1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION
3	
4	SIMON BERNSTEIN IRREVOCABLE INSURANCE TRUST DTD 6/21/95,
5	
6	Plaintiff, v.
7	HERITAGE UNION LIFE INSURANCE
8	COMPANY,
9	Defendant,
10	HERITAGE UNION LIFE INSURANCE
11	COMPANY,
12	Counter-Plaintiff
13	V.
14	SIMON BERNSTEIN IRREVOCABLE INSURANCE TRUST DTD 6/21/95
15	Counter-Defendant
16	and,
17	FIRST ARLINGTON NATIONAL BANK as Trustee of S.B. Lexington, Inc.
18	Employee Death Benefit Trust,
19	UNITED BANK OF ILLINOIS, BANK OF AMERICA, Successor in interest to
20	LaSalle National Trust, N.A., SIMON BERNSTEIN TRUST, N.A., TED BERNSTEIN,
21	individually and as purported Trustee of the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable
22	Insurance Trust Dtd 6/21/95, and ELIOT BERNSTEIN
23	Third-Party Defendants.
24	//
25	
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN,		
2	Cross-Plaintiff		
3	V.		
4	TED BERNSTEIN, individually and as alleged Trustee of the Simon Bernstein		
5	Irrevocable Insurance Trust Dtd 6/21/95,		
6	Cross-Defendant		
7	and,		
	PAMELA B. SIMON, DAVID B. SIMON, both		
8	Professionally and Personally, ADAM SIMON, both Professionally and Personally,		
9	THE SIMON LAW FIRM, TESCHER & SPALLINA, P.A., DONALD TESCHER, both Professionally		
10	and Personally, ROBERT SPALLINA, both Professionally and Personally, LISA		
11	FRIEDSTEIN, JILL IANTONI, S.B. LEXINGTON, INC. EMPLOYEE DEATH BENEFIT TRUST, S.T.P.		
12	ENTERPRISES, INC., S.B. LEXINGTON, INC,		
13	NATIONAL SERVICE ASSOCIATION (OF FLORIDA), NATIONAL SERVICE ASSOCIATION (OF ILLINOIS),		
14	AND JOHN AND JANE DOES		
15	Third-Party Defendants.		
16			
17	DEPOSITION OF TED BERNSTEIN		
18	Taken on behalf of the Estate of Simon Bernstein		
19			
20	DATE TAKEN: May 6, 2015		
21	TIME: 5:06 p.m 8:15 p.m. PLACE: 2385 N.W. Executive Center Drive		
22	Boca Raton, Florida		
23			
	Ctone washing]]. Dependent of hur		
24	Stenographically Reported by:		
25	Lisa Gropper, R.P.R., F.P.R.		
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052		

1	APPEARANCES
2	ON BEHALF OF TED BERNSTEIN:
3	
4	ADAM M. SIMON, ESQ. THE SIMON LAW FIRM 303 East Wacker Drive
5	Suite 2725 Chicago, Illinois 60601
6	ALAN B. ROSE, ESQ.
7	MRACHEK, FITZGERALD, ROSE, KONOPKA, THOMAS & WEISS, P.A.
8	505 South Flagler Drive Suite 600
9	West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
10	ON BEHALF OF THE ESTATE OF SIMON BERNSTEIN:
11	JAMES J. STAMOS, ESQ.
12	KEVIN P. HORAN, ESQ. STAMOS & TRUCCO, LLP
13	One East Wacker Drive Suite 300
14	Chicago, Illinois 60601
15	ELIOT BERNSTEIN, PRO SE
16	2753 NW 34th Street Boca Raton, Florida 33434
17	
18	ALSO PRESENT: William Stansbury Candice Bernstein (as noted)
19	
20	
21	
22 23	
23 24	
24	
ر ے	
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc.
	Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1			INDEX		
2	Witness	Direct	Cross	Redirect	Recross
3	Ted Bernste	in			
4	(By Mr. Sta	mos) 6		118, 120	
5	(By Mr. Eli	ot Bernstein)	94		115, 121
6	(By Mr. Sim	on)	113		119
7					
8					
9		E	XHIBITS		
10	Exhibit	De	escription		Page
11	1	Email chain	·	ped TS4965	33
12	_	through TS49			
13	2	Email chain through TS44		ped TS4489	50
14	3	Email from F		ated	54
15		December 6,			
16	4	Email chain through BT70		ped BT67	55
17 18	5	Email chain through BT66		ped BT65	57
19	8	Email chain through BT50		ped BT48	58
20	9	Email chain		ned BT51	59
21	5	through BT52			55
22	10	Email chain	Bates stam	ped BT47	60
23	11	Email chain through TS44		ped TS4464	62
24					
25					

1		EXHIBITS (Cont'd)	
2	Exhibit	Description	Page
3 4	14	Email chain Bates stamped TS6578 through TS6579	66
5	15	Email chain Bates stamped TS6508 through TS6512	67
6 7	16	Email chain Bates stamped TS5252 through TS5255	69
8	17	Email chain Bates stamped TS6547 through TS6549	71
9	18	Email chain Bates stamped TS7019 through TS7020	75
.1	19	Affidavit of Ted Bernstein	11
.2	21	Trust draft Bates stamped BT2 through BT12	13
.3 .4	22	Trust draft Bates stamped BT13 through BT21	13
.5	23	Simon Bernstein 2000 Insurance Trust dated August 15, 2000	77
_6 _7	24	Simon L. Bernstein Amended and Restated Trust Agreement	78
.8	25	Simon L. Bernstein Irrevocable Trust Agreement	78
.9 20	26	Document titled "Text of Pam's Notes 1 & 2" with two pages and handwritten notes attached	90
21 2	А	Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office Offense Report	108
23			
24			
25			
		McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	

	1	
1		THE COURT REPORTER: Do you swear or affirm
2	that	the testimony you're about to give will be the
3	trut	h, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
4		THE WITNESS: I do.
5	DIRECT EX	AMINATION
6	BY MR. ST	AMOS:
7	Q	State your name for the record, please.
8	А	Ted Bernstein.
9	Q	Where do you reside, Mr. Bernstein?
10	А	880 Berkeley Street, Boca Raton, Florida.
11	Q	Where are you employed?
12	А	In Boca Raton, Florida.
13	Q	What's the entity that employs you?
14	А	Life Insurance Concepts.
15	Q	How long have you been in that business?
16	А	Approximately 15, 16, 17 years.
17	Q	Were you engaged in the insurance business
18	before wo	rking with Life Concepts?
19	А	I was in the insurance business before.
20	Q	With who?
21	А	Primarily for myself.
22	Q	Were you employed by yourself or were you an
23	employee	of some other person or entity?
24	А	I was employed by companies that I set up.
25	Q	Can you just tell me generally I don't need
		McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago. Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	a lot of detail, but what was the nature of it? Was it
2	mostly life insurance?
3	A Yes, it was.
4	Q Do you hold a license of any kind in Florida?
5	A I do.
6	Q What kind of license do you hold?
7	A A life insurance license: Life, accident and
8	health insurance.
9	Q Do you hold a license in any other state?
10	A I believe I do.
11	Q What other state or states?
12	A I can't remember off the top of my head.
13	Q What are the candidates for states in which
14	you might hold a license?
15	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
16	You can answer.
17	A I can't I really can't remember. There's a
18	lot of states, and at different times we will do
19	business in those states and get a nonresident license.
20	I really can't remember.
21	Q Let me ask you this: Did you ever have a
22	resident license in any other state?
23	A I did.
24	Q What state is that?
25	A Illinois.
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 7 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	Q		
2		Is that license still active?	
2	А	My resident license is not.	
3	Q	Okay. Has any license, resident	or otherwise,
4	in any st	ate ever been disciplined or rest	cricted in any
5	way?		
6	А	I don't recall. I don't think s	50.
7	Q	Can you tell me what status you	now have with
8	respect t	o the Estate of Simon Bernstein.	
9		MR. SIMON: Objection; vague.	
10	Q	Do you understand my question?	
11	А	I don't understand the word "sta	atus".
12	Q	Well, do you have any official r	role in any
13	official	capacity with regard to the estat	te itself or
14	any entit	ties or structures that relate to	the estate?
15		MR. SIMON: Objection; vague.	Estate Executor/Personal Representative Brian O'Connell Affirmative Defense Ted lawsuit.
16	А	I believe I do; as trustee.	"1. First Affirmative Defense- Lack of Standing- Ted Bernstein lacks the requisite standing as
17	Q	Of what are you trustee?	he is not validly serving as Trustee of the Simon Trust not a beneficiary of the Simon
18	А	Simon Bernstein Trust.	Trust, and is not representing any minor child that is a beneficiary of the Simon Trust.
19	Q DMPENTENCY	What is the year of that trust?	Click box to see, http://iviewit.tv/Simon%20and%20Shirley%
20	A	I don't recall.	20Estate/20150217%20Answer%20%20Affirmati %20Defenses%200%27Connell%20States%201
21	Q	You are also a plaintiff in the	%20is%20NOT%20VALID%20TRUSTEE.pdf
22	pending i	n Chicago; is that correct?	
23	А	Yes.	
24	Q	So have you perceived any diverg	gence of
	intoroct	or any conflict of interest in ha	aving a role

1 with respect to the trust and the estate while simultaneously being a plaintiff in the case in Chicago? 2 Attorney at Law 3 Α I do not. Feaman Letter re Conflict issues of 4 As the trustee of the trust, the Simon 0 Ted and Adam Simon Click here 5 Bernstein Trust, will the proceeds of the estate, once they are disbursed, be disbursed to that trust of which 6 you are a trustee? 7 Objection; speculation. 8 MR. SIMON: To your knowledge, is that your understanding 9 Q 10 of the mechanics of it? 11 I do believe that that's correct. Α 12 And you agree that, if you are successful as a 0 13 plaintiff in the Chicago case, the amount of assets 14 available in the estate to be disbursed to the trust of 15 which are you a trustee will be reduced, correct? 16 Could you -- could you ask me that in a Α 17 different wav? 18 If you are successful as a plaintiff in Yes. 0 19 the Chicago case and the proceeds of the insurance 20 policy regarding which we are all litigating is 21 disbursed to the plaintiffs in the Chicago case, those 22 funds will not be disbursed to the estate. You 23 understand that? 24 I do. Α And, therefore, the estate will have less 25 Q

1	funds to disburse to the trust of which you are a
2	trustee. Do you understand mechanically that's what
3	would happen in that circumstance?
4	A IIdo.
5	Q So you don't perceive a conflict in those
6	roles?
7	A I do not.
8	Q Okay. Now, the date of your father's death
9	was September 13, 2012, correct?
10	A Yes.
11	Q Prior to the time that your father died, were
12	you aware of the existence of any trust with regard to
13	any life insurance policy?
14	MR. SIMON: Objection; vague.
15	A Can you define "existence"?
16	Q Well, when did you first learn that well,
17	strike that.
18	In the lawsuit in Chicago, you're aware that
19	the plaintiffs are promoting the notion that there is a
20	1995 insurance trust which should receive the funds of
21	the insurance proceeds, correct?
22	A Correct.
23	Q When did you first become aware of the
24	existence of the trust that is being promoted as the
25	beneficiary in the Chicago case?

Ē

I'm not sure that I can recall when I first 1 Α 2 remembered when there was a trust. 3 0 Did you learn of it before or after your 4 father passed away? 5 Α Before. 6 MR. STAMOS: I just want to get oriented What we did was we have a bunch 7 mechanically here. of exhibits that we sent down, and the court 8 9 reporter was kind enough to break them into 10 exhibits so that we could use them with some ease. 11 I think there should be more than one set there I'm 12 hoping. And so we'll address those in a moment. 13 Among them would be the affidavit that was submitted in support of the Motion for Summary 14 I'm wondering if the court reporter 15 Judament. 16 could give that to the witness now, and it is 17 Exhibit 19. 18 (Exhibit 19 was marked for identification.) 19 (By Mr. Stamos) Now, first of all, 0 20 Mr. Bernstein, can you tell me, who drafted this 21 affidavit? $22^{\text{COMPENTENCY}} \Delta$ Can you explain -- help me with the term 23 "draft"? 24 Who wrote it? Who created it? I'm not sure 0 25 how to put it otherwise, but let's start with that.

McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	Compentecy? A Counsel and and me, I guess.
2	Q Mr. Simon
3	A Correct.
4	Q and you?
5	A Correct.
6	Q What did you understand the purpose of the
7	affidavit to be?
8	A To create a record of what my understanding
9	was of the questions being addressed here.
10	Q Now, if I could ask you, please, to look at
11	I think it's the I don't know what page it is, but
12	it's I guess at the top it's Page 6 of 20, if you
13	look up there, and paragraph 25. Do you see that?
14	A Ido.
15	Q Now, that paragraph says that, "I, Ted
16	Bernstein, as trustee of the Bernstein Trust, retained
17	plaintiff's counsel and initiated the filing of this
18	action."
19	Now, the first question I have for you is
20	what's the basis for your assertion that you are the
21	trustee of the Bernstein Trust?
22	A What is the basis of my understanding?
23	Q Yeah.
24	A I guess a couple of different things would be
25	the basis of my understanding.

1	Q	What are they?	
2	А	David Simon told me I was the successor	
3	trustee.		
4	Q	Okay.	
5	А	I've seen documents that would lead me to Ted did not see these documents until over	
6	believe t	hat I was a successor trustee in some of the year after the lawsuit	t ·e
7	notes tha	t were in the documents that I've seen.	
8	Q	What documents are those?	
9	А	Trust documents.	
10	Q	Which trust documents are you referring to?	
11	А	I'm referring to the trust document that owned	
12	this trus	t. I mean owned this policy.	
13	Q	So do we share the understanding that no one	
14	has locat	ed an executed copy of the 1995 trust?	
15	А	we do.	
16	Q	I have Exhibits 21 and 22. I would ask the	
17	court rep	orter to give those to you.	
18		(Exhibits 21 and 22 were marked for	
19	identific	ation.)	
20	Q	Looking at number 21, I understand this to	
21	have been	a draft of represented to be a draft of a	
22	trust tha	t was found on a computer in the Simon law	
23	office.	Have you seen this document before and is my	
24	understan	ding correct as far as you know?	
25	А	21?	

E.

1	Q Yeah.
2	(Pause.)
3	Q Does my question make sense or should I
4	restate it? It was kind of convoluted.
5	A Sure, please.
6	Q So looking at number 21, what do you
7	understand that to be?
8	A An unexecuted copy of the irrevocable trust
9	agreement.
10	Q I'll tell you what. When we're talking about
11	the '95 trust, how about if we both call it the '95
12	trust? That way we won't confuse ourselves. Because I
13	think I started by not doing that, and I don't want us
14	confused. Okay?
15	A The '95 trust, certainly.
16	Q Have you seen this before?
17	A Yes, I have.
18	Q Is this one of the documents you're referring
19	to as being one of the bases for your belief that you
20	are the trustee of the '95 trust?
21	A I believe so.
22	Q When I look at Page 10, BT10, paragraph A
23	refers to the appointment of a successor trustee and it
24	refers to David Simon, and I'm wondering what about this
25	document implies to you that you would be the successor
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 14 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

trustee.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

15

16

22

well, there's a couple of versions of this Α document if my recollection is correct, and -- or maybe not this document. but maybe forms of this document. and in another one of the forms of this document I have seen in this, what I believe would be the same or similar section, some handwritten notes that listed me as a successor trustee. So, at least for our purposes, what I've shown 0 10 you as number 21 does not refer to you, correct? 11 That's correct. Α All right. We'll get back to 21. 0 Looking at 22 now, if you go to Page 20, I 13 understand, and tell me if you share this understanding, 14 that number 22 was a hard copy draft represented to be a draft of the '95 trust that was found in a file 17 someplace in the Simon law office. Do you share that 18 understanding? 19 Α I'm -- I'm not sure. Could you repeat that 20 for me. please? 21 0 well, have you seen this before? I have. Α 23 what do you understand it to be? Q A version, another version of the -- of the 24 Α

25 trust document, of the '95 trust.

<pre>1 Q It is also unexecuted, correct? 2 A Yes, it is. 3 Q When you look at Page BT20, do you see tha 4 A I do. 5 Q When you look at paragraph A under article 6 is that the handwriting you're talking about having 7 seen? 8 A Yes, it is. 9 Q It says, "If for any reason," it looks 10 it says, "Shirley dead," et cetera, question mark,</pre>	
Q When you look at Page BT20, do you see tha A I do. Q When you look at paragraph A under article is that the handwriting you're talking about having seen? A Yes, it is. Q It says, "If for any reason," it looks	
 A I do. Q When you look at paragraph A under article is that the handwriting you're talking about having seen? A Yes, it is. Q It says, "If for any reason," it looks 	
Q When you look at paragraph A under article is that the handwriting you're talking about having seen? A Yes, it is. Q It says, "If for any reason," it looks	11,
<pre>6 is that the handwriting you're talking about having 7 seen? 8 A Yes, it is. 9 Q It says, "If for any reason," it looks</pre>	11,
<pre>7 seen? 8 A Yes, it is. 9 Q It says, "If for any reason," it looks</pre>	
 8 A Yes, it is. 9 Q It says, "If for any reason," it looks 	
9 Q It says, "If for any reason," it looks	
10 it says, "Shirley dead," et cetera, question mark,	like
11 right?	
12 A Yes.	
13 Q Then it says, "Does not continue to act as	
14 trustee," and then it looks like it says, "Pam, Ted,	
15 right?	
16 A Yes.	
17 Q Whose handwriting is that, do you know?	
18 A I believe it to be David's.	
19 Q Did David ever have a conversation with yo	u
20 about either of these documents, 21 or 22?	
21 A NO. CONTRADICTS - On Page 13 Ted states he was told by David Simon that he was Succes saw documents that indicated he was and these are the same documents he now claims he David Simon regarding. that led him to believe he was trustee,	
22 Q Other than those two documents that I've j	ust
23 shown you, Exhibits 21 and 22, are you aware of any	
24 other documents that exist that constitute drafts of	the
25 1995 trust?	

Ż

1	A NO.
2	Q So, as far as you know, these are the only
3	drafts that are in our communal possession, correct?
4	A I believe so.
5	Q Earlier, in beginning to answer one of my
6	questions, you said that David Simon was a source of
7	your knowledge that you were the trustee. Did you ever
8	have a conversation with David in that regard, or
9	conversations?
10	A About him telling me that I was the successor
11	trustee? CONTRADICTS statement on Page 16 stating he did not speak to David about these documents.
12	Q Yes.
13	A Yes.
14	Q When was the first time you and he talked
15	about that?
16	A It was sometime after Simon's death. I would
17	say after Simon's death.
18	Q Do you have a sense for how long after Simon's
19	death?
20	A No, I really don't.
21	Q Who was present for that conversation?
22	A Other than he and me, I don't know if anybody
23	was.
24	Q What did you say to him? What did he say to
25	you in that conversation?
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 17 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	A I don't have any idea.
2	Q Well, did you talk about the '95 trust?
3	A Yes.
4	Q What did you say to him and what did he say to
5	you?
6	A I can't recall the specifics, but it was about
7	the fact that there was a trust that was unable to be
8	located and who the the trustees were, who the
9	successor trustees were.
10	I can't be more specific with you than
11	than than that. I just don't recall, you know, the
12	specifics of the conversation at that point in time.
13	Q All right. At the point in time that you had
14	that conversation, did David have in his possession
15	either Exhibit Number 21 or Number 22, or had you seen
16	either of them by then?
17	A I don't believe so.
18	Q Is it fair to say that you didn't see 21 and
19	22 until sometime after your father died?
20	A That's correct.
21	Q Now, if you would go to looking back at
22	your exhibit now, which is number 19, if you would look
23	at paragraph 47. Do you see that?
24	A Yes.
25	Q Now, you describe there that you participated
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 18 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	in and conducted diligent searches of your father's
2	home, office and condominium, and some further activity
3	following that. Can you tell me when those searches
4	took place relative to his death?
5	A No, I can't.
6	Q Can you give me a time range? If you think
7	about the date of his death being in September, did you
8	do that search October, November, December?
9	A I really I don't know the dates.
10	Q Who else searched, or who searched with you,
11	if that's different?
12	A I don't believe that anybody else searched
13	with me.
14	Q Did anyone search separately for documents?
15	MR. SIMON: Object
16	A NO.
17	Q In paragraph 48 of Exhibit 19, it says, "I am
18	aware that the documents produced by Plaintiffs in this
19	matter also contain documents located by David Simon and
20	Pamela Simon in their offices in Chicago." Do you see
21	that there?
22	A I do.
23	Q When do you understand they performed a search
24	of their offices in Chicago for documents relative to
25	the dispute we're in now?

ł

1	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
2	A I have no idea.
3	Q Well, you said that you're aware. How were
4	you made aware of that fact?
5	A By learning of it probably from conversations.
6	Q Conversations with whom?
7	A With David Simon, I would imagine.
8	Q But you don't know the source you can't
9	tell me specifically the source of that information,
10	correct?
11	A Well, you're asking for dates or source?
12	Q Well, source is where I'm going now.
13	A Source, I think it was with with David
14	Simon.
15	Q What documents do you understand were located
16	and produced that were found in their offices?
17	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
18	Q Well, now, let's make sure we're clear. I'm
19	never asking you to speculate there might be times
20	that I do ask you to speculate. Sometimes that's a
21	useful question to ask. So when Mr. Simon says,
22	"Objection; speculation," I'm asking you to tell me what
23	you know or you don't know or what you think. So I just
24	want you to be aware that I'm not asking you to take
25	wild guesses about things.

E

1	A Okay.	
2	Q All right?	
3	A Could you ask me that last question again,	
4	please.	
5	Q Now I forget my question.	
6	MR. SIMON: Can you read the question?	
7	MR. STAMOS: Why don't you read that question	
8	back.	
9	(Candice Bernstein enters the room.)	
10	(Read back by the reporter.)	
11	MR. SIMON: Same objection.	
12	Let's just take a one-minute break.	
13	(Recess taken.)	
14	MR. STAMOS: Was there a question pending?	
15	(Read back by the reporter.)	
16	THE WITNESS: And other than these	
17	documents, I would imagine, that you're asking me	
18	about?	
19	Q (By Mr. Stamos) Other than 21 and 22 you mean?	
20	A Yes.	
21	Q Yes.	
22	A Other than 21 and 22. I believe there was a	
23	document that was something to do with a filing to the	
24	IRS concerning the trust. There might have been a a	
25	W-9 or something. And I think that might be the extent	
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	21

1	of it.	
2	Q All right. So let's then go to number 88,	
3	paragraph 88. That's page 13 of 20.	
4	A 88?	
5	Q Yes.	
6	A Okay. It's on my Page 12, but okay.	
7	Q Oh. If you look at the top, does the top say,	
8	"13 of 20"?	
9	A 13 of 20 on the top, it does.	
10	Q Yeah, I'm sorry. I think actually we had	
11	those numbered and sent to you, but the copy I had it	
12	made from was never numbered. So we'll refer to it as	
13	Page 12.	
14	A Okay.	
15	Q All right. So 88, it says here, "In 1995, I	
16	was sharing office space with Simon Bernstein in	
17	Chicago, as was your sister Pam and David."	
18	Now, first of all, during what years did you	
19	share office space with your father in Chicago?	
20	A About these times, I'm going to say shared	
21	office space in 1980 through 1995-ish.	
22	Q In 1995, did you leave for Florida?	
23	A Yes. I began	
24	Q Okay.	
25	A Yes, I began going to Florida in 1995 back and	
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 2 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	2

McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

forth.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q It says, "In the summer of 1995, Simon Bernstein discussed with me that he was forming a life insurance trust with a policy and that I would be named one of the trustees for the life insurance trust."

