Vacate Judge Phillip's Order, the Court finds, without court order, the Personal Representative has the right to retain counsel to defend lawsuits. Independent of the same, after a hearing wherein no objection was raised, Judge Phillips granted the retention of the Personal Representative's choice of counsel. This Court denies the motion to vacate.
21. With regard to the Motion to Disqualify, the parties have all stipulated and agreed that the undersigned judge should decide this matter versus the civil judge in the probate proceeding.

The parties' rationale is that since the prior judge approved the retention of counsel by the Personal Representative, this Court should make the decision on whether to disqualify Mrachek Firm from another judge's case. Stansbury is objecting *as the Plaintiff* in the civil lawsuit to the Defendant's choice of counsel. Specifically, Stansbury, Plaintiff, objects to the Defendant, Estate's choice of counsel via the Personal Representative of the Estate. Elliot believes there has been a continuing fraud being perpetrated by the Court and Ted; Elliot joins Stansbury's objection.

22. Despite the parties' stipulation allowing this Court to decide whether Mrachek Firm should be disqualified from representing the Estate in the civil case, this Court is hard pressed to see how this Court can rule on a matter in a separate case without the other judge's approval / acquiesce of the same. This Court hereby finds this Court is not the proper forum and the matter should be heard in the civil litigation. However, if in fact the other Court chooses to accept this Court's findings in order to conserve judicial resources and the efficiency of justice, since this Court heard in excess of six hours of evidence and testimony, this Court would deny the motion to vacate and to disqualify on the merits.

23. Stansbury has alleged disqualification of Mrachek Firm is appropriate under Florida Rule Regulating the Florida Bar, 4-1.7(a):

Rule 4-1.7. Conflict of Interest; Current Clients

**(a) Representing Adverse Interests.** Except as provided in subdivision (b), a lawyer must not represent a client if:

- (1) the representation of 1 client will be directly adverse to another client; or
- (2) there is a substantial risk that the representation of 1 or more clients will be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person or by a personal interest of the lawyer.

**(b) Informed Consent.** Notwithstanding the existence of a conflict of interest under subdivision (a), a lawyer may represent a client if:



- (1) the lawyer reasonably believes that the lawyer will be able to provide competent and diligent representation to each affected client;
- (2) the representation is not prohibited by law;
- (3) the representation does not involve the assertion of a position adverse to another client when the lawyer represents both clients in the same proceeding before a tribunal; and
- (4) each affected client gives informed consent, confirmed in writing or clearly stated on the record at a hearing.

**(c) Explanation to Clients.** When representation of multiple clients in a single matter is undertaken, the consultation must include an explanation of the implications of the common representation and the advantages and risks involved.

24. Again, Stansbury is not asserting Mrachek Firm ever represented Stansbury. The Personal Representative of the Estate, Brian O'Connell, executed the PR's Statement of Its Position That There is No Conflict and His Waiver of Any Potential Conflict. Mr. O'Connell also testified that it is his opinion that the Estate would be best served by the Mrachek Firm being retained.
25. The comment Rule 4-1.7 states as follows:

**Conflict charged by an opposing party**

Resolving questions of conflict of interest is primarily the responsibility of the lawyer undertaking the representation. In litigation, a court may raise the question when there is reason to infer that the lawyer has neglected the responsibility. In a criminal case, inquiry by the court is generally required when a lawyer represents multiple defendants. Where the conflict is such as clearly to call in question the fair or efficient administration of justice, opposing counsel may properly raise the question. Such an objection should be viewed with caution, however, for it can be misused as a technique of harassment. See scope.

26. The Court has reviewed all the testimony, case law, positions of the parties, and considered the position of the Estate as expressed by the Personal Representative, an experienced Estate and Probate Attorney.

