Geraci vs. Cotton, et al.

Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings July 15, 2019



```
1
                    SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
                COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CENTRAL DIVISION
 3
    Department 73
                                       Hon. Joel R. Wohlfeil
 4
 5
    LARRY GERACI, an individual,
 6
              Plaintiff,
                                    ) 37-2017-00010073-CU-BC-CTL
 7
      vs.
    DARRYL COTTON, an individual;
 8
 9
    and DOES 1 through 10,
10
     inclusive,
11
              Defendants.
12
13
    AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION.
14
15
16
                Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings
17
                          JULY 15, 2019
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
    Reported By:
25
    Margaret A. Smith,
26
    CSR 9733, RPR, CRR
27
    Certified Shorthand Reporter
28
    Job No. 10057778
```

1 APPEARANCES 2 FOR PLAINTIFF AND CROSS-DEFENDANT LARRY GERACI AND 3 CROSS-DEFENDANT REBECCA BERRY: 4 FERRIS & BRITTON 5 BY: MICHAEL R. WEINSTEIN, ESQUIRE 6 BY: SCOTT H. TOOTHACRE, ESQUIRE 7 BY: ELYSSA K. KULAS, ESQUIRE 501 West Broadway, Suite 1450 8 9 San Diego, California 92101 mweinstein@ferrisbritton.com 10 stoothacre@ferrisbritton.com 11 12 ekulas@ferrisbritton.com 13 14 FOR DEFENDANT AND CROSS-COMPLAINANT DARRYL COTTON: 15 ATTORNEY AT LAW 16 BY: JACOB P. AUSTIN, ESQUIRE 17 1455 Frazee Road, Suite 500 18 San Diego, California 92108 619.357.6850 19 20 jpa@jacobaustinesq.com 21 22 23 2.4 25 26 2.7 28

1	I N D E X		
2		PAGE	
3	CLOSING STATEMENTS:		
4	On behalf of Plaintiff/Cross-Defendant On behalf of Defendant/Cross-Complainant	10, 62 51, 70	
5	on benati of berendanc, cross compramane	31, 70	
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
2425			
26			
27			
28			
20			

```
1
           July 15, 2019; San Diego, California; 8:49 a.m.
 2
                    Hon. Joel R. Wohlfeil
 3
                              -- 000 --
              THE COURT: All right. Good morning,
 4
     everybody.
 5
 6
              MR. WEINSTEIN: Good morning, your Honor.
 7
              MR. TOOTHACRE: Good morning, your Honor.
              MR. AUSTIN: Good morning, your Honor.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: All right. We're on the home
     stretch.
10
11
              Let me make sure, though, there's nothing that
12
     came up that is inconsistent with what we reviewed and
13
    discussed late last week.
14
              Let me go first to plaintiff's counsel. Did
15
    you catch anything over the weekend that we missed last
16
    week?
17
                              No.
              MR. WEINSTEIN:
              THE COURT: All right. Defense counsel?
18
              MR. AUSTIN: No, your Honor.
19
20
              THE COURT: Okay. So that's a relief. We were
21
    pretty careful. Maybe even more so than we normally
22
     are. So I would have been a little surprised if you
23
     said you had something.
              So when the jury gets in -- just give me one
2.4
25
    moment here -- the Court will instruct. And, as
26
    mentioned late last week when we met -- met first, if it
2.7
    takes me something closer to 9:30, other than the few
28
    moments it takes for plaintiff's counsel to set up to
```

2.7

1 move to your opening closing. If it's closer to 9:45, 2 then we'll take our first morning break.

And then when we're done with plaintiff's counsel's opening argument, if it's before the break, we'll take our break. If it's after the break, then we'll move into defense counsel's opening argument. And then after we will take our either first or second morning break. And then depending upon where we sit for time, time permitting, we'll get one or both of the second rebuttal closing arguments before we break for noon.

Once we break for noon and the jury comes back, we'll finish whatever we've got left to do and then get the case to the jury so they can begin their deliberations.

Assuming that one or more of our alternate jurors show up -- and I expect them to -- they have been awfully conscientious, all of them. What I would expect to do is to allow them to leave the courthouse, not discharge them as jurors, but to allow them to go about the rest of their lives unless and until we call them to tell them to come down and we substitute in and replace one of our regular jurors or the jury returns a verdict, at which time everyone will be discharged. That's my expectation.

Let me go to plaintiff's counsel. Any questions about any of the process?

MR. WEINSTEIN: No, your Honor.

2.7

THE COURT: Defense counsel?

MR. AUSTIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We'll have more time to talk about this between now and when the jury gets the verdict. But once the jury does come back with their verdict and we take -- one or both of you ask me to poll the jury or not, as soon as I discharge the jury, so too will counsel be discharged. You're under no obligation to remain behind to chat with the Court. And I'll remind you of that. But oftentimes, the only opportunity to catch up with the jurors, should you wish to catch up with them to talk to them, is when they're still out in the hallway.

So as soon as I let the jurors go, Counsel are free to go. What I do do, though, is direct that -- the side that based upon the verdict form has prevailed will be directed to prepare the judgment.

It's conceivable we could have a split decision here with a complaint and a cross-complaint, in which case, if not, after -- the same day as the jury returns a verdict, at some later time, we might have to have another discussion.

Usually, it's pretty obvious which side has prevailed, and that side will be directed to prepare a judgment in accordance with the findings reflected on the verdict form.

So in any event, after I have -- after you all have had a chance to talk to the jury or otherwise, if

2.7

you want me to retake the bench after the jury has returned a verdict, assuming there's still some time left in the day, whether it be today, tomorrow, or otherwise, I'm more than happy to do so. But I just want to make clear that counsel will not be expected to sit around here while the jurors go on about their way.

I think we've already arranged for the exhibits to be organized so that my deputy can bring them in as quickly as possible when you're done with your closings. Is that correct?

THE CLERK: Yes, they're already to go, your Honor.

is you all have gone through the volume. If you haven't already done so, make sure you've gone through them to make sure that you're satisfied. The last thing we want to do is to let something slip by all of us that gets before the jury that they shouldn't have seen. So counsel are directed -- and you'll have some time between now and when the jury gets the case to begin deliberations and before my deputy brings those exhibits in.

I think I've told you previously that we'll arrange for every member of the jury to get a copy of their own set of the instructions, including the pre-instructions, as well as each get a copy of their own verdict form. And I'll explain why I do that practice when we get to that point in the admonitions.

```
1
              So if there's nothing else, stand down.
     I can invite -- we need to use the projector while I'm
 2
 3
     reading and displaying the instructions. But other than
     that, if there's anything else you can begin to get
 4
     ready now.
 5
 6
              MR. WEINSTEIN: We're ready.
 7
              THE COURT: Are you ready?
              So, Madam Deputy, where do we stand with the
 8
 9
     jurors?
10
              THE BAILIFF: We are at 13.
11
              THE COURT: All right. We can all breath a big
12
     sigh of relief. We have at least 12.
13
              THE REPORTER: And your Honor, would there be
     waiving of the reporting of the jury instructions since
14
15
     they were deliberated with counsel?
              THE COURT: Counsel, now, the record will
16
17
     include all of the instructions that I provide -- or
     present to the jury will be filed with the Court. They
18
     will be filed with the case file. So it's not like
19
20
     there isn't a record of what's being presented to the
21
     jury.
22
              So let me go first to plaintiff's counsel.
23
     Waive reading (sic) of the instructions, or not?
2.4
              MR. WEINSTEIN: Waived.
25
              MR. AUSTIN: Waived.
26
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Madam
2.7
     Reporter.
28
              So Counsel, as soon as we get all of our jurors
```

```
1
     here, we will move forward.
 2
              THE REPORTER: And your Honor said waive
 3
     reading and meant to say waive reporting?
 4
              THE COURT: Waive recording, right. Or waive
 5
 6
     reporting. Yes.
              (Discussion off the record.)
 7
              THE COURT: Good morning, everybody.
 8
 9
              So we're going to move into most but not quite
10
     all of the instructions in a few moments. And then --
11
     Madam Deputy, you can turn the projector on, please.
12
     And then proceed with closing arguments. And you'll
13
     have the case early in the day if we can possibly get it
14
     for you.
15
              By the way, for what it's worth, I was meeting
     with counsel until after 11 o'clock on Thursday morning
16
17
     and then had another hearing on another matter at 1:30.
18
     So we would not have had nearly enough time to get you
19
     the case last week. Again, for what it's worth.
20
              You may recall that we're going to get you a
21
     copy of all the instructions. So if you miss something
22
     as I'm going through it -- although, you will see it on
     the overhead -- don't be concerned. You'll have that to
23
     look at as much as you like once you get the case and
24
25
     begin your deliberations.
26
              Madam Clerk, can I ask that you dim one row of
2.7
     the lights, please. Thank you.
28
              (Reporting of jury instructions waived.)
```

THE COURT: All right. Madam Clerk, if you can 1 2 turn the lights on. 3 Madam Deputy, if you can turn the projector on. What we're going to do now is go into plaintiff 4 5 counsel's opening argument because each has a claim and a cross-claim. Each bears a burden on their responsive 6 7 claim. Each is going to be allowed to give two 8 arguments. However, they each have time limitations. 9 And I'm keeping track of them. 10 So we're going to start now with plaintiff's counsel's opening argument. You recall what the lawyers 11 12 say is not evidence, but it may help you evaluate the 13 evidence and what you have heard from the witnesses and the law that I have given to you. 14 15 Counsel, whenever you're ready, please. 16 MR. WEINSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor. 17 (Closing argument on behalf of the 18 plaintiff/cross-defendant.) 19 MR. WEINSTEIN: Ladies and gentlemen of the 20 jury, good morning. My client and I and my colleagues 21 thank you for your patience in listening to the 22 testimony. I know it's been over a couple of weeks. So 23 thank you. This case involves a dispute between Larry 24 25 Geraci and Darryl Cotton involving the personal sale of 26 Mr. Cotton's property at 6176 Federal Boulevard. 2.7 crux of the dispute is evident from both the jury 28 instructions just read to you and the special verdict

2.7

forms you will receive.

My client, Mr. Geraci, contends that the two of them entered into a November 2nd, 2016 written agreement. That's the document that you've seen as Exhibit 38. And you'll be shown that again during the closing argument.

Mr. Cotton, on the other hand, contends that the two of them entered into an oral contract to form a joint venture. I'll discuss at length the evidence presented by the parties as it relates to those contentions.

But before I do, please be reminded that what I say or what Mr. Cotton's counsel says is not evidence.

The evidence is the testimony you heard from the witnesses and the documents that were admitted into evidence.

At the end of closing argument, and as the judge has told you, you will get two special verdict forms, each of which contains specific questions that you must -- that relate to the legal claims of the parties that you must answer.

You'll also be able to be given a complete set of jury instructions given to you, which are instructions regarding the law. I'll refer to some of those jury instructions during my argument to guide you through the factual questions you're going to be answering on those special verdict forms.

Now, the judge mentioned in his instructions

2.4

2.7

the standard more likely true than not true. That's the burden of proof that each party is required to prove something must -- must prove to. And, obviously, it's not reasonable doubt like in a criminal case. It's more like a scale of justice. If they're exactly even, the burden hasn't been sustained. But they're slightly tipped in favor of the party that has the burden of proof, then they have met their burden of proof.

Now, as I go through the questions on the special verdict form, I will actually be reminding you who has the burden of proof with respect to the various questions you have to answer.

So I'm going to give you a sneak preview of the special verdict forms. So if you'll put up Special Verdict Form No. 1.

So that's the first page. Each special verdict form will be multiple pages, and it will have each party's claims and a list of questions. I'm not going to go through each of those questions now. We'll do that later. But just understand that you're going to get one form that relates to Mr. Geraci's claims that asks you all the questions that you need to answer to determine his claims and one form that talks about all the claims of Mr. Cotton.

Now, the Special Verdict Form No. 1 involving Mr. Geraci's claims will be the ones where you decide his two claims: Breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

2.7

Special verdict Form No. 2, Mr. Cotton's claims for breach of contract, intentional misrepresentation, false promise, and negligent misrepresentation.

Now, near the end of my closing argument, I will actually put up on the screen the special verdict form and go through with you the answers that I think the evidence compels you to make after you have heard all the evidence in this case.

So it's a little confusing at first, certainly in the abstract. When you see the verdict form, you will understand that you just go one question at a time to follow the instructions until you get to the end of the form.

So let's start with the breach of contract claims of Mr. Geraci.