Now, who was present for that conversation? A Of course Simon Bernstein, my father, would have been present, but other than that I can't remember.

Q After you and he talked about that in 1995, what was the next time you had any information or knowledge regarding the existence, creation, changes to, et cetera, regarding a trust in 1995, dated 1995?

A I believe that would have been maybe a year, a year and a half prior to my father's death when there was a -- this -- the policy that was in this trust lapsed and there was a reinstatement matter, and about that time it would have -- it would have come up again.

Q When you say, "It would have come up again," did you have a conversation with anyone at that time about the 1995 trust? In other words --

A NO.

Q -- at the time that you were addressing the reinstatement of the policy the year or two before he died, did you have any conversation with him, not about the reinstatement of the policy, but about the 1995

1 trust? 2 Α NO. So any other time prior to his death that you 3 0 4 had conversations with anyone about the 1995 trust? 5 Α NO. Now, it says here that he told you you were 6 0 7 going to be one of the trustees. I take it you never 8 saw an executed trust with you -- period, correct? 9 Correct. Α 10 So, therefore, you never saw an executed trust 0 11 with your name on it as trustee, correct? 12 Not -- not that I recall. Α 13 well, when you had the conversation with David 0 14 Simon that you described earlier in which you learned that you were the replacement -- the successor trustee, 15 16 did you remember this conversation with your father, or 17 was that a different topic because in '95 he said you 18 would be the trustee, not a successor trustee? 19 Objection; vague. MR. SIMON: 20 So the conversation with David Simon would Α 21 have made perfect sense -- based on '88. would have made 22 perfect sense when he told me that I was, you know, 23 successor trustee. 24 I mean, I know it would have made 0 Right. 25 perfect sense. What I'm asking you is: Did you hearken

back and say, "Oh, yeah, dad told me that," or something like that?

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Oh. I don't recall. I can't remember.

Q Then if you would go, please, to paragraph 97, it says, "Following the death of my father, my sister Pamela and brother-in-law David conducted searches of their office files and records and that's where they located the unexecuted drafts." I take that to be 21 and 22, correct?

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A Yes.

Q Now, referring to the metadata that is in the last sentence of that paragraph, if you would please look at Exhibit 21, let me tell you what I understand the facts to be, and tell me if you share the understanding. I always get a little confused about metadata, but where it indicates, "Wednesday June 21, 1995," then says, "Modified," David's told us that's actually the date the document was created. Does that sound like your understanding?

MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation. This is not his database. He knows nothing about it.

MR. STAMOS: Adam, if you've got an objection as to form, you may do that, but I don't expect you to give answers about what he knows or he doesn't know, because the affidavit says it includes a

1 printout of metadata from the computer file for 2 this draft indicating it was last modified on 3 June 21st. So he's got some knowledge; otherwise, 4 he wouldn't have signed the affidavit. So please 5 don't tell him what he knows and doesn't know. 6 So I'm going to ask my guestion again. 7 (By Mr. Stamos) When you look at the metadata, 0 do you understand -- this is my understanding. 8 Do you understand that, where it says, "Modified Wednesday 9 June 21, 1995" -- David Simon has told us that's the day 10 11 that the document was created. Is that your 12 understanding of it? Objection: speculation. 13 MR. SIMON: 14 I just want to make sure that -- could you Α 15 help me out and -- where do you want me to look at on 16 this document in reference to what you're asking me? 17 On the page you're looking at, is there --0 Can you see this (indicating)? 18 19 Is there a little square box --20 Yes, there is. Α 21 -- rectangular box? Okay. Q 22 So you see those words there about -- on the 23 second half of it, so to speak, "Created, modified, 24 accessed"? 25 Yes, I do now, yeah. Yes. Α

1 what I understand David has testified to, and 0 I believe it's on Page 90 of his deposition, is that 2 where it says, "Modified," that was the day it was put 3 4 in the computer; where it says, "September 3rd," that 5 was the day it was re-entered into a new database. September 3, 2004; and where it says, "September 30, 6 2013 accessed," that's the day it was taken off of the 7 8 computer and ultimately printed so that we could see it. 9 Do you share that understanding? MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation. 10 11 I don't. I don't have any idea what this --Α 12 all this means. 13 Do you know what date it was that this 0 document, 21, was taken off of the computer? 14 15 Α I don't. where paragraph 98 says, "The second draft of 16 0 17 the Bernstein trust was located as a hard copy inside a 18 file folder within the stored files of David Simon," do 19 you know when that was found? Back to this document (indicating)? 20 Α 21 Back to Exhibit Number 22, yes. 0 22 Α Okay. Could you ask me that again, please? 23 Yeah. If you look at -- do you know when Q 24 Exhibit Number 22 was found? 25 I don't. Α

đ.

How did you learn it was found? 1 0 2 I learned of it from conversations with David. Α I learned of it reading these things. I -- that's, I 3 guess, the two ways I would have learned about it. 4 5 we're going to go through some emails in a 0 moment, but I imagine that the discovery of those two 6 7 drafts was considered to be an important step in this case for you, correct? 8 9 MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation. 10 Was it important or not? 0 11 I don't know. Α 12 Did you think it was a positive development 0 13 from the point of view of the lawsuit, you as a 14 plaintiff in the Chicago lawsuit, that these documents were found? 15 Objection; relevance. 16 MR. SIMON: 17 I thought it was a positive development as a Α 18 layperson. 19 How did you come to possess them so that you 0 20 could look at them? Were they emailed to you from 21 Chicago? 22 Α I don't recall. 23 Do you recall seeing them before today, Q obviously? 24 25 Α Yes. McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago. Illinois (312) 263-0052

Do you recall seeing him before the lawsuit 1 0 2 was filed in Chicago? 3 I don't recall. Α 4 Now, a couple of more things about your 0 5 affidavit. Some of these things that are in here -- I'd 6 7 like you, if you would, to look at paragraph 21, would you, of Exhibit Number 19. Do you see paragraph 21? 8 9 Α I do. Now, the first sentence where it says, "The 10 0 11 Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust dated 12 6/21/95 is an irrevocable life insurance trust formed in Illinois as further described below," does that assume 13 14 that the trust -- your statement that it is a trust, is that based upon your understanding that it was executed? 15 16 If I'm understanding your question correctly, Α 17 yes. what's the basis for your understanding that 18 Q 19 it was executed? 20 That -- number one, that David told me that it Α 21 was; number two, that there were filings that had tax ID 22 number. I believe I -- there was a form that may have 23 been filled out for the insurance company that named the beneficiary -- I mean -- yeah, that named the life 24 25 insurance trust as the beneficiary, and maybe there was

mentioned insurance Q	x reporting where I think Simon said that the contingent beneficiary of the life policy was an irrevocable trust, just But in terms of your father having signed the	
insurance Q	policy was an irrevocable trust, just	
Q		
•	But in terms of your father having signed the	
document,		
	the knowledge of that is based on what David	
Simon told	d you, correct?	
А	Yes.	
Q	Look if you will, at paragraph 40, which is on	
page I	'm guessing 7 at the bottom.	
А	40?	
Q	Yes, paragraph 40, the last line of that.	
	Do you see that?	
А	I do.	
Q	It says, "The vivo was dissolved in 1998 upon	
dissolutio	on of S.B. Lexington, Inc." How do you know	
that?		
А	I know that from from David.	
Q	Where it says, paragraph 41, "Robert Spallina,	
Esquire wa	as named a third-party defendant to Eliot's	
claims,"	now do you know that?	
А	I'm not sure how I know it. I just I'm not	
exactly su	ure that I even understand that question.	
Q	You don't understand the question or the	
assertion	in 41?	
А	Your question of how I know something.	
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	3(
	Simon told A Q page I A Q dissolution that? A Q Esquire wa claims," H A exactly su Q assertion	<pre>document, the knowledge of that is based on what David Simon told you, correct? A Yes. Q Look if you will, at paragraph 40, which is on page I'm guessing 7 at the bottom. A 40? Q Yes, paragraph 40, the last line of that. Do you see that? A I do. Q It says, "The vivo was dissolved in 1998 upon dissolution of S.B. Lexington, Inc." How do you know that? A I know that from from David. Q Where it says, paragraph 41, "Robert Spallina, Esquire was named a third-party defendant to Eliot's claims," how do you know that? A I'm not sure how I know it. I just I'm not exactly sure that I even understand that question. Q You don't understand the question or the assertion in 41? A Your question of how I know something.</pre>

1	Q Well, how did you become aware? How did you
2	become aware of the statement of the fact asserted in
3	paragraph 41, that Robert Spallina, Esquire was named a
4	third-party defendant to Eliot's claims? How do you
5	know that to be true?
6	A Probably from seeing documents where he was a
7	named defendant.
8	Q Would that also be true with regard to the
9	succeeding paragraphs, 42, 43, 44?
10	A Okay. So I've read those subsequent
11	paragraphs. What is the question about them?
12	Q How do you know the facts asserted in those
13	paragraphs?
14	A Well, they're all different paragraphs about
15	different things, so some
16	Q Well, we'll go through them one by one.
17	That's fine.
18	A Okay.
19	Q How do you know that National Services
20	Association was named as a third-party defendant to
21	Eliot's claim?
22	A From seeing documents or from and/or from
23	having conversations with David and counsel.
24	Q How about Benjamin Brown filed a motion to
25	intervene? How did you know that?

A From conversations with -- with counsel or seeing documents.

Q Look at page 59 -- I'm sorry, paragraph 59 on Page 9, please, and in that first sentence, it says, "During the application process, the insurer conducted a routine underwriting investigation of Simon Bernstein prior to approving his policy." How do you know that?

A From conversations with counsel, and also there were a lot of documents that the insurance company sent over to me at the time that this policy was going through the reinstatement process. So these are all pretty common things for -- for me to see in -- in an insurance company's document like that.

I'm -- I'm -- I think it would be also in something about an application process that may have been through the discovery of the documents that the insurance company provided in that reinstatement process.

19QLook at paragraph 70, please. It's on Page2010.

21 A Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Q It says, "On or about June 5, 1992, a letter was submitted on behalf of the policyholder informing the insurer that LaSalle National Trust was being appointed as successor trustee." Did you become aware

1	of that by reviewing documents in this case?
2	A Yes, I believe so.
3	Q Likewise, the June 17, 1992, acknowledgment by
4	the insurer is also something you learned long after
5	1992, correct?
6	A Yes.
7	Q That's all I want to talk to you about your
8	affidavit for now. I want to walk through the emails
9	with you, if we can. I think they've been numbered.
10	I'd like to begin with Exhibit Number 1.
11	(Exhibit 1 was marked for identification.)
12	Q Do you have that in front of you? I believe
13	it's marked Exhibit Number 1 with Bates numbers TS4965
14	to 4966. Do you see that?
15	A Yes, I do.
16	Q Now, this is dated it's a string that
17	begins, it looks like, on October 15th and ends on
18	October 19th, if I'm looking at that correctly. So we
19	have to read the second page first. Okay?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Now, as best I'm able to tell, this is the
22	earliest email that I have on the subject matter of
23	obtaining the life insurance proceeds that we're
24	addressing here. Do you know when the process began, if
25	this was the beginning of the process or was there

E

effort and discussion about that prior to October 15, 2012? Α I do not know. what's the first conversation you recall with 4 0 anyone after your father's passing about the insurance policy and the trust and so forth? My recollection would be with Robert Spallina Α and/or Don Tescher. If we're looking here at Exhibit Number 1, 0 10 Page 2 of that exhibit, on the 15th it looks like Pam 11 wrote, "Hi all. Do you have time for a status," to which Spallina writes, "There are no updates at this 12 13 time." Does that imply to you that there must have been communications before October 15th about the insurance 14 15 policy? Objection; speculation. 16 MR. SIMON: 17 No. it doesn't. Α 18 It doesn't? Q 19 Α NO. 20 So, when he says there are no updates, would 0 21 that not imply to you that he knew there was something to be updated and, therefore, would have been familiar 23 with the topic? I -- I'm not sure. There were a lot of things 24 Α 25 going on about a lot of topics. So the question "Do you

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

22

have time for status --" 1 2 0 Okay. -- I -- I can't be sure what led up to the --3 Α 4 to that question being asked without any more guiding 5 information in that sentence. 6 0 Did you have an understanding that Mr. Spallina submitted a claim to the insurance company 7 representing himself to be the trustee of the '95 trust? 8 9 Can you ask me that again? There was wind or Α 10 something. 11 I'm sorry. That's actually a train. 0 12 Do you understand that Mr. Spallina made 13 application to the insurance company for the proceeds of 14 the insurance stating that he was the trustee of the 15 trust? 16 I do understand that, yes. Α 17 when is the first time you became aware that 0 Mr. Spallina was going to make an application 18 identifying himself as the trustee? 19 I'm -- I will say after Simon's death 20 Α 21 obviously, but other than that, I don't -- I can't tell 22 you what the time period was. 23 0 Did you ever have a -- were you aware he was going to do that before he did it? 24 25 I was not. Α

You were only aware of that after he was --1 0 2 after he did it? 3 After he did it. Α 4 How did vou become aware of that? 0 5 Through conversations with Robert Spallina. Α Look, if you will, at the top of -- I'm sorry, 6 0 look at the middle, from Robert Spallina, October 19th, 7 to Pam Simon, copied to you. Do you see that? 8 9 We're on Page 1 now? Α 10 Yes, we are. Q 11 Page 1, and you want me to pick up where? Α where it says, right in the middle, "Pam, my 12 0 13 office is processing." 14 Yeah. Α 15 Q Do you see that? 16 Yes, I do. Α 17 And you were copied on this, correct? 0 18 I was. Α It says, "My office is processing --" this is 19 Q 20 from Spallina. "My office is processing the claim as 21 your father was the owner of the policy and the proceeds 22 will likely be paid to the estate in the absence of 23 finding the trust." 24 Is it fair to say -- did you understand at 25 that point it was understood that the trust could not be

located, the '95 trust? 1 Objection; speculation, form. 2 MR. SIMON: 3 Α Yes. 4 Then he says, "As I mentioned previously, 0 5 there was a discussion with the carrier about possibly 6 using the 2000 trust (the one you are carved out of but would be split five ways according to Ted), but I am not 7 sure that we will achieve that result." Do you see 8 9 that? 10 I do. Α 11 what was the first conversation you had with 0 Mr. Spallina about the possibility of submitting the 12 13 claim to the insurance company using the 2000 trust? 14 Around the same time that these discussions Δ 15 were going on. 16 when did you become aware that the 2000 trust 0 17 existed? 18 Around this same time period. Α 19 when you first had that conversation with Q 20 Mr. Spallina, what did you say to him and what did he 21 say to you about using the 2000 trust to submit a claim 22 to the insurance company? 23 MR. SIMON: Objection; privilege. 24 Don't answer. 25 MR. STAMOS: Privilege? Privilege of who for McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 37

Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	whom?
2	MR. SIMON: Attorney-client. He was his
3	attorney. Spallina was his attorney. You're
4	asking about a conversation between him and his
5	attorney.
6	Q Well, he was your attorney personally or as
7	trustee or what?
8	A He was my attorney as trustee.
9	Q Trustee of what?
10	A Shirley Bernstein Trust.
11	Q Did the Shirley Bernstein Trust have an
12	interest in the insurance policy that we're litigating
13	about?
14	A It did not.
15	Q So what did the conversation you had with him
16	about the 2000 trust have to do with your role as
17	trustee of Shirley's trust?
18	MR. SIMON: Same objection; privilege.
19	Don't answer.
20	MR. STAMOS: Well, I'm not asking for a
21	conversation. I'm trying to establish I think
22	that you're obligated to establish the basis of a
23	privilege objection, and I'm entitled to test the
24	existence of the privilege.
25	You've declared that Mr. Spallina was his

lawyer. He's now told me Mr. Spallina was his 1 2 lawyer as trustee of Shirley's trust, and he's now established with me that Shirley's trust had no 3 4 interest in the subject matter of the insurance 5 policy, while we know that Mr. Bernstein has a personal interest in the result of the insurance 6 So I don't see how Mr. Spallina was his 7 policy. lawyer with regard to this topic. 8 9 Do you have a basis for asserting that? 10 MR. SIMON: He consulted with him as an 11 attorney on this matter. That's my basis. 12 (By Mr. Stamos) Is that true, Mr. Bernstein. 0 13 THE WITNESS: Answer? 14 (Nonverbal response.) MR. SIMON: 15 Α Is it true that I consulted with him about 16 this matter? 17 That you consulted with him about this matter 0 in a capacity other than as the trustee of Shirley's 18 19 trust. 20 And I don't mean to be disrespectful by saying 21 "Shirley's trust". I'm just shortening --22 Α Sure. 23 Is "sure" the answer to my question or 0 24 response to my comment there? 25 Α Oh.

1	Q I'm sorry, I'm confused.
2	MR. ROSE: Do you want to confer about the
3	privilege issue if you're confused?
4	MR. STAMOS: I do. I do.
5	Would you please recite the question again to
6	the witness leaving out my comment about Shirley.
7	MR. SIMON: We're going to take a minute and
8	confer on a privilege issue.
9	MR. STAMOS: That's a good idea.
10	(Recess taken.)
11	MR. STAMOS: All right. So can we read the
12	last question back to the witness without my
13	editorial comment at the end.
14	(Read back by the reporter.)
15	Q (By Mr. Stamos) Can you answer that, please.
16	THE WITNESS: Could you read it back to me
17	again, please.
18	Q Actually, you know what, let me stop there.
19	Let me ask a couple of more questions and I'll get back
20	to that.
21	Would you agree with me that Exhibit Number 1
22	reflects an email by Mr. Spallina to yourself and to Pam
23	with regard to the subject matter of the potential use
24	of the 2000 trust?
25	A Yes.
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc.

And, likewise, the email from yourself at the 1 0 top to Mr. Spallina and to Pam is talking generally here 2 about making the application to the insurance company, 3 4 correct? 5 Α Correct. 6 So you made Pam privy to your conversations 0 and vour communications with Mr. Spallina with regard to 7 this topic, correct? 8 9 well, I don't know if I made her privy, but Α this was a chain of people in -- in this email going, 10 11 you know, between two and three people. 12 Right. But you were the only one who was the 0 13 trustee of Shirley's trust, correct? 14 Α Yes. 15 MR. STAMOS: All right. Well, let me just add that, not only do I still not understand what the 16 17 basis for a privilege would be, but if there was a privilege, it was waived by including Pam in these 18 communications. So do I need to establish that any 19 20 more, Adam, or can I ask more questions? 21 If depends what the question is. MR. SIMON: 22 If it's about these emails, that's fine. If it's 23 about conversations between Robert and him personally, it's not fine. It's privileged. 24 25 MR. STAMOS: All right.

é

(By Mr. Stamos) Were there any other 1 0 2 conversations in which you and Pam and he participated 3 with regard to the subject matter of the 2000 trust? 4 No. not that I recall. Α 5 0 what was the notion behind the potential for 6 using the 2000 trust? Objection; speculation. 7 MR. SIMON: I don't know. 8 Α 9 when Mr. Spallina made the application to the Q company identifying himself as the trustee of the '95 10 11 trust, was he acting as your lawyer at that time? 12 Objection: form. I think you said MR. SIMON: 13 made an application to an insurance company? I thought we established earlier that you were 14 Q 15 aware that Mr. Spallina had applied to the insurance company for distribution of the proceeds to the '95 16 17 trust and had done that representing himself to be the 18 trustee of the '95 trust. Did I hear that correctly? 19 Δ Yes. 20 Okay. When he did that, was he your lawyer 0 21 then? 22 Yes. Α So are you telling us that he submitted that 23 Q as your lawyer without your knowledge? 24 25 I'm telling you that, if that's what he did as Α McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 42

Chicago. Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	my if that's what he did, he was doing it as my
2	attorney.
3	Q But you're telling me that he did it without
4	your knowledge?
5	A I'm telling you that, if he did it, he did it
6	as my attorney. Whether he did it with my knowledge or
7	not, that's something I think I've said I I don't
8	remember.
9	Q When you say he did it as your attorney, are
10	you saying he did it as your attorney in your capacity
11	as the trustee of Shirley's trust?
12	A All my
13	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
14	MR. STAMOS: Well, I mean, I'm not sure what's
15	speculative about that.
16	Q Can you answer that question?
17	MR. SIMON: Yeah, I can answer what's
18	speculative about it. He
19	MR. STAMOS: No, no, no. I haven't asked you
20	any questions. I'm asking the witness. I'm not
21	asking you to explain to the witness now how to
22	calculate this as being speculative. I'm asking
23	the question.
24	I'm going to ask the court reporter to read
25	that question back.

E

(Read back by the reporter.) 1 I'm saying that my conversations with Robert 2 Α 3 Spallina, I viewed him as my counsel. In anv conversations I had with Robert Spallina, I expected 4 5 that the attorney-client privilege was there. 6 But what I'm trying to get at is, do you have 0 7 an understanding as to in what -- because you have --8 you wear many hats apparently. Are you saying he was 9 your attorney in every hat you wore? 10 MR. SIMON: Object to form. 11 Do you understand my question? 0 12 I believe I do. Α 13 Okay. Are you telling us that he was your 0 attorney in each of the capacities you have that relate 14 15 to the subject matter of this lawsuit? 16 In these -- in these matters --Α 17 For your father's --0 18 Α Yes. 19 So that would include he was your attorney as 0 20 the trustee of Shirley's trust; he was your attorney as 21 the successor trustee of the '95 trust; and he was your 22 personal attorney? 23 Α As everything that relates to these matters, 24 yes, I -- I viewed Robert as my attorney. 25 Did he ever disclose to you potential issues Q

1	of conflict that arose by virtue of the divergent roles
2	you have as I've just described, and perhaps there are
3	other roles?
4	MR. SIMON: Objection; privilege.
5	MR. STAMOS: Privilege for which attorney
6	MR. SIMON: If that's not privileged, nothing
7	is.
8	MR. STAMOS: Well, we're going to have to
9	litigate about this, so I'm trying to figure out
10	MR. SIMON: That's fine.
11	MR. STAMOS: a privilege in which
12	attorney-client relationship? The attorney-client
13	relationship of him to
14	MR. SIMON: You just asked Jim, let me
15	answer your question. You just asked about a
16	conflict in many different capacities, correct?
17	MR. STAMOS: Yes.
18	MR. SIMON: So any of those capacities or all
19	of them, it's privileged, and that's
20	MR. STAMOS: I understand conceptually. What
21	I'm asking you is, in which capacity are you saying
22	there was a conversation that resulted in a
23	privileged conversation?
24	MR. SIMON: In the capacity that he was the
25	client and Robert was the attorney, and we won't be

Ē

1	talking about conversations between them that are
2	privileged.
3	Q (By Mr. Stamos) Are you going to follow your
4	lawyer's instruction not to answer any questions about
5	conversations you had with Robert Spallina?
6	A Iam.
7	Q Will that extend to conversations that are
8	memorialized in the emails that we're going to be
9	reviewing here?
10	MR. SIMON: I will
11	Is that for me or him?
12	MR. STAMOS: Well, that's for him, but I guess
13	I'm curious
14	(Cross-talking. Interruption by the
15	reporter.)
16	MR. SIMON: We won't assert privilege where
17	there's a third party on the email or it's been
18	disclosed because we didn't assert the privilege.
19	MR. STAMOS: Okay. I just want to state that
20	my position, so to give you an opportunity to
21	modify yours, is that, by virtue of our having been
22	produced these emails, and we're going to go
23	through more, which themselves give us partial
24	information about conversations that took place and
25	communications that took place about the topics

McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

Ē

we're addressing, such as the potential use of the 2000 trust, that the privilege was waived, that you can't -- that's number one.