27. The Estate's goal in the Stansbury litigation is to defend against Stansbury's claim and minimize Stansbury's recovery. The Mrachek Firm has extensive knowledge of this lawsuit. Given Stansbury is the Plaintiff in that lawsuit, the Court embraces the Comment to Rule 4-1.7 and heeds its warning. The Court finds no conflict in affirming the Personal Representative's choice of counsel, the Mrachek Firm, to defend the Estate in the Stansbury litigation. Additionally, this Court finds that if in fact there is a conflict, it has been waived by the Personal Representative.
28. The Court now turns to the question of whether Ted Bernstein should be appointed by the Court as an Administrator Ad Litem on behalf of the Estate in the Stansbury litigation.
29. Florida Statute 733.308 Administrator ad litem states as follows:
- When an estate must be represented and the personal representative is *unable to do so*, the court shall appoint an administrator ad litem without bond to represent the estate in that proceeding. The fact that the personal representative is seeking reimbursement for claims against the decedent does not require appointment of an administrator ad litem.
- (emphasis added).
30. Brian O'Connell testified in Court that it is his position that the appointment of Ted would be in the best interest of the Estate for the following reasons: Ted has the most knowledge of the claims; Ted will not charge the estate and Mr. O'Connell would charge for his time; the appointment is limited to the civil litigation and has no overlap with the Insurance Litigation in Illinois; Mr. O'Connell's busy schedule would delay the litigation's progress; and, he would still be intricately involved with any negotiations on behalf of the Estate. There is no indication that Mr. O'Connell is unable to represent the Estate.
31. The parties stipulated to the March 13, 2017 deposition of Brian O'Connell coming into evidence. Stansbury's counsel, Mrachek Firm, and Elliot all had the opportunity to question Mr. O'Connell regarding his positions regarding the Estate being represented by Ted as administrator ad litem. Additionally, all parties questioned Mr. O'Connell regarding his

position on whether the Estate should continue in the Insurance Litigation. It is Mr.


O'Connell's position that the Estate should continue its positions in the Insurance Litigation.

32. The Court finds Mr. O'Connell to be credible. Conserving the Estate's assets by not having to pay the Personal Representative to be involved in the Stansbury litigation is a laudable goal; nonetheless, the Court cannot ignore the fact that the Estate and Ted are adverse in the Illinois lawsuit. Moreover, Mr. O'Connell is capable of representing the Estate. While the Illinois action is still pending, the Court declines to appoint Ted as Administrator Ad Litem.

**IT IS ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:**

The Court **DENIES** Stansbury's motions seeking to vacate the retention order of September 7, 2016, and to disqualify the Mrachek Firm. The Court **DENIES** appointment of Ted Bernstein as Administrator Ad Litem.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers, North County Courthouse on ~~3rd~~ <sup>April 27,</sup> 2017.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rosemarie Scher". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "R".

---

HONORABLE ROSEMARIE SCHER

cc: All parties on the attached service list

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,  
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA  
PROBATE DIVISION "IH"

Case No. 50 2012-CP-4391 XXXX NB

IN RE: THE ESTATE OF:  
**SIMON BERNSTEIN,**  
Deceased.

---

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO VACATE**  
**AND**  
**DENYING MOTION TO DISQUALIFY FOR INAPPROPRIATE JURISDICTION,**  
**ALTERNATIVELY, DENYING ON ITS MERITS, AND**  
**ORDER DENYING APPOINTMENT OF TED BERNSTEIN AS ADMINISTRATOR AD**  
**LITEM**

**THIS MATTER** came before the Court February 16, 2017, March 2, 2017, and March 16, 2017 on the following matters:

1. October 7, 2016, D.E. 496, Stansbury's Motion to Vacate in Part the Court's Ruling on September 7, 2016, and/or Any Subsequent Order, Permitting the Estate of Simon Bernstein to Retain Alan Rose and Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald, Rose, Konopka, Thomas & Weiss, P.A. as Legal Counsel and Motion for Evidentiary Hearing to Determine Whether Rose and Page, Mrachek are Disqualified from Representing the Estate Due to an Inherent Conflict of Interest.
2. November 28, 2016, D.E. 507, Stansbury's Motion to Disqualify Alan Rose and Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald, Rose, Konopka, Thomas & Weiss, P.A.<sup>1</sup> as Legal Counsel for the Estate of Simon Bernstein Due to an Inherent Conflict of Interest.
3. Evidentiary Hearing on Trustee's Motion to Approve Retention of Counsel and to Appoint Ted S. Bernstein as Administrator Ad Litem to Defend Claim Against the Estate by William Stansbury, D.E. 471, Objection to Trustee's Motion to Appoint Ted S. Bernstein as Administrator Ad Litem to Defend Claim Against Estate by William Stansbury, D.E. 475, and Order Granting Retention of Counsel and Deferring on Administrator Ad Litem, D.E. 495

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter, "Mrachek Firm" unless quoted separately from an Order or document.

Present before the Court were Peter Feaman, Esquire on behalf of William Stansbury (hereafter “Stansbury”); Alan Rose, Esquire on behalf of Ted Bernstein, Trustee, Brian O’Connell as Personal Representative of the Estate of Simon Bernstein, Eliot Bernstein as interested party. The parties presented their testimony and evidence. Thereafter, pursuant to the Court’s March 3, 2017 Order, the parties were to submit written closing arguments and proposed orders no later than March 9, 2017<sup>2</sup>.