Would you put up Jury Instruction 303. Highlight, please.

So you read Jury Instruction No. 303. The top half of the form are what Mr. Geraci has to prove with respect to his claim that there was a breach of the -- that they entered into the November 2nd written contract and that that contract was breached.

Would you go to Special Verdict Form No. 1.

The reason I put this up at the outset of my closing argument is that you sort of see the logic in all of this. The jury instructions tell you what must be proved, and the special verdict forms mirror the elements that you must -- must prove, as stated in the

2.1

2.7

jury instructions.

So you see with respect to Mr. Geraci, breach of contract claim, he has to prove that Geraci and Cotton entered into the November 2nd, 2016 written contract.

And the first question on the verdict form you'll be answering is did Plaintiff Larry Geraci and Defendant Darryl Cotton enter into the November 2nd, 2016 written contract?

So that's how the logic works. If you go to the second half of the CACI Instruction 303, where it talks about what Mr. Cotton has to prove, you'll see -- and I'll have them both highlighted. You will see in the bottom half of the jury instruction, Mr. Cotton has to prove that they entered into an oral agreement to form a joint venture.

And then in the special verdict form, you'll be asked that question.

So as you go through the special verdict form at the end, you'll see how they mirror the jury instructions.

Now, what's important at this point in my closing is that you understand that what we're really talking about here are competing contract claims. One party says the written November 2nd, 2016 contract was entered into in connection with the purchase and sale of the property. Another says, no, there was an oral agreement to form a joint venture.

1 And much of the evidence in the case that was 2 presented relates to those competing contract claims. 3 You're going to be evaluating those competing contract claims both together because the evidence may go to both 4 issues, but also evaluating those claims for purposes of 5 the verdict separately because they are separate 6 7 contract claims: One by Mr. Geraci, one by Mr. Cotton. So let's turn now to review the evidence, which 8 9 I submit will support the following conclusions. 10 I think the evidence will show that Mr. Geraci 11 proved it was more likely true than not true that the 12 parties entered into the written November 2nd, 2016 13 contract for the purchase and sale of the property. I think the evidence will show that Mr. Cotton 14 15 failed to show that it was more likely true than not 16 true that the parties entered into the oral -- entered 17 into an agreement -- an oral agreement to form a joint 18 venture. 19 The only third possibility, which I hope is 20 obvious, is no agreement was entered into between 21 anybody of any kind. That's really the only other 22 alternative. 23 Now, Mr. Geraci, as you heard, was interested in purchasing a property for which it might be feasible 24 25 to obtain a conditional use permit to develop a medical 26 marijuana -- to develop a marijuana dispensary. 2.7 He assembled a team to assist him. He hired

Mr. Bartell. He later hired Schweitzer, the project

2.7

designer, who was really the main person that was in contact with the City with respect to the CUP application. And he hired Gina Austin, among other people.

Each of these persons has substantial experience in applying and obtaining CUP permits for marijuana principals. And they each talked about their experience. They talked about their experience and qualifications and the extensive number of applications they worked on previously.

Mr. Cotton has presented no testimony challenging that team's qualifications or experience.

Now, Mr. Cotton's property was identified as a potentially feasible property. So in July 2016, Mr. Geraci contacted him to acquire about buying this property.

Now, both Mr. Cotton and Mr. Geraci agreed that the first contract occurred in approximately July of 2016. That's actually corroborated by the text messages that were admitted as Exhibit 5. Those are all the text messages between Mr. Geraci and Mr. Cotton. The very first one is dated July 21st, 2016, which would have been after they had their initial telephone call.

Mr. Geraci told Mr. Cotton he was interested in buying or looking to purchase the property for which he could obtain an additional use permit to operate an MMCC or medical marijuana consumer cooperative and to develop that on the property. He asked Mr. Cotton if he'd be

2.7

willing to sell and at what price.

Mr. Geraci told Mr. Cotton that he had assembled a team of qualified, experienced persons to handle the CUP application process. They discussed that zoning was a problem, but Mr. Geraci told him that he had hired Jim Bartell to handle that issue.

Now, you'll recall -- and we won't go into detail about it, but Mr. Cotton actually denied having heard of Mr. Bartell in the first meeting, but then he was impeached by his deposition testimony in which he actually testified earlier at his deposition that he had met him at the outset, not two to three months later, which is what he told you while he was on the witness stand.

Anyway, back to this initial contact with the initial conversations. Mr. Cotton told Mr. Geraci he was interested in selling, and the price was 800,000. And Mr. Geraci told him that was within his budget.

Mr. Geraci told Mr. Cotton that he or his team needed to do some more -- work on the feasibility of the project. And from that -- at that point, Mr. Cotton allowed Mr. Geraci's civil engineers and other folks to come onto the property to begin that feasibility work.

Now, Mr. Cotton did not deny that these things were discussed in the initial conversations. He confirmed they talked about potential zoning problems because he knew already that there was a conflict between the zoning that was allowed in the medical

2.7

marijuana consumer cooperative information bulletin put out by the City and that it was in conflict with the zoning ordinance.

He was also already aware that he needed a conditional use permit to operate a dispensary. And he knew that because he had also been previously sued by one of his tenants for an illegal medical marijuana dispensary that was operated on his property. And you'll hear Mr. Cotton telling you that he had a discussion -- and this would have been before he met Mr. Geraci. He had a discussion with his tenant in which the tenant told him that he was qualified to obtain -- or had the ability to obtain a conditional use permit. But as Mr. Cotton said, his tenant never followed through.

So the notion that you needed a conditional use permit, Mr. Cotton knew at the time of his first conversation with Mr. Geraci.

Now, some of the initial feasibility work went on. You saw a survey, a topographical survey was done. You saw some emails about people going onto the property.

And then the parties met face-to-face for the first time on September 20th, 2016, at Mr. Geraci's office.

Mr. Geraci updated Mr. Cotton regarding the feasibility issues, including the zoning status. And at that meeting, Mr. Cotton asked if he could provide a

2.4

2.7

written proposal to Mr. Geraci for the purchase and sale of the property. And Mr. Geraci told him go ahead and do so.

Would you put up Exhibit 9, please. On September 26th, following that initial face-to-face meeting, you saw that Mr. Cotton emailed Mr. Geraci and included two documents with that email, one called a services agreement, which is Exhibit 10 -- go to that -- and one called a memorandum of understanding, which was Exhibit 11.

It's undisputed that Mr. Geraci did not respond in writing to these proposed written agreements. He didn't text or email any suggested edits or comments to the proposed documents. And it's undisputed he never signed the proposed documents.

Mr. Geraci testified that he followed up that email and spoke to Mr. Cotton by telephone and told him he had reviewed the agreement and noticed it had a provision that he provide Mr. Cotton with a 10-percent equity interest in the dispensary. Of course, we're talking, assuming the dispensary ever -- a CUP was ever approved and the dispensary was ever opened. But in any event, it mentions that in the agreement.

Mr. Geraci testified he told Mr. Cotton the purchase price was 800,000. He was not going to agree to give him the 10-percent equity interest in the dispensary, and he didn't want a partner.

Mr. Geraci told Mr. Cotton that he was not

2.1

2.4

2.7

1 | going to sign the proposed agreements.

Mr. Cotton, I believe, denied that this telephone conversation took place. Mr. Cotton interestingly also denied that he wanted to be a partner in the dispensary. He testified he wanted nothing to do with the operation of the dispensary. He was just looking for an additional revenue stream. And we're going to talk about that testimony a little later.

So what happens after these documents are signed? They just move forward. On October 31st, 2016, if you put up Exhibit 30, Mr. Cotton comes into the office and signs the ownership disclosure statement, which is one of the things that needs to be submitted with the CUP application.

Mr. Cotton testified it had already been filled out by Rebecca Berry. And when he signed it, he had already been informed by Mr. Geraci that Rebecca Berry was going to be the applicant acting in her capacity as his agent. And he testified he had no problem with Ms. Berry applying for the CUP as an agent for Mr. Geraci.

So I'm moving quickly. I realize that. But I'm trying to set out sort of the timeline.

And then the next face-to-face meeting that they have, if anybody can recall, Mr. Cotton, I think testified that he recalled several face-to-face meetings, but he didn't recall any specifics except the September 20th meeting and the November 2nd meeting.

2.7

Mr. Cotton comes to Mr. Geraci's office on November 2nd, 2016 -- would you put up Exhibit 38, please -- and he signs this agreement.

Now, it's undisputed that this document was signed before a notary just after 3 o'clock p.m. on November 2nd, 2016. We know that because Exhibit 39, which you have seen, is the notary acknowledgment that shows that Mr. Cotton signed it at 3:05 p.m., Mr. Geraci at 3:03 p.m.

Now, Mr. Geraci and Mr. Cotton have told you conflicting versions of how the document was drafted. I'm going to go through that. And I'm going to submit to you that Mr. Geraci's testimony was more believable and more credible.

Mr. Geraci told you the meeting took 20 minutes. Mr. Geraci told you he typed the agreement at his computer, and Mr. Cotton watched, because he has a 65-inch monitor, computer monitor on the wall at his office, watched, and they went through and drafted each sentence one at a time while Mr. Geraci was at his desk typing and Mr. Cotton was standing. And they were going through it together in his office.

He testified that they -- after each sentence was typed and any changes that were necessary that were made, they agreed that that was an appropriate sentence for their -- for their document. And they went through it one by one.

Mr. Geraci then told you they signed the final

2.7

document. He gave him the \$10,000 in cash, which was the earnest money deposit. And six minutes later after it had been signed, you saw an email, Exhibit 40, in which Mr. Geraci emailed a copy, a PDF of that, to Mr. Cotton.

Now, as I said, Mr. Cotton's version of events is different than Mr. Geraci's, and it's up to you to decide who to believe. In determining who to believe, you must keep in mind that Mr. Cotton testified about a number of details regarding the meeting that were contrary to what he testified to in his deposition on May 14th, 2018, nearly 14 months before this trial.

The judge read you the Jury Instruction No. 208 that tells you you must consider deposition testimony in the same way as you consider testimony at trial. During my examination, I confronted Mr. Geraci -- Mr. Cotton with the deposition testimony when he changed his story from what he had said at trial -- at trial from what he had said at deposition.

Now, why is that important? First, presumably, Mr. Cotton's memory was better 14 months ago than it was today -- you know, today or last week at trial. But more importantly, I submit that you should conclude that these changes to his stories were intentional as opposed to honest mistakes or simply misremembering, and that these false statements should cause you seriously to question his credibility concerning all his testimony, not just his testimony as to the events of November 2nd.

2.7

And I invite you to look at Pre-instruction 107, which gives you the discretion, as the jury, if you believe somebody has falsely testified about something, you're entitled if you choose to consider that, that person has testified falsely about other things.

Now, why do I say that you should consider Mr. Cotton's changes in his stories as falsehoods rather than honest mistakes or misremembering? Because I will show you each of those changes were obvious attempts to minimize his familiarity with the November 2nd written contract that he signed. He wants you to believe that when he said he thought the November 2nd contract was merely a receipt for the \$10,000 he received as a deposit and not a signed contract for the purchase of the property. It helps if you believe -- in his case if you believe that he wasn't familiar with the contract and didn't pay much attention to it.

To the extent that he can convince you that he did not pay attention to that document and thus minimize his familiarity, it helps him with his argument that it was merely a receipt.

But let's examine that testimony. He testified the document was already prepared when he arrived. I asked him was -- did the meeting last 30 minutes. And he denied that. He described the meeting as -- he described the meeting as -- and we'll show you the testimony -- short and sweet. I came in, signed, got my money, and left.

2.7

Now, Mr. Cotton was then impeached with his earlier deposition testimony from 14 months earlier when he had said in deposition that it was actually a 30-minute meeting.

Not coincidentally, that's the same length of the meeting that Mr. Geraci testified to, 30 minutes.

Even when confronted with that deposition testimony that it was 30 minutes, you heard Mr. Cotton insist that he really recalled it was only half that time.

Now, why did Mr. Cotton change his story to minimize the length of that meeting? Because if as Mr. Cotton says the agreement had already been prepared and he just came in, signed, and got the money, that would be consistent with the short and sweet meeting in which he didn't give much attention to the document and thus thought it was merely a receipt.

If, on the other hand, as Mr. Geraci testified, the agreement was testified (sic) by the two of them, sitting in his office, while they went through it line by line, even though it's not a long -- Exhibit 38 -- it's not a long document, going through it line by line and agreeing to each of the sentences and then having it signed before a notary and he gave him the money, that would be consistent with a meeting that took 30 minutes, not just somebody dropping by short and sweet and signing something.