And, number 2, that these documents reflect that the communications on these topics were not conducted solely between Mr. Spallina, as Mr. Bernstein's lawyer, and Mr. Bernstein, but were conducted among Mr. Spallina and Mr. Bernstein and others who did not have his capacities regarding these matters and was waived in that way as well.

So that's my position, and I ask you to reconsider yours. Otherwise, we'll have to have the judge address it.

MR. SIMON: We'll likely have to have the judge address it, but we'll consider it at a break. MR. STAMOS: Okay.

Q (By Mr. Stamos) Did you personally make a judgment or reach a conclusion as to whether the 2000 trust should be used as a beneficiary in making a submission to the insurance company for proceeds of the insurance policy?

I did not.

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q Did you ever have a conversation with anyone other than Mr. Spallina about the potential for using the 2000 trust in making an application to the insurance company?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Possibly -- possibly Donald Tescher. Α 0 Did you ever have a conversation with your sister who would not have received proceeds of the policy if, in fact, the 2000 trust were employed? Α Not that I recall, no. So this entire process was conducted, and at 0

no point did you discuss with your sister the fact that if the 2000 trust were employed, in fact, she would be cut out of the proceeds of the insurance policy?

> Objection; asked and answered. MR. SIMON: You can answer.

Is that correct? That's your testimony? 0 Α That's correct.

Did you have a conversation with anyone else Q other than maybe Spallina and maybe Tescher?

About the 2000 trust document; is that the Α question?

19

20

0

Α

Yes.

No, I don't believe so.

21 0 where Mr. Spallina writes to Pam here in the 22 middle of Exhibit Number 1, Page 1, "As I mentioned 23 previously, there was a discussion with the carrier about possibly using the 2000 trust, the one you are 24 25 carved out of but would be split five ways according to

Ted, but I'm not sure that we will achieve that result." 1 Are you familiar with what he's talking about there? 2 3 Α Yes. 4 what's he talking about there? 0 5 Α It looks like he's talking about the fact that the 2000 document didn't include Pam, and he was 6 probably -- he -- it looks like he may have been 7 referencing, according to him, according to me, the --8 9 the -- there would be a split five ways. 10 what was the basis for your belief that there 0 11 would be a split five ways? 12 There were conversations going on at that Α 13 point in time about how to -- what to do with, you know, this insurance policy, and splitting it five ways was 14 15 what -- my understanding was how the -- what the proceeds of the policy -- of the trust were going to be. 16 17 The 2000 trust? 0 No, not the -- I knew nothing about a 2000 18 Α 19 trust. Do you recall receiving this email where --20 0 21 the last item in the string is from you, where 22 Mr. Spallina says, "As I mentioned previously, there was 23 a discussion with the carrier about possibly using the 2000 trust, the one you are carved out of but would be 24 25 split five ways according to Ted," doesn't that imply

that you were involved in a conversation about the 2000 trust?

A I didn't have conversations with the carrier. Spallina had conversations with the carrier. I did not.

Q No, no. Doesn't this imply that you had a conversation with Mr. Spallina in which he says, "But it would be split five ways according to Ted"? I mean, how would he know what Ted thought unless Ted told him, and you're Ted?

A I--I-I can't help you there. I don't know what Spallina was thinking.

Q In any event, so we've established that this is a string of emails that you and Ted and Pam shared, correct? You and Spallina and Pam shared, correct?

A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Q And you would have seen them at or about the time they're dated, correct?

A Yes.

Q Let me then go to Exhibit Number 2, which is TS4489 through 92.

(Exhibit 2 was marked for identification.)
Q Again, we have to go back to front, and this
is a string of emails -- am I correct, this is a string
of emails in which you participated, the last one being
from you to Mr. Spallina, Pam Simon, David Simon and --

I guess Pam Simon twice, right? 1 2 Α Yes. 3 0 Okay. Going back to front, the first message 4 appears to be from Pam to Spallina and to you saying, "Hi, Robert. Any word on the proceeds," asking whether 5 6 he needed help, correct? 7 Α Yes. Then the next item of the string is from 8 0 Spallina to Pam saying, "Heritage responded back that 9 10 they need a copy of the trust instrument. We do not 11 have a copy, and the only executed trust document that we have in which the policy is listed as an asset is the 12 13 2000 trust prepared by Al Gortz." Do you see that? 14 Α I do see that. This is dated, it looks like, November 19, 15 0 2012. It is your email back. "Highly unlikely they 16 17 will use another trust. What is the SOP when a doc can't be found?" That's from you, right? 18 19 Yes, it is. Α 20 And it's dated November 19, 2012, right? Q 21 Α Yes. 22 Am I correct, as I'm reading this, at least by 0 23 November 19, 2012, no one has located Exhibits 21 and 22 24 that we talked about earlier, the unsigned drafts of the 25 trust, correct?

1	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
2	A You are right, correct.
3	Q When you then go to the next page, 4490, it
4	says, from Pam to you, copied to Spallina, "Please send
5	the executed trust document before you respond to
6	Heritage." Do you remember what Pam what trust
7	document she was talking about?
8	A I do not.
9	Q Is it fair to say the only executed document
10	you had that would be relevant at that point would have
11	been the 2000 trust document, correct?
12	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
13	Q As far as you knew.
14	A Can you ask me that question again, please?
15	Q Yeah. Actually, it might help if I go above
16	that. When you look at Spallina's note to you then, a
17	little bit below the halfway point of page 4409, it
18	says, from Spallina, "We are not responding to them with
19	the document from 2000. We discussed that and you are
20	carved out under that document. We need to find the
21	1995 trust ASAP."
22	Do you understand that was him responding to
23	Pam where she said, "Please send the executed trust
24	document before you respond to Heritage"?
25	A IIdo.

É

1 He must have been talking about the 2000 0 trust, and he's telling her we're not going to use that 2 3 trust because you're cut out, right? I can't say for sure, you know, why he's 4 Α saying that, but that's, you know, what -- what it looks 5 like from this document. 6 When you received this and saw it, is that 7 0 what you assumed, that he's telling her we're not going 8 9 to use the 2000 trust because you're cut out of it? 10 Objection: speculation. MR. SIMON: 11 No. I'm not asking him to MR. STAMOS: 12 speculate. 13 I'm asking your perception when you read this. 0 14 MR. SIMON: No. You asked him what he 15 assumed, is what you asked. 16 MR. STAMOS: Well, I'm not asking him to 17 speculate about what he assumed. I'm asking him to 18 tell me what he assumed, if he can remember. I can't remember, but according to this, 19 Α that's what it looks like Spallina is saying. 20 21 Okav. That's fine. 0 22 Then there's another letter -- there's another 23 note November 19th, the same date, from David Simon, "May be able to achieve Sy's intended result through 24 waiver and settlement agreement." That was the attempt 25

> McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	that was made to get all five children to sign off, and
2	then you wouldn't need to worry about what the trust
3	said or didn't say, correct?
4	A I believe so, yes.
5	Q Okay, excellent. If you then look at Exhibit
6	Number 3, it looks to me if you just take a quick
7	look at this, it looks to me that this is an email from
8	Pam, and you are among those copied
9	A I don't have it.
10	Q We don't have 3 yet.
11	MR. STAMOS: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Could
12	the court reporter please give it to him.
13	(Exhibit 3 was marked for identification.)
14	Q I just have a simple question for you.
15	Looking at this, am I correct that this is a letter
16	an email that Pam sent and that you were copied on which
17	attempted to circulate a settlement agreement among you
18	to try to get the proceeds without the need for
19	litigation or worrying about the trusts?
20	A That is what it looks like to me, yes.
21	Q And you recall that effort was made, correct?
22	A Yes.
23	Q And it was not successful because Eliot would
24	not agree, correct?
25	A I believe that's the reason why, yes.
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 54

Г

McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1 If you could then --0 2 I'm sorry, continue to look at that exhibit. It said there was -- at the bottom, that's 3 at 4519. 4 your email, correct, that says, "There was an exhaustive 5 search for the original trust document from 1995 which is the beneficiary of the policy owned by dad. Since 6 we've have not been able to locate it," and then some 7 further text. Is it fair to say that as of December 6, 8 9 2012, the drafts of the trust, Numbers 21 and 22, had 10 still not been located? 11 That is correct. Α 12 Thank you. 0 All right. If you could then look at Exhibit 13 14 4. 15 (Exhibit 4 was marked for identification.) 16 Now, reading bottom to top here, which I think 0 17 we need to do, on Page 69, this is from you -- I'm sorry, this is from Spallina to you, correct? 18 19 Α NO. 20 On 67 or -- a different page? 21 0 I'm sorrv. 22 Oh, you got 67. Okay, yeah, I'm sorry. Ι 23 have two sets of them. 24 When you're looking at Page 67, that's Mr. Spallina writing to you, correct? 25

1	A Well, I'm copied.
2	Q You are one of those to whom this was
3	addressed, correct?
4	A Yes.
5	Q In it, Mr. Spallina was talking about options
6	and trying to deal dealing with the situation where
7	the agreement could not be achieved, right?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Among the things he said was, and this is in
10	the fourth line from the bottom, "As none of us can be
11	sure exactly what the 1995 trust said (although an
12	educated guess would point to the children in light of
13	the document prepared by Al Gortz in 2000), it is
14	important that we discuss further prior to spending more
15	money to pursue this option." As of that day, and this
16	was dated January 22, 2013, none of you could know for
17	sure what it said, correct?
18	A That's correct.
19	Q Am I correct, as of this date, Exhibits 21 and
20	22 had not been located, correct?
21	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, asked and
22	answered.
23	A That's correct.
24	MR. STAMOS: No, it hasn't been asked.
25	Q I'm sorry, what was the answer?
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	A Correct.
2	Q Thank you.
3	MR. STAMOS: Do you want to take a break now,
4	Adam?
5	MR. SIMON: Please.
6	MR. STAMOS: Okay.
7	(Recess taken.)
8	MR. STAMOS: So now we're on Exhibit 5.
9	(Exhibit 5 was marked for identification.)
10	Q (By Mr. Stamos) Now, I'm looking at Exhibit
11	Number 5. Do you have page 65? Is that the page number
12	at the bottom?
13	A Yes.
14	Q Looking at the message from Spallina, the
15	second one here - it looks like the top is from Lisa to
16	Spallina and Jill - where Spallina said, "I need to see
17	Pam's life insurance trust to answer the question," do
18	you know what question he was talking about?
19	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
20	A I don't.
21	Q All right. Then I'm going to skip Number 6.
22	I'm just trying to cut this down so we can
23	move along. I'm saving time by wasting a little bit of
24	time.
25	I'm not going to talk to you about 7.
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 57 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

If you would then look at Exhibit Number 8, 1 2 please. 3 (Exhibit 8 was marked for identification.) 4 This is from Mr. Spallina to Eliot and 0 5 yourself and -- to Pam, carbon copied to Eliot and yourself, Lisa, Jill and Christine, right? 6 7 Α Correct. See at the top there? 8 Q 9 Yes, you are correct. Α 10 Thank you. And I want to direct you to the 0 11 fourth paragraph up, the one that begins, "Let's stop 12 making." Do you see that? 13 Α I do. The second sentence says, "Pam saw him execute 14 Q 15 the trust with the same attorney that prepared her own 16 trust, a copy of which I have and will offer up to fill 17 in the boilerplate provisions." Do you see that? 18 Yes. Α when you received this, did you understand 19 0 20 that to mean that Mr. Spallina understood that your 21 father's '95 trust was basically a mirror image of Pam's 22 and, therefore, he would use Pam's in order to fill in 23 the blanks with regard to boilerplate language? Objection; speculation, form. 24 MR. SIMON: 25 I'm asking if that's your understanding. Q

MR. SIMON: You said did he understand that he It's like two understandings removed. understood.

MR. STAMOS: If that's what I did, let me fix it.

When Mr. Spallina wrote that and you received 0 this and read it, was it your understanding that Mr. Spallina had the understanding that the 1995 trust was basically a copy, so to speak, of Pam's trust and, therefore, he could use Pam's trust to fill in the missing boilerplate language that might be necessary to be filled in?

Same objections. MR. SIMON:

You're using words like "mirror image" and Α I -- I don't believe that he was looking at Pam's document, according to this email, as a -- as a tool and a mirror image. I think he was using Pam's document maybe as -- more as a guide, because I think they were prepared around the same time by the same firm. So -but I can't honestly speculate what was in Spallina's mind at the time he wrote this.

> 0 Have you ever seen Pam's trust?

I have not. Α

Then let's go to -- looking now at Exhibit Q Number 9.

(Exhibit 9 was marked for identification.)

We have number 9 in front of you. Page 51 and 1 0 2 52, do you see that? 3 Α I do. 4 This looks to be, going back on Page 52, an 0 5 email that you drafted giving your analysis of the Heritage payout situation, and looking at that document, 6 about seven lines down, as of that point the trust could 7 not be located still, correct? 8 9 Correct. Α 10 I take it at that time Exhibits 21 and 22 were 0 11 still not located, because if they were, you would have 12 talked about them, correct? Objection; speculation. 13 MR. SIMON: 14 Α Correct. Then on Page 51, that's your email to your 15 Q 16 siblings and Mr. Spallina in which -- in further 17 analysis -- this is actually to Eliot - I see - with 18 copies to your siblings responding to a prior email he had written about what he thought the situation was, 19 20 correct? 21 Α Yes. sir. 22 MR. STAMOS: Now, if we could go, please, to 23 Exhibit 10. 24 (Exhibit 10 was marked for identification.) 25 If you're looking at the bottom of Page 47, Q

McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	this is part of a string that ends with Eliot writing on
2	February 9th to yourself and to Pam, copies to many
3	other people. Do you see that?
4	A Yes, I do.
5	Q Then when you look at the bottom, the first
6	email on that page where Pam says, on February 8, 2013,
7	"Yeah, bad news. We don't have copies of the policy.
8	Dad probably took it when he emptied his office.
9	Probably the trust, too." Do you see that?
10	A Yes, I do.
11	Q Do you have any understanding as to how it
12	came to be that a copy of the draft trust was located at
13	a later date even though a search had already been done
14	trying to find the trust document itself?
15	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
16	A None.
17	Q When the trust documents strike that.
18	When the draft trust documents, Exhibits 21
19	and 22, were located, do you recall having any
20	conversation with anybody, Mr. Simon, your sister,
21	anything to the effect of, "How come you didn't find
22	these the first time you looked," or anything like that?
23	A No, nothing like that with me, no.
24	Q Did it strike you? Did you wonder? Whether
25	you had a conversation or not, did you wonder how it was

1	that they didn't find them the first time?
2	A NO.
3	Q It didn't strike you as odd?
4	MR. SIMON: Objection; asked and answered.
5	A No, it didn't. Having searched for things
6	before in my life, you search once, you search again,
7	sometimes you come across things, especially old. No,
8	it didn't strike me as odd.
9	Q If you could look at Exhibit Number 11,
10	please.
11	(Exhibit 11 was marked for identification.)
12	Q This is another string here. Beginning at the
13	bottom, this is your brother Eliot telling you that he's
14	seeking independent counsel, correct, on February 13,
15	2013?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Then the next email up, on February 14th, is
18	you to Robert Spallina saying, "Please move forward as
19	we discussed in the last group phone call in which we
20	decided to have Heritage pay your trust account or a
21	trust that you would act as trustee. Heritage has
22	stated that they will pay based on a court order showing
23	that there's consensus among the 1995 trust
24	beneficiaries. Let's get this done."
25	My question about that is, as of that point,

1	was it your understanding that Eliot would agree to have
2	such a court order entered?
3	A I don't know.
4	Q This communication with Mr. Spallina includes
5	copies to all of your siblings as well as to Christine
6	Yates, who was Eliot's attorney, correct?
7	A II believe so.
8	Q Is it your position that this was
9	attorney-client communication, as well, between you and
10	Mr. Spallina?
11	MR. SIMON: We didn't assert a privilege, if
12	that's what you're asking. I didn't object.
13	MR. STAMOS: Well, our position, for the
14	record, is that you may not selectively employ the
15	privilege.
16	Q So my question is, was this an attorney-client
17	communication, as far as you were concerned?
18	A In every communication I had with Robert
19	Spallina, I would expect that that privilege was there.
20	MR. ROSE: This is Alan Rose, just for the
21	record, since I'm Mr. Bernstein's personal counsel.
22	He's not asserting the privilege as to
23	communications of this nature as responded in your
24	email. He's asserting privilege to private
25	communications he had one-on-one with Robert

É

Spallina, who he considered to be his counsel. That's the position for the record and that's why the privilege is being asserted.

Continue.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. STAMOS: No, I understand that. It's just that our position is that, if one has an attorney-client relationship, in particular with regard to discussions concerning a particular topic, the privilege is waived when you do not maintain the privilege with respect to certain communications and you do with others, and that's our position. So --

MR. ROSE: Okay. But for the record, since you're going to argue this in Illinois potentially, in every piece of litigation, certain things that you communicate with your lawyer eventually find their way into pleadings or communication with the other side. That does not mean that private communication you have one-on-one with your lawyer about various things when you're seeking legal advice on a confidential basis are not privileged. That's the sole basis upon which the privilege is being asserted and it's going to continue to be asserted.

25

MR. STAMOS: Can we proceed?

1 Absolutely. Thanks. MR. ROSE: 2 MR. STAMOS: Got it. 3 0 (By Mr. Stamos) In any event, looking at 4 Exhibit 11, this was a -- whatever it says, this was an 5 email series of -- exchange between yourself and Eliot 6 and all the addressees, correct? 7 Α It appears to be, yes. Have you ever investigated to advise yourself 8 Q 9 as to what took place within the insurance company, that 10 is to say the insurance company records, as to your 11 father's interactions or lack of interactions with them 12 about beneficiary changes or ownership changes? 13 I -- I have not; did not do that. Α 14 I take it you, therefore, have no knowledge Q 15 about that, no personal knowledge about that? Can you tell me what "that" is again. 16 Α 17 About beneficiary changes that your father 0 18 either did send or did not send to the insurance 19 company. Again, I'm going to go back to that time of 20 Α 21 reinstatement where it was my understanding that the 22 beneficiary of this insurance policy was the trust. 23 so -- I think you stated something that wasn't entirely accurate about that I didn't have any knowledge. 24 25 So your knowledge of it would have been Q Okay.

1	with regard I think we talked about that earlier.
2	You told us what your role was in that what you knew
3	about the reinstatement provision a couple of years
4	before he died, correct?
5	A Yes, that's right.
6	Q All right. We don't need to go over that
7	again. That, I understand.
8	Let's look, if we can, at Exhibit Number 14.
9	(Exhibit 14 was marked for identification.)
10	Q Looking at that document, it looks like a
11	string that ends with an email from Mr. Spallina to Pam
12	and copied to yourself and David, correct?
13	A Yes, that is correct.
14	Q Now that email the initial email in that
15	string is one from David Simon I'm guessing to
16	Mr. Spallina, although it's not clear, where it says,
17	"Last of the docs we could dig up." Do you see that?
18	A I do.
19	Q My assumption, although it's not clear from
20	the email, is that there was oh, yeah, I'm sorry. At
21	the bottom you can see there's a PDF attachment, a
22	Document 9 PDF. Do you see that on Page 6579?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Do you know what document he's referring to in
25	that email?

1	A I don't.
2	Q If you would look at Exhibit Number 15,
3	please.
4	(Exhibit 15 was marked for identification.)
5	Q This document, 6508 through 6512, is a string
6	of emails that ends with one from you to Robert Spallina
7	copied to several people, correct?
8	A It appears that way so far, yes.
9	Q Take your time. Is that what that is?
10	A Yes.
11	Q The last email in that string is one that you
12	sent, correct?
13	A Yes.
14	Q When you say, "I think one of my" This is
15	to Robert: "Pam, Scooter, Jill, Lisa and I will be
16	discussing several related issues over the weekend," and
17	this is Saturday, March 16, 2013. "I think one of my
18	previous emails asked you to hold off doing anything
19	concerning the life insurance policy after a specific
20	date. Please continue to work with the insurance
21	company on our behalf."
22	What were you talking about there?
23	A I cannot remember.
24	Q If you would please look at 6510. It's the
25	third page of that exhibit.

È

1	A Okay.
2	Q Do you see the reference to March 15, 2013
3	there from Spallina?
4	A I see March 15, 2013.
5	Q Right. 7:07 a.m., in the middle of that page?
6	A Yes, I do.
7	Q And Mr. Spallina wrote in this email string
8	that ends with your last email, "There is a break in
9	title and beneficiary designation prior to getting where
10	the confirmation letters state where we are today, Sy as
11	owner and the trust as beneficiary." Do you know what
12	they're talking about?
13	A I believe that I do.
14	Q What did you understand Mr. Spallina was
15	conveying by that message?
16	A That there was a previous owner or an initial
17	owner of this policy and that I think he was learning
18	about the the chain of of ownership of the policy
19	from the very beginning and its iterations over time
20	when after speaking with the insurance company.
21	Q Did you understand this to be that
22	Mr. Spallina was told by the insurance company that
23	there was a break in title and beneficiary designation?
24	A Well, I I'm only because I'm reading
25	what he said. I don't know what he assumed that meant,

McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

É

1	but I'm assuming from what I'm reading that he is saying
2	that there was some break there.
3	Q And this was in response to your email from
4	it looks like
5	well, it looks like the times are a little bit
6	odd there. I'm not sure why that is.
7	A Right.
8	Q I wonder if one is eastern time and one is
9	central time?
10	A Between me and Robert?
11	Q Yeah. Could that have been possible?
12	A Anything's possible, but unlikely, I think.
13	Q Well, in any event, when you received that,
14	did you understand what he was talking about?
15	A At the time, I probably did not.
16	Q Now, looking at Exhibit 16, please.
17	(Exhibit 16 was marked for identification.)
18	Q Do you know who Mr. Welling is, before I ask
19	you any questions about the document?
20	A I believe that he was someone connected to the
21	insurance company.
22	Q I'd like you, if you will, to take a moment
23	and read Exhibit Number 12 I'm sorry, Exhibit
24	Number 16, back to front, and then I want to ask you
25	some questions about it. It's not all that long.