The Court carefully evaluated and weighed the testimony presented, considering the intelligence, frankness, credibility, plausibility, character, and competence of each witness, all the while being cognizant of the interests of the parties in the outcome of the case. Based on the forgoing, giving the evidence and testimony the weight it deserves, the Court has resolved any conflicts in the evidence. After evaluating the witnesses’ testimony, exhibits, and the applicable law, and being otherwise informed in the premises, the Court makes the following findings of fact:

1. On July 24, 2014, “the parties having agreed to the appointment,” this Court entered an Order Appointing Successor Personal Representative, Brian M. O’Connell, Esquire, D.E. 219. The letters issued on July 24, 2014 give Brian O’Connell, as the Personal Representative of the Estate of Simon Bernstein, the “full power to administer the estate according to law; to ask, demand, sue for, recover . . . .”
2. Pursuant to Fl. Stat. 733.612(19), *without court order*, a personal representative acting reasonably for the benefit of the interested persons may properly employ persons, including, but not limited to, attorneys. Moreover, pursuant to 733.612(20) the Personal Representative, *without court order*, has the power to prosecute or defend claims or

---

<sup>2</sup> On March 10, 2017 Eliot Bernstein filed a motion to accept a late filing in excess of the given page limit. While the Court acknowledges the late filing and will give it the weight appropriate, this Court will not condone or excuse violations of its Order.

proceedings in any jurisdiction for the protection of the estate and of the personal representative.

3. On September 1, 2016 the parties presented to the Court on Successor Trustee's [Brian O'Connell's] Motion to Approve Retention of Counsel AND, to Appoint Ted S. Bernstein as Administrator Ad Litem to Defend Claim Against Estate by William Stansbury.
4. On September 29, 2016, D.E. 495, this Court entered its Order Approving Retention of Counsel and Deferring Ruling on Appointment of Ted S. Bernstein as Administrator Ad Litem to Defend Claim Against Estate by William Stansbury. This Order states, "The Court, having reviewed the Motion and the record, *having been advised in the Motion that the PR and the beneficiaries of the Estate believe this relief will result in a benefit to the Estate, having been advised that William Stansbury has filed a written objection to Ted S. Bernstein serving as Administrator. . . .*" (emphasis added).
5. Notwithstanding the Personal Representative's statutory right to retain counsel without court approval, the September 29, 2016 Order then grants in part and defers in part, stating as follows:

2. The Court approves the retention of the law firm Mrachek, Fitzgerald, Rose, Konopka, Thomas & Weiss, P.A. ("Mrachek-Law") to serve as counsel for Brian O'Connell, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Simon L. Bernstein, for the purpose of defending the Estate in an independent action brought by William Stansbury. The reasonable costs and attorneys' fees incurred by Mrachek-Law in defending the claim shall be paid by the Estate.

3. Unless Stansbury withdraws his objection, the Court will need to conduct an evidentiary hearing on that portion of the motion which seeks the appointment of an administrator

ad litem. The Court will determine at the evidentiary hearing whether to appoint Ted S. Bernstein as administrator ad litem under Rule 5.120, which provides that when necessity arises, "the court may appoint an administrator ad litem . . . without bond or notice for that particular proceeding."

Until the evidentiary hearing, the Court defers ruling on the administrator ad litem issues.

6. Noteworthy is the fact that in the Court's Order appointing the Mrachek Firm, no objection from Stansbury was noted; the only objection noted is to appointment of Ted as administrator ad litem to which an evidentiary hearing would be required.
7. The 2012 independent action brought by William Stansbury referenced in the Court's Order cited above is a 2012 case pending in the Civil Division, 50-2012-CA-013933, Division AN, wherein Stansbury seeks to recover in excess of \$2.5 million from the Estate of Simon Bernstein based upon alleged misconduct of Simon Bernstein. (After Simon's death the Personal Representative of the Estate was substituted as the real party in interest.)
8. Stansbury's claims arise from Stansbury's part ownership and employment with LIC Holdings, Inc. ("LIC") and Arbitrage International Management, LLC ("AIM"), two companies founded by Simon and Ted Bernstein. Stansbury has asserted claims against the Estate of Simon Bernstein for breach of contract, fraudulent inducement, conspiracy, equitable lien, and constructive trust. Stansbury is a claimant, not a creditor, against the Estate. On June 23, 2014 in the independent civil case, 50-2012-CA-013933, the Court entered an Order of Dismissal with Prejudice of Certain Parties and Claims; specifically, the Court dismissed Defendants, Ted S. Bernstein, individually, LIC Holdings, Inc., Arbitrage International Management, LLC, f/k/a Arbitrage International Holdings, LLC and the Shirley Bernstein Trust Agreement dated May 20, 2008, D.E. 214.
9. Pending ending in Illinois is the case of *Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust Dtd. 6/21/95, Ted Bernstein, et al. v. Heritage Union Life Insurance Company, et al.*, Case No. 13