What Mr. Geraci described, as short as the

2.7

document is, is consistent with that 30-minute meeting,
which isn't a particularly long meeting. But it's
certainly not 15 minutes or a drop-in.

Now, Mr. Cotton has testified he's not questioning the use of the words in the first line of agreement. He did testify when I asked him in the second paragraph, which says Darryl Cotton has agreed to sell, I actually asked him specifically if that statement was a true statement at the time that document was signed, and he said it was.

Now, even though he admitted he read the agreement, he testified at that time he did not notice that there was no mention of his 10-percent equity interest in the dispensary. And this is important. When I asked him if he had discussed the 10-percent equity interest at that November 2nd meeting, you recall his answer was, no, that they had discussed it prior to that meeting.

I then impeached him again with his deposition testimony in which he testified 14 months earlier that he did discuss the 10-percent equity interest at the November 2nd meeting. That was another falsehood that he was caught in.

Now, why would Mr. Cotton change his testimony at trial to say that the 10-percent equity interest was not discussed at the November 2nd meeting? I suggest to you the answer is fairly obvious. How incongruous would it be for Mr. Cotton to say, on the one hand, that they

2.7

literally discussed that provision while he was in Mr. Cotton's -- Mr. Geraci's office, and then say on the other hand he did not notice that it wasn't included in that document.

It was important at trial for Mr. Cotton to attempt to mislead you by falsely stating they had not discussed it at the meeting. Fortunately, he had not thought that through at the time he testified at his deposition, and he got caught at trial for that misstatement.

Having now been impeached several times during his testimony, Mr. Cotton had to admit the following when he was questioned. He read the November 2nd written contract. Even though it says that they discussed and agreed with -- he said they discussed and agreed to a 50,000-dollar nonrefundable deposit at the meeting, he never asked Mr. Geraci to put that in the written document.

Even though he says and said that they had discussed a 10-percent equity interest at the November 2nd meeting, he never asked Mr. Geraci to correct the document to say that he was having a 10-percent equity interest.

Even though he says that they had agreed as of the date of that meeting that he would get minimum guaranteed payments of \$10,000 a month once the dispensary opened, he had to admit he never asked Mr. Geraci at that meeting to correct the document to

include that.

2.7

And although -- and this is very important -you'll recall what he's alleging is that he had an oral
agreement with Mr. Geraci that and the terms and
conditions of the oral agreement were the terms and
conditions that were set forth in those two documents
dated September 24th, 2016, the ones he sent to him more
than a month previously. And his testimony was we
orally agreed to all those things I put into those two
prior documents, even though it was never signed. Yet,
he doesn't ask at that meeting to add any of those
provisions or ask Mr. Geraci to correct the November 2nd
document to add any of those provisions.

Now, based on Mr. Austin's opening agreement, I expect Mr. Cotton to argue that the November 2nd, 2016 agreement was so short, a half page, that it could not reasonably have been intended to be a complete purchase and sale agreement. But that, ladies and gentlemen, is nonsense. There is no requirement that a real estate contract -- purchase agreement must be of a particular length to be binding. Ms. Berry, a real estate agent, testified that in her experience, contracts for purchase of real estate between owners not involving agents had often, in her experience, been short.

But more importantly than what Ms. Berry said, none of the jury instructions that the Court has provided would set forth a law you are to follow say any such thing.

2.7

Instead, what you will see is the jury instruction read to you this morning called Special No. 1 labeled the statute of frauds. And it tells you that a contract for the purchase and sale of real property is invalid unless it is in writing, signed by the parties and contains all the essential terms. And then it tells you what the essential terms of a real estate purchase agreement generally are. It includes the parties, the time, the manner of payment, and a description of the property to be sold so that it could be identified. Only the essential terms must be stated. It says not the particulars.

Well, when you look at Exhibit 38 -- well, first, before you look at Exhibit 38, what it tells you is agreements to sell real property have to be in writing.

And then when you look at the written contract, it has all of those essential terms. It identifies the parties, Mr. Cotton and Mr. Geraci or his assignee. It lists the price, 800,000. It lists the matter of payment, 10,000-dollar deposit with the balance due upon approval of the CUP dispensary. And it includes a description of the property, 6176 Federal Boulevard. Those are all the essential terms that are required and that are listed in the jury instructions that are required for a written agreement to purchase and sell real property.

And equally important, the instruction tells

2.4

2.7

you only the essential terms must be stated, not the particulars. In other words, it wasn't necessary for the parties to specify whether in that agreement the deposit was refundable or not refundable. That's just a particular.

It was also not necessary that the contract spell out who was responsible for obtaining the CUP. That too was a detail that's not particular. And in this case, there was no dispute that the parties had discussed those particulars. There was no dispute that it was a nonrefundable deposit. And there's no dispute that Mr. Geraci had the obligation to go ahead and obtain the CUP. But all the essential terms were included in that document.

Now, what should jump out from you at this instruction is that the law provides that all real estate purchase agreements must be in writing and signed by the parties. Why do you think that Mr. Cotton is attempting to characterize his agreement with Mr. Geraci as an oral agreement to form a joint venture? I'll tell you why. It's because he's alleged an oral agreement. He couldn't have been more clear. We had an oral agreement. As a result, if you mischaracterize — or if he characterizes it as an oral agreement to sell real property, that alleged agreement is invalid. So he has to concoct this notion of a joint venture.

Now, fortunately, ladies and gentlemen, you've gotten the instruction about what a joint venture is.

24

25

26

2.7

28

Would you show 3712, which was provided to you 1 2 by the Court? 3 And it's -- a joint venture exists. We'll have it to you in a minute. A joint venture exists when two 4 5 or more persons combine their property, skill, or knowledge to carry out a single business undertaking and 6 7 agree to share the control, the profits, and the losses. Here, the evidence is uncontrovertible that the 8 9 oral agreement Mr. Cotton alleged is not an agreement to 10 bind their property, skill, or knowledge to carry out a 11 single business undertaking and agree to share the 12 control, profits, and losses, he merely alleges that an 13 the parties orally agreed that a payment for the sale of this property, he would receive \$800,000 plus 14 15 a 10-percent equity interest, plus quaranteed minimum 16 payments, plus all the other things he says were agreed 17 to that were in the September 24th, 2016 unsigned 18 documents that he gave him a month before the 19 November 2nd agreement was signed. 20 Mr. Cotton didn't testify that this alleged 21 oral agreement involved the combining of his and 22 Mr. Geraci's business efforts to form a single business

Mr. Cotton didn't testify that this alleged oral agreement involved the combining of his and Mr. Geraci's business efforts to form a single business enterprise. In fact, he testified to exactly the opposite. He categorically denied that that oral agreement he's alleging included -- gave him any involvement in the operation of the dispensary or any interest in operating the dispensary.