1	A So you'd like me to read all the pages in the
2	email?
3	Q Yeah.
4	A Okay.
5	Q Just take a moment to read it. The messages
6	are actually pretty brief.
7	MR. ROSE: While he's looking at that, I'd
8	just state for the record that TS5253, at the
9	bottom, clearly supports the assertion of the
10	privilege.
11	MR. STAMOS: In as much as it includes Scott
12	Welling on it, I'd have a hard time understanding
13	how that supports the existence of a privilege,
14	but
15	MR. ROSE: Okay.
16	Q (By Mr. Stamos) Have you had a chance to read
17	that yet, Mr. Bernstein?
18	A Yes. I'm yes, I have.
19	Q I bet you recall this email string, correct?
20	A Yes.
21	Q It ends with a message from Mr. Spallina to
22	you which would have included all the rest of it,
23	correct?
24	A Yes.
25	Q What's this about? What's the genesis of this
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 70 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

,	
1	dispute that results in Mr. Spallina saying, "Ted, I'm
2	done with this matter"? What did you understand was
3	going to happen?
4	A The change in who was going to be handling the
5	life insurance policy at at around this time.
6	Q It was changed from whom to whom?
7	A From the Tescher & Spallina firm to Adam
8	Simon.
9	Q Were there any discussions with the insurance
10	company about that prior to the lawsuit being filed in
11	Chicago?
12	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
13	A I've I simply don't know.
14	Q You don't?
15	A I do not.
16	Q Now, when you then look at
17	I'm sorry, we'll go to the next exhibit, which
18	is it looks like Exhibit 17.
19	(Exhibit 17 was marked for identification.)
20	Q Now, looking at Exhibit Number 17, where
21	Mr. Tescher writes, "I feel that we have serious
22	conflicts in continuing to represent you as trustee to
23	the life insurance trust and need to withdraw from
24	further representation," do you see that?
25	A I do.

1	Q Now, first, this document is an email string
2	that ends with Mr. Tescher sending an email to
3	Mr. Welling, Mr. Spallina and also to yourself, as well
4	as the Simons, correct?
5	A Yes.
6	Q You recall receiving this, do you?
7	A Now that I see it, I recall.
8	Q Now, where Mr. Tescher says that, "There's a
9	serious conflict continuing to represent you as trustee
10	of the life insurance trust," is he referring to the
11	1995 trust?
12	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
13	A I believe that that's what he's referring to
14	here.
15	Q I take it that he withdraw from representing
16	you in that capacity as of this email?
17	A I I believe that to be the case.
18	Q Did they continue to represent you in any
19	other capacity after that date?
20	A Yes.
21	Q In what capacities did they continue to
22	represent you?
23	A As the counsel for the Shirley Bernstein
24	Trust.
25	Q Do they continue to be your attorney in that
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 72 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

_			
1	capacity?		
2	A Cur	rently?	
3	Q Yes	•	
4	A The	y are not.	
5	Q Whe	n did they cease being your attorney in	
6	that capacity	?	
7	A Ear	ly 2014 is my recollection.	
8	Q Wha	t led to that?	
9	A wha	t led to that was	
10	MR.	ROSE: Well, let me to the extent he's	
11	discussi	ng communications he had with his former	
12	counsel,	they would be privileged, and I would	
13	instruct	him not to answer based upon any	
14	communic	ations with his counsel.	
15	MR.	STAMOS: Okay.	
16	Q I d	on't agree with that, but I assume you're	
17	going to foll	ow your attorney's instruction not to	
18	answer that?		
19	A Yes		
20	Q A11	right. We don't need to say anymore, but	
21	we'll certify	that.	
22	Lea	ving aside conversations then with	
23	Mr. Spallina	or Mr. Tescher, what led to their ceasing	
24	to be your at	torneys?	
25	A My	recollection is that they withdrew.	
		McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	73

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

Q Okay.

A Again, we're going back quite a while, but I believe what led to them not being my attorneys is that they withdrew.

MR. ROSE: And just for the record, there are aspects of that that are not privileged, but you asked him about his -- I just advised him not to disclose his private, confidential communication with them while they were still his lawyers. That does not foreclose your questioning.

MR. STAMOS: No, what I asked him was what other circumstances led to that other than -without reference to such conversations, and he said they withdrew.

Q Do you know why they withdrew?

A I -- I do know why they withdrew. There were some questions within their firm about documents and irregular -- irregularity around documents, and they withdrew because I felt it was best for them to withdraw.

Q What documents were there -- with regard to what documents were there irregularities, as far as you knew?

A There was an amendment to a trust document.Q Which trust?

1	A Shirley Bernstein Trust.
2	Q And finally Exhibit Number 18.
3	(Exhibit 18 was marked for identification.)
4	Q Are you ready?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Let me just back up a second. The document
7	that you were talking about that there was a problem
8	with was a document which it appeared that the Tescher &
9	Spallina firm had participated in backdating a signature
10	by your father, correct? Is that your understanding of
11	it?
12	A Something along those lines. I'm not quite
13	sure that it's backdating or creation of a document.
14	I'm not sure that backdating would be the right way to
15	describe that.
16	Q It included a notarization that was not
17	authentic, correct?
18	A There were there were two issues that arose
19	out of that law firm that were highly irregular as far
20	as I'm concerned.
21	Q What were those?
22	A One was a was the signing of a notarized
23	document by a notary that was not proper, and the second
24	was the creation or fabrication of a document by
25	Mr. Spallina that that related to Shirley's trust

É

1	document. It was, I believe, in the amended trust
2	document, but I'm going now by complete recollection
3	of
4	Q Do you recall what the purpose of that
5	document was, the second document you're talking about?
6	A The purpose was to make changes to the
7	original trust document.
8	Q Any particular change that you can recall?
9	A No, not not, you know, sitting here without
10	the document, no.
11	Q The last document that I've shown you, this
12	Exhibit Number 18, this is Mr. Tescher it looks like
13	he's writing to you and your siblings in particular
14	about billing, correct?
15	A Yes.
16	Q This is August 30, 2013, correct?
17	A Yes, it is.
18	Q As of this date, he's still referring to the
19	fact that your father's - looking at the second full
20	paragraph from the bottom - that your father's affairs
21	were not left in the best order and so forth, and also
22	some concern that Eliot's activity might be costing the
23	estate money, correct?
24	A That's what he says here, yes.
25	Q As of this time that this was written, you

ł

still were not aware of the existence of Exhibits 21 and 1 22, the draft unsigned '95 trust, correct? 2 3 I'm not sure. Α 4 Here's what I want to ask vou: You're aware 0 5 that the 2000 trust is an insurance trust, correct? It's for the purpose of receiving insurance proceeds, 6 7 correct? MR. SIMON: Objection. Are you going to show 8 9 him the document? 10 MR. STAMOS: Yeah, I can. I was going to work 11 from memory, but we can. 12 That's Exhibit Number 23. (Exhibit 23 was marked for identification.) 13 14 So, first, let me ask you this: I imagine Q that your business, over the years that you've been 15 16 involved in selling life insurance, you've dealt with 17 many customers or clients who have had insurance trusts, 18 correct? 19 That is correct. Δ 20 This is not the first time you've ever looked 0 21 at an insurance trust, the one you've just looked at, 22 correct? 23 Α Also correct, yeah. 24 In your experience, the lawyers who draft 0 25 trusts, for example this one, very often do what was

> McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	done here, which is they provide a first page indicating
2	who prepared it with the law firm's name on it, right?
3	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
4	Q Is that your experience to see that?
5	A Yes.
6	Q If you look at Exhibit Number 24 and 25
7	Let's start with Number 24.
8	(Exhibits 24 and 25 were marked for
9	identification.)
10	Q Looking at 24, that's the trust dated July 25,
11	2012, correct?
12	A Yes, it is.
13	Q And number 25 is a trust dated May 20, 2008,
14	correct?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And those are both prepared by the Tescher &
17	Spallina firm, right?
18	A Yes.
19	Q The three trusts that we have, at least that
20	we know are executed, each one of them identifies the
21	law firms who prepared them, correct?
22	A Yes.
23	Q In your experience as a life insurance
24	professional, I'm sure you've had occasion over time to
25	be the first one advised that one of the insureds has
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 78 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

died and then you participated in helping to make a claim, correct?

A Yes.

Yes.

Q In doing that, I'm sure you've interacted with attorneys, including those who have drafted trusts as part of that process, right?

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Q Is it your experience, what I believe to be universal among estates and trusts lawyers, that they maintain trusts that they have drafted or estate plans they have created because they're aware that down the line when someone dies, number one, they might need to find those documents, and number 2, the lawyers hope to get the business as part of the estate? Is that true in your experience?

MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, form.MR. STAMOS: I'm asking for his experience.MR. SIMON: He's not an attorney.

A That, I don't know. I mean, what their intent is for drafting the documents and -- I can't say in general terms --

Q Okay. But in your experience, have you ever gone to a firm that drafted a trust and they didn't have a copy of it?

25

Α

I don't know.

Q Here, do you know if efforts were made to contact the attorneys who are purported to have drafted the 1995 trust to see if they had a copy of it?

A I believe that efforts were made to do that, yes.

Q Did you learn what the results of that investigation were?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A My recollection was the firm was absorbed by another firm, or maybe there were two, you know, iterations of this, but the firm is no longer in existence and that they didn't keep the records or they may have sent out something about records.

I'm just going by memory, so I can't be -- you know, give you anything more than that.

Q Do you remember who told you that?

A I do believe that was Robert Spallina. I think he was making those inquiries to the other firm.

It may have been David in Chicago.

Q Now, David has testified that -- I'm speaking roughly, but I believe accurately in describing his testimony, which is that he -- that when Simon created the '95 trust, that David assisted him in preparing it on the computer actually and Simon then took that version and took it over to Hopkins & Sutter, the law firm that they say prepared it, and that was the basis

1	for the trust ultimately that Simon executed. Does that
2	sound familiar to you?
3	A It doesn't. It does not sound familiar that
4	Scooter was that David was creating a document on
5	a on a on a computer.
6	Q We now know that David testifies that there
7	was a document on the computer, correct, because that's
8	what Exhibit Number 21 is, right?
9	A Okay.
10	Q Okay? I mean, do you agree with me, that's
11	what we understand that to be?
12	A I do.
13	Q So the question I have for you is, did you
14	ever have a conversation with David in which he said
15	when these communications were taking place with
16	Mr. Spallina about how do we approach, we can't find the
17	'95 trust and so forth, did David ever say anything to
18	you like, "You know, I put it on my computer to begin
19	with. Maybe I should check there"? Do you ever
20	remember any such conversation?
21	A I do not.
22	Q When you look at Exhibit Number 23, if you
23	would look at that, please, the first page indicates
24	that the 2000 trust is to receive the proceeds
25	looking at the very first paragraph, the first sentence
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 81 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	actually, was to receive the proceeds of some insurance
2	policies listed on Exhibit A, correct?
3	A Okay. I'm with you now. You want me looking
4	at 23?
5	Q Yup. And look at the first page of it, which
6	is 3893, the first text page.
7	A Okay. I'm with you.
8	Q This trust provides that the insurance
9	policies set forth in Schedule A, the proceeds of those
10	policies are going to be paid to the trust, right?
11	MR. SIMON: Objection; the document speaks for
12	itself.
13	MR. STAMOS: I'm asking if that's his
14	understanding of it.
15	MR. SIMON: Same objection.
16	A I mean, the document says what it says.
17	Right?
18	Q It says that it transfers to the trustees of
19	this 2008 trust the life insurance policies set forth in
20	Schedule A, right?
21	MR. ROSE: Wait. Which one are you looking
22	at?
23	MR. SIMON: Objection as to form of question.
24	That's not what it says.
25	MR. ROSE: Which document are you looking at?
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 82 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1 Don't tell me the number. 2 I'm looking --MR. STAMOS: 3 MR. ROSE: What does it say on the front? 4 MR. STAMOS: Let's start again. 5 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Proskauer Rose trust. 6 MR. STAMOS: I'm looking at Exhibit 23. The 7 very first page indicates it was prepared by the Proskauer firm. Do we all have that document in 8 9 front of us? 10 MR. SIMON: Yes. 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. (By Mr. Stamos) All right. If you flip that 12 0 13 first page and go to TS3893, paragraph number 1, do we agree that it says, "As and for a gift, the settlor 14 15 hereby assigns and transfers to the trustees and their 16 successors (together "the trustees"), the life insurance 17 policies set forth in Schedule A." 18 MR. STMON: Continue. 19 Do you see that? Q 20 MR. SIMON: Continue. 21 0 well, it says other things as well, but -- you 22 can read as much as you -- read as much of it as you 23 want and then tell me whether you've read it. 24 Into the record. Read the whole MR. SIMON: 25 thing into the record.

Okay? You see that, correct? 1 0 2 Α I see it. 3 All right. And then Schedule A includes in it 0 the life insurance policy with regard to which we are 4 5 currently litigating, right? I'm going to object as to form, 6 MR. SIMON: 7 because again you've misstated what paragraph 1 8 said. I'm going to read it. "The life 9 Α Yeah. 10 insurance policies set forth in Schedule A annexed 11 hereto, and the settlor agrees to execute all such 12 assignments and changes of beneficiary and to do such 13 other acts and things as may be necessary in order to 14 make the trustees irrevocable absolute assignees of said life insurance policies. The trustee shall hold said 15 16 policies together with any other property which may be 17 received by them in trust upon the terms and conditions 18 set forth herein. This trust shall be known as the 19 Simon Bernstein 2000 Insurance Trust." 20 And I don't believe this policy ever 21

21 received -- this trust ever received the policy, but22 okay.

Q I just want to establish first what it says, see if we could agree what it says. I agree that's what it -- you accurately read it. I agree with you.

1	A Okay.
2	Q Listed on Schedule A then, as being subject to
3	the words that you just read, is included the insurance
4	policy that we're litigating about, correct?
5	A Let me go to sub 2A.
6	Q Okay.
7	THE WITNESS: Do you have Schedule A?
8	MR. SIMON: It's the last page, I think.
9	Q It's the last page of that exhibit.
10	A Gotit.
11	Q All right?
12	A I missed it at the top.
13	Q That's okay. And that includes the life
14	insurance policy that we are litigating about in this
15	case, correct?
16	A That is correct.
17	Q Do you agree with me that this trust document
18	does not reference the existence of a prior trust that
19	had any interest in that insurance policy or any prior
20	trust at all, right?
21	MR. SIMON: I'm going to have to ask him to
22	read the entire document.
23	THE WITNESS: Yeah, I can't answer
24	MR. SIMON: Go ahead.
25	A I can't answer that question without reading
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 85 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	the whole document.
2	MR. SIMON: Go ahead.
3	Q Well, it speaks for itself.
4	Let me ask you this: Are you aware of whether
5	it does without reading it? Are you aware of whether it
6	references any 1995 trust or any other trust?
7	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation. Not
8	allowing him to read it.
9	MR. STAMOS: No, no. I'm just asking if he's
10	aware of it without reading it. It says what it
11	says. His reading is not going to change what it
12	says. I'm asking his state of mind.
13	Q Are you aware of whether or not that document
14	references the 1995 trust without having read it?
15	MR. SIMON: Objection; relevance.
16	Go ahead.
17	Q Do you know?
18	A I'm not I'm not aware.
19	Q Do you think that if this document did
20	reference the 1995 trust, that Mr. Spallina would have
21	commented on that?
22	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
23	Q Would you have expected him to tell you that
24	it did?
25	A Can you ask me that question again?
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. & Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

Г

Q Yeah. If this document said, for example, "I'm replacing the '95 trust with this 2000 trust," would you have expected that Mr. Spallina would have given you advice with regard to that fact, if it were a fact?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

MR. ROSE: I'm going to object, instruct him not to answer based on communications he had with Mr. Spallina, but you can ask the question with regard to information that Spallina disseminated to third parties or --

Q Well, other than conversations that just involved you and Mr. Spallina, but not excluding communications that involved your siblings, like so many of these emails did, would you have expected in such communications when you and he were talking about whether we're going to use the 2000 trust and so forth, if the 2000 trust had referenced the existence of a prior trust, do you not think he would have brought that to your attention so that you could decide what impact that had on your view that the '95 trust still applied?

MR. SIMON: Objection; form.

A Honestly, I'm not sure. I can't, you know, tell you or speculate as to what Spallina -- what the expectations were of what was in this document. Honestly, I -- I can't.

_		
1	MR. STAMOS: If you can give me just one	
2	second, I want to confer with Mr. Horan for a	
3	second.	
4	(Recess taken.)	
5	Q (By Mr. Stamos) If you would look at Exhibit	
6	24, please.	
7	A Okay.	
8	Q Is it your understanding that this document,	
9	the Simon L. Bernstein Trust I'm sorry, let me start	
10	again.	
11	This document is dated July 25, 2012, correct?	
12	A Yes. It's hard to read, but yes.	
13	Q You understand this document treats all of	
14	Simon's children as predeceasing for the purpose of its	
15	distribution, correct?	
16	A I have not read this document, but so I	
17	can't you know, I can't tell you that I agree with	
18	you.	
19	Q Are you aware, being one of those children, as	
20	to whether you are a beneficiary or are entitled to any	
21	distribution from the 2012 trust?	
22	MR. SIMON: Objection; the document speaks for	
23	itself.	
24	A Do you want me to read the whole document? If	
25	that's what it says, then that's what it says. If not,	
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 88 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	

1 then --No, I don't -- that's not what I'm asking you. 2 0 3 There's a reasonable amount of money involved here, and 4 what I'm asking you is. as one of Simon's children. are you aware, personally aware -- not did you read this 5 6 just now and what is it saying, but are you aware of 7 whether you are a beneficiary of a trust that he left when he died? 8 9 I am -- I am aware of the trust when he died Α 10 and I'm aware that I'm not a beneficiary. 11 Okay. That's what 2012 talks about, correct? 0 12 Α Correct. 13 Not only are you not a beneficiary, none of 0 14 your siblings are beneficiaries, correct? 15 Α You are correct. was there a dispute in the family when you all 16 0 17 learned that your father was going to, in effect, disinherit his singling? I'm sorry, the siblings? 18 19 MR. ROSE: What time was that? Did you --20 MR. STAMOS: Let me start again. 21 0 Prior to his death, you became aware that it 22 was his plan that he was not going to leave money to his 23 children, correct? 24 I did -- I'm aware of that. Α 25 And that lead to some discord in the family, Q

É.

1	correct?
2	A It did.
3	Q Was there a call in which he participated, as
4	did the siblings, in which you attempted to get him to
5	change his mind or explain why his plan was not
6	appropriate?
7	A NO.
8	Q There was no such call?
9	A There was no such call based on what you just
10	said that call was about.
11	Q Was there a call prior to his death that
12	involved inheritance, that involved the siblings and
13	your father?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Who said what to whom in that conference?
16	A Robert Spallina explained that my father was
17	going to leave the his assets to ten grandchildren
18	equally.
19	Q When I ask you to if you could pick up
20	Exhibit Number 26, please.
21	(Exhibit 26 was marked for identification.)
22	Q Exhibit Number 26 was one of the documents
23	produced by the Tescher & Spallina firm. Have you seen
24	it before?
25	A Yes.

Ì

1	Q The third page is a transcription so that we
2	could read what it actually said. Do you see that?
3	A Do I see what the third page is?
4	Q Yeah.
5	A Yes, I do.
6	Q What was the genesis of the facts surrounding
7	Pam writing this note?
8	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.
9	Q I'm asking what you know, not what you're
10	speculating about.
11	A Can you ask me the what the question
12	again, or what you're specifically asking me?
13	Q What do you understand to have been the
14	circumstances of the facts that led to Pam writing this
15	note to your father? Why did she write it, as far as
16	you know?
17	MR. SIMON: Objection.
18	A As far as I know, she read it she wrote it
19	because she was she was passionate about the fact
20	that the document that the estate plan did not
21	include some of Sy's beneficiaries.
22	Q Meaning several of the siblings, right?
23	A Some of his children. Some of my siblings.
24	Q Did it exclude you as well?
25	A It did.

1	Q Did you encourage her to write that, or did
2	you know she was going to write that note when she wrote
3	it?
4	A I did not.
5	Q Did you take any view on the subject matter?
6	MR. SIMON: Objection.
7	Q The subject of the disinheritance.
8	MR. SIMON: Objection; relevance.
9	Q You may answer.
10	A Did I take any view to who?
11	Q Did you have a view internally as to the
12	appropriateness of your father's plan to disinherit some
13	of his children?
14	A Appropriateness, no. I encouraged
15	Q You didn't have any
16	A my father
17	Q Oh, go ahead, I'm sorry.
18	A I encouraged my father to go speak with his
19	counsel about the fact that he received this and what he
20	should contemplate doing in receipt of it and how he was
21	feeling about it, and I encouraged him to talk to
22	counsel about it.
23	Q Ultimately, he left the estate plan in place
24	so that upon his death none of his estate passed to the
25	siblings, correct?

1	MR. ROSE: Object to the form.
2	Oh, that's your objection.
3	A He left the he left it in place.
4	Q Meaning that each of you and your siblings was
5	deemed to have been predeceased for the purpose of his
6	estate planning?
7	MR. SIMON: Objection; form.
8	Q Is that your understanding? If it's not, tell
9	me. I mean, I don't I'm not going to
10	MR. SIMON: Well, the first time you said
11	"estate" and the second time you said "estate
12	planning", which is much more general.
13	MR. STAMOS: I didn't mean a distinction.
14	Q I just want to establish, upon his death, no
15	money as a consequence of his death passed or will have
16	passed to you and your siblings if the '95 trust is
17	never enforced and receives money through the insurance
18	policy, right?
19	A Correct.
20	Q But the money will otherwise pass to all of
21	your children, correct?
22	A To all of his grandchildren.
23	Q All of Simon's grandchildren, including your
24	children as well, correct?
25	A Correct.

E

1	MR. STAMOS: Give me just one second.
2	THE WITNESS: Sure.
3	Q This is my final question, or just about:
4	When you learned that Mr. Spallina had filed a claim
5	identifying himself as trustee of the '95 trust, did you
6	ever report to anyone in the insurance company or any
7	authority that he, in fact, was never the trustee of the
8	'95 trust?
9	A I did not.
10	Q Did you ever instruct him to take steps to
11	correct any misimpression he might have caused others to
12	form as a result of him having made that claim?
13	A I'm not sure he caused misimpressions in
14	anybody, so I don't know, and I didn't have any
15	conversations with insurance companies.
16	MR. STAMOS: All right. That's all I have.
17	Thank you.
18	THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
19	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I have a few
20	questions.
21	CROSS-EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
23	Q Ted, are you aware of a holographic will
24	leaving some of the insurance proceeds to Maritza
25	Puccio?