CV 3643, United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (the “Insurance Litigation”). This case commenced after Simon’s death and seeks to have the Court determine the rightful owners of Simon’s 1.7 million dollar life insurance death benefit proceeds. Ted Bernstein, individually, and as an alleged Trustee of a purported lost trust document, and his siblings, Pamela Simon, Jill Iantoni, and Lisa Friedstein, as Plaintiffs, seek to recover the \$1.7 million dollar life insurance proceeds for the ultimate benefit of Simon Bernstein’s adult children.

10. The Simon Trust is the primary beneficiary of the Estate via a pour over will. The beneficiaries of the Trust are Simon’s ten grandchildren. Initially, the Estate was not a party to the Insurance Litigation. The Illinois Court denied Stansbury the right to intervene in the Insurance Litigation. Subsequently, the Estate, at the request of Stansbury in the instant probate litigation, intervened. Stansbury is funding the Estate’s costs and fees in the Illinois litigation based on this Court’s dated May 23, 2014. Clearly, Stansbury, as a claimant of the Estate, seeks to benefit from the Estate’s collection of the insurance proceeds *if* Stansbury prevails in his civil independent action against the Estate.
11. Stansbury argues that Mrachek Firm represented Ted in his deposition in the Insurance Litigation in Illinois. Illinois counsel for Ted as the Plaintiff attended the deposition. Apparently, O’Connell agreed not to attend the trial to save money. Mrachek Firm never filed a notice of appearance in the Illinois Court. It is undisputed that Elliot and Stansbury were present during that deposition. Ted was examined extensively by counsel for the Estate. Mrachek Firm objected approximately four times. The deposition was taken prior to the trial in Palm Beach County to determine the validity of the will and trusts. There is no indication that Mrachek Firm was acting in any capacity other than on behalf of Ted as Trustee in an effort to protect any interests in the validity dispute.



12. On October 7, 2016, D.E. 496, in the instant probate action Stansbury filed his Motion to Vacate in Part the Court's Ruling on September 7, 2016, and/or Any Subsequent Order, Permitting the Estate of Simon Bernstein to Retain Alan Rose and Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald, Rose, Konopka, Thomas & Weiss, P.A. as Legal Counsel and Motion for Evidentiary Hearing to Determine Whether Rose and Page, Mrachek are Disqualified from Representing the Estate Due to an Inherent Conflict of Interest.

13. In D.E. 496, Stansbury's Motion to Vacate, Stansbury states as follows:

1. Stansbury filed a lawsuit styled *William E. Stansbury v. Ted Bernstein, et al*, Case No. 50 2012 CA 013933 MB AA, Palm Beach County, Florida against Simon Bernstein ("Simon"), Ted Bernstein ("Ted") and several corporate defendants in August of 2012 to collect compensation, and other damages due Stansbury arising out of an insurance business in which Stansbury, SIMON and TED were principals. Stansbury asserted claims against Simon and Ted both as agents of the corporate defendants and in their individual capacities (the claims against TED and the companies have settled). The Shirley Bernstein Trust was dropped as a Party.

14. After Simon died, the Estate was substituted into the lawsuit; Ted Bernstein serves as Trustee of the July 25, 2012 "Simon Trust". It is undisputed that Stansbury has settled the claims against Ted, individually, and as to the corporate defendants. It is undisputed that Mrachek Firm represented some of the dismissed corporate defendants in the civil independent lawsuit set forth above.

15. Mrachek Firm represents Ted Bernstein, as Trustee of the Simon Trust, the sole residuary beneficiary of the Estate with the exception of certain personal property, in the current probate litigation involving the Estate of Simon, 50-2012-CP-4391. The Simon Trust is a pour over trust and Simon's ten grandchildren are the beneficiaries of the Simon Trust.