Would you put up this next.

```
1
              I'm going to show you just a couple pieces of
 2
     his testimony. I asked him: "So when you talk about
 3
     this joint venture, you're not talking about any
     involvement in the operation of the dispensary itself,
 4
 5
     are you?
              "Answer: I wanted nothing to do with retail
 6
 7
     cannabis.
              "Ouestion: Right. You wanted nothing to do
 8
9
     with the operation of the business?
10
              "Answer: Correct."
11
              Go to the next one.
12
              And then later in his questioning, just to be
     sure, I asked him, okay. So he was going to be --
13
     "Mr. Geraci, was going to operate the business.
14
15
     Correct?
16
              "Answer: Correct.
17
              "Question: And you were going to get a revenue
18
     stream based on what that understanding was. Correct?"
              "Correct" is his answer.
19
20
              And then I asked him: "And you had no interest
21
     in operating the business. Correct?"
22
              And he answered: "None whatsoever."
              So his alleged oral agreement contains no
23
     obligation, created no obligation on his part of any
24
25
     kind in connection with running the dispensary business.
26
     It did not give him any control in the operation of the
2.7
     business. His alleged oral agreement did not require
28
     him to share in the dispensary's profits and losses. He
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

admitted he was merely receiving a revenue stream and he 2 would be guaranteed \$10,000 irrespective -- a month, irrespective of whether there were profits and losses. If there were losses, he still got \$10,000. So there is not a combining for a single business. There was no control in any of those documents on September 24th, 2016 that he says were orally agreed to. There's no provision in there for any control. And there was no sharing of profits and losses. And he said that himself 10 on the witness stand.

What he did tell you was, well, we had discussions about potential co-branding opportunities for his cannabis-based products and potential selling opportunities to sell his cannabis products in a dispensary. But there was no obligation. He admitted if the dispensary did not purchase product from him, they could get the product from another vendor.

So what Mr. Cotton has described to you, what he claims is the alleged oral agreement, isn't a joint venture.

Now, there's simply no mention -- he tells you he uses the word "joint venture" in his communications with Mr. Geraci, but there's no mention of joint venture in any of those September 24th, 2016 agreements. I challenge you to find those words anywhere in any discussions between them in text or email in which they were discussing the business transaction that they were going to be entering into.

2.4

25

26

2.7

28

1 Finally -- and this is almost so obvious it's 2 easy to miss -- the instruction tells you that a joint 3 venture requires an agreement. You have to have an agreement. Mr. Cotton's alleged oral agreement, what 4 5 he's trying to -- he's trying to convince you that he had an oral agreement to form a joint venture. 6 testimony on at least four occasions was we never had a 7 8 binding agreement. In fact, the parties intended that 9 no agreement be binding. My -- the alleged oral 10 agreement that I'm telling you, even though Mr. Geraci, 11 he says, agreed to those various terms and conditions in 12 the unsigned September 24th, 2016 documents, he says 13 that it was never intended to be binding unless and until it was put down in writing and signed. And he was 14 unequivocal that he never entered into an agreement with 15 Mr. Cotton -- with Mr. Geraci, not the written contract 16 17 that we claim he entered into, and not this alleged oral 18 agreement that he now is going to try to convince you he 19 entered into when his testimony completely contradicted 20 that. Let me now return back to the sort of 2.1 22

chronology of events.

So we have the meeting on November 2nd. Mr. Cotton receives Mr. Geraci's email that attaches a copy of the agreement.

Six months after -- but Mr. Cotton doesn't see it until that evening.

Now, somewhat, I think preposterously, given

1 the fact of the document itself, which he admitted he 2 read, was called an agreement, Mr. Cotton first became 3 concerned that Mr. Geraci thought the -- the signed document was an agreement when he read that email. 4 5 Because when Mr. Geraci attached a copy as a PDF, he labeled the PDF Cotton and Geraci contract. 6 So, 7 apparently, that triggered this epiphany by Mr. Cotton. So it's not disputed. Exhibit 41. Would you 8 9 put it up? Mr. Cotton that night responds by email and 10 tells him thank you -- thank you for the meeting today. 11 And then he goes on and says, hi, Larry. 12 you for the meeting today. Since we executed the purchase agreement in your office for the sale price of 13 the property, I just noticed the 10-percent equity 14 15 position in the dispensary was not language added into 16 the document. I just wanted to make sure that we're not 17 missing any language in the agreement, as it is a 18 factored element in my decision to sell the property. 19 You'll note in this email that Mr. Cotton 20 refers to the November 2nd document as a purchase 21 agreement, which is what it states in the document. 22 he refers to the sale price of the property in the email 23 and his decision to sell the property in his email. Thus, twice characterizing the transaction as one for 24 the sale of property. 25 26 Now, it's also undisputed -- and this is 2.7 Exhibit 43, if you could put it up -- that Mr. Geraci responded at 9:11 that night by email, Exhibit 43, and 28

2.7

wrote, no, no problem.

Now, Mr. Cotton would have you believe, at least now at trial, that Mr. Geraci intended and that Mr. Cotton understood at the time that that no, no problem response was a confirmation by Mr. Geraci that he agreed to provide Mr. Cotton with a 10-percent equity interest in the dispensary. Well, the evidence doesn't support that inference. First, Mr. Geraci testified that he didn't see Mr. Cotton's email until around 9:00 p.m. and that he only read the first sentence, thank you for the meeting. And so when he responded no, no problem, he testified he was responding to only that first sentence.

Mr. Geraci is not claiming he sent the email by mistake or action, only that he responded to the first sentence, which is the only part of the email that he read.

On cross-examination by Mr. Austin, Mr. Geraci said that when an email is received on his phone, it displays only the first two lines, and he actually offered to show his phone to Mr. Austin, who declined.

Third, Mr. Geraci himself -- Mr. Geraci testified he read the entire email that morning and had a telephone call the next day, November 3rd, with Mr. Cotton and told him that he never agreed to a 10-percent equity interest, that was not part of their agreement, and that Mr. Cotton responded lightheartedly well, you can't blame a guy for trying. And they moved

on.

2.7

Fourth, the evidence shows that at the time, Mr. Cotton didn't understand, even though he says he does now, at the time, he didn't understand that that was a confirmation of an agreement to pay him a 10-percent equity interest. In fact, quite the opposite. I showed you Exhibit 69, which is an email from March 16th, 2016, and I confronted him with it because he went through his recitation of what was happening in their communications back and forth.

And if you go to the second email -- I realize I'm going fast. I apologize -- he literally says in the last sentence from the second paragraph -- he actually says in that response, "I asked you to please respond and confirm via email that a condition of the sale was my 10-percent equity stake. You did not respond and confirm the 10 percent as I requested," because he didn't feel at the time that response was any confirmation. He didn't affirmatively say he was going to get the 10-percent equity interest. And he testified on the stand when I asked him about it that he didn't feel he had gotten a confirmation of the 10-percent equity interest. He -- he -- there was going to be no confirmation until it was put down in an agreement and signed by the parties.

Now, Mr. Cotton testified, I think I've mentioned, that it was merely a receipt and nothing was to be binding until there was a signed agreement between

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

them containing all the terms and conditions in the September 24th, 2016 documents. There was -- and that never happened. And his view is there's never been an agreement, not in the November 2nd agreement, and not in his alleged oral agreement.

Now, what happened after that November 3rd telephone call in which Mr. Geraci told Mr. Cotton he would not agree to the 10-percent equity interest? answer is nothing much more for the three months. After the November 3rd telephone call described by Mr. Geraci, more than three months passed without any texts or emails between them regarding the terms and conditions of their purchase and sale agreement. And this is very telling. Yes, there were no texts and emails exchanged during that period. And you have Exhibit 5, which are all of the texts. And you've seen a number of emails. But they all had to do with updates regarding zoning or the status of the CUP application. They were unrelated matters. None of had to do with the terms and conditions of any agreement. And that's not surprising because they had a written agreement back on November 2nd.

And if -- and, in fact -- this is a quick point -- Mr. Cotton told you he didn't even know a CUP application had been filed until I think he said -- it was certainly after March of 2017. And we showed you -- and I'm not going to put it up at this time. It's short.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

2.7

28

But if you look at the text messages,
Exhibit 5, on page 19, we confronted him at trial with a
text he sent on November 14th, 2016, in which he asked
Mr. Geraci did they accept the CUP application? This is
the CUP application he claimed he knew nothing about.
His testimony is not believable. How can something be
accepted until it has been submitted. He knew it had
been submitted.

Now, the zoning issues I'm going to cover very quickly, but they're important because of when the parties knew the zoning would resolve. You heard Mr. Bartell testify about he got involved in a general planning code amendment update. He was able to get an errata sheet submitted to the City that got this particular zoning change they needed for the dispensary at this location to get on the City Council agenda. Не was successful at doing that. And then the zoning ordinance was issued on January 31st, 2017. Although, it wasn't passed by the City Council until February 22nd, and it wasn't effective until March 12th, it was a done deal as of January 31st because it had already been prepared and issued as a proposed change to the Municipal Code.

You've got a copy of the zoning ordinance. If you go to the last page, it gives you those three dates, when it was issued, when it was passed, and when it was effective.

And Ms. Austin testified and Mr. Bartell

Code.

changes.

8

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

- testified he knew that it was highly likely it was going to be passed in that form once it got put in the Municipal Code of the proposed amendment. Ms. Austin told that you that whole zoning change had to go through an entire code amendment process and planning commission hearing before it ever got put and issued on the -- as it changed -- the potential change to the Municipal
- So essentially it was a done deal. And
 Mr. Bartell was apprising Mr. Geraci of the status of
 the zoning. And you'll see in the text messages that
 Mr. Geraci was apprising Mr. Cotton of the zoning
 - So then on February 7th, 2017, by which date it was known that the zoning problem had been resolved, Mr. Geraci receives what he recalls the disturbing phone call in which Mr. Cotton demanded -- this is almost more than three months after November 2nd, 2016, after the November 3rd telephone call, he demanded minimum guaranteed payments.

He told Mr. Geraci he talked to other people who could give him \$10,000 a month. Mr. Geraci told him he couldn't afford it and explained why and it occurred to Mr. Geraci he told you that he was being extorted because right after -- because it occurred right after the zoning was a done deal. Now, all of a sudden, the property is potentially valuable because you can't get a CUP without the zoning being changed. And now he's

2.7

getting a demand to do something that was not in the signed agreement.

But we don't have to rely on Mr. Geraci's discussion -- or testimony about that. He also testified he told this to Gina Austin because he decided that he couldn't afford to lose his investment. So even though he had an existing agreement, he needed to attempt to renegotiate a new deal that would save the investment.

Ms. Austin testified that in February of 2017 she got a call from Mr. Geraci in which he explained what was happening. He told her, and he used the word "extort," that he thought Mr. Cotton was attempting to extort him. And he asked her to draft up some agreements that he could attempt to renegotiate the deal. And she did. She told you she put in those drafts agreements what he asked her to. Didn't include the 10-percent equity interest and didn't include guaranteed monthly payments because he had no intention of changing the existing agreement to agree to that.

Then the process moves on. Provides drafts of -- Gina Austin's firm creates drafts of these potential new agreements. Exhibit 59 is the February 27th, 2017, the first draft purchase agreement.

A few days later on March 2nd, it is Exhibit 62, they set a side agreement. These are all documents they signed. But -- and thereafter, they had calls about it, and they exchanged texts and emails.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

1 But the long and short of it is they never were able to come to an agreement, either a new agreement or 2 3 any renegotiation of the existing agreement. In fact, Mr. Cotton continued to insist on receiving a 10-percent 4 5 equity interest and these quaranteed monthly payments. And then if you'll look at Exhibit 69, and you'll 6 7 remember his testimony. He then on March 16th, 2017 actually asked for some additional things. He asked for 8 9 minority consent rights and those kind of things, but 10 things that he even admitted had never been discussed. 11 So the renegotiation attempts went nowhere, and they 12 failed.

Mr. Geraci wasn't willing to agree to change the agreement to renegotiate a new one on those terms. So they never reached an agreement.

And on March 19th, Mr. Geraci sent him an email to -- to Mr. Cotton, pointing out to him that he kept changing his mind and that he was done. Essentially, he was going to go forward on the existing agreement. And that's what happened. And on March 21st, 2017, the lawsuit was filed.

On March 21st, Mr. Cotton terminated the agreement by an email. He contacted -- you heard he contacted Firouzeh Tirandazi at the City to try to get the CUP application withdrawn. You saw emails that he sent to her shortly thereafter in which he said he never finalized the deal with Mr. Geraci and he has no right to have access to the property and they should deny the

1 | CUP application.

2.7

And he entered into another contract to sell the property to somebody else on March 21st, Mr. Richard John Martin.

All these things were things he started to do to interfere with the CUP process once that lawsuit was filed and once they were unable to come to an agreement to renegotiate the existing agreement.

And I'm sure you'll remember the email that he responded to from me when I explained -- when he was asked to provide access to the property because Mr. Geraci intended to move forward to get the CUP application approved. And he basically said in that email -- and it's Exhibit 85 on March 29. He says you come on my property, I'm going to call the police and have you arrested. And he admitted that he meant it when he said it. And he admitted on the witness stand that after March 21st, 2017, he was refusing access to his property for Mr. Geraci for purposes of a CUP application process.

And last but not least, of course, the soils testing. Mr. Cotton has suggested, I think, why wasn't the soils testing done earlier, was known about earlier. But the reality is that CUP application was deemed complete on March 12th, 2017 when the zoning application -- or the zoning amendment took effect. There's an e-mail from Mr. Schweitzer in there to that effect. And I believe actually Firouzeh Tirandazi

2.7

testified to that as well. And up until that point in time, the City wouldn't allow the application to go through the completeness review and begin to go into the review process.

So on March 12th, that was the first time that that changed because the zoning amendment had been approved. In -- eight days later, the lawsuit was filed, and Mr. Cotton is refusing access to his property.

So you heard Mr. Schweitzer and Mr. Bartell -I think Mr. Schweitzer primarily testify about a meeting
with the City and attempting to get them to accept soils
reports on nearby properties in exchange because -- to
satisfy requirements because they didn't have access.
The City said they would consider it. Then there was a
meeting. Then ultimately, the City said they weren't
going to do it and they needed site-specific testing.

Then you heard about the two court orders that had to be obtained in order to literally force access to the property. You were provided with those exhibits, 118 and 119. But essentially, Mr. Geraci had to go to Court to get access to the property so his geotechnical engineers could go on the property and complete the soils testing so then they would continue through with the CUP application.

Now -- and I realize I'm moving quickly. But you heard a lot of evidence about the CUP process and all the work that went into it. It's kind of dull and

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

- 1 boring, lots of maps. But the whole purpose of that was 2 to show you the way that Mr. Geraci and his team 3 diligently pursued that CUP application from the get-go and even after the lawsuit was filed. In fact, the 4 5 evidence is overwhelming that they did so. Mr. Schweitzer testified his staff spent over 681 hours 6 7 on that CUP application. They spent a lot of money, which we'll come to. And they did everything they could 8 9 to get that CUP application passed. Mr. Schweitzer has 10 testified -- in fact, not only did they include efforts 11 to pursue their own CUP application in December 2018, 12 they actually appeared in front of the planning 13 commission to appeal a decision to grant a competing CUP
 - Now, we all heard about this competing CUP application. It beat the application for 6176 to the finish line. You've heard testimony uncontradicted. I shouldn't say uncontradicted.

application to a neighboring property.

- Mr. Cotton, surprisingly, when he testified, said there was no delay, even though we showed you court orders and delay and refusal to allow access to the property. But putting aside this incredible statement by Mr. Cotton that there was no delay, the testimony is uncontroverted. Mr. Bartell said he thought the delay was up to six months.
- Mr. Bartell stated throughout the process, we were tracking ahead of them, the 6220 application, the competing process. They passed up 6176 during the

2.1

2.4

2.7

geotechnical study process. That was his testimony.

Abhay Schweitzer testified the chances would have been significantly better. I think it would have been very likely we would have gotten that approved first. That's

5 uncontroverted testimony.

Now, Mr. Geraci also has a claim for breach of the implied covenant for good faith and fair dealing. And CACI 325 is the jury instruction that tells you the elements of Mr. Geraci's second claim. What's important and what you'll see on the verdict form is that really the same elements you've got to prove for the first number of them are the same as for the breach of contract claim. Really, the question that's different is it asks whether Mr. Geraci has to prove that Mr. Cotton interfered -- unfairly interfered with the CUP application process -- or unfairly interfered with his right to obtain the benefits of the contract.

But what I'm going to argue to you is it's the same evidence. Mr. Geraci -- Mr. Cotton's attempt to interfere with the CUP application process and delay and interfere with the soils testing and cause them to lose out to the 6220 application, both excuse, we'll argue, Mr. Geraci's performance of the contract condition in the breach of contract claim, and also constitutes unfair interference by Mr. Cotton in depriving the benefits of the contract.

Now, I'll move quickly on his damages. Then I'm going to show you the verdict forms.

1 You've been instructed that Mr. Cotton --2 Mr. Geraci if he proves his claim can recover what we 3 call reliance damages. He can recover them on both the breach of contract and breach of implied covenant 4 5 There's a jury instruction, 361, on reliance Importantly, the evidence is uncontradicted 6 damages. 7 that a reliance on that agreement, Mr. Geraci, through 8 his team, diligently pursued that CUP application and 9 spent lots of money invested in trying to get that CUP 10 application approved. 11 You saw Exhibit 137, which is a -- would you 12 put that up -- which is the chart, if you will, the 13 calculation of the expenses that were paid in pursuing this CUP application. And that's uncontradicted. 14 15 fact, I don't believe that Mr. Cotton's attorney is even 16 going to make an argument that those weren't expended. 17 There's been no witnesses that testified otherwise. 18 Mr. Geraci testified to those expenditures and that he 19 review the supporting documentation. 20 And so his damage, quite frankly, in reliance 21 is the \$260,109.58 that he spent trying to pursue this 22 That's the combination of what he pays and what he still owes Mr. Bartell that are shown on this document. 23 I've got about six minutes. Your Honor, I'm 24 25 going to reserve on the tort claims. 26 THE COURT: It's up to you. 2.7 MR. WEINSTEIN: I want to show you Special

Verdict Form No. 1 and part of Special Verdict Form

1 No. 2. So let's start with 1. We're going to go 2 through the questions. I'm going to essentially suggest 3 to you how these should be answered based on the evidence presented. 4 The first question is: Did Geraci and Cotton 5 enter into the November 2nd, 2016 contract? 6 7 Go to the next page. I conveniently filled this in for you. 8 9 The answer is, yes, I believe we've proven 10 that. 11 The next question you will be asked to answer 12 if you answer yes on that -- go to the next question. 13 Did Mr. Geraci do all of the things that the 14 contract required him to do? 15 The answer is no. He didn't get the CUP. That 16 was clearly a condition of the contract. However, 17 that's not the end of the story. 18 If your answer to Question No. 2 is no, you go 19 to Question 3. 20 Question 3 says: Was plaintiff excused from 21 having to do all or substantially all of the significant 22 things that the contract required him to do? 23 The only significant thing that the contract required him to do was obtain the CUP, and he was 24 25 excused from doing that because of all the interference 26 from Mr. Cotton in trying to obtain the CUP application. 2.7 And so you should answer that question yes. 28 Go to the next question. It talks about the

2.7

conditions that were required for performance. They
didn't occur because the CUP wasn't obtained. It's a
literal condition.

But that's not the end of it. Because if you answer no, you go to Question 5.

It asks you if that was excused. Again, it was excused by virtue of Mr. Cotton's interference with the CUP application process. So answer yes to that.

Did defendant fail to do something that the contract required him to do?

That's Mr. Cotton. Yes. He terminated the contract. He anticipatorily breached it. You can see the jury instruction on that. He signed a contract --we're talking about the November 2nd agreement. He signed a contract to sell to somebody else, and the November 2nd agreement specifically says he can't enter into any other contracts.

He also did something the contract prohibited him from doing, and that is it prohibited him from his implied good faith obligation to interfere with the CUP application. So I think you should answer yes to both of those.

Then you move on to the breach of the implied covenant claim. All right. So we need to go a little before that. And this is not as tricky as it seems because the questions on the breach of contract claim are the same as the questions you would answer on the breach of the implied covenant claim. It merely says at

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

26

2.7

28

- the very beginning, right there -- go ahead -- it really says if you answered yes to Question 4 or Question 5 on the breach of contract claim, which takes you through all those basic questions, then you go and answer the claims that deal with the breach of the implied covenant claim. So that's Question 8.
 - Then it asks you did he un- -- did he take action that unfairly interfered with Mr. Geraci receiving the benefits of the contract?
 - And the answer is yes for all the reasons that I've told you, in terms of his interference with the CUP application process, in particular, the soils testing, that caused him to lose out to the competing CUP application.
- Then go to 9.
 - Yes, he was harmed. The answer is, yes, he was harmed. How was he harmed? He spent all that money on reliance and didn't get any benefit from them. So yes to that question.
 - And then the last question is: What are the damages?
- They're the same for both claims. We'd ask
 that you write in the amount of his actual out-of-pocket
 expenses, the \$260,109.58.
 - That's the entirety of Special Verdict Form

 No. 1. I'm going to go to just the first part of

 Special Verdict Form No. 2 and then save the remainder

 for my rebuttal.

2.4

2.7

We just talked about his first claim, the breach of contract claim. Did cross complainant -- this is Mr. Cotton's claims. Did cross complainant Darryl Cotton and cross-defendant Larry Geraci enter into an oral contract to form a joint venture?

The answer is no for all the reasons I've argued with you this morning. First of all, his alleged agreement -- remember, we're talking about his alleged agreement that they orally agreed to what was in those September 24th, 2016 documents, but they were not going to have an agreement unless and until that was written down into another agreement that was signed by the parties. So there was no agreement, number one. That's one reason to answer no.

The other reason is, as I described, nothing described in those documents, nothing in the testimony is a joint venture. They tried to characterize it as that to try to avoid the invalidity of the contract under the statute of frauds because it really is a contract to enter into the purchase of sale of property. But it's not a joint venture to your -- by the definition of joint venture that you've been asked to apply to this case.

The answer to that question is no. If you answer the question no, as I believe you should, that ends the breach of contract claim, and you should be going on to his other claim, which I will discuss with you when I return for my rebuttal argument. Thank you.