E

1	А	I don't know what a holographic will is.
2	Q	It's a document that was written to leave
3	•	portion of the death benefit that Rachel
4	Walker	
5		Did she give you documents at the hospital the
6	night he d	
7	5	MR. SIMON: Objection; form. What's the
8	quest	tion? Did she give you documents?
9	Q	Did Rachel do you know Rachel Walker?
10	A	I do.
11	Q	On the night your father died, did she bring
12		to you at the hospital?
13	А	I believe she did.
14	Q	was one of those documents a document with a
15	•	a letter regarding Maritza Puccio?
16	A	No.
17		What documents did she bring you?
18	A	My recollection is she brought me something
19	things pe	rtaining to living wills. I'm not using
20		egal terms I'm sure, but DNRs and things like
21	that.	
22	Q	On the day your dad died, did you contact the
23	sheriff?	
24	А	No.
25	Q	On the day after he died, did you contact the
	 	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 95 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	sheriff?	
2	А	I don't recall.
3	Q	Did you file a sheriff's report at all after
4	your fath	ner died?
5	А	I don't recall.
6	Q	Did you make any claims that Maritza Puccio,
7	his girlf	Friend, might have poisoned him?
8	А	No.
9	Q	You gave no statement to the sheriff?
10		MR. SIMON: Objection; asked and answered.
11		Don't answer.
12	Q	Did you file a coroner's did you order a
13	coroner i	inquiry on the day your father died?
14	А	I did not.
15	Q	At any time?
16	А	I did not.
17	Q	Do you know anybody who did?
18	А	I believe the Palm Beach County did.
19	Q	Palm Beach County who?
20	А	The County.
21	Q	The County ordered a coroner's
22		MR. SIMON: Asked and answered.
23	Q	investigation?
24		MR. SIMON: Asked and answered.
25	Q	Okay. Why did they order it?

É

_			
1		MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.	
2	Q	Have you seen the report?	
3	А	I believe so.	
4	Q	On the day after your on the morning after	
5	your fath	er died or actually that morning, did you go	
6	to your fa	ather's house?	
7	А	What date are you asking me about?	
8	Q	September 13th.	
9	А	You know, it's a blurry time. I shortly	
10	after dad	died, I I went to his house.	
11	Q	Were there sheriffs there?	
12	А	I believe some somebody from a law	
13	enforceme	nt agency showed up one of those days shortly	
14	after dad	died.	
15	Q	Did you speak with those sheriffs?	
16	А	I did.	
17	Q	What did you talk to them about?	
18	А	Not a lot of recollection, but they were	
19	asking me	questions about things.	
20	Q	Like?	
21	А	Medication, what what amounts of	
22	medicatio	n, if I knew what kind of medication he took or	
23	was taking	g or things like that.	
24	Q	Why were they there?	
25		MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation.	
	 	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	9

Well, you met with the sheriff. Didn't you 1 0 wonder why he was at your father's house on the day he 2 3 died and you were giving statements to him? 4 MR. SIMON: Same objection. 5 You -- did you ask me why were they there? Α 6 Yeah. 0 7 I don't know. I can't remember why they were Α there. 8 9 And you had no involvement in the call. Did 0 10 your attorney have any involvement in the call to the 11 sheriff that you're aware of? I don't -- I can't -- I don't think so. I 12 Α 13 don't think so. So you, to the best of your recollection, you 14 Q 15 don't know who called the sheriff or contacted them? 16 MR. SIMON: Objection; form. 17 Are you aware the night your father died that 0 a call had been made to the hospital claiming that he 18 19 had been poisoned? 20 I'm not -- I'm not aware of a call that was Α made where -- where it was claimed that he was poisoned. 21 22 You weren't aware of that? 0 23 (Nonverbal response.) Α 24 Q Okay. 25 MR. ROSE: Can you hear this okay in Chicago? McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 98

Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

I can't tell if you're acting like you're not able 1 2 to hear. 3 MR. STAMOS: No, we can hear. We got it. 4 MR. ROSE: Okay. 5 MR. STAMOS: Thank you. 6 MR. ROSE: You're welcome. I just saw your 7 face, so... Thanks. 8 MR. STAMOS: 9 (By Mr. Eliot Bernstein) So you became aware Q 10 at some point that there was a coroner's inquiry and you 11 were aware that there was claims about his medication. 12 correct? Objection: form. 13 MR. SIMON: 14 That if he had been --Q 15 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay. I'll skip 16 that for a second. 17 If this 1995 trust is lost and is not valid by 0 18 the court, you get no benefits whatsoever, correct? 19 Objection; speculation, and calls MR. SIMON: 20 for a legal conclusion. 21 0 Can you look at the trust document, either one 22 of those trust documents that were exhibited, and tell 23 me who the law firm is on that trust document. 24 Tescher & Spallina's law firm? Α 25 No, the two 1995 trusts that you're claiming Q

you're the trustee of. Who's the law firm that prepared 1 2 that document? 3 Those are Exhibit 21 and 22. MR. STAMOS: 4 THE WITNESS: Oh. thank vou. Jim. 21 and 22? Of course I kept everything in 5 6 order except 21 and 22. Do you have it? He's looking for the law 7 firm's name? Is this 21 and 22? 8 9 MR. SIMON: Yeah, these are 21 and 22. You 10 can just look at it. 11 Are you asking me for the law firm on 21 and Α 12 22? 13 0 Yes. I don't see a law firm. 14 Δ 15 Q You don't see a law firm on the trust 16 document? 17 I don't. Α 18 Anywhere on the document, does it say who 0 19 prepared it? 20 Objection; asked and answered. MR. SIMON: MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I'm asking him 21 22 is -- anywhere on the document, is there a 23 reference to a law firm. 24 MR. SIMON: Asked and answered. 25 Not -- not that I see. Α

1	Q Are you aware of any claim that your father	
2	had been poisoned by anybody? Have you ever heard that	
3	claim in the course of these proceedings?	
4	A I I have heard things about dad being	
5	poisoned.	
6	Q Did you report those things to the insurance	
7	company?	
8	MR. SIMON: Objection; relevance.	
9	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, there's a death	
10	benefit claim, and I think it would be pretty	
11	relevant, if somebody was murdered, who the	
12	beneficiaries would be and how it would be paid and	
13	if the insurance company should seek an	
14	investigation.	
15	MR. SIMON: You can ask the question.	
16	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: SO	
17	Q Go right ahead.	
18	A Can you ask me the question again?	
19	Q Did you report to the insurance company that	
20	you had information that your father might have been	
21	poisoned?	
22	A I did not.	
23	Q Did you report it to the federal court that	
24	your father might have been poisoned?	
25	A I have I have not.	
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 102 Chicago. Illinois (312) 263-0052	

	1		
1	Q	When you filed the lawsuit, did you notify	
2	anybody t	hat your father might have been poisoned?	
3	А	Which lawsuit?	
4	Q	The 1995 trust.	
5	А	I did not.	
6	Q	When you became trustee Robert Spallina	
7	filed tha	t original claim. When you became trustee, who	
8	did you n	otify? Did you send out anything to the	
9	beneficia	ries?	
10	А	when I became the trustee of	
11	Q	The successor trustee of this lost trust that	
12	doesn't e	xist legally.	
13	А	Did I send anything to anybody?	
14	Q	Yeah.	
15		MR. SIMON: Objection as to form.	
16	Q	Did you contact the beneficiaries by sending	
17	them prop	er notice that you were trustee?	
18		MR. SIMON: Objection as to form.	
19	А	I think all the beneficiaries were in	
20	discussio	ns, but I didn't.	
21	Q	Are you familiar with the laws regarding	
22	successor	trustees?	
23		MR. SIMON: Objection; vague, asking for legal	
24	conc	lusions.	
25		MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.	
		McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	102

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q Is Adam Simon related to you? MR. SIMON: It's an easy question. No. A I don't think so, no. Q Is he related to your sister's husband? A He is. Q He is. And does your sister stand to lose all of her benefit if this trust can't be proven and the money gets paid to the estate? MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, calls for a legal conclusion. A No no idea. Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed and the money's paid to the estate, you, because you're
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A I don't think so, no. Q Is he related to your sister's husband? A He is. Q He is. And does your sister stand to lose all of her benefit if this trust can't be proven and the money gets paid to the estate? MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, calls for a legal conclusion. A No no idea. Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Is he related to your sister's husband? A He is. Q He is. And does your sister stand to lose all of her benefit if this trust can't be proven and the money gets paid to the estate? MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, calls for a legal conclusion. A No no idea. Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A He is. Q He is. And does your sister stand to lose all of her benefit if this trust can't be proven and the money gets paid to the estate? MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, calls for a legal conclusion. A No no idea. Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q He is. And does your sister stand to lose all of her benefit if this trust can't be proven and the money gets paid to the estate? MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, calls for a legal conclusion. A No no idea. Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of her benefit if this trust can't be proven and the money gets paid to the estate? MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, calls for a legal conclusion. A No no idea. Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>money gets paid to the estate? MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, calls for a legal conclusion. A No no idea. Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed</pre>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, calls for a legal conclusion. A NO no idea. Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a legal conclusion. A No no idea. Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A No no idea. Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q So you know that if the trust doesn't succeed
13 14 15 16 17 18	
14 15 16 17 18	and the money's paid to the estate, you, because you're
15 16 17 18	
16 17 18	considered predeceased, don't get benefit, but you're
17 18	not sure about your sister who's also considered
18	predeceased?
	MR. SIMON: Objection as to form; makes a
19	legal conclusion that's not necessarily correct.
	I wouldn't even answer that one.
20	Continue.
21	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. So we'll certify
22	that to take up with the judge.
23	MR. SIMON: Please.
24	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
25	Q Do you think that notifying an insurance
\langle	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 103 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

1	company of a potential claim that the insured was
2	murdered is appropriate in your experience as an
3	insurance agent?
4	MR. SIMON: Objection; speculation, form.
5	You can try to answer.
6	A I think you're asking me, if I knew that
7	somebody was murdered would I notify an insurance
8	company if I knew that somebody was murdered.
9	Q If you thought somebody was murdered.
10	A Would I notify an insurance company if I had
11	reason to be involved in that situation, I think what
12	you're asking me is, if I had that knowledge, I would
13	notify an insurance company.
14	Q When you filed this lawsuit, you filed a
15	breach of contract lawsuit, correct?
16	A I'm not sure.
17	Q Well, you're the plaintiff. You filed the
18	lawsuit
19	MR. SIMON: Show him the Complaint. That's
20	what it's for.
21	Q So you're not sure
22	MR. SIMON: Show him the Complaint, Mr.
23	Bernstein.
24	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's a good enough
25	answer.

Ē

what type of lawsuit did you file with the 1 0 2 federal court? MR. SIMON: Objection. Show him the 3 4 Complaint, please. 5 0 I'm just asking based on your knowledge. And I'm -- and I'm not a lawyer, and I don't 6 Α 7 have the document, and the type of lawsuit that was filed, without looking at something, I can't tell you. 8 9 So you're the trustee of this trust and you 0 filed as a plaintiff a lawsuit and you don't know what 10 11 kind of lawsuit? 12 Objection: speculation. MR. SIMON: argumentative. We've asked you several times to 13 14 give him the Complaint which would give you the answer you're looking for, Mr. Bernstein, so please 15 16 continue. 17 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm just asking for his 18 knowledge. 19 I'm just asking you to continue. MR. SIMON: 20 We'll just stop. We can just stop. 21 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm just asking for his 22 knowledge. 23 MR. SIMON: Then go ahead. 24 so, based on your knowledge, you are claiming Q 25 that you have no idea how you filed this lawsuit?

г		
1	MR. SIMON: Objection. That's not what	
2	he's you're testifying for him. Ask him a	
3	question.	
4	Q Did you deliver the documents that you got	
5	from Rachel Walker at the hospital to any party?	
6	A Other than the hospital?	
7	Q Yeah.	
8	A Deliver them? I don't recall, Eliot.	
9	Q Where are those documents?	
10	A I don't recall that either.	
11	Q Well, Rachel Walker, you sent her to get	
12	documents from the home of Simon after he died, correct?	
13	A I believe I did.	
14	Q And they were estate documents, correct?	
15	A I think I understand what you're asking me,	
16	and, yes, they were they were documents that were	
17	part of his estate planning.	
18	Q And I'm asking you if you know where they are.	
19	A I think I answered. I don't recall right now	
20	where they are.	
21	Q Were you in custody of Simon's personal	
22	property and possessions after he died?	
23	MR. SIMON: Objection; relevance.	
24	A Was I in custody? Can you clarify "custody"	
25	for me?	
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 106 Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	

1 well, were you in charge of Simon's personal 0 property to remove documents off the estate when he 2 3 died? 4 MR. SIMON: Objection: relevance. 5 I don't understand the question. Α 6 Well, we have missing documents, Ted --Q 7 Α Yes. -- as you're aware, estate documents, trusts. 8 0 9 Rachel came with --10 How many documents did she give you that 11 night? 12 MR. SIMON: Objection; form. That's not 13 even --Approximately how many documents did she bring 14 Q 15 to you that were estate planning documents? 16 A couple. Α 17 And then you have no idea where you have those 0 18 documents? No. At this time, I don't. 19 Δ 20 In those documents, you weren't aware of any 0 21 documents that were supposed to be tendered back to the 22 estate? 23 Objection. MR. SIMON: 24 You removed property from the estate or had Q 25 someone remove it on your behalf. Did you have it

1 returned to the estate? Objection; form. Didn't let him 2 MR. SIMON: 3 answer. Compound questions. 4 were you requested by any parties to turn 0 5 those documents over to them? I don't believe so. 6 Α MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'd like to submit this 7 8 as an exhibit. Can we get a copy of that real 9 quick. 10 (Recess taken.) 11 (Exhibit A was marked for identification.) MR. STAMOS: Can you describe that for us? 12 We 13 don't have a copy. (By Mr. Eliot Bernstein) Ted, could you 14 Q 15 describe that document. (Indicating.) 16 MR. ROSE: 17 Is that the police report MR. STAMOS: 18 document? 19 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes. 20 MR. STAMOS: Yeah, we have that. I think we 21 have that. 22 MR. ROSE: I'm just trying to be helpful. 23 MR. STAMOS: Thank you. 24 Is that topped by the February 11, 2014 fax 25 number -- fax legend?

1	MR. ROSE: This one says January 31, '13.	
2	MR. STAMOS: Oh.	
3	MR. ROSE: The report entry though is	
4	starts with the words "On 9/13/12 at 12:11 hours."	
5	MR. STAMOS: Oh, okay. We don't have that	
6	one. All right.	
7	THE WITNESS: Okay.	
8	Q (By Mr. Eliot Bernstein) You were talking to	
9	the sheriff's department on this day, correct?	
10	A Yes, I was.	
11	Q And that's the day your father died, right?	
12	A Yes.	
13	Q Did you advise the sheriff's department that	
14	your father might have been overdosed or the likes by	
15	his girlfriend?	
16	A NO.	
17	Q NO?	
18	A NO.	
19	Q Okay. Were you advised by anybody that your	
20	father could have been overdosed?	
21	A Yes.	
22	Q That's good. So now you're remembering that	
23	you did talk to the sheriff's department that day?	
24	MR. SIMON: Objection; move to strike,	
25	argumentative.	

E

1 Did you voice concerns to Delray Hospital that 0 your father might have been overdosed or taken too much 2 3 medication? 4 MR. SIMON: Objection: asked and answered. 5 Okay. Can you read in the 11th line. 0 what is the first word? 6 Α It will be at the end of that sentence. 7 "Не." 0 being you, Ted, "said," can you read that? 8 "He said he voiced his concerns to the doctors 9 Α at Delray Community Hospital but they advised there did 10 11 not appear to be any suspicious circumstances 12 surrounding Simon's death and they would not be 13 conducting an autopsy." Can you keep reading the next sentence, 14 Q 15 please. "Ted contacted both a private company and the 16 Α Palm Beach County Medical Examiner's Office regarding 17 having an autopsy conducted." 18 19 would you like to change your prior statement? Q 20 Objection; argumentative, form. MR. SIMON: 21 0 Does that say you contacted the private 22 autopsy firm? 23 MR. SIMON: Objection. It says, "Regarding." 24 А 25 Document says what it says. MR. SIMON:

1 Did you contact a private company regarding 0 2 doing an autopsy? 3 I believe that I did. Α 4 Oh, now you did, okay. 0 5 MR. SIMON: Objection: move to strike. 6 argumentative. Did you contact the Palm Beach County Medical 7 0 Examiner's Office about having an autopsy? 8 9 Α I can't recall. 10 Well, read the next line. Did you tell a 0 11 sheriff's deputy that? 12 which line are you asking me to read? Α 13 The one that is -- I think it's like 14. Hold 0 14 on. 15 MR. SIMON: Eliot, I'm going to give you two more questions, and then we're going to do my 16 17 questions, and then I'm going to stop. 18 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I've got a few more 19 questions. 20 MR. SIMON: You've got two. 21 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And these are very 22 serious questions, so please. This could have --23 you know, potential murder of my father. I know you're concerned because my father spoonfed you his 24 25 whole life.

MR. SIMON: Nobody from the insurance 1 2 department --3 Ted, on Line 15 --Q 4 MR. SIMON: we're done now. 5 -- Ted contacted -- it starts with "Ted 0 contacted." Could you read that into the record, 6 7 please. MR. SIMON: You can read that. 8 9 Three lines up from the bottom of the first Q 10 paragraph. 11 "Ted contacted both the private company and Α 12 the Palm Beach County Medical Examiner's Office regarding having an autopsy conducted. 13 Both advised he should contact the Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office." 14 Did you contact the Palm Beach County 15 0 16 Sheriff's Office? 17 I don't remember. Α MR. SIMON: We're done. 18 19 You don't recall that you're --Q 20 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not done. I have 21 questions. 22 MR. SIMON: You're done. We agreed to five to 23 eight. I'm going to ask him two guestions and then 24 we're out of here. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Then you're out of time. 25

1	MR. SIMON: Come on.		
2	Okay.		
3	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah.		
4	(Mr. Simon and Mr. Ted Bernstein exit the		
5	room.)		
6	MR. ROSE: We're temporarily off the record.		
7	(Recess taken.)		
8	MR. SIMON: This is Adam Simon. I just have		
9	two or three questions.		
10	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well so you're		
11	interrupting my line of questioning? I was		
12	questioning. So we should take this up with the		
13	judge to give me more time?		
14	MR. SIMON: Please do.		
15	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, we will.		
16	MR. SIMON: Please do. Please. Please do.		
17	Yeah, the judge has been so		
18	(Cross-talking. Interruption by the		
19	reporter.)		
20	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Your father would be		
21	ashamed.		
22	MR. SIMON: All right. You guys ready?		
23	MR. STAMOS: We're ready.		
24	CROSS-EXAMINATION		
25	BY MR. SIMON:		

E

Ted, we talked about the 2000 insurance trust, 1 0 2 correct? 3 Α Yes. 4 Have you seen any documents produced by anyone 0 5 that assigned the ownership of the Capital Bankers policy to the 2000 trust? 6 No, I haven't. It's my understanding that 7 Α 8 that -- that trust never received any assets, didn't 9 receive the insurance policy, was never named as a 10 beneficiarv. 11 Never named as a beneficiary or an owner, 0 12 correct? 13 Α Or an owner. Around the time of the reinstatement of the 14 Q 15 policy that you discussed, did you have any 16 conversations with your father regarding the beneficiary 17 of the policy and the purpose of the policy? 18 т did. Α And can you describe that conversation. 19 Q 20 So we were having conversations at that time Α 21 about a buy/sell agreement, you know, buying each other 22 out of the business as he was winding things down in his 23 career, and I wanted a life insurance policy because we were partners in that business and I, you know, was 24 25 hoping that we would get a life insurance policy, but he

made it, you know, emphatically clear, and I knew it 1 2 from the reinstatement process, and I also just knew it 3 from his medical history, that there was really little chance or no chance of getting another life insurance 4 5 policy on his life. So I thought it might be easy to 6 use existing life insurance and just change the beneficiary portion of the policy to take care of the 7 needs that we would have needed in the buy/sell 8 9 agreement discussions, but he was unwilling to do that. I quess he was unwilling to do that because he felt it 10 11 was part of his overall plan to have those life 12 insurance policies, you know, do other things to be left 13 obviously for his children through the trust. I have nothing further. 14 MR. SIMON: 15 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'd like to ask you a 16 question on that. 17 RECROSS EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You mentioned the policy. You're the trustee 19 0 20 of this lost trust. Do you have possession of the 21 policy? 22 I think I have a copy of the policy. Α 23 Q A fully executed life insurance policy? Objection; relevance. 24 MR. SIMON:

Q Have you produced that policy to the court?

25

1	MR. SIMON: Objection; relevance. The	
2	policy's been paid out by the carrier.	
3	Q The policy, do you have a copy of the actual	
4	policy from the carrier?	
5	A A copy of the policy? I think so.	
6	Q Fully executed?	
7	MR. SIMON: Objection.	
8	A I don't know what that means.	
9	Q A policy that has all the pages to it that's a	
10	complete policy, that's got the beneficiaries, the death	
11	benefits, all that listed out. A copy of the policy.	
12	MR. SIMON: Objection; form	
13	Q Do you have possession of that?	
14	MR. SIMON: Objection; form. Objection;	
15	foundation.	
16	Q Do you have the policy?	
17	MR. SIMON: Objection, relevance.	
18	A I believe I have a copy of what the insurance	
19	company sent during this time of reinstatement. I	
20	believe I have a copy of the insurance policy. Whether	
21	executed, I I don't know what they deem executed.	
22	Q You have a copy of the insurance policy, okay.	
23	Have you given that in your production?	
24	MR. SIMON: Objection; misstated his answer.	
25	Q I asked you did you put it in production. You	
	A Macankla Litization Complete The 11(

Ì

1	haven't answered.	
2	MR. SIMON: He said he saw it in production.	
3	He said what was produced.	
4	Q No. I asked you, did you put your copy of the	
5	policy in production. You were supposed to	
6	MR. SIMON: No, you didn't.	
7	Q put all your documents.	
8	MR. SIMON: That's not what you said. That's	
9	not what he said. He said he found the documents	
10	through production.	
11	Q Did you put the policy in with your production	
12	documents?	
13	A I'm not sure.	
14	Q You were asked by the court to produce	
15	documents. Did you produce all your documents?	
16	A I don't know if I was asked by a court to	
17	produce documents, but	
18	Q Okay. We had to do a Rule 26 document	
19	request. You're the plaintiff. You produced documents.	
20	MR. SIMON: I'm going to object to this line	
21	of questioning. He has answered about the policy.	
22	He believes he had a copy. He's not sure if	
23	Q You believe you had a copy	
24	(Cross-talking. Interruption by the	
25	reporter.)	