16. On November 28, 2016, D.E. 507, Stansbury filed his Motion to Disqualify Alan Rose and Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald, Rose, Konopka, Thomas & Weiss, P.A. as Legal Counsel for the Estate of Simon Bernstein Due to an Inherent Conflict of Interest.
17. Elliot Bernstein joins Stansbury's opposition to the appointment of Mrachek Firm. Elliot is a residuary beneficiary of any tangible property of the Estate. All other beneficiaries (Trust Beneficiaries) approve the retention of the Mrachek Firm.
18. Stansbury's Motion to Vacate, D.E. 496, and Stansbury's Motion to Disqualify, D.E. 507, are *not* based on perceived conflict arising out of the Mrachek Firm and alleged association or representation of William Stansbury, Plaintiff in the civil suit. ***It is undisputed that the Mrachek Firm never represented Stansbury, obtained any confidential information from Stansbury, or attempted to use, obtained, or are in possession of privileged information regarding Stansbury and now must be disqualified.*** In fact, there was no evidence that Mrachek has obtained or used any information that would prejudice a current or former client.
19. Stansbury is objecting to the Personal Representative's choice of counsel for the Estate based on a perceived conflict from Mrachek's Firm's representation of Ted as Trustee of the Simon Trust.
20. With regard to the Motion to Vacate Judge Phillip's Order, the Court finds, without court order, the Personal Representative has the right to retain counsel to defend lawsuits. Independent of the same, after a hearing wherein no objection was raised, Judge Phillips granted the retention of the Personal Representative's choice of counsel. This Court denies the motion to vacate.
21. With regard to the Motion to Disqualify, the parties have all stipulated and agreed that the undersigned judge should decide this matter versus the civil judge in the probate proceeding.

The parties' rationale is that since the prior judge approved the retention of counsel by the Personal Representative, this Court should make the decision on whether to disqualify Mrachek Firm from another judge's case. Stansbury is objecting *as the Plaintiff* in the civil lawsuit to the Defendant's choice of counsel. Specifically, Stansbury, Plaintiff, objects to the Defendant, Estate's choice of counsel via the Personal Representative of the Estate. Elliot believes there has been a continuing fraud being perpetrated by the Court and Ted; Elliot joins Stansbury's objection.

22. Despite the parties' stipulation allowing this Court to decide whether Mrachek Firm should be disqualified from representing the Estate in the civil case, this Court is hard pressed to see how this Court can rule on a matter in a separate case without the other judge's approval / acquiesce of the same. This Court hereby finds this Court is not the proper forum and the matter should be heard in the civil litigation. However, if in fact the other Court chooses to accept this Court's findings in order to conserve judicial resources and the efficiency of justice, since this Court heard in excess of six hours of evidence and testimony, this Court would deny the motion to vacate and to disqualify on the merits.

23. Stansbury has alleged disqualification of Mrachek Firm is appropriate under Florida Rule Regulating the Florida Bar, 4-1.7(a):

Rule 4-1.7. Conflict of Interest; Current Clients

**(a) Representing Adverse Interests.** Except as provided in subdivision (b), a lawyer must not represent a client if:

- (1) the representation of 1 client will be directly adverse to another client; or
- (2) there is a substantial risk that the representation of 1 or more clients will be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person or by a personal interest of the lawyer.

**(b) Informed Consent.** Notwithstanding the existence of a conflict of interest under subdivision (a), a lawyer may represent a client if:

- (1) the lawyer reasonably believes that the lawyer will be able to provide competent and diligent representation to each affected client;
- (2) the representation is not prohibited by law;
- (3) the representation does not involve the assertion of a position adverse to another client when the lawyer represents both clients in the same proceeding before a tribunal; and
- (4) each affected client gives informed consent, confirmed in writing or clearly stated on the record at a hearing.

**(c) Explanation to Clients.** When representation of multiple clients in a single matter is undertaken, the consultation must include an explanation of the implications of the common representation and the advantages and risks involved.

24. Again, Stansbury is not asserting Mrachek Firm ever represented Stansbury. The Personal Representative of the Estate, Brian O'Connell, executed the PR's Statement of Its Position That There is No Conflict and His Waiver of Any Potential Conflict. Mr. O'Connell also testified that it is his opinion that the Estate would be best served by the Mrachek Firm being retained.
25. The comment Rule 4-1.7 states as follows:

**Conflict charged by an opposing party**

Resolving questions of conflict of interest is primarily the responsibility of the lawyer undertaking the representation. In litigation, a court may raise the question when there is reason to infer that the lawyer has neglected the responsibility. In a criminal case, inquiry by the court is generally required when a lawyer represents multiple defendants. Where the conflict is such as clearly to call in question the fair or efficient administration of justice, opposing counsel may properly raise the question. Such an objection should be viewed with caution, however, for it can be misused as a technique of harassment. See scope.

26. The Court has reviewed all the testimony, case law, positions of the parties, and considered the position of the Estate as expressed by the Personal Representative, an experienced Estate and Probate Attorney.