```
1
              THE COURT: All right. Folks, we're going to
 2
    take our first morning break. We're going to be in
 3
    recess for about 15 minutes. And when you return,
    you'll hear defense counsel's opening and closing
 4
     argument. We'll be in recess now for about 15 minutes.
 5
              (Discussion off the record.)
 6
 7
              THE COURT: All right. The jury has left the
 8
    courtroom. Counsel, one hour precisely. You've still
9
    got 15 minutes left in your rebuttal. We'll be in
10
    recess now for about 15 minutes.
11
              MR. WEINSTEIN: Sorry, Maggie.
12
              (Recess from 10:33 a.m. to 10:48 a.m.)
13
              THE COURT: All right. We've got all our
     jurors. Now it's time for defense counsel's closing
14
15
     argument.
16
              Counsel, whenever you're ready, please begin
17
    your argument.
18
              (Closing argument on behalf of the
19
              defendant/cross-complainant)
20
              MR. AUSTIN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen
21
    of the jury. Again, thank you for being here and thanks
22
     for being my first jury. You guys have been very
23
    pleasant and patient, and we all appreciate that.
              I want to jump to the chase here. This case
24
    only comes down to one or two issues. Basically, if you
25
26
     look at the actual intentions of each party, I told you
2.7
    during opening that this was a case about greed. And it
28
     is. A CUP application for marijuana dispensary is worth
```

2.7

- potentially millions of dollars. And you've heard all
 the testimony from all the players involved on

 Mr. Geraci's team trying to acquire one of the CUPs.

 You see how much actually goes into it. And for some
 reason, it took them almost two years to get close to
 the finish line, and in this competing CUP application,
- 7 6220 just jumps right in. That gets completed in less than six months.

You've heard testimony from Tirandazi, from Schweitzer, from Bartell that it didn't make sense that that got pushed through so fast or how they were able to jump ahead, which essentially eviscerated the condition precedent of acquiring the CUP for Mr. Geraci's alleged version of the contract.

Both sides, to be clear, did want a CUP application to be approved of on that property.

Mr. Geraci led Mr. Cotton to believe that due to his superior qualifications, his knowledge of tax law, of real estate, the team he had with lobbyists and attorneys, he assured them that together, they could form somewhat of a team, if you will, almost a partnership. Essentially, you'll go through the joint venture agreement language again, and you'll see that Mr. Geraci led Mr. Cotton to believe he would have a piece of this CUP, he would get money for the property, 10-percent equity stake, 10-percent — or a minimum of \$10,000 a month for presumably a period of a five-year CUP. He thought he was going to be able to

2.1

2.7

work with Mr. Geraci in some of his medical cannabis as
he testified.

He did testify that he didn't want to deal with any operations for a retail marijuana facility. He didn't want to manage it. Mr. Geraci had someone he already proposed was going to be his manager, someone named Matt who said that Mr. Cotton maybe for the first six months of the business should only get paid 10,000 -- or \$5,000 a month, not \$10,000 a month.

Mr. Cotton knew that Mr. Geraci had already been involved in three other principals, and he purported to be an expert on having these operations and businesses managed and successful. Mr. Cotton had no reason not to rely on these assertions. He had no reason to believe that Mr. Geraci would not give him the full 50,000-dollar retainer or down deposit.

These are all things that Mr. Cotton anticipated would be going forward in due time.

Mr. Geraci testified that he thought from July, on, they had developed a special friendship. And then when Mr. Cotton was insisting on new terms, it just broke his heart. And you saw the crocodile tears up there. They weren't friends. Friends would have been able to come together with actual written agreements specifying their terms.

Mr. Cotton submitted Exhibits 10 and 11 as just baseline recommendations on what the --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, Counsel. May I hear

2.1

2.7

again. Baseline recommendations on what the -
MR. AUSTIN: On what their final agreement

should be.

On November 2nd, Mr. Cotton did come into Mr. Geraci's office, and there's conflicting evidence of how long he says he was there. It's also unclear how much time of that 30 minutes that he was there. Was he in the office? Was he talking to someone else in the office? These are just minor details. And opposing counsel has to bring up every tiny little inconsistency he can possibly point out because this is all a smoke screen.

The reality is you look at the intentions of the parties. Was there mutual consent between the parties? Was there a meeting of the minds? Did Mr. Cotton have a belief of what the contract was going to be that coincided with Mr. Geraci's belief?

And in Jury Instruction CACI 302, you'll notice it says you're not to take into consideration the hidden intentions of a party. And, here, Mr. Geraci did have hidden intentions. He didn't want to outlay anymore money or to have to meet the responsibilities of Mr. Cotton in case the CUP application were not approved. His intention was to not give an extra \$40,000 in a deposit. His intention was to see how this would go along and if he could just string Darryl along and not have to make any real commitments.

You'll see everything in writing. If you look

extras that he had wanted.

2.7

- through all of Exhibit 5, 25 pages of text messages, and you can see from July to March -- so we have July, August, September, October, November, December, January, February, March, Mr. Cotton's conversation is consistent the entire time. If you look through all of their emails, Exhibit 69, you can see where Cotton lays out everything that was expected from his part. He never contradicted himself. Mr. Geraci says these are all
 - But in none of the conversations does
 Mr. Geraci deny anything. He does not mention the
 November 2nd agreement until two days before this
 lawsuit was filed.

Read between the lines, folks. He went back through all their communications, and he found the one thing that looked as if it were close enough to a contract that he could try and force Mr. Cotton's hand and force him to give up his right to the property.

Going through all the emails, looking at that

November 2nd document, there's a few essential terms.

But you also heard Mr. Geraci testify as they were in that office discussing that document, he was typing it up and he -- and Mr. Geraci's counsel said, oh, there's a few details that were just a particular here or there that Mr. Geraci didn't talk about. But if you're to believe that this November 2nd document is intended to be the final expression of what their agreement was, it doesn't make sense for him to leave out certain details

2.7

of, like, who was responsible for acquiring the CUP, timing of payments, and -- and other matters like that, and the deposit.

If they were taking the time to actually draft out a contract, keep in mind, Mr. Geraci at the time was a real estate agent, his secretary, Rebecca Berry, a real estate broker. They could have come up with a much more inclusive, extensive, and well thought out contract than that three-sentence document.

You have to look at the intention of the parties. You should look at their particular skill sets, and you should understand why it was reasonable for Mr. Cotton to rely on signing a receipt for a 10,000-dollar cash deposit. I don't know if any of you would ever anticipate receiving \$10,000 in cash and not signing off on it. And, yes, it had a couple of terms.

But keep in mind, within hours, Mr. Cotton receives the email of that document, and he immediately shoots off a response. And it's rather lengthy. And they only want you to focus in on the it was a pleasure meeting you today section, not everything else where he says, like, I want to ensure that any other terms, especially the 10-percent equity stake, is included in any final agreement between us.

Mr. Cotton had no idea that that receipt would ever take him into the courthouse and he would have to defend against that, pretending that -- having

2.7

1 Mr. Geraci pretending that that was a full expression of their agreement.

Mr. Cotton gave Mr. Geraci ample opportunity over the course of several months to give him a final written contract. Mr. Geraci, in those text messages and in Exhibit 5, tells Mr. Cotton go see my attorney, Gina Austin. She will be at this event. She will be wearing a red jacket.

You heard testimony from a litigation investor named Joe Hurtado, who at Darryl's suggestion, went in Darryl's place to that --

THE COURT: Counsel, no first names, please.

MR. AUSTIN: Oh. I apologize.

So Mr. Hurtado goes in Mr. Cotton's stead and has a conversation with this attorney, and she says contracts are forthcoming.

The very next day, on March 7th, Mr. Cotton does receive draft contracts from the Austin Law Group. So for several months, Mr. Geraci never says anything disputing what Mr. Cotton is asking for.

And, in fact, when you look through all their text messages, there's consistently wording about this will be good for us, and we can do this together. This whole time, he's stringing Mr. Cotton along, trying to prevent him from entering into a contract with a more serious buyer.

And Mr. Cotton had no reason to believe that a better opportunity would come along because of the

2.1

2.7

hidden intentions of Mr. Geraci to have him rely on his expertise, his experience, his team.

Mr. Cotton had no reason not to rely on Mr. Geraci.

But what we're really here for today is to determine whether that three-sentence agreement on November 2nd with Mr. Cotton and Mr. Geraci is an actual contract to sell his property or whether they came to a discussion that ended up in the oral agreement to be in a joint venture together.

It's clear Mr. Cotton did not intend for that three-sentence document to be a contract in and of itself. And going through every email response back and forth, if you look at Exhibits 40, 41, and 42 specifically, you can see that Mr. Geraci says, no, no problem at all to Mr. Cotton's request that the 10-percent equity stake be included in any final document. Their intention is clear from their own words. Every denial that Mr. Geraci has said refers to an oral statement. These things need to be in writing for a reason. It's not fair for one party to say, oh, I told him over the phone that that wasn't going to be a term or I told him that's not true. This was over three years -- this started over three years ago, July 2016.

Yes, my client may have made some minor inconsistent statements about timing or this or that or his understanding of things, but overall, all the evidence is in writing. We have all the text messages

2.4

2.7

in Exhibit 5. We have his memorandum of understanding, services agreement, Exhibits 10 and 11. We have the emails 40, 41, 42 and 69 where he more fully lays out all of their expectations. And it is not until two days before filing the lawsuit on March 19th that Mr. Geraci and his counsel are able to concoct this version of

events that November 2nd is a final agreement.

You've heard a lot of testimony on the CUP on 6176 getting denied, and they try to shift all blame on that to Mr. Cotton. And the reason they're trying to do that is because they know this is a sham cause of action saying this is a breach of contract. They had no expectation of having to take this all the way to trial. They thought Mr. Cotton was going to give in a long time ago and they had no expectation of that November 2nd document ever being held up in front of a court of law. So the only way they could limit their liability to Mr. Cotton would be for the CUP not to go through.

Mr. Cotton wanted that CUP to go through on his property. And you heard him testify that he even offered to split the cost of the application. He was still willing to try to work something out.

But, now, look at who is really the loser here. Mr. Cotton can never have a CUP on his property. He's losing out at a very minimum \$10,000 a month for a period of time, 10 years, under the deal that he had worked out with Mr. Geraci.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Objection. your Honor.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

1 THE COURT: Sustained, Counsel. Limit the time 2 frame. 3 MR. AUSTIN: Presumably from the time the CUP application could have been passed and the business 4 started, Mr. Cotton would start collecting a minimum 5 of \$10,000 a month. That was his assumption. 6 7 So if we could cut straight to it we've got to determine was there a meeting of the minds, who was 8 9 being the reasonable party here, and was Mr. Geraci 10 trying to pull something over on my client? 11 Almost all discussion on the CUP was just more 12

of a smoke screen to distract you. Yes, of course,
Mr. Geraci wanted a CUP in his name. That's why he had
all the agents and all the team assembled. So,
hopefully, he would have the CUP under his name. But
the reality is he just didn't want Mr. Cotton to have
his fair share of what they had agreed upon in the very
beginning and what he had strung him along and led him
to believe.

Mr. Cotton validly terminated their agreement. He realized he could sell this to someone who was actually going to treat him fairly, and that's what he wanted to do, as is his right.

So there's no need for me to go through all the verdict forms or the jury instructions and suggest the answers for you. I think you've heard enough testimony, and it's up to you to come up with, you know, your decision and who you feel is more credible and what is

1 | more likely.

2.7

Mr. Geraci might be a sophisticated party, but Mr. Cotton is an intelligent person. And he's not going to -- he's not going to just give away his property without putting up a fight for the terms that they had agreed upon. He's not going to sign away his property on a three-sentence document without any of the essential terms entered. That's why he sent that email asking that any final version contain the 10-percent equity stake.

He wanted to have a back-and-forth exchange of information. Look at September 24th, that email where he gives Mr. Geraci those shared documents, he specifically lays out, like, I would like for you to make edits and suggestions. He wanted a back-and-forth exchange.

On November 2nd, assurances were made to Mr. Cotton by Mr. Geraci and he simply wanted those assurances to be alleviated. He wanted those terms to be in writing and he wanted to move forward with this as quick as possible. And as soon as Mr. Geraci filed this lawsuit, everything fell apart.

Keep in mind, Mr. Geraci had this lawsuit at the ready, and the second Mr. Cotton tried to sell his property is when he was sued, preventing him from the value of his own property.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Counsel.

1 All right. Plaintiff's rebuttal closing 2 argument? MR. WEINSTEIN: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. 3 (Rebuttal closing argument on behalf of the 4 5 plaintiff/cross-defendant) MR. WEINSTEIN: So, ladies and gentlemen, in 6 7 listening to the closing, I'm really not sure whether Mr. Cotton is contending he had an agreement or he 8 9 didn't. September 24th, 2016 agreements that were 10 emailed on September 26th -- those were Exhibits 10 and 11 11 -- in closing, Counsel called those -- and the words 12 I think he used were baseline recommendations on what 13 their final agreement should be. 14 So the argument is, on that date, Mr. Cotton 15 sent baseline recommendation on what their agreement should be to Mr. Geraci. And then supposedly on 16 November 2nd, 2016, in the 30-second meeting, which 17 18 should be characterized initially at trial by Mr. Cotton 19 as in and out -- or short and sweet, rather, I came in, 20 signed the agreement, got the money, and left, or words 21 to that effect, he was supposedly, I guess based on this argument I just heard, given assurances that -- oral 22 assurances that Mr. Geraci had and was agreeing to all 23 of the terms and conditions in this unsigned written 24 25 agreement from September 24th. 26 That makes no sense and the argument is 2.7 contradictory. What I think I really heard -- and what I heard from the testimony, which is what -- and I 28

2.7

believe what you heard the testimony was that

Mr. Cotton's position is they have never had a binding

agreement of any kind, not the written agreement on

November 2nd and not this oral agreement for a joint

venture.

It's a bit baffling the -- if you look at counsel argued that there's no evidence -- well, there is -- that things should be in writing. If you're going to agree to something, things should be in writing. There's no evidence of Mr. Cotton's oral agreement to any of these terms and conditions to the unsigned documents, other than Mr. Cotton's testimony to that. And he's arguing that not only did Mr. Geraci give him assurances on November 2nd that he was agreeing to all of these other things, that's the same day that he signed a written agreement that had specific terms and conditions under which the law establishes are these necessary essential terms for an agreement to sell the property.

So it makes no sense that Mr. Cotton comes in and says to you I came in, it was short and sweet, I signed the document. And, by the way, Mr. Geraci also gave me written -- gave me oral assurances that I was going to -- that he was going to agree to all these terms and conditions in these previously submitted baseline recommendations. And, by the way, we signed a written agreement that says something else the same day.

The only signed written document in evidence,

2.1

2.4

2.7

as the parties contend, is the signed November 2nd, 2016 written agreement. So if we're talking about hidden intentions, the intentions in a written agreement are not hidden. It spells out clearly what the terms were. And if you look at CACI 302, which counsel referred you to, it talks about the agreement has to be clear. There's nothing unclear about the November 2nd written agreement. And it has to be agreed to. And the signature on it is an agreement to it.

And it doesn't -- it does not make sense that the parties signed a document indicating all the essential terms and conditions of a real estate purchase agreement in a 30-minute meeting in which my client testified they went through everything or in a very short and sweet meeting, which Mr. Cotton tried to characterize it as. And, yet, he went through and tried to assure him that he was agreeing to not what was in the written agreement, but what was in this oral agreement that compasses these baseline recommendations.

So, quite frankly, I don't understand what's being argued is not inherently consistent.

Mr. -- counsel argued -- talked about this case was about greed. My client has nothing except the money he expended on the CUP. He didn't have a backup offer to sell the property. So I'm not sure how the argument washes that this case was about greed, unless it's the greed of Mr. Cotton, because my client got nothing out of it unless the CUP was approved for the property,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

because that was a condition of the sale.

In fact, talking about the CUP, let's not forget that the CUP -- approval of the CUP is a condition of the written agreement that we contend the parties entered into, but it's also a condition of the oral agreement that's being alleged by Mr. Cotton. Mr. Cotton is saying he had nothing to do -- he didn't interfere, didn't cause any delay, he's just trying to be blamed for the competing CUP application. He's offered no evidence that that competing CUP application that -- anything that happened with that CUP application was under the control of Mr. Geraci. He has to prove under his contract that the CUP would have been obtained. And if he's now telling you there were no delays in it, I guess he's admitting that the condition for his agreement could never even have occurred because the CUP was never approved. And he can't recover anything on his agreement unless he can satisfy that condition.

He also can't argue, I would submit to you, that, well, I would have gotten the CUP if I hadn't delayed the process, because, you remember our contention is he unfairly interfered with the CUP process. And we gave you -- we presented evidence of that and that caused the CUP to be beaten out by the competing CUP application. And as a result of the delays caused by Mr. Cotton.

Mr. Cotton can't argue that, well, gee, I would

2.7

28

1 have satisfied that condition when he's the one that 2 caused the delay. He's offering no explanation other 3 than what we have offered in terms of his interference as to why the CUP wasn't approved. So no evidence that 4 5 it would have been approved under his theory of the 6 case. 7 Now, he's -- counsel argued that the November 2nd written contract had a couple of terms. 8 Ιt 9 had all the essential terms that you need for a 10 real estate agreement, not just a couple of terms. 11 He also mentioned this meeting between Gina 12 Austin, the attorney, and Joe Hurtado, a very brief 13 conversation. I think Mr. Hurtado testified that she told him that the contracts were forthcoming. But, 14 15 remember, that was in February of 2017 at a point in time after which Mr. Cotton had made demands for 16 17 the 10,000-dollar minimum guaranteed payments and at the 18 time that Mr. Geraci had instructed Ms. Austin to 19 prepare documents in an attempt to renegotiate the deal 20 because of a demand and because he feared losing his 2.1 investment. There's nothing inconsistent with what 22 Ms. Austin told Mr. Hurtado and what has been testified to by Mr. Geraci and Ms. Austin. They were trying to 23 renegotiate an agreement and save an investment. And 24 25 that renegotiation happened. 26 Would you put up the verdict forms --

Form 2, which contains Mr. Geraci's claims for

So I'm going to show you the rest of Verdict

2.4

2.7

intentional misrepresentation, false promise, and negligent misrepresentation. I'm trying to ascertain from the argument, because I didn't hear it in the evidence, as to what was that was falsely represented to Mr. Cotton that he relied on.

The argument was he was told that the team was well qualified and had experience in obtaining a CUP application. Did you hear any evidence that that wasn't true? And he talked extensively about their applications. That was a true representation, not a false representation.

I suppose what's being argued is that he was alleged -- allegedly falsely told that Mr. Geraci would not rely on this written agreement on November 2nd but would put down this oral agreement that somehow is created from these two written documents that were never signed and somehow Mr. Cotton -- Mr. Geraci falsely represented that he was going to put down what they had agreed to in writing. And that's what Mr. Cotton relied on.

But I don't believe there's evidence that that representation was made, except the oral testimony of Mr. Cotton, which Mr. Geraci denied. He's not carried his burden on that. And it makes literally no sense that that representation would have been made at the same date that a written agreement was signed. If you --

So I believe you should answer no to all the

2.7

first questions of the -- of what I call the tort claims. There's going to be -- they're going to be similar. The potential misrepresentation claim, the false promise claim, and the negligent misrepresentation claim are all claims that rely on there having been a false representation having been made and relied upon Mr. Cotton to take some action adverse to himself.

If you get past the question and you answer yes as opposed to no -- and I'm not sure how you do that. But if you do, you have to answer questions about actual reliance and reasonable reliance by Mr. Cotton on those representations. There are questions that will ask you did he actually rely on that false representation? Did he reasonably rely on that false representation?

But his testimony is that he never had a binding agreement, ever. So how -- what did he -- you know, what was his basis for reliance? He was relying not on the representation -- he knew that there had been no agreement signed that was binding for them. There was no surprise. He knew that until an agreement was signed under his version of events, there's no agreement. So he's not relying on -- on anything. He knows the situation based on his version of the events.

Then you get to -- you have to -- the question you get to if you get past those questions, which I don't believe you should -- you have to ask how was his reasonable and actual reliance on those alleged false representations? How did that harm him? It only harmed

2.7

him if he can also show that he would have gotten the CUP because he was relying, he says, on this agreement to reduce all of this other stuff to writing. But if that had been done, in other words, that representation that he alleges with me was in fact not false, which means they would have signed, you know, he assumes he would have signed a written agreement that had all of the terms of these oral agreements, there's no dispute that one of the terms of that agreement was sale of the property was going to be conditional upon the CUP being issued.

There's no evidence that he's presented that the CUP would have been -- would have issued, which -- so how could he have been caused damage by reliance? He still would have had to -- the CUP still would have had to have been approved. He's presented no evidence other than to say we can't figure out how the 6220 application beat us. But the evidence that's overwhelmingly been presented is of the efforts of Mr. Geraci and his team to get a CUP application.

And he can't say he's been caused harm by reliance and representation when, as we contend, he was the one that unfairly interfered with obtaining the CUP application, that the cause of his damages, that the reliance, even under his theory, it's his own bad acts that delayed the CUP from being approved.

So either way, he has no damages. If -- if he says there was no delay, then there's no proof that the

1 CUP would have ever been obtained in the first place. 2 And if he says, well, I would have gotten the CUP 3 because I quess I wouldn't have interfered with the process, which is the only other alternative you have, 4 5 he can't claim that we're the cause -- the false representation for the cause of that harm. It would 6 7 have been the fact that he interfered with getting the 8 CUP. So I don't believe you should get to any of those 9 questions. 10 But when you go through the verdict form, if 11 you do get to those questions, that's what you should be 12 thinking about, what was relied upon, and if it hadn't 13 been relied -- was it false? Was it a reasonable act 14 for him to rely on those things? And how was he harmed? 15 And I don't think you can answer any of those questions 16 with a yes, no reliance, actual reliance, no reasonable 17 reliance, no false misrepresentation in the first place, 18 and no harm caused by anything to do with his 19 interference of the CUP application. And I'm done. 20 THE COURT: Counsel? 2.1 MR. WEINSTEIN: I'm done. 22 Thank you. THE COURT: 23 MR. WEINSTEIN: I appreciate your time. Thank 24 you very much. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Austin, final closing argument? 26 (Rebuttal closing argument on behalf of the 2.7 defendant/cross-complainant) MR. AUSTIN: When it comes to the CUP and 28

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

establishing damages, Mr. Cotton testified that he wanted to have a third-party receiver overseeing the soils sample, and the reason is he wanted to see this go They could have worked something out. He through. wanted the CUP to go through, and Mr. Geraci had a benefit to be gained if the CUP did not go through. Here, he had a crack team, Jim Bartell, 19 out of 20 CUPs approved, Attorney Austin, 20 or 30 CUPs approved, Mr. Schweitzer, 20 or 30 CUPs approved, and you also heard testimony that although they don't understand the 11 reasoning, Mr. Schweitzer's employee, one Carlos 12 Gonzales, was listed on the competing CUP as an agent 13 for that property. So there were a lot of suspicious circumstances wherein it would seem as if the CUP was not being pursued fully.

That project took over two years, and as I've already described, no one could understand why. And Mr. Bartell's only explanation is that it should have went through, but we kind of blame Darryl.

And you heard Mr. Schweitzer say between one and 100 cycle issues had not yet been taken care of. It's a wide range. And they also said that those were probably just really insignificant issues that could have been resolved quickly.

Mr. Bartell also said he did receive notice of inactivity for a 90-day period. So when it comes to whether the CUP would be approved or not, we can really only speculate. But it seems as if a good faith effort

2.7

was not truly being made by Mr. Geraci.

And as far as the clarity of what Mr. Cotton expected on November 2nd, he expected what they had been on and off discussing for a long time. And Mr. Geraci assured Mr. Cotton all of the terms that would constitute the joint venture agreement. Mr. Geraci was always very clear in all of their text messages, all of Exhibit 5, that they were going to have some involvement together.

He was asking Mr. Cotton about marijuana things, Mr. Cotton was explaining to him things about, like, the new law that was passed, the Proposition 64, Adult Marijuana User Act.

Mr. Cotton is very interested in the medical side of cannabis. And he was under the impression from Mr. Geraci that they could pursue some branding of his 151 Farms.

Mr. Geraci induced Mr. Cotton's reliance to believe that they would have a joint venture agreement. He would get a 10-percent equity stake, \$10,000 a month, and the remainder of the 50,000-dollar deposit. That was Mr. Cotton's understanding on November 2nd, and he was given \$10,000 cash. There has been discussion. He signed off on that document, but it's clear that the intention of Mr. Cotton was to have the joint venture agreement and that they would pursue this together. And he knew he wasn't going to be in every single aspect, but Mr. Geraci very clearly kept him updated over the

2.7

course of those months.

If you look at all of their text messages and all their emails, there is only one logical conclusion.

And that is everything that Mr. Cotton has asserted. He never contradicted himself at all.

Opposing counsel says all terms of the real estate contract were met on that November 2nd agreement. This wasn't just like an empty lot. This was a property that was going to be -- was set up to be a marijuana outlet. It's worth potentially tens of millions of dollars over the course of its life. There is no way that we should believe this three-sentence document is supposed to entail and encompass all of their agreements that they had come to that day.

Mr. Geraci made promises. Mr. Cotton relied on them.

And when he requested that everything be reduced to a final writing, that's for the common sense reason of you want to have all your rights and liabilities laid out. That's why the draft agreements that were received from the Austin Law Group had dozens of terms, to try to specify everything that was expected from each side. So although they had the oral agreement, Mr. Cotton would have felt more comfortable knowing that everything was actually reduced to writing. But that doesn't mean they didn't have an agreement at that time.

And, again, it goes back to the hidden intentions of Mr. Geraci. He intended Mr. Cotton to go

1 along with him and allow him to pursue getting the CUP 2 and owning that property. But he did not intend to give 3 Mr. Cotton everything that he had promised. Thank you. 4 THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. 5 All right. That completes the closing 6 7 arguments, folks. 8 Madam Deputy, may I ask that you turn on our 9 projector. 10 I've got a couple of instructions, a few 11 admonitions, the jury will get the case, and then I've 12 got some additional admonitions for our alternate 13 jurors. We're almost there. We'll have the case to you before the noon recess. 14 15 And Madam Clerk, there you are. If you could 16 turn off one row of the light, please. 17 (Reporting of jury instructions waived.) 18 THE COURT: Madam Deputy, if you could off the 19 projector. 20 Madam Clerk, if you could turn on all of the 21 lights. All right. As mentioned, each of you will get 22 your own copy of the verdict forms -- I'm sorry -- set 23 of the jury instructions. And each of you will get a 24 25 copy of your own verdict form. 26 The foreperson or presiding juror will be 2.7 responsible for completing the official verdict form. 28 However, when you present your verdict in the courtroom,

2.7

either or both sides can ask that I poll you or ask each of you how you answered those questions on the verdict form.

The first verdict form is four pages in length and contains 10 questions.

The second verdict form is nine pages in length and contains 25 questions.

So what I'm going to urge each of you to do on your copy of the verdict form, please make note of how you answered each of those questions. Rather than relying upon your memory, when asked how you answered, if you do so accurately, you'll then be able to refer to your own answers on your copy of the verdict form.

In addition, my deputy will be bringing in the exhibits in to you as quickly as is possible.

Once you begin your deliberations, you'll need to stop for the noon hour, between 12:00 and 1:30. But once you get past that, how often you stop for breaks, whether you do stop or not, how long you take breaks will be entirely up to you. If you don't return a verdict by 4:30 this afternoon, we'll have to stop you at that time and then return tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

But in between those blocks of times, 9 to 12 and 1:30 to 4:30, you'll have all the discretion in the world to decide whether or not you take a break, and if so, how long.

Your point of contact from here on out, though,

1 at all times will be my deputy. 2 Madam Clerk, may I ask you to swear in Madam 3 Deputy. (The deputy was duly sworn.) 4 THE COURT: Folks, one final admonition. I 5 have colleagues that at this point in the proceedings 6 7 confiscate all the cell phones or other electronic devices that each of you have in your possession. 8 9 don't do it. As far as I am concerned, we're all adults 10 in the courtroom. 11 What I am going to direct that you do, though, 12 is when you are in deliberations, turn your cell phones off. These folks, the parties, and the lawyers have 13 spent a ton of money, they have put in a lot of time. 14 15 It's an important case to them. Give them your 16 undivided attention when you're deliberating. If you're 17 not deliberating and you're on a break, feel free to 18 turn them on and communicate with people so long as it's 19 not about the case. So, please, turn the cell phones 20 off when you're deliberating. 21 So at this point in time, the 12 of you, 22 excluding our alternates, please pick up all your belongings, your notebooks, if you would like, and 23 follow our deputy, please. 24 25 All right. Our jurors have left the courtroom. 26 We have four alternates. Mr. Fitzgerald, Ms. Frye, 2.7 Ms. McKnight, and Mr. Dunbar, I never expected that we

would not lose any of the first 12. I truly didn't.

1 my experience, it's unusual that we haven't lost one or 2 more. But nonetheless, you all are here. I cannot 3 begin to tell you how much I appreciate everything you've done. It's still possible that you could become 4 5 a part of the jury. But I'm not going to make you remain around the courtroom. 6 7 So here's what we're going to do. In just a few minutes when I let you go, you're not being 8 9 discharged from your jury service, and you're not 10 allowed to talk about the case with anyone just in case 11 one or more of you become members of the jury. My 12 courtroom clerk is going to meet each of you in the 13 hallway or somewhere outside the department. And what I'm going to ask that you do is to give her or confirm 14 15 that you have given her a telephone number that we can 16 reach you and communicate to you that we need you to 17 come back down to become a part of the jury. 18 Now, with that in mind, let's start with 19 Mr. Fitzgerald. Approximately -- if we give you a call 20 and ask you to come back downtown -- and I don't know if 21 that would be this afternoon or sometime this morning, 22 any idea how long it might take you to get downtown if 23 we give that call to you? JUROR FITZGERALD: 30 to 40 minutes. 24 25 THE COURT: All right. How about Ms. Frye? 26 hope I'm pronouncing that correctly. 2.7 JUROR FRYE: Yes. Hmm-mm. THE COURT: Your best estimate. 28