E

1	Q Did you put the copy of the policy you claim		
2	to have with your production to the court when you		
3	produced?		
4	A I'm not sure.		
5	MR. SIMON: Jim, we're ten minutes over the		
6	agreed time. Do you have anything further?		
7	MR. STAMOS: I just have one additional		
8	question, if you don't mind.		
9	REDIRECT EXAMINATION		
10	BY MR. STAMOS:		
11	Q You described this conversation you had with		
12	your father a moment ago about the trust, how it related		
13	to the buy/sell and so forth. Do you recall that		
14	question and answer you just gave?		
15	A Yes, I do.		
16	Q And apropos of that conversation and any		
17	other apropos of that conversation, you understand		
18	that if the court recognizes the '95 trust as being the		
19	appropriate beneficiary for the policy, that you will		
20	receive 20 percent of the proceeds, and that if the		
21	court doesn't recognize the '98 [sic] trust as the		
22	beneficiary of the insurance policy in question, you		
23	will receive none of the proceeds of that policy,		
24	correct?		
25	MR. SIMON: Objection; it's a legal conclusion		

McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

Ì

1	which is probably inaccurate.	
2	Q I'm asking your understanding.	
3	MR. SIMON: Relevance. His understanding is	
4	not going to determine that.	
5	A It's my understanding that if the trust is	
6	determined not to be the beneficiary of the insurance	
7	policy, that I will not receive whatever it was I was	
8	supposed to receive. That's my what I understand.	
9	Anything else, I don't I don't know.	
10	Q Just one last but the corollary of that is	
11	your notion that if the court does recognize the trust	
12	as being the beneficiary, you'll receive something;	
13	you're just not sure what it is?	
14	A That's correct.	
15	MR. STAMOS: Okay. Thanks. That's all I	
16	have.	
17	MR. SIMON: I just have one more.	
18	RECROSS EXAMINATION	
19	BY MR. SIMON:	
20	Q Do you understand that there is a third	
21	possibility, that even if the trust is not acknowledged,	
22	it may not go to the estate? It could possibly be	
23	decided to go somewhere else by the judge? Do you	
24	understand that?	
25	A I do understand that.	

1	MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I have one last	
2	question.	
3	MR. STAMOS: Let me ask let me follow that	
4	up.	
5	REDIRECT EXAMINATION	
6	BY MR. STAMOS:	
7	Q Where do you understand to be the third	
8	possibility as the destination for the proceeds of the	
9	policy?	
10	A So there's, you know, all kinds of	
11	possibilities of where insurance proceeds can go when	
12	they're up for grabs like that and	
13	MR. SIMON: And I'm going to object, because	
14	this is all legal conclusion for the judge to	
15	decide.	
16	MR. STAMOS: I'm just following up your	
17	question. You asked him was there a third	
18	possibility; he said yes. I'm just trying to find	
19	out what third possibility he understands that	
20	there is.	
21	MR. SIMON: I said third possibility that the	
22	judge would determine. That was my question.	
23	MR. STAMOS: Yeah. Well, Adam, I'm just	
24	asking what he understands. If he has no	
25	understanding, he can tell me that and we can go	

1 home. T understand that there's infinite 2 Α 3 possibilities of where it could go in the event that a 4 judge makes a ruling on where they go. 5 MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I have one last question. 6 7 RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: 8 Ted, what's the primary beneficiary on the 9 0 10 policy that you possess? 11 The primary beneficiary, if I recall, was a --Α was a -- I think it was a voluntary employee benefit 12 13 plan. would that happen to be LaSalle National 14 Q 15 Trust? 16 Oh, boy, I -- I don't know. Α 17 You don't know who the primary beneficiary on 0 the policy that you're the trustee for is? 18 19 MR. SIMON: Objection; asked and answered, 20 argumentative. 21 We're done. Let's go. 22 One more question. 0 23 No. We're done. MR. SIMON: 24 who's the contingent beneficiary named on it? Q 25 Are you aware your father -- of his heavy

1	metal poison test, Ted? Ted?	
2	MR. ROSE: I think Adam's terminated the	
3	deposition, so	
4	MR. SIMON: Yeah. We're way past	
5	MR. ROSE: You have no further questions in	
6	Chicago, right?	
7	MR. SIMON: Way past.	
8	MR. STAMOS: No, we're all set.	
9	MR. ROSE: Have a good night, guys.	
10	(Mr. Simon and Mr. Ted Bernstein exit the	
11	room.)	
12	(Deposition concluded at 8:15 p.m.)	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	McCorkla Litization Somuicos Inc.	
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	

1	ERRATA-SIGNATURE PAGE SIMON BERNSTEIN IRREVOCABLE TRUST VS. HERITAGE UNION
2	LIFE INSURANCE Case No. 13 CV 3643
3	DEPOSITION TAKEN May 6, 2015
4	
5	Page Line: Now Reads:
6	Should Read: Reason for Change:
7	Page Line:
8	Now Reads:
9	
10	Page Line: Now Reads: Should Read: Reason for Change:
11	Should Read: Reason for Change:
12	Page Line:
13	Now Reads:
14	Reason for Change:
15	Page Line: Now Reads:
16	Should Read: Reason for Change:
17	Page Line:
18	Now Reads: Should Read:
19	Reason for Change:
20	Page Line: Now Reads:
21	Should Read: Reason for Change:
22	
23	Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have read the foregoing transcript and that the facts stated
24	in it are true.
25	Date TED BERNSTEIN
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052

		-
1		
2	CERTIFICATE OF OATH	
3		
4		
5	STATE OF FLORIDA)	
6	COUNTY OF PALM BEACH)	
7		
8	I, Lisa Gropper, Registered Professional Reporter,	
9	Florida Professional Reporter, Notary Public, State of	
10	Florida, certify that TED BERNSTEIN personally appeared	
11	before me on the 6th day of May, 2015 and was duly	
12	sworn.	
13	WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL this 19th day of	
14	May, 2015.	
15		
16	LISA GROPPER, RPR, FPR	
17	Notary Public, State of Florida My Commission No.: EE136111	
18	My Commission Expires: 11/18/2015	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. Chicago, Illinois (312) 263-0052	1

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA)) COUNTY OF PALM BEACH)

I, LISA GROPPER, Registered Professional Reporter, Florida Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the deposition of TED BERNSTEIN; that a review of the transcript was requested; and that the foregoing transcript is a true record of my stenographic notes.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

Dated this 19th day of May, 2015.

Lisa Gropper, R.P.R., F.P.R.

1 2	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc. 200 N. LaSalle Street - Suite 2900 Chicago, Illinois 60601
3	(312) 263-0052
4	May 19, 2015
5	
6	The Simon Law Firm 303 East Wacker Drive
7	Suite 2725 Chicago, Illinois 60601
8	ATTN: Adam M. Simon, Esq.
9	RE: SIMON BERNSTEIN IRREVOCABLE TRUST VS. HERITAGE UNION LIFE INSURANCE
10	UNION LITE INSURANCE
11	Dear Mr. Simon,
12	Enclosed please find the deposition transcript of TED BERNSTEIN in the above-captioned case taken on
13	May 6, 2015. Please have Mr. Bernstein read your transcript copy
14 15	and sign the attached errata sheet. Make a copy of the errata sheet to attach to your copy of the transcript, and then please forward the original errata sheet back
16	to our office. Please make arrangements to have this accomplished
17	as soon as possible. The failure to read and sign the deposition could be constituted as a waiver if not accomplished within a reasonable period of time.
18	Your attention to this matter is appreciated.
19	Sincerely,
20	
21	Lisa Gropper, RPR, FPR
22	
23	
24	
25	
	McCorkle Litigation Services, Inc.

Exhibits	T. Bernstein Exhibit 5
T. Bernstein Exhibit	5 57:8,9,10,11 T.
1 33:10,11,13 34:9	Bernstein Exhibit
40:21 48:22	58:1,3
T.	T.
Bernstein Exhibit 10	Bernstein Exhibit
60:23,24	59:23,24,25
T.	T.
Bernstein Exhibit 11	Bernstein Exhibit
62:9,11 65:4 T.	82:2 108:11
Bernstein Exhibit 14	1
66:8,9	1
T.	33:10,11,13 34:9
Bernstein Exhibit	36:9,11 40:21 48:22
15	83:13 84:7
67:2,4	10
T.	14:22 32:20 60:23,
Bernstein Exhibit	24
16	11
69:16,17,23,24 T.	16:5 62:9,11 65:4 108:24 11th
Bernstein Exhibit	110:5
17	12
71:18,19,20 T.	22:6,13 69:23
Bernstein Exhibit	109:4
18	13
75:2,3 76:12	10:9 22:3,8,9 62:14
T.	109:1
Bernstein Exhibit	13th
19	97:8
11:17,18 19:17 29:8	14
T.	66:8,9 111:13
Bernstein Exhibit	14th
2	62:17
50:19,21	15
T.	6:16 34:1 67:2,4
Bernstein Exhibit 21	68:2,4 112:3 15th 33:17 34:10,14
18:15 25:13 81:8	16
100:3	6:16 67:17 69:16,17
T.	24
Bernstein Exhibit	17
22	6:16 33:3 71:18,19,
27:21,24	20
T.	18
Bernstein Exhibit	75:2,3 76:12
23 77:12,13 81:22 83:6 T.	19 11:17,18 18:22
Bernstein Exhibit	19:17 29:8 51:15,20 23
24	1980
78:6 88:5,6	22:21
T.	1992
Bernstein Exhibit	32:22 33:3,5
25	1995
25	10:20 13:14 16:25
T.	22:15,22,25 23:2,9,
Bernstein Exhibit	12,20,25 24:4 25:17
26	26:10 52:21 55:5
90:20,21,22	56:11 59:7 62:23
T.	72:11 80:3 86:6,14,
Bernstein Exhibit	20 99:17,25 102:4
3	1995-ish
54:5,6,13 T.	22:21 1998 30:14
Bernstein Exhibit	19th
4	33:18 36:7 53:23
55:13,14,15	00.10 00.1 00.20

É

ein Exhibit	2
10,11	2
ein Exhibit	34:10 47:4 50:19,21 79:13
ein Exhibit	20 12:12 15:13 22:3,8,9
ein Exhibit	78:13 118:20 2000 37:6,13,16,21 38:16
24,25	40:24 42:3,6 47:2, 18,25 48:5,9,17,24
ein Exhibit	49:6,17,18,24 50:1 51:13 52:11,19 53:1,
08:11	9 56:13 77:5 81:24 84:19 87:2,16,17
1	114:1,6 2004 27:6
11,13 34:9	27.0 2008 78:13 82:19
1 40:21 48:22 34:7	2012 10:9 34:2 51:16,20,
32:20 60:23,	23 55:9 78:11 88:11, 21 89:11
	2013 27:7 56:16 61:6
2:9,11 65:4	62:15 67:17 68:2,4 76:16 2014
	73:7 108:24 21
3 69:23	13:16,18,20,25 14:6 15:10,12 16:20,23
	18:15,18 21:19,22 25:8,13,16 26:10
2:3,8,9 62:14	27:14 29:7,8 51:23 55:9 56:19 60:10
	61:18 77:1 81:8 100:3,5,6,8,9,11 21st
111:13	26:3 22
	13:16,18 15:13,15 16:20,23 18:15,19
4:1 67:2,4 112:3	21:19,22 25:9 27:21, 24 51:23 55:9 56:16,
34:10,14	20 60:10 61:19 77:2 100:3,5,6,8,9,12
7:17 69:16,17,	23 77:12,13 81:22 82:4 83:6
0 74 40 40	24 78:6,7,8,10 88:6
3:3 71:18,19,	25 12:13 78:6,8,10,13
76:12	88:11 26
18 18:22 29:8 51:15,20,	90:20,21,22 117:18 2A 85:5
22·2 E	3
33:3,5 13:14 16:25	27:6 54:6,10,13 30
22,25 23:2,9, 25 24:4 25:17	27:6 76:16 31
52:21 55:5 59:7 62:23	109:1 3893
30:3 86:6,14, 17,25 102:4	82:6 3rd
h	27:4
	4
36:7 53:23	4 55:14,15
	-

	40
	30:8,10,11 41
21	30:18,24 31:3 42
	31:9 43
3,9	31:9 44
16	31:9
16	4409 52:17
4 1	4490 52:3
:1, 4	4519 55:3
	47 18:23 60:25
	48
	19:17 4966
_	33:14
), 11,	5
	5 32:22 57:8,9,11
4	51
	60:1,15 52
	60:2,4 59
:6	32:3
	6
3	6
	12:12 55:8 57:21 6/21/95
	29:12 65
	57:11 6508
	67:5
21,	6510 67:24
16, ::2	6512 67:5
	6579 66:22
:4	67 55:20,22,24
	69
	55:17
3	7
8	7 30:9 57:25
	70 32:19
	7:07
_	68:5
	8
	8 58:1,3 61:6
	88 22:2,3,4,15 24:21
	880
	6:10 8:15
	122:12
	9
	9 32:4 59:24,25 60:1
	JZ.7 JJ.24,20 00.1
	1

66:22 9/13/12 109:4 90 27:2 92 50:20 95 14:11,15,20 15:16, 25 18:2 24:17 35:8 37:1 42:10,16,18 44:21 58:21 77:2 80:22 81:17 87:2,20 93:16 94:5,8 118:18 97 25:4 98 27:16 118:21 9th 61:2
Α
a.m. 68:5 absence 36:22 absolute 84:14 Absolutely 65:1 absorbed 80:8 accessed 26:24 27:7 account 62:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:20 80:20 accurately 80:2

addressees 65:6 addressing 23:22 33:24 47:1 advice 64:21 87:4 advise 65:8 109:13 advised 74:7 78:25 109:19 110:10 112:13 affairs 76:20 affidavit 11:13,21 12:7 25:25 26:4 29:5 33:8 affirm 6:1 agency 97:13 agent 104:3 agree 9:12 40:21 54:24 63:1 73:16 81:10 83:14 84:24,25 85:17 88:17 agreed 112:22 118:6 agreement 14:9 53:25 54:17 56:7 114:21 115:9 agrees 84:11 ahead 85:24 86:2,16 92:17 101:17 105:23 Alan 63:20 allowing 86:8 amended 76:1 amendment 74:24 amount 9:13 89:3 amounts 97:21 analysis 60:5,17 and/or 31:22 34:8 annexed 84:10 answers 25:24 anymore 73:20 Anything's 69:12 apparently 44:8 appeared 75:8 appears 51:4 65:7 67:8 application 32:5,15 35:13,18 41:3 42:9,13 47:25 applied 42:15 87:20 appointed 32:25 appointment 14:23 approach 81:16 appropriateness 92:12,14

approving 32:7 Approximately 6.16 107.14 apropos 118:16.17 argue 64:14 argumentative 105.13 109.25 110:20 111:6 121:20 arose 45:1 75:18 article 16.5 ASAP 52:21 ashamed 113:21 aspects 74:6 assert 46:16,18 63:11 asserted 31:2.12 64:3.23.24 asserting 39:9 63:22.24 assertion 12:20 30:24 70:9 asset 51:12 assets 9:13 90:17 114:8 assigned 114:5 assignees 84.14 assignments 84:12 assigns 83.15 assisted 80:22 Association 31:20 assume 29:13 73:16 assumed 53:8,15,17,18 68:25 assuming 69:1 assumption 66:19 attachment 66:21 attempt 53.25 attempted 54:17 90:4 attention 87:19 attornev 38:3,5,6,8 39:11 43:2,6,9,10 44:9,14, 19,20,22,24 45:5,25 58:15 63:6 72:25 73:5 79:18 98:10 attorney's 73:17 attorney-client 38:2 44:5 45:12 63:9.16 64:7 attorneys 73:24 74:3 79:5 80:2 August 76:16 authentic 75:17 authority 94:7

autopsy 110:13,18,22 111:2, 8 112:13 aware 10:12,18,23 16:23 19:18 20:3,4,24 31:1.2 32:25 35:17. 23 36:1,4 37:16 42:15 77:1,4 79:11 86:4,5,10,13,18 88:19 89:5,6,9,10, 21,24 94:23 98:11, 17,20,22 99:9,11 101:1 107:8,20 121:25 в back 15:12 18:21 21:8.10. 15 22:25 25:1 27:20. 21 40.12 14 16 19 43:25 44:1 50:22 51:3.9.16 60:4 65:20 69:24 74:2 75:6 107:21 backdating 75:9,13,14 bad 61.7 Bankers 114:5 based 24:21 29:15 30:5 62:22 73:13 87:7 90:9 105:5,24 bases 14:19 basically 58:21 59:8 basis 12:20,22,25 29:18 38:22 39:9,11 41:17 49:10 64:21,22 80.25 Bates 33:13 Beach 96:18,19 110:17 111:7 112:12,14,15 began 22:23,25 33:24 begin 33:10 81:18 beginning 17:5 33:25 62:12 68.19 begins 33:17 58:11 behalf 32:23 67:21 107:25 belief 14:19 49:10 believes 117:22 beneficiaries 62:24 89:14 91:21 101:12 102:9,16,19 116:10 beneficiary 10:25 29:24,25 30:2 47:19 55:6 65:12,17, 22 68:9,11,23 84:12 88:20 89:7,10,13 114:10,11,16 115:7 118:19.22 119:6.12 121:9,11,17,24 benefit 95:3 101:10 103:7, 14 121:12

benefits 99:18 116:11 Beniamin 31.24 Berkeley 6:10 Bernstein 6:8,9 8:8,18 9:5 11:20 12:16,21 21:9 22:16 23:3,7 27:17 29.11 32.6 38.10 11 39.5 12 47.7 8 70.17 72:23 75:1 83:5 84:19 88:9 94:19.22 99:9.15 100:21 101:9,16 102:25 103:21,24 104:23,24 105:15,17,21 108:7, 14,19 109:8 111:18, 21 112:20,25 113:3, 4,10,15,20 115:15, 18 120:1 121:5,8 122:10 Bernstein's 47:7 63:21 bet 70:19 billing 76:14 bit 52:17 57:23 69:5 blanks 58:23 blurry 97.9 Boca 6:10,12 boilerplate 58:17,23 59:10 bottom 30:9 55:3,16 56:10 57:12 60:25 61:5 62.13 66.21 70.9 76:20 112:9 box 26:19,21 boy 121:16 breach 104:15 break 11:9 21:12 47:15 57:3 68:8,23 69:2 bring 95:11,17 107:14 brother 62:13 brother-in-law 25.6brought 87:18 95:18 Brown 31:24 **BT10** 14.22 **BT20** 16:3 bunch 11:7 business 6:15,17,19 7:19 77:15 79:14 114:22, 24 buy/sell 114:21 115:8 118:13 buying 114.21

С calculate 43:22 call 14:11 62:19 90:3,8, 9,10,11 98:9,10,18, 20 called 98:15 calls 99:19 103:9 candice 21.9 candidates 7:13 capacities 44:14 45:16,18 47:9 72:21 capacity 8:13 39:18 43:10 45:21,24 72:16,19 73:1,6 Capital 114:5 carbon 58.5 care 115:7 career 114.23 carrier 37:5 48:23 49:23 50:3,4 116:2,4 carved 37:6 48:25 49:24 52:20 case 8:21 9:2,13,19,21 10:25 28:8 33:1 72:17 85:15 caused 94:11,13 cease 73:5 ceasing 73:23 central 69:9 certify 73:21 103:21 cetera 16:10 23:12 chain 41:10 68:18 chance 70:16 115:4 change 71:4 76:8 86:11 90:5 110:19 115:6 changed 71:6 charge 107:1 check 81.19 95.15 Chicago 8:22 9:2,13,19,21 10:18,25 19:20,24 22:17,19 28:14,21 29:2 71:11 80:18 98:25 122:6 children 54:1 56:12 88:14.19 89.4 23 91.23 92.13 93:21,24 115:13 Christine 58:6 63:5

circulate 54:17 circumstance 10.3circumstances 74:12 91:14 110:11 claim 31:21 35:7 36:20 37:13,21 79:2 94:4, 12 101:1,3,10 102:7 104:1 118:1 claimed 98:21 claiming 98:18 99:25 105:24 claims 30:20 31:4 96:6 99.11 clarify 106:24 clear 20:18 66:16,19 115.1 client 45:25 clients 77:17 comment 39:24 40:6,13 commented 86:21 common 32:12 communal 17:3 communicate 64:16 communication 63:4,9,17,18 64:17, 19 74:8 communications 34:14 41:7,19 46:25 47:5 63:23,25 64:11 73:11,14 81:15 87:7, 13.15 Community 110:10 companies 6:24 94:15 company 29:23 32:9,17 35:7, 13 37:13,22 41:3 42:10.13.16 47:20 48.1 65.9 10 19 67:21 68:20.22 69:21 71:10 94:6 101:7.13.19 104:1.8. 10.13 110:16 111:1 112:11 116:19 company's 32:13 Complaint 104:19,22 105:4,14 complete 76:2 116:10 Compound 108:3 computer 13:22 26:1 27:4,8,14 80:23 81:5,7,18 Concepts 6:14,18 conceptually 45.20 concern 76:22 concerned 63:17 75:20 111:24 concerns 110:1,9

concluded 122:12 conclusion 47:18 99:20 103:10. 18 118:25 120:14 conclusions 102.24 conditions 84:17 condominium 10.2 conducted 19:1 25:6 32:5 47:6, 8 48:7 110:18 112.13 conducting 110:13 confer 40:2,8 88:2 conference 90:15 confidential 64:21 74:8 confirmation 68:10 conflict 8:25 10:5 45:1,16 72:9 conflicts 71:22 confuse 14:12 confused 14:14 25:15 40:1,3 connected 69:20 consensus 62.23 consequence 93:15 considered 28:7 64:1 103:14,15 constitute 16:24 consulted 39:10,15,17 contact 80:2 95:22,25 102:16 111:1,7 112.14 15 contacted 98:15 110:16,21 112:5,6,11 contemplate 92:20 contingent 30:2 121:24 continue 16:13 55:2 64:4,23 67:20 72:18,21,25 83:18,20 103:20 105:16,19 continuing 71:22 72:9 contract 104:15 conversation 16:19 17:8.21.25 18:12,14 23:6,19,24 24:13,16,20 34:4 37:11,19 38:4,15,21 45:22,23 47:23 48:3, 15 50:1.6 61:20.25 81:14,20 114:19 118:11,16,17 conversations 17:9 20:5,6 24:4 28:2 31:23 32:1,8 36:5 41:6,23 42:2 44:2.4 46:1.5.7.24 49:12 50:3,4 73:22