27. The Estate's goal in the Stansbury litigation is to defend against Stansbury's claim and minimize Stansbury's recovery. The Mrachek Firm has extensive knowledge of this lawsuit. Given Stansbury is the Plaintiff in that lawsuit, the Court embraces the Comment to Rule 4-1.7 and heeds its warning. The Court finds no conflict in affirming the Personal Representative's choice of counsel, the Mrachek Firm, to defend the Estate in the Stansbury litigation. Additionally, this Court finds that if in fact there is a conflict, it has been waived by the Personal Representative.
28. The Court now turns to the question of whether Ted Bernstein should be appointed by the Court as an Administrator Ad Litem on behalf of the Estate in the Stansbury litigation.
29. Florida Statute 733.308 Administrator ad litem states as follows:
- When an estate must be represented and the personal representative is *unable to do so*, the court shall appoint an administrator ad litem without bond to represent the estate in that proceeding. The fact that the personal representative is seeking reimbursement for claims against the decedent does not require appointment of an administrator ad litem.
- (emphasis added).
30. Brian O'Connell testified in Court that it is his position that the appointment of Ted would be in the best interest of the Estate for the following reasons: Ted has the most knowledge of the claims; Ted will not charge the estate and Mr. O'Connell would charge for his time; the appointment is limited to the civil litigation and has no overlap with the Insurance Litigation in Illinois; Mr. O'Connell's busy schedule would delay the litigation's progress; and, he would still be intricately involved with any negotiations on behalf of the Estate. There is no indication that Mr. O'Connell is unable to represent the Estate.
31. The parties stipulated to the March 13, 2017 deposition of Brian O'Connell coming into evidence. Stansbury's counsel, Mrachek Firm, and Elliot all had the opportunity to question Mr. O'Connell regarding his positions regarding the Estate being represented by Ted as administrator ad litem. Additionally, all parties questioned Mr. O'Connell regarding his

position on whether the Estate should continue in the Insurance Litigation. It is Mr.


O'Connell's position that the Estate should continue its positions in the Insurance Litigation.

32. The Court finds Mr. O'Connell to be credible. Conserving the Estate's assets by not having to pay the Personal Representative to be involved in the Stansbury litigation is a laudable goal; nonetheless, the Court cannot ignore the fact that the Estate and Ted are adverse in the Illinois lawsuit. Moreover, Mr. O'Connell is capable of representing the Estate. While the Illinois action is still pending, the Court declines to appoint Ted as Administrator Ad Litem.

**IT IS ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:**

The Court **DENIES** Stansbury's motions seeking to vacate the retention order of September 7, 2016, and to disqualify the Mrachek Firm. The Court **DENIES** appointment of Ted Bernstein as Administrator Ad Litem.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers, North County Courthouse on ~~3rd~~ April 27, 2017.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rosemarie Scher". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "R".