```
1
              JUROR FRYE: One hour today, and if it was
 2
    tomorrow, maybe two.
 3
              THE COURT: Okay. Now, that begins to present
    a problem in that we only call you if we need to have
 4
 5
    you become a part of the jury. And while we're waiting
 6
     for you to arrive, everyone is standing down.
 7
              Let me go to Ms. McKnight. How about you?
    Your estimate?
8
9
              JUROR McKNIGHT: 45 minutes.
10
              THE COURT: And Mr. Dunbar?
11
              JURORY DUNBAR: About an hour.
12
             THE COURT: I'm sorry?
13
             JURORY DUNBAR: About an hour.
14
              THE COURT: Okay. So, Ms. Frye, I understand
15
    the hour part. And I don't recall which part of town
    you're coming from, but why the possibly two hours?
16
17
              JUROR FRYE: It would be one hour. I was just
18
    thinking if I could go to work tomorrow. So it's an
19
    hour.
20
              THE COURT: I understand we're asking a lot,
21
     folks. And your quess is as good as mine as to whether
22
    we'll need to make that phone call to you. Once they
    get going, my suspicion is all 12 are going to be
23
    heavily invested to be a part of the ultimate decision.
24
25
    But, as you know, things can come up.
26
              All right. So we've got that. So, again,
2.7
    thank you for everything. Now, one other thing that
28
    might -- what we'll do -- all of you are telling me that
```