74:13 87:11 94:15 114:16,20 conveying 68·15 convoluted 14:4 copied 36:8,17 52:4 54:8,16 56:1 58:5 66:12 67:7 copies 60:18 61:2,7 63:5 copy 13:14 14:8 15:15 22:11 27:17 51:10, 11 58:16 59:8 61:12 79:24 80:3 108:8,13 115:22 116:3,5,11, 18,20,22 117:4,22, 23 118.1 corollary 119:10 coroner 96:13 coroner's 96:12.21 99:10 correct 8:22 9:11,15 10:9, 21,22 12:3,5 13:24 15:3,10,11 16:1 17:3 18:20 20:10 24:8,9, 11 25:9 28:8 30:6 33:5 36:17 41:4,5,8, 13 45:16 48:13,14 50:14,17,23 51:6,22, 25 52.2 11 54.3 15 21.24 55:4.11.18.25 56:3.17.18.19.20.23 57:1 58:7,9 60:8,9, 12.14.20 62:14 63:6 65:6 66:4,12,13 67:7,12 70:19,23 72:4 75:10,17 76:14, 16,23 77:2,5,7,18, 19,22,23 78:11,14, 21 79:2 81:7 82:2 84:1 85:4,15,16 88:11,15 89:11,12, 14,15,23 90:1 92:25 93:19,21,24,25 94:11 95:20 99:12, 18 103:18 104:15 106.12 14 109.9 114:2,12 118:24 119:14 correctly 29:16 33:18 42:18 costing 76:22 counsel 12:1,17 31:23 32:1,8 44:3 62:14 63:21 64:1 72:23 73:12,14 92:19.22 County 96:18,19,20,21 110:17 111:7 112:12,14,15 couple 12:24 15:2 29:4 40:19 66:3 107:16 court 6:1 11:8,15 13:17 43:24 54:12 62:22 63:2 99:18 101:23 105:2 115:25 117:14.16 118:2.18. 21 119:11 create 12:8 created 11:24 25:18 26:11, 23 79:11 80:21

creating 81:4 creation 23:11 75:13,24 CROSS-**EXAMINATION** 94:21 113:24 cross-talking 46:14 113:18 117:24 curious 46:13 custodv 106.21.24 customers 77:17 cut 48:10 53:3,9 57:22 D dad 25:1 55:6 61:8 95:22 97:10.14 101:4 database 25:21 27:5 date 10:8 19:7 25:18 27:13 53:23 56:19 61:13 67:20 72:19 76.18 97.7 dated 23:12 29:11 33:16 50:17 51:15,20 56:16 78:10,13 88:11 dates 19:9 20:11 David 13:2 14:24 16:19 17:6,8 18:14 19:19 20:7,13 22:17 24:13, 20 25:6 26:10 27:1, 18 28:2 29:20 30:5, 17 31:23 50:25 53:23 66:12,15 80:18,19,22 81:4,6, 14.17 David's 16:18 25:17 dav 26:10 27:3,5,7 56:15 95:22,25 96:13 97:4 98:2 109:9,11,23 days 97:13 dead 16:10 deal 56:6 dealing 56.6 dealt 77:16 death 10:8 17:16.17.19 19.4 7 23.14 24.3 25:5 35:20 89:21 90:11 92:24 93:14, 15 95:3 101:9 110:12 116:10 December 19:8 55:8 decide 87.19 120.15 decided 62:20 119:23 declared 38:25 deem 116:21

deemed 93:5 defendant 30:19 31:4,7,20 define 10:15 deliver 106:4,8 Delray 110:1,10 department 109:9,13,23 112:2 depends 41:21 deposition 27:2 122:3.12 deputy 111:11 describe 18:25 75:15 108:12, 15 114:19 describing 80:20 designation 68:9.23 destination 120:8 detail 7:1 determine 119:4 120:22 determined 119:6 development 28:12.17 died 10:11 18:19 23:24 66:4 79:1 89:8.9 95:6,11,22,25 96:4, 13 97:5,10,14 98:3, 17 106:12,22 107:3 109:11 dies 79:12 dig 66:17 diligent 19:1 direct 6.5 58.10 disburse 10:1 disbursed 9:6,14,21,22 disciplined 8:4 disclose 44:25 74:8 disclosed 46:18 discord 89:25 discovery 28:6 32:16 discuss 48.8 56.14 discussed 23:3 52:19 62:19 114:15 discussing 67:16 73:11 discussion 34:1 37:5 48:23 49:23 discussions 37:14 64:8 71:9 102:20 115:9 disinherit 89:18 92:12

disinheritance 92:7 dispute 19:25 71:1 89:16 disrespectful 39:20 disseminated 87:9 dissolution 30.12 dissolved 30:14 distinction 93:13 distribution 42:16 88:15,21 divergence 8:24 divergent 45:1 DNRS 95:20 doc 51:17 docs 66[.]17 doctors 110:9 document 13:11.23 14:25 15:3. 4.5.25 21:23 25:18 26:11.16 27:14.20 30:5 32:13 48:17 49:6 51:11 52:5.7.9. 11,19,20,24 53:6 55:5 56:13 59:15,16 60:6 61:14 66:10,22, 24 67:5 69:19 72:1 74:24 75:6,8,13,23, 24 76:1,2,5,7,10,11 77:9 81:4,7 82:11, 16,25 83:8 85:17,22 86:1,13,19 87:1,24 88:8,11,13,16,22,24 91:20 95:2.14 99:21. 23 100:2.16.18.22 105.7 108.15 18 110:25 117:18 documents 13:5,7,8,9,10 14:18 16:20,22,24 19:14, 18,19,24 20:15 21:17 28:14 31:6,22 32:2,9,16 33:1 47:4 61:17,18 74:17,18, 21,22 79:13,20 90:22 95:5,8,12,14, 17 99:22 106:4,9,12, 14 16 107.2 6 8 10 14 15 18 20 21 108:5 114:4 117:7,9, 12,15,17,19 Don 34:8 Donald 48:2 draft 11:23 13:21 15:15, 16 26:2 27:16 61:12, 18 77:2.24 drafted 11:20 60:5 79:5,10, 23 80:2 drafting 79.20 drafts 16:24 17:3 25:8 28:7 51:24 55:9

Е earlier 17:5 24:14 42:14 51:24 66:1 earliest 33:22 Early 73:7 ease 11:10 eastern 69:8 easy 103:2 115:5 editorial 40:13 educated 56.12 effect 61:21 89:17 effort 34:1 54:21 efforts 80:1,4 Eliot 54:23 58:4,5 60:17 61:1 62:13 63:1 65:5 83:5 94:19,22 99:9, 15 100:21 101:9.16 102.25 103.21 24 104:24 105:17,21 106:8 108:7.14.19 109:8 111:15,18,21 112.20 25 113.3 10 15,20 115:15,18 120:1 121:5,8 Eliot's 30:19 31:4,21 63:6 76:22 email 33:22 40:22 41:1.10 46.17 49.20 51.16 54:7,16 55:4 59:15 60:5,15,18 61:6 62:17 63:24 65:5 66:11,14,20,25 67:11 68:7,8 69:3 70:2,19 72:1,2,16 emailed 28:20 emails 28:5 33:8 41:22 46:8,22 50:13,23,24 67:6,18 87:14 emphatically 115:1 employ 63.14 employed 6:11,22,24 48:5,9 employee 6:23 121:12 employs 6:13 emptied 61:8 encourage 92:1 encouraged 92:14,18,21 end 40:13 110:7 ends 33:17 61:1 66:11 67:6 68:8 70:21 72:2 enforced 93:17 enforcement 97:13

engaged 6:17 entered 63.2 enters 21:9 entire 48:7 85:22 entities 8.14 entitled 38:23 88:20 entity 6:13,23 entry 109:3 equally 90:18 Equifax 30:1 Esquire 30:19 31:3 establish 38:21,22 41:19 84:23 93:14 established 39:3 42:14 50:12 estate 8:8,13,14 9:1,5,14, 22,25 36:22 76:23 79:10,14 91:20 92:23,24 93:6,11 103:8.13 106:14.17 107.2 8 15 22 24 108.1 119.22 estates 79:9 event 50:12 65:3 69:13 121:3 eventually 64.16 **EXAMINATION** 6:5 115:17 118:9 119:18 120:5 121:7 Examiner's 110:17 111:8 112:12 excellent 54:5 exchange 65:5 exclude 91.24 excluding 87:12 execute 58.14 84.11 executed 13:14 24:8,10 29:15, 19 51:11 52:5,9,23 78:20 81:1 115:23 116:6,21 exhaustive 55:4 exhibit 11:17,18 18:15,22 19:17 25:13 27:21, 24 29:8 33:10,11,13 34:9,10 40:21 48:22 50:19,21 54:5,13 55:2,13,15 57:8,9,10 58:1,3 59:23,25 60:23,24 62:9,11 65:4 66:8,9 67:2,4, 25 69:16,17,23 71:17,18,19,20 75:2, 3 76:12 77:12.13 78.6 81.8 22 82.2 83:6 85:9 88:5 90:20,21,22 100:3 108:8.11

exhibited 99:22 exhibits 11.8 10 13.16 18 16:23 51:23 56:19 60:10 61:18 77:1 78.8 exist 16:24 102:12 existed 37.17 existence 10:12,15,24 23:11 38:24 70:13 77:1 80:11 85:18 87:17 existing 115:6 exit 113.4 122.10 expect 25:23 63:19 expectations 87.24 expected 44:4 86:23 87:3,14 experience 77:24 78:4,23 79:8. 15,17,22 104:2 explain 11.22 43.21 90.5 explained 90:16 extend 46.7 extent 21:25 73:10 F fabrication 75.24 face 99.7 fact 18:7 20:4 31:2 48:5, 8,9 49:5 76:19 87:4, 5 91:19 92:19 94:7 facts 25:14 31:12 91:6,14 fair 18.18 36.24 52.9 55:8 familiar 34:22 49:2 81:2,3 102.21 family 89:16.25 father 10:11 11:4 18:19 22:19 23:7 24:16 25:5 30:4 36:21 65:17 75:10 89:17 90:13,16 91:15 92:16,18 95:11 96:4, 13 97:5 98:17 101:1, 20.24 102:2 109:11. 14 20 110.2 111.23 24 113 20 114 16 118.12 121.25 father's 10:8 19:1 23:14 34:5 44:17 58:21 65:11 76:19,20 92:12 97:6 98:2 fax 108.24 25 February 61:2,6 62:14,17 108:24 federal 101:23 105:2

feel 71:21 feelina 92.21 felt 74:19 115:10 figure 45:9 file 15.16 26.1 27.18 96:3.12 105:1 filed 29:2 31:24 71:10 94:4 102:1,7 104:14, 17 105:8,10,25 files 25:7 27:18 filing 12:17 21:23 filings 29:21 fill 58:16,22 59:9 filled 29:23 59:11 final 94.3 finally 75:2 find 52:20 61:14,21 62:1 64:16 79:13 81:16 120:18 finding 36:23 fine 31:17 41:22,24 45:10 53:21 firm 59.18 71.7 74.17 75.9 19 78.17 79.23 80:8,9,10,17,25 83:8 90:23 99:23,24 100:1,11,14,15,23 110:22 firm's 78:2 100:8 firms 78:21 fix 59:3 flip 83:12 Florida 6:10,12 7:4 22:22,25 folder 27.18 follow 46:3 73:17 120:3 foreclose 74:10 forget 21:5 form 25.23 29.22 37.2 42:12 44:10 58:24 79:16 82:23 84:6 87:21 93:1,7 94:12 95:7 98:16 99:13 102:15,18 103:17 104:4 107:12 108:2 110:20 116:12,14 formed 29.12 forming 23:3 forms 15:4.5 forward 62:18

found 13:22 15:16 20:16 27:19,24 28:1,15 51:18 117:9 foundation 116.15 fourth 56:10 58:11 front 33:12 50:22 51:3 60:1 69:24 83:3.9 full 76:19 fully 115:23 116:6 funds 9:22 10:1.20 G gave 96:9 118:14 general 79:21 93:12 generally 6.25 41.2 genesis 70:25 91:6 get all 54:1 gift 83.14 girlfriend 96:7 109:15 give 6:2 11:16 13:17 19:6 25.24 46.20 23 54:12 80:14 88:1 94:1 95:5,8 105:14 107:10 111:15 113:13 giving 60:5 98:3 good 40:9 104:24 109:22 122.9 Gortz 51:13 56:13 grabs 120:12 grandchildren 90:17 93:22,23 group 62:19 guess 12:1,12,24 28:4 46:12 51:1 56:12 115:10 guesses 20:25 guessing 30:9 66:15 guide 59:17 guiding 35:4 guys 113:22 122:9 н half 23:14 26:23 halfway 52:17 handling 71:4 handwriting 16:6.17

handwritten 15:7 happen 10:3 71:3 121:14 hard 15:15 27:17 70:12 88:12 hat 44:9 hats 44.8 head 7:12 health 7.8 hear 42:18 98:25 99:2,3 heard 101:2,4 hearken 24:25 heavy 121:25 helpful 108:22 helping 79:1 hereto 84:11 Heritage 51:9 52:6,24 60:6 62:20,21 highly 51:16 75:19 history 115:3 hold 7:4,6,9,14 67:18 84:15 111:13 holographic 94.23 95.1 home 19:2 106:12 121:1 honestly 59:19 87:22,25 hope 79:13 hoping 11:12 114:25 Hopkins 80:24 Horan 88.2 hospital 95:5,12 98:18 106:5, 6 110:1,10 hours 109:4 house 97:6,10 98:2 husband 103:4 Т ID 29:21 idea 18:1 20:2 27:11 40:9 103:11 105:25 107:17 identification 11:18 13:19 33:11 50:21 54:13 55:15 57:9 58:3 59:25 60:24 62:11 66:9 67:4 69:17 71:19 75:3 77:13 78:9 90:21 108:11

identifies 78:20 identifvina 35:19 42:10 94:5 Illinois 7:25 29:13 64:14 image 58:21 59:13,16 imagine 20:7 21:17 28:6 77.14 impact 87:19 implies 14.25 imply 34:13,21 49:25 50:5 important 28:7,10 56:14 inaccurate 119.1 include 44:19 49:6 91:21 included 70:22 75:16 85:3 includes 25:25 63:4 70:11 84:3 85:13 including 41:18 79:5 93:23 independent 62:14 indicating 26:2,18 27:20 78:1 108:16 infinite 121:2 information 20:9 23:10 35:5 46:24 87:9 101:20 informina 32:23 inheritance 90:12 initial 66:14 68:16 initiated 12:17 inquiries 80:17 inquiry 96:13 99:10 inside 27.17 instruct 73:13 87:6 94:10 instruction 46:4 73:17 instrument 51:10 insurance 6:14,17,197:2,7,8 9:19 10:13,20,21 23:4,5 29:11,12,23, 25 30:3 32:9,13,17 33:23 34:5,14 35:7, 13.14 37:13.22 38:12 39:4,6 41:3 42.13 15 47.20 21 25 48:10 49:14 57:17 65:9,10,18,22 67:19,20 68:20,22 69:21 71:5.9.23 72:10 77:5,6,16,17, 21 78:23 82:1,8,19 83:16 84:4,10,15,19 85:3,14,19 93:17 94:6,15,24 101:6,13, 19 103:25 104:3,7, 10,13 112:1 114:1,9, 23,25 115:4,6,12,23

116:18,20,22 118:22 119:6 120:11 insured 104.1 insureds 78.25 insurer 32:5,24 33:4 intended 53.24 intent 79:19 interacted 79:4 interactions 65:11 interest 8:25 38:12 39:4,6 85:19 internally 92:11 interrupting 113:11 Interruption 46:14 113:18 117:24 intervene 31:25 investigated 65:8 investigation 32:6 80:7 96:23 101.14 involved 50:1 77:16 87:12,13 89:3 90:12 104:11 involvement 98:9.10 irregular 74:18 75:19 irregularities 74.22 irregularity 74:18 irrevocable 14:8 29:11,12 30:3 84:14 IRS 21:24 issue 40:3.8 issues 44:25 67:16 75:18 item 49.21 51.8 iterations 68:19 80:10 J January 56:16 109:1 Jill 57:16 58:6 67:15 Jim 45:14 100:4 118:5 judge 47:13.15 103:22 113:13.17 119:23 120:14.22 121:4 judgment 11:15 47:18 July 78:10 88:11 June 25:16 26:3,10 32:22 33:3

kind 7:4,6 11:9 14:4 97:22 105:11 kinds 120:10 knew 34:21 49:18 52:13 66:2 74:23 97:22 104:6,8 115:1,2 knowledge 9:9 17:7 23:11 26:3 30:5 42:24 43:4,6 65:14.15.24.25 104:12 105:5,18,22, 24 L lack 65:11 language 58:23 59:10 lapsed 23.16Lasalle 32:24 121:14 law 13:22 15:17 75:19 78:2,21 80:24 97:12 99:23,24 100:1,7,11, 14 15 23 laws 102:21 lawsuit 10:18 28:13,14 29:1 44:15 71:10 102:1,3 104:14,15,18 105:1, 7.10,11,25 lawver 39:1,2,8 42:11,20,24 47:7 64:16,19 105:6 lawyer's 46:4 lawvers 74:9 77:24 79:9,13 layperson 28:18 lead 13:5 89:25 learn 10:16 11:3 28:1 80:6 learned 24:14 28:2,3,4 33:4 89:17 94:4 learning 20:5 68:17 leave 22:22 89:22 90:17 95:2 leaving 40:6 73:22 94:24 led 35:373:8,9,2374:3, 12 91:14 left 76:21 89:7 92:23 93:3 115:12 legal 64:20 95:20 99:20 102:23 103:10.18 118:25 120:14 legally 102:12 legend 108:25 letter 32:22 53:22 54:15

κ

95:15 letters 68·10 Lexington 30:15 license 7:4,6,7,9,14,19,22 8:1,2,3 life 6:14,18 7:2,7 10:13 23:3 5 29:12 24 30:2 33:23 57:17 62:6 67:19 71:5,23 72:10 77:16 78:23 82:19 83:16 84:4,9,15 85:13 111:25 114:23,25 115:4,5,6, 11,23 light 56.12 likes 109:14 likewise 33:3 41:1 lines 60:7 75:12 112:9 Lisa 57:15 58:6 67:15 listed 15:7 51:12 82:2 85:2 116.11 litigate 45:9 litigating 9:20 38:12 84:5 85:4,14 litigation 54:19 64:15 living 95:19 locate 55.7 located 13:14 18:8 19:19 20:15 25:8 27:17 37:1 51:23 55:10 56:20 60:8,11 61:12, 19 long 6:15 17:18 33:4 69.25 longer 80:10 looked 61:22 77:20,21 lose 103.6 lost 99:17 102:11 115:20 lot 7:1.18 32:9 34:24.25 97.18 М made 20.4 22.12 24.21 24 35:12 41:6,9 42:9,13 54:1,21 80:1,4 94:12 98:18,21 115:1 maintain 64:10 79:10 make 14:3 20:18 26:14 35.18 47.17 76.6 79:1 84:14 96:6 makes 103:17 121:4 making 41:3 47:19,25 58:12 80.17

March 67:17 68:2,4 Maritza 94.24 95.3 15 96.6 mark 16:10 marked 11:18 13:18 33:11, 13 50:21 54:13 55:15 57:9 58:3 59:25 60:24 62:11 66.9 67.4 69.17 71:19 75:3 77:13 78:8 90:21 108:11 matter 19:19 23:16 33:22 39:4,11,16,17 40:23 42:3 44:15 71:2 92:5 matters 44.16 23 47.10 Meaning 91:22 93:4 means 27:12 116:8 meant 68·25 mechanically 10:2 11:7 mechanics 9:10 medical 110:17 111:7 112:12 115:3 medication 97:21,22 99:11 110:3 memorialized 46:8 memory 77:11 80:13 mentioned 30:2 37:4 48:22 49:22 115:19 message 51:3 57:14 68:15 70:21 messages 70:5 met 98.1 metadata 25:11,16 26:1,7 metal 122. middle 36:7,12 48:22 68:5 mind 59:20 86:12 90:5 118:8 minute 40.7 minutes 118:5 mirror 58:21 59:13.16 misimpression 94:11 misimpressions 94:13 missed 85:12 missing 59:10 107:6 misstated 84:7 116:24 modified 25:17 26:2,9,23 27:3 modify 46:21

moment 11:12 28:6 69:22 70:5 118:12 monev 56:15 76:23 89:3,22 93:15,17,20 103:8 money's 103:13 morning 97:4.5 motion 11:14 31:24 move 57:23 62:18 109:24 111.5 murder 111.23 murdered 101:11 104:2,7,8,9 Ν named 23:4 29:23,24 30:19 31:3,7,20 114:9,11 121:24 National 31.19 32.24 121.14 nature 7:1 63:23 necessarily 103.18 needed 51:6 115:8 news 61:7 niaht 95:6,11 98:17 107:11 122:9 nonresident 7.19 nonverbal 39.14 98.23 notarization 75:16 notarized 75:22 notarv 75:23 note 52:16 53:23 91:7,15 92:2 notes 13:7 15:7 notice 102:17 notify 102:1,8 104:7,10,13 notifying 103.25 notion 10:19 42:5 119:11 November 19:8 51:15.20.23 53:23 number 13:20 14:6 15:10,15 18:15,22 22:2 27:21, 24 29:8,20,21,22 33:10,13 34:9 40:21 47:3,4 48:22 50:19 54:6 57:11,21 58:1 59:24 60:1 62:9 66:8 67:2 69:23,24 71:20 75:2 76:12 77:12 78:6.7.13 79:12.13 81:8.22 83:1.13 90:20.22 108:25 numbered 22:11,12 33:9

numbers 33:13 55:9 O object 19:15 44:10 63:12 84:6 87:6 93:1 117.20 120.13 objection 7:15 8:9,15 9:8 10:14 20:1,17,22 21:11 24:19 25:20, 22 26:13 27:10 28:9, 16 34:16 37:2,23 38:18,23 42:7,12 43:13 45:4 48:11 52:1,12 53:10 56:21 57:19 58:24 60:13 61:15 62:4 71:12 72:12 77:8 78:3 79.16 82.11 15 23 86:7,15,22 87:21 88:22 91:8,17 92:6,8 93.27 95.7 96.10 97:1.25 98:4.16 99:13,19 100:20 101:8 102:15,18,23 103:9,17 104:4 105:3,12 106:1,23 107:4,12,23 108:2 109:24 110:4,20,23 111:5 115:24 116:1, 7,12,14,17,24 118:25 121:19 objections 59.12 obligated 38:22 obtaining 33:23 occasion 78:24 October 19:8 33:17,18 34:1, 14 36:7 odd 62:3,8 69:6 offer 58:16 office 13:23 15:17 19:2 22:16.19.21 25:7 36:13,19,20 61:8 110:17 111:8 112:12,14,16 offices 19:20,24 20:16 official 8:12.13 one-minute 21:12 one-on-one 63:25 64:19 opportunity 46:20 option 56:15 options 56:5 order 58.22 62.22 63.2 76:21 84:13 96:12. 25 100:6 ordered 96:21 oriented 11:6 original 55:5 76:7 102:7

overdosed 109:14,20 110:2 owned 13:11,12 55:6 owner 36:21 68:11,16,17 114:11,13 ownership 65:12 68:18 114:5 Ρ p.m. 122:12 pages 70:1 116:9 paid 36:22 82:10 101:12 103:8,13 116:2 Palm 96:18,19 110:17 111:7 112:12,14,15 Pam 16:14 22:17 34:10 36:8,12 40:22 41:2, 6,18 42:2 48:21 49:6 50:13,14,25 51:1,4,9 52:4.6.23 54:8.16 58:5.14 61:2.6 66:11 67:15 91:7.14 Pam's 57:17 58:21,22 59:8, 9,14,16,21 Pamela 19:20 25:6 paragraph 12:13,15 14:22 16:5 18:23 19:17 22:3 25:4,12 27:16 29:7,8 30:8,11,18 31:3 32:3,19 58:11 76:20 81:25 83:13 84:7 112:10 paragraphs 31:9.11.13.14 part 61:1 79:6,14 106:17 115:11 partial 46:23 participated 18:25 42:2 50:24 75:9 79:1 90:3 parties 87:10 108:4 partners 114.24 party 46:17 106:5 pass 93:20 passed 11:4 92:24 93:15,16 passing 34.5 passionate 91.19 past 122:4,7 Pause 14.2 pay 62:20,22 payout 60:6 PDF 66:21.22 pending 8:22 21:14

people 41:10,11 61:3 67:7 perceive 10.5perceived 8.24 percent 118:20 perception 53.13 perfect 24:21,22,25 performed 19:23 period 24:8 35:22 37:18 person 6:23 personal 39:6 44:22 63:21 65:15 106:21 107:1 personally 38:6 41:24 47:17 89:5 pertaining 95.19 phone 62:19 pick 36:11 90:19 piece 64:15 place 19:4 46:24,25 65:9 81:15 92:23 93:3 plaintiff 8:21 9:2,13,18 28:14 104:17 105:10 117:19 plaintiff's 12:17 plaintiffs 9:21 10:19 19:18 plan 89:22 90:5 91:20 92:12,23 115:11 121:13 planning 93:6,12 106:17 107:15 plans 79:10 pleadings 64:17 point 18:12.13 28:13 36.25 48.8 49.13 52:10,17 56:12 60:7 62.25 99.10 poison 122:1 poisoned 96:7 98:19,21 101:2, 5,21,24 102:2 police 108:17 policies 82:2,9,10,19 83:17 84:10,15,16 115:12 policy 9:20 10:13 13:12 23:4,15,23,25 30:3 32:7.10 34:6.15 36:21 38:12 39:5,7 47:21 48:5,10 49:14, 16 51:12 55:6 61:7 65:22 67:19 68:17, 18 71:5 84:4,20,21 85:4,14,19 93:18 114:6,9,15,17,23,25 115:5,7,19,21,22,23,