---

HONORABLE ROSEMARIE SCHER

cc: All parties on the attached service list

SERVICE LIST

<p>Alan B. Rose, Esq.        Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald &amp;        Rose, PA.        505 S. Flagler Dr., Suite 600        West Palm Beach, FL 33401        (561) 355-6991  <a href="mailto:arose@mrachek-law.com">arose@mrachek-law.com</a>  <a href="mailto:mchandler@mrachek-law.com">mchandler@mrachek-law.com</a></p>	<p>John P. Morrissey, Esq.        330 Clematis St., Suite 213        West Palm Beach, FL 33401  <a href="mailto:john@jmorrisseylaw.com">john@jmorrisseylaw.com</a></p>	<p>Diana Lewis obo Joshua, Jacob        and Daniel Bernstein,        ADR &amp; Mediation Services,        LLC        2765 Tecumseh Drive        West Palm Beach, FL 33409        (561) 758-3017  <a href="mailto:dzlewis@aol.com">dzlewis@aol.com</a></p>
<p>Peter Feaman, Esq.        Peter M. Feaman, P.A.        3695 Boynton Beach        Blvd., Suite 9        Boynton Beach, FL 33436  <a href="mailto:pfeaman@feamanlaw.com">pfeaman@feamanlaw.com</a></p>	<p>Shendell &amp; Pollock, P.L.        2700 N. Military Trail, suite 150        Boca Raton, FL 33431        241-2323 Fax: 241-2330        Gary R. Shendell, Esq.  <a href="mailto:gary@shendellpollock.com">gary@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:estella@shendellpollock.com">estella@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:grs@shendellpollock.com">grs@shendellpollock.com</a>        Kenneth S. Pollock, Esq.  <a href="mailto:ken@shendellpollock.com">ken@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:britt@shendellpollock.com">britt@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:grs@shendellpollock.com">grs@shendellpollock.com</a>        Matthew A. Tornincasa, Esq.  <a href="mailto:matt@shendellpollock.com">matt@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:robyne@shendellpollock.com">robyne@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:grs@shendellpollock.com">grs@shendellpollock.com</a></p>	<p>Max Friedstein        2142 Churchill Lane        Highland Park, IL 60035</p>
<p>Eliot Bernstein        2753 N.W. 34<sup>th</sup> St.        Boca Raton, FL 33434  <a href="mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv">iviewit@iviewit.tv</a></p>	<p>Pamela Beth Simon        950 N. Michigan Ave., Apt. 2603        Chicago, IL 60611  <a href="mailto:psimon@stpcorp.com">psimon@stpcorp.com</a></p>	<p>Lisa Friedstein and        Carley Friedstein, Minor        c/o Jeffrey and Lisa Friedstein        Parent and Natural Guardian        2142 Churchill Lane        Highland Park, IL 60035  <a href="mailto:Lisa@friedsteins.com">Lisa@friedsteins.com</a>  <a href="mailto:Lisa.friedstein@gmail.com">Lisa.friedstein@gmail.com</a></p>
<p>Jill Iantoni and        Julia Iantoni, a Minor        c/o Guy and Jill Iantoni, her        Parents &amp; Natural Guardians        2101 Magnolia Lane        Highland Park, IL 60035  <a href="mailto:jilliantoni@gmail.com">jilliantoni@gmail.com</a></p>	<p>Brian M. O'Connell, Esq.        Ashley Crispin Ackal, Esq.        Ciklin Lubitz &amp; O'Connell        515 N. Flagler Dr., 20<sup>th</sup> FL        West Palm Beach, FL 33401  <a href="mailto:service@ciklinlubitz.com">service@ciklinlubitz.com</a>  <a href="mailto:probateservice@ciklinlubitz.com">probateservice@ciklinlubitz.com</a></p>	<p>Robert Spallina, Esq.  <a href="mailto:rspallina@comcast.net">rspallina@comcast.net</a></p>



SERVICE LIST

<p>Alan B. Rose, Esq.        Page, Mrachek, Fitzgerald &amp;        Rose, PA.        505 S. Flagler Dr., Suite 600        West Palm Beach, FL 33401        (561) 355-6991  <a href="mailto:arose@mrachek-law.com">arose@mrachek-law.com</a>  <a href="mailto:mchandler@mrachek-law.com">mchandler@mrachek-law.com</a></p>	<p>John P. Morrissey, Esq.        330 Clematis St., Suite 213        West Palm Beach, FL 33401  <a href="mailto:john@jmorrisseylaw.com">john@jmorrisseylaw.com</a></p>	<p>Diana Lewis obo Joshua, Jacob        and Daniel Bernstein,        ADR &amp; Mediation Services,        LLC        2765 Tecumseh Drive        West Palm Beach, FL 33409        (561) 758-3017  <a href="mailto:dzlewis@aol.com">dzlewis@aol.com</a></p>
<p>Peter Feaman, Esq.        Peter M. Feaman, P.A.        3695 Boynton Beach        Blvd., Suite 9        Boynton Beach, FL 33436  <a href="mailto:pfeaman@feamanlaw.com">pfeaman@feamanlaw.com</a></p>	<p>Shendell &amp; Pollock, P.L.        2700 N. Military Trail, suite 150        Boca Raton, FL 33431        241-2323 Fax: 241-2330        Gary R. Shendell, Esq.  <a href="mailto:gary@shendellpollock.com">gary@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:estella@shendellpollock.com">estella@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:grs@shendellpollock.com">grs@shendellpollock.com</a>        Kenneth S. Pollock, Esq.  <a href="mailto:ken@shendellpollock.com">ken@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:britt@shendellpollock.com">britt@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:grs@shendellpollock.com">grs@shendellpollock.com</a>        Matthew A. Tornincasa, Esq.  <a href="mailto:matt@shendellpollock.com">matt@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:robyne@shendellpollock.com">robyne@shendellpollock.com</a>  <a href="mailto:grs@shendellpollock.com">grs@shendellpollock.com</a></p>	<p>Max Friedstein        2142 Churchill Lane        Highland Park, IL 60035</p>
<p>Eliot Bernstein        2753 N.W. 34<sup>th</sup> St.        Boca Raton, FL 33434  <a href="mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv">iviewit@iviewit.tv</a></p>	<p>Pamela Beth Simon        950 N. Michigan Ave., Apt. 2603        Chicago, IL 60611  <a href="mailto:psimon@stpcorp.com">psimon@stpcorp.com</a></p>	<p>Lisa Friedstein and        Carley Friedstein, Minor        c/o Jeffrey and Lisa Friedstein        Parent and Natural Guardian        2142 Churchill Lane        Highland Park, IL 60035  <a href="mailto:Lisa@friedsteins.com">Lisa@friedsteins.com</a>  <a href="mailto:Lisa.friedstein@gmail.com">Lisa.friedstein@gmail.com</a></p>
<p>Jill Iantoni and        Julia Iantoni, a Minor        c/o Guy and Jill Iantoni, her        Parents &amp; Natural Guardians        2101 Magnolia Lane        Highland Park, IL 60035  <a href="mailto:jilliantoni@gmail.com">jilliantoni@gmail.com</a></p>	<p>Brian M. O'Connell, Esq.        Ashley Crispin Ackal, Esq.        Ciklin Lubitz &amp; O'Connell        515 N. Flagler Dr., 20<sup>th</sup> FL        West Palm Beach, FL 33401  <a href="mailto:service@ciklinlubitz.com">service@ciklinlubitz.com</a>  <a href="mailto:probateservice@ciklinlubitz.com">probateservice@ciklinlubitz.com</a></p>	<p>Robert Spallina, Esq.  <a href="mailto:rspallina@comcast.net">rspallina@comcast.net</a></p>