```
1
     it would take you 40 minutes or longer to come down
 2
    here. Even if we don't call you to ask you to come down
 3
    to become a part of the jury, what my clerk will do is
     advise you of what the ultimate verdict is. We will
 4
 5
    call you. We'll be proactive about that. You don't
    need to call and say whatever happened. We'll make sure
 6
 7
    as soon as reasonably possible we contact you to let you
    know what happened. We won't be able to call you and
 8
 9
    wait around long enough, which could be an hour or so
10
     for you to all come down and be a part of the verdict
11
     even if you wanted to do so. That wouldn't be fair to
12
     those other 12. Once they get to their verdict, you can
13
     imagine how motivated they are to present it in the
     courtroom and then go on with other things. But we will
14
15
     advise you proactively of what the verdict resulted in.
16
              Now, before I let you go, Mr. Fitzgerald, any
17
    questions about the process at all?
18
              JUROR FITZGERALD:
                                 No.
19
              THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Frye, any questions?
20
              JUROR FRYE: No.
2.1
              THE COURT: Ms. McKnight, any questions?
22
              JUROR McKNIGHT:
                               No.
23
              THE COURT:
                          And then Mr. Dunbar, any questions?
2.4
              JURORY DUNBAR:
                              No.
25
              THE COURT: I am still thinking about when I
26
    thought you weren't in the department, you know.
2.7
    apologies.
28
              JURORY DUNBAR: That's all right.
```