25 116:3.4.5.9.10. 11,16,20,22 117:5, 11,21 118:1,19,22, 23 119:7 120:9 121:10,18 policy's 116.2 policyholder 32:23 portion 95:3 115:7 position 46:20 47:11 63:8,13 64:2,6,12 positive 28:12,17 possess 28.19 121.10 possession 17:3 18:14 115:20 116:13 possessions 106.22 possibilities 120:11 121:3 possibility 37:12 119:21 120:8, 18,19,21 possibly 37:5 48:2.24 49:23 119.22 potential 40:23 42:5 44:25 47:1,24 104:1 111:23 potentially 64:14 predeceased 93:5 103:14,16 predeceasing 88:14 prepared 51:13 56:13 58:15 59:18 78:2,16,21 80:25 83:7 100:1,19 preparing 80:22 present 17:21 23:6.8 pretty 32:12 70:6 101:10 previous 67:18 68:16 previously 37:4 48:23 49:22 Primarily 6.21 primary 121:9,11,17 printed 27:8 printout 26:1 prior 10:11 23:14 24:3 32:7 34:1 56:14 60:18 68:9 71:10 85:18,19 87:18 89:21 90:11 110:19 private 63:24 64:18 74:8 110:16,21 111:1 112.11 privilege 37:23,25 38:18,23, 24 40:3,8 41:17,18 44:5 45:4,5,11 46:16,18 47:2 63:11, 15,19,22,24 64:3,9, 10,22 70:10,13

privileged 41:24 45:6,19,23 46:2 64:21 73:12 problem proceed proceedings proceeds 9:5,19 10:21 33:23 35:13 36:21 42:16 47:20 48:4,10 49:16 51:5 54:18 77:6 81:24 82:1,9 94:24 118.20 23 120.8 11 process 32:5,11,15,18 33:24, 25 48:7 79:6 115:2 processing 36:13,19,20 produce 117:14,15.17 produced 19:18 20:16 46:22 90:23 114:4 115:25 117:3,19 118:3 production 116:23,25 117:2,5, 10,11 118:2 professional promoted read promoting proper 75:23 102:17 property 84:16 106:22 107:2, Proskauer 83:5,8 proven provide provided provision real provisions Puccio 94:25 95:15 96:6 purported purpose 12:6 76:4,6 77:6 88:14 93:5 114:17 purposes pursue 11:25 27:3 81:18 116:25 117:4,7,11 Q question 8:10 12:19 14:3 16:10 20:21 21:3,5, 6,7,14 26:6 29:16 30:22.23.25 31:11 34:25 35:4 39:23 40:5,12 41:21 43:16,

74:6

41.69

75:7

64:25

101:3

78:24

10:24

10:19

24

103:7

78.1

32:17

66·3

58:17

80:2

15.9

56:15

118:1

put

privy

23,25 44:11 45:15 48:18 52:14 54:14 57:17,18 62:25 63:16 81:13 82:23 85:25 86:25 87:8 91:11 94:3 95:8 101:15,18 103:2 106.3 107.5 115.16 118:8,14,22 120:2, 17.22 121:6.22 questioning 74:10 113:11,12 117:21 questions 12:9 17:6 40:19 41:20 43:20 46:4 69:19.25 74:17 94:20 97:19 108:3 111:16.17.19.22 112:21.23 113:9 122:5 quick 54:6 108:9 R Rachel 95:3.9 106:5.11 107:9 range 19:6 Raton 6:10,12 re-entered 27.5 reach 47:18 21:6,7,10,15 31:10 33:19 40:11.14.16 43.24 44.1 53.13 59:6 69:23 70:1.5.16 83:22.23.24 84:9.25 85.3 22 86.8 14 88:12.16.24 89:5 91:2,18 110:5,8 111:10,12 112:6,8 reading 28:3 51:22 55:16 68:24 69:1 85:25 86:5,10,11 110:14 ready 75:4 113:22,23 108:8 reason 16:9 54:25 104:11 reasonable 89:3 recall 8:6,20 11:1 18:6,11 24:12 25:3 28:22,23 29:1,3 34:4 42:4 48:6 49:20 54:21 61.19 20.19 25.6 2 76:4.8 96:2.5 106:8. 10.19 111:9 112:19 118:13 121:11 receipt 92:20 receive 10:20 81:24 82:1 114:9 118:20.23 119:7.8.12 received 48:4 53:7 58:19 59:5 69:13 84:17,21 92:19 114:8 receives 93:17

receiving 49:20 72:6 77:6 recess 21.13 40.10 57.7 88:4 108:10 113:7 recite 40:5 recognize 118:21 119:11 recognizes 118.18 recollection 15:3 34:7 73:7,25 76:2 80:8 95:18 97.18 98.14 reconsider 47.12 record 6:7 12:8 63:14,21 64:2,13 70:8 74:5 83:24,25 112:6 113:6 records 25:7 65:10 80:11,12 RECROSS 115:17 119:18 121:7 rectangular 26:21 REDIRECT 118:9 120:5 reduced 9:15 refer 15:10 22:12 reference 26:16 68:2 74:13 85:18 86:20 100:23 referenced 87:17 references 86:6.14 referencing 49:8 referring 13:10,11 14:18 25:11 66:24 72:10, 13 76:18 refers 14:23,24 reflect 47:4 reflects 40.22 regard 8:13 10:12 17:8 31:8 39:8 40:23 41:7 42:3 58:23 64:8 66:1 74:21 84:4 87:4,9 reinstatement 23:16,23,25 32:11, 17 65.21 66.3 114:14 115:2 116:19 relate 8:14 44:14 related 67:16 75:25 103:1,4 118.12 relates 44:23 relationship 45:12,13 64:7 relative 19:4.24 relevance 28:16 86:15 92:8 101:8 106:23 107:4 115:24 116:1,17 119:3 relevant 52:10 101:11

remember 7:12,17,20 23:8 24:16 25:3 43:8 52:6 53:18,19 67:23 80:15 81:20 98:7 112:17 remembered 11:2 remembering 109:22 remove 107.225removed 59:2 107:24 repeat 15:19 replacement 24.15replacing 87:2 report 94:6 96:3 97:2 101:6,19,23 108:17 109:3 reporter 6:1 11:9,15 13:17 21:10,15 40:14 43:24 44:1 46:15 54:12 113:19 117:25 reporting 30.1 represent 71:22 72:9,18,22 representation 71:24 represented 13:21 15:15 representing 35:8 42:17 72:15 request 117:19 requested 108:4 reside 6:9 resident 7:22 8:2.3 respect 8:8 9:1 64:10 respond 52:5.24 responded 51.9 63.23 responding 52:18,22 60:18 response 39:14,24 69:3 98:23 rest 70:22 restate 14:4 restricted 8.4 result 37:8 39:6 49:1 53:24 94:12 resulted 45:22 results 71:1 80:6 retained 12:16 returned 108.1 reviewing 33:1 46:9 Robert 30:18 31:3 34:7 36:5,7 41:23 44:2,4, 24 45:25 46:5 51:5

62:18 63:18,25 67:6, 53:10,14,23 56:21 57:14,16 58:4,20 set 6:24 11:11 82:9,19 59:5,7 60:16 62:18 15 69:10 80:16 57:5,19 58:24 59:1, 90:16 102:6 83:17 84:10.18 12 60:13 61:15,20 63:4,10,19 64:1 122:8 62:4 63:11 66:15 66:11,16 67:6 68:3, role 8:12,25 38:16 66:2 71:8,12 72:12 77:8 7,14,22 70:21 71:1,7 sets 78:3 79:16.18 80:21. 72:3 73:23 75:9.25 roles 55.23 23 81:1 82:11.15.23 78:17 80:16 81:16 10:6 45:1,3 settlement 83.10 18 20 24 84.6 86.20 87.3 8 9 12 23 53:25 54:17 room 90:16,23 94:4 102:6 19 85:8.21.24 86:2. 21:9 113:5 122:11 settlor 83:14 84:11 7.15.22 87:21 88:9. Spallina's Rose 22 91:8.17 92:6.8 52:16 59:19 99:24 40:2 63:20 64:13 share 93.7 10 95.7 96.10 speak 13:13 15:14,17 65:1 70:7,15 73:10 22,24 97:1,25 98:4, 26:23 59:8 92:18 74:5 82:21,25 83:3,5 22:19 25:14 27:9 16 99:13,19 100:9, 97:15 87:6 89:19 93:1 shared 20,24 101:8,15 speaking 98:25 99:4,6 108:16, 22:20 50:13,14 102:15,18,23 103:1, 68:20 80:19 22 109:1,3 113:6 sharing 2,9,17,23 104:4,19, 122:2,5,9 speaks 22:16 22 105:3,12,19,23 82:11 86:3 88:22 roughly sheriff 106:1,12,23 107:4, specific 80.20 95:23 96:1,9 98:1, 12,23 108:2 109:24 routine . 18·10 67·19 11,15 110:4,20,23,25 32:6 specifically sheriff's 111:5,15,20 112:1,4, Rule . 20:9 91:12 96:3 109:9,13,23 8,18,22 113:1,4,8, 117:18 111.11 112.14 16 specifics 14,16,22,25 115:14, ruling . 18:6,12 sheriffs 24 116:1.7.12.14.17. speculate 121:4 97:11,15 24 117:2.6.8.20 20:19,20 53:12,17 Shirley 118:5,25 119:3,17, 16:10 38:10,11 40:6 59.19 87.23 19 120.13 21 S speculating 72:23 75:1 121:19.23 122:4.7. . 91:10 Shirley's S.B. 10 speculation 38:17 39:2.3.18.21 30:15 Simon's 7·15 9·8 20·1 17 22 41:13 43:11 44:20 17:16,17,18 35:20 Saturday 25:20 26:13 27:10 67:17 75:25 88:14 89:4 93:23 28:9 34:16 37:2 42:7 shortening 106:21 107:1 110:12 saving 43.13 52.1 12 53.10 39:21 Simons 57:23 56:21 57:19 58:24 shortly Schedule 72.4 60:13 61:15 71:12 82:9,20 83:17 84:3, 97:9.13 simple 72:12 78:3 79:16 show 10 85:2.7 54:14 86:7.22 91:8 97:1.25 77:8 104:19,22 Scooter simply 99:19 103:9 104:4 105:3 67:15 81:4 71:13 105:12 showed Scott simultaneously speculative 70:11 97:13 9:2 . 43:15.18.22 showing singling search spending 19:8,14,23 55:5 62:22 89:18 56:14 61:13 62:6 shown sir split 15:9 16:23 76:11 60:21 searched 37:7 48:25 49:9,11, siblinas 19:10,12 62:5 sister $25\,50.7$ 60:16,18 63:5 76:13 searches 22:17 25:5 48:4,8 splitting 87:13 89:14,18 90:4, 61:20 103:6,15 19:1,3 25:6 49.14 12 91:22.23 92:25 section sister's spoonfed 93:4.16 103:4 15:7 111:24 sic seek sitting square 118:21 101:13 76:9 26:19 side seeking situation Stamos 64·18 56:6 60:6,19 104:11 62:14 64:20 6:6 11:6,19 21:7,14, selectively sign skip 19 25:22 26:7 37:25 57:21 99:15 54:1 63.14 38:20 39:12 40:4,9, signature selling sole 11,15 41:15,25 42:1 75:9 64:22 77:16 43:14,19 45:5,8,11, signed send solely 17,20 46:3,12,19 26:4 30:4 52:4,23 65:18 102:8, 47:6 47:16,17 53:11,16 signing 13 someplace 54:11 56:24 57:3,6, 75:22 sending 15.17 8,10 59:3 60:22 similar 72:2 102:16 SOP 63:13 64:5,25 65:2,3 15:6 51:17 sense 70:11,16 73:15 14:3 17:18 24:21,22, Simon sound 74:11 77:10 79:17 7:15 8:8,9,15,18 9:4, 25:19 81:2.3 25 82.13 83.2 4 6 12 8 10:14 12:2 13:2,22 sentence source 86:9 88:1.5 89:20 14:24 15:17 17:6 25:12 29:10 32:4 17:6 20:8,9,11,12,13 93:13 94:1,16 99:3. 19:15,19,20 20:1,7, 35:5 58:14 81:25 5,8 100:3 108:12,17, space 14,17,21 21:6,11 110:7,14 22:16,19,21 20.23 109:2.5 22:16 23:2,7 24:14, separately 113:23 118:7,10 Spallina 19,20 25:20 26:10, 119:15 120:3,6,16, 19.14 30:18 31:3 34:7,12 13 27:10,18 28:9,16 23 122:8 September 35:7,12,18 36:5,7,20 29:11 30:1,6 32:6 stand 10:9 19:7 27:4.6 37:12.20 38:3.25 34:16 36:8 37:2,23 103:6 97.8 39:1,7 40:22 41:2,7 38:2,18 39:10,14 start series 42:9,15 44:3,4 46:5 40:7 41:21 42:7.12 11:25 78:7 83:4 88:9 65:5 47:6,8,24 48:16,21 43.13 17 44.10 45.4 Services 49:22 50:4,6,11,14, 89.20 6,10,14,18,24 46:10, started 25 51:4.9 52:4.18 31:19 16 47.14 48.11 53:20 55:18,25 56:5 14:13 50:25 51:1 52:1.12

starts 109:4 112:5 state 6:7 7:9,11,22,24 8:4 46:19 68:10 70:8 86.12 stated 62:22 65:23 statement 29:14 31:2 96:9 110:19 statements 98:3 states 7:11,13,18,19 stating 35.14 status 8:7,11 34:11 35:1 step 28:7 steps 94:10 stop 40:18 58:11 105:20 111:17 stored 27:18 Street 6:10 strike 10:17 61:17,24 62:3, 8 109:24 111:5 string 33:16 49:21 50:13, 23 51:8 61:1 62:12 66:11,15 67:5,11 68:7 70:19 72:1 structures 8:14 subject 33.22 39.4 40.23 42:3 44:15 85:2 92:5. submission 47:20 submit 37:21 108:7 submitted 11:14 32:23 35:7 42:23 submitting 37:12 subsequent 31:10 succeed 103:12 succeeding 31.9 successful 9:12,18 54:23 successor 13:2,6 14:23,25 15:8 17:10 18:9 24:15,18, 23 32:25 44:21 102.11 22 successors 83:16 Summary 11:14 summer 23:2 support 11:14 supports 70:9.13 supposed 107:21 117:5 119:8 surrounding 91:6 110:12

suspicious 110:11 Sutter 80.24 swear 6:1 Sy 68:10 Sy's 53:24 91:21 т taking 81:15 97:23 talk 18:2 33:7 57:25 92:21 97:17 109:23 talked 17:14 23:9 51:24 60:12 66:1 114:1 talking 14:10 16:6 41:2 46:1 49:2,4,5 52:7 53:1 56:5 57:18 67:22 68:12 69:14 75:7 76:5 87:15 109:8 talks 89:11 tax 29:21 Ted 6:8 12:15 16:14 37:7 49:1,25 50:7,8,9,13 71:1 94:23 107:6 108:14 110:8.16 112:3,5,11 113:4 114:1 121:9 122:1, 10 telling 17:10 42:23,25 43:3, 5 44:13 53:2,8 62:13 temporarily 113.6 ten 90:17 118:5 tendered 107.21 term 11:22 terminated 122:2 terms 30:4 79:21 84:17 95:20 Tescher 34:8 48:2,16 71:7,21 72:2,8 73:23 75:8 76:12 78:16 90:23 99:24 test 38:23 122:1 testified 27:1 80:19 testifies 81:6 testifying 106:2 testimony 6:2 48:13 80:21 text 55:8 82:6 thing 83:25 things 12:24 20:25 28:3 29:4,6 31:15 32:12 34:24 56:9 62:5.7 64.15 20 83.21 84.13 95.19 20 97:19,23 101:4,6

114:22 115:12 thinking 50.11third-party 30:19 31:4,20 thought 28:17 42:14 50:8 60:19 104:9 115:5 time 10:11 17:14 18:12. 13 19:6 23:10.17.19. 22 24:3 32:10 34:11, 13 35:1,17,22 37:14, 18 42:11 49:13 50:17 57:23,24 59:18,20 60:10 61:22 62:1 65:20 67:9 68:19 69:8,9,15 70:12 71:5 76:25 77:20 78:24 89:19 93:10,11 96:15 97:9 107:19 112:25 113:13 114:14.20 116:19 118:6 times 7:18 20:19 22:20 69:5 105:13 title 68:9,23 today 28:23 68:10 told 13:2 24:6,22 25:1,17 26:10 29:20 30:6 39:1 50:8 66:2 68:22 80:15 tool 59:15 top 7:12 12:12 22:7,9 36:6 41:2 55:16 57:15 58:8 85:12 topic 24:17 34:23 39:8 41:8 64:9 topics 34:25 46:25 47:5 topped 108:24 train 35:11 turn transcription 91:1 type transfers 82.18 83.15 treats 88:13 true 31:5,8 39:12,15 79:14 trust 8:18.19 9:1.4.5.6.14 10:1,12,20,24 11:2 12:16,21 13:9,10,11, 12,14,22 14:8,11,12, 15,20 15:16,25 16:25 18:2,7 21:24 23:4,5,12,15,20 24:1,4,8,10 27:17 29:11,12,14,25 30:3 32:24 34:6 35:8,15 36:23,25 37:1,6,13, 16,21 38:10,11,16, 17 39:2.3.19.21 40.24 41.13 42.3 6 11 17 18 43.11 44:20.21 47:2.19.25 48:5,9,17,24 49:16 17.19.24 50:2 51:10. 11,13,17,25 52:5,6, 11,21,23 53:2,3,9 54:2 55:5,9 56:11

truth

6.3

70:8

18.7

57:17 58:15.16.21 58:25 59:6,7 61:11 59:7,8,9,21 60:7 63:1 65:21 70:12 61:9,12,14,17,18 75:10 82:14 88:8 62:20,21,23 65:22 68:11 71:23 72:10, 120:25 11,24 74:24,25 75:1, understandings 25 76:1.7 77:2.5.21 59.2 78:10,13 79:23 80:3, understands 22 81:1.17.24 82:8. 120:19,24 10,19 83:5 84:17,18 understood 19.21 85:17.18.20 36:25 58:20 59:2 86:6,14,20 87:2,16, underwriting 17,18,20 88:9,21 32:6 89:7,9 93:16 94:5,8 unexecuted 99:17,21,22,23 14:8 16:1 25:8 100:15 102:4,11 universal 103:7,12 105:9 79.9 114:1,6,8 115:13,20 unsigned 118:12,18,21 119:5, 51:24 77:2 11,21 121:15 unwilling trustee 115:9.10 8:16.17 9:4.7.15 updated 10:2 12:16.21 13:3.6 34.22 14:20.23 15:1.8 updates 16:14 17:7,11 24:11, 34:12,20 15,18,23 32:25 35:8, 14,19 38:7,8,9,17 39:2,18 41:13 42:10, 18 43:11 44:20,21 62:21 71:22 72:9 vague 84:15 94:5,7 100:1 8:9.15 10:14 24:19 102:6,7,10,11,17 102:23 105:9 115:19 121:18 valid trustees 99:17 18:8.9 23:5 24:7 version 82.18 83.15 16 15:24 80:24 84.14 102.22 versions trusts 15.2 54:19 77:17,25 view 78:19 79:5,9,10 99:25 107:8 11 viewed 44:3.24 TS3893 virtue 83:13 45:1 46:21 TS4489 vivo 50:20 30:14 TS4965 voice 33:13 110:1 TS5253 voiced 110:9 voluntary 108:4 121:12 105:1,7 U W-9 21:25 ultimately Wait 27:8 81:1 92:23 82:21 unable waived 41:18 47:2,10 64:9 understand waiver 8:10,11 9:23 10:2 53:25 12:6 13:20 14:7 walk 15:14,23 19:23 33:8 20:15 25:13 26:8,9 Walker 27:1 30:22,23 35:12, 95:4,9 106:5,11 16 36:24 41:16 wanted 44:11 45:20 52:22 114:23 58:19 59:1 64:5 66:7 wasting 68:14,21 69:14 71:2 57:23 81:11 88:13 91:13 ways 106:15 107:5 118:17 28:4 37:7 48:25 119:8,20,24,25 49:9,11,14,25 50:7 120.7 121.2 wear understanding 44:8 9:9 12:8,22,25 Wednesday 13:13,24 15:14,18 25:16 26:9 25:15,19 26:8,12 27:9 29:15,16,18 weekend 35:6 44:7 49:15 67:16

v

w

Welling 69:18 70:12 72:3 whatsoever 93:8 114:7 119:2,3,5 99.18 wild 20:25 wills 95:19 wind 35:9 winding 114:22 withdraw withdrew 19 wondering 11:15 14:24 word words 85:3 109:4 wore 44.9 work 67:20 77:10 working 6:18 worry 54:2 worrying 54:19 write 91:15 92:1,2 writes writing 28:13 87:20 92:5,10, 91:7,14 written wrote Υ Yates 63:6 year years 77:15 Yup 82:5

71:23 72:15 74:20 73:25 74:4,14,15,16, 8:11 51:5 110:6 23:20 26:22 59:13 34:12 48:21 71:21 55:25 61:1 76:13 60:19 76:25 95:2 11:24 34:11 59:5,20 68:7 91:18 92:2 8:19 23:13,14,23 6:16 22:18 66:3