EXHIBIT 2 - June 05, 2017 Order

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

June 05, 2017

**CASE NO.: 4D16-0222**

L.T. No.: 2011CP000653XXXXSB  
2014CP003698XXXXNB

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN

v. TED BERNSTEIN, AS TRUSTEE, ET AL.

---

Appellant / Petitioner(s)

Appellee / Respondent(s)

**BY ORDER OF THE COURT:**

ORDERED that the appellant's May 30, 2017 motion to accept motion for rehearing and other relief filed less than one hour late is granted; further,

ORDERED that the appellant's May 30, 2017 motion for rehearing, clarification, written decision and certification is denied.

Served:

cc: Lorin Louis Mrachek  
Steven A. Lessne  
Alan Benjamin Rose  
Joielle A. Foglietta  
Lisa Friedstein  
Pamela Beth Simon  
James Dimon  
Neil Wolfson  
Lindsay Baxley  
Heritage Union Life Ins.  
Co.


Brian M. O'Connell  
John P. Morrissey  
Peter Marshall Feaman  
Charles D. Rubin  
Jill Iantoni  
Dennis McNamara  
William McCabe  
Stp Enterprises, Inc.  
T & S Registered Agents,  
Llc  
David Lanciotti

Mark R. Manceri  
Kenneth S. Pollock  
Donald R. Tescher  
Eliot Ivan Bernstein  
Theodore Stuart Bernstein  
Dennis G. Bedley  
Gerald Lewin  
Ralph S. Janvey  
Joseph M. Leccese  
Brian Moynihan

II



**LONN WEISSBLUM, Clerk**  
Fourth District Court of Appeal



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

June 05, 2017

**CASE NO.: 4D16-0222**

L.T. No.: 2011CP000653XXXXSB  
2014CP003698XXXXNB

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN

v. TED BERNSTEIN, AS TRUSTEE, ET AL.

---

Appellant / Petitioner(s)

Appellee / Respondent(s)

**BY ORDER OF THE COURT:**

ORDERED that the appellant's May 30, 2017 motion to accept motion for rehearing and other relief filed less than one hour late is granted; further,

ORDERED that the appellant's May 30, 2017 motion for rehearing, clarification, written decision and certification is denied.

Served:

cc: Lorin Louis Mrachek  
Steven A. Lessne  
Alan Benjamin Rose  
Joielle A. Foglietta  
Lisa Friedstein  
Pamela Beth Simon  
James Dimon  
Neil Wolfson  
Lindsay Baxley  
Heritage Union Life Ins.  
Co.

Brian M. O'Connell  
John P. Morrissey  
Peter Marshall Feaman  
Charles D. Rubin  
Jill Iantoni  
Dennis McNamara  
William McCabe  
Stp Enterprises, Inc.  
T & S Registered Agents,  
Llc  
David Lanciotti

Mark R. Manceri  
Kenneth S. Pollock  
Donald R. Tescher  
Eliot Ivan Bernstein  
Theodore Stuart Bernstein  
Dennis G. Bedley  
Gerald Lewin  
Ralph S. Janvey  
Joseph M. Leccese  
Brian Moynihan

II



**LONN WEISSBLUM, Clerk**  
Fourth District Court of Appeal