```
THE COURT: So, please, my clerk will catch up.
 1
 2
    Leave your notebooks behind. Thank you very much,
 3
    folks.
              Okay. The alternates and my clerk have left
 4
 5
     the department.
 6
              Counsel, how far -- in case we have a question
 7
    or we get word of a verdict, how far will you be from
    the courtroom?
 8
9
              MR. WEINSTEIN: We're across the street.
10
              THE COURT: Oh, you are?
11
              MR. WEINSTEIN: Yeah. In the Koll Center.
12
              THE COURT:
                          I got you.
13
              And then, Counsel, how far are you away?
                           I don't have an office down here.
14
              MR. AUSTIN:
15
     So we'll just find somewhere within a short walk.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. You don't have
17
    to be in the courtroom -- or courthouse, per se. Now,
18
    make sure if you haven't already done so, that you give
19
    my clerk a number that we can reach you at.
20
              When it comes to jury questions, I don't insist
21
     that counsel be present as we go through it. I
22
     encourage it. What we'll do is the first opportunity
23
    that we have, we'll give you a copy of the question.
    And then after we've consulted, we'll ultimately give
24
25
    you a copy of the answer that we develop. It's kind of
26
    hard to do some of that right away if you happen to be
2.7
    on the phone. And occasionally we get questions that
28
     it's just easier to confer when we're in the same room.
```

```
1
              But I don't insist that you be present for jury
 2
    questions.
 3
              Whether you want to be present for the verdict
     is entirely up to you. But we will notify you of
 4
 5
     everything.
              I take it that you all have gone through the
 6
 7
     exhibit volumes and are satisfied?
 8
                               They haven't had time.
              THE CLERK: No.
 9
              THE COURT: Haven't had time yet?
10
              THE CLERK: They're still here.
11
              THE COURT: So we're going to adjourn in a few
12
    minutes. You're have a few minutes before noon.
13
    guess is my deputy would like to bring them in before
     they recess for the noon hour. But, if not, we'll bring
14
15
     them in first thing after they resume at 1:30.
              I think I've given you all the admonitions.
16
17
              Counsel, any questions about anything?
18
             MR. WEINSTEIN: No, your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: Okay. Counsel?
20
             MR. AUSTIN: No, your Honor.
2.1
              THE COURT: All right. Now, I do have another
22
     trial starting first thing tomorrow morning. Whether
    they return -- whether your jury has returned a verdict
23
    or not. So what I'm going to do is ask you to begin
24
25
    clearing out your volumes from counsel's table so that
    other folks will be able to find room when they come in
26
2.7
    tomorrow morning. I guess we have an exparte at 8:30,
28
     and then the trial starts at 9:00. So there will be
```

1 other people coming into the department. 2 My clerk may want to talk to you about other 3 things too involving exhibit notebooks and stuff. I'll let you do that off the record. All right, Counsel, 4 5 we're in recess. Thank you. (Lunch recess from 11:47 a.m. to 2:44 p.m.) 6 7 THE COURT: All right. Counsel, we got our first jury note since deliberations began. 8 9 The question reads as follows, a hard copy of 10 which we've provided to you: 11 Does Question No. 5 in Special Verdict Form 12 No. 1 refer to only the defendant's condition, or to 13 both the plaintiff and the defendant's condition? It's signed by the foreperson, 7/15/19. 14 15 Since this is plaintiff's verdict form, we'll 16 start with plaintiff. And then I'll get comments from 17 defense counsel. 18 Counsel, your comments? 19 MR. WEINSTEIN: Yeah. It refers to the 20 plaintiff's condition, I believe. I'm not going to try 21 to interpret it, but the conditions I think they're 22 referring to is the condition that the CUP approval be obtained. And so that's talking -- that question talks 23 about whether or not the -- the condition that the 24 25 plaintiff was to obtain approval of the CUP, was that 26 condition the plaintiff had to satisfy excused? 2.7 That's I think --28 THE COURT: All right. Now --

1	MR. WEINSTEIN: I'm concerned about how it's
2	answered for them, because I don't know how they're
3	interpreting it. But that's what I think it means.
4	THE COURT: Well, let's fall back to Question
5	No. 4, which reads: Did all of the conditions that were
6	required for defendant's performance occur? If your
7	answer to Question 4 is yes, do not answer Question 5
8	and answer Question 6.
9	If your answer to Question 4 is no, answer
10	Question 5.
11	The operative Question 5 reads: Was the
12	required conditions that did not occur excused?
13	So it seems to the Court that the party
14	responsible for the to perform the condition, if one
15	was to be performed or not excused was defendant?
16	Now, I have an additional comment, but five
17	seems to logically track a question directed to
18	defendant's performance, not plaintiff's.
19	MR. WEINSTEIN: Give me a moment.
20	THE COURT: Now, Counsel, before you strain
21	your brain any further, and before I hear from defense
22	counsel, these questions were taken from the proposed
23	verdict form. I don't know if there were any conditions
24	that needed to have been performed or excused by
25	defendant before plaintiff's performance was required.
26	The CUP that needed to have been obtained
27	needed to have been obtained was a condition that
28	needed to have been satisfied before defendant was

1 required to sell plaintiff the property. 2 So there may be some question as to whether 3 these two questions should have been on the form at all, given the way the contract was formed -- or the -- given 4 the way the contract is worded. 5 Well, let me go to defense counsel. Do you 6 7 have any comments? MR. AUSTIN: 8 I agree with your assessment so 9 The only conditions we would be talking about far. 10 would be basically getting the CUP approved or selling 11 the property. And Number 4 does say defendant's 12 performance. So 5 kind of only makes sense that it 13 would be talking about defendant. 14 THE COURT: Let's just walk through this real slowly. 15 Ouestion No. 4, did all of the conditions that 16 17 were required for Mr. Cotton's performance occur? 18 Defendant in the first verdict form is Mr. Cotton. It's not Mr. Geraci. 19 20 MR. TOOTHACRE: Correct. 21 THE COURT: So this is plaintiff's, in effect, 22 verdict form. It's your cause of action. What conditions, if any, did Mr. Cotton need to 23 have performed or be excused before he was required to 24 25 perform? 26 MR. WEINSTEIN: I have an answer, but I want to look at the CACI because I'm also mindful of the Court's 2.7

statement of whether the question should have been asked

 $1 \mid at all.$

2.7

I guess, whether it's right or wrong, the way I read the verdict form is that first you deal with plaintiff's obligations, and then Question 3 was what plaintiff had to do excused. Okay. And now what defendant's obligation to do in the next two questions is to deliver the property. But he's only required to deliver the property if the CUP is approved. That didn't occur.

So the next question is that required condition that was necessary -- was the required condition excused that would have required him to perform? That's how I read it.

THE COURT: So let me just think through this for just a moment.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Because you only get to the -you only get to the breach of the implied covenant
question if either 4 is yes or 5 is yes.

THE COURT: So let me just think through this for just a minute.

MR. WEINSTEIN: So, in other words, the -- my argument is the condition that was required to be -- to -- that was required to be satisfied to cause defendant to have to perform was approval of the CUP. So that didn't occur. But the happening of that condition was excused. That way, you get to -- that way, the question either yes to 4 or yes to 1 five gets you -- boy. You only get to 6 if 5 is yes. That

1 condition had to have been excused or defendant wouldn't 2 have been required to perform. 3 I still think it's referring to the excuse of the condition that plaintiff would have to perform, 4 5 which is get approval of the CUP. THE COURT: So let me back up to Question 4. 6 7 Did all of the conditions that were required for defendant performance occur? 8 9 The one condition that needed to have occurred 10 before defendant, Mr. Cotton, was obligated to sell the 11 property was Mr. Geraci needed to have obtained the CUP. 12 MR. WEINSTEIN: Correct. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Five, was the required conditions -- let's call it condition --14 15 MR. WEINSTEIN: Okay. 16 THE COURT: -- mainly that Mr. Geraci had 17 obtained 1 CUP excused? 18 MR. WEINSTEIN: That's 1 way I believe it should read. 19 20 THE COURT: All right. Let me give you a 21 proposed answer. And we might shorten it just a bit. 1 condition referred to in Question No. 5 22 refers to -- refers to a condition which had occurred or 23 was excused before defendant was obligated to perform. 2.4 25 Now, they're already past 1 occurrence part. 26 They're wondering whether Mr. Geraci's obligation to get 2.7 1 CUP was excused. MR. WEINSTEIN: Right. So when they ask 28

1 whether it's 1 plaintiff's condition or 1 defendant's 2 condition, 1 required condition referred to there is the 3 condition that plaintiff obtain approval of the CUP. Well, I'm not inclined to become 4 THE COURT: 5 that specific in answering 1 question. Folks, that's how we get ourselves into trouble. It's a big 6 7 presumption, but it is a presumption. But the presumption that you're making, Counsel, may be entirely 8 9 reasonable and logical. But that's not what they're --10 they aren't that specific. 11 So let me -- I've modified what I just gave you a little bit more. So let me throw this one at you. 12 13 1 condition referred to in Question No. 5 refers to a condition -- so we're now focusing on a 14 15 condition. I think we can all agree that there was one condition -- or there is one condition at issue. 16 17 think I hear plaintiff saying yes. 18 Does 1 defense agree with that? 19 MR. AUSTIN: Can you restate that last part? 20 So if four --21 THE COURT: 1 condition at issue in this case 22 is limited to Mr. Geraci's obligation to obtain 1 CUP or that it was -- or he was excused from doing so. But we 23 are talking about a single condition, namely, 1 CUP. 24 25 Do you agree with that, Counsel? 26 MR. AUSTIN: Well, No. 4, it does say 2.7 defendant's performance, and I think his only condition -- well, he just had to sell 1 property. 28

```
1
              THE COURT: Right.
 2
              MR. AUSTIN: So the condition --
 3
              THE COURT: He didn't have to do -- meaning,
     Mr. Cotton, didn't have to do anything unless and until
 4
     Mr. Geraci got 1 CUP or Mr. Geraci's obligation to
 5
     obtain 1 CUP was excused. But, again, we keep coming
 6
 7
    back, 1 condition refers to the CUP application.
 8
              Do you agree with that?
 9
              MR. AUSTIN: Yes, your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: All right. So let me back up and
11
     read this to you as a proposed answer.
12
              1 condition referred to in Question No. 5
13
     refers to a condition which was excused, if at all,
    before defendant was obligated to perform. Now, we can
14
15
     even go Defendant Cotton was obligated to perform.
16
              And if you want me to recite it again, I'd be
17
    happy to do so.
18
              1 condition referred to in Question No. 5
19
     refers to a condition which was excused, if at all,
20
    before Defendant was obligated to perform.
21
              Let me go to the plaintiff's side.
22
              MR. WEINSTEIN: One moment.
23
              May I try something else out on you?
2.4
              THE COURT:
                          Sure.
25
              MR. WEINSTEIN: I would -- I would say 1
26
     condition referred to in Ouestion 5 refers to a
2.7
     condition that, unless excused, would have to be
     satisfied by plaintiff in order for defendant's
28
```

1 performance to be required. 2 THE COURT: All right. Let me make -- I 3 better -- why don't you give that to me again very 4 slowly. MR. WEINSTEIN: Right. 1 condition referred to 5 in Question 5 refers to a condition that, comma --6 7 THE COURT: One moment. Okay. MR. WEINSTEIN: That, comma, unless excused, 8 9 comma, would have to be satisfied by plaintiff in order 10 for defendant's performance to be required. 11 THE COURT: Would have to be satisfied by 12 plaintiff in order --13 MR. WEINSTEIN: For defendant's performance to 14 be required. 15 THE COURT: Let me go to defense counsel. 16 MR. AUSTIN: I mean, they look pretty similar 17 to me. Yours is a little bit shorter, which might be 18 easier to understand. 19 THE COURT: Well, let me just say I take no 20 pride in authorship. I can assure all of you of that. 21 I am open-minded to a better-word proposal. It is true 22 that mine is more concise, which I always prefer. But if you two agree to plaintiff's proposal, I don't see 23 that that's inaccurate. It seems to convey 1 correct 24 response. And if there's a stipulation, I'll give it. 25 26 If not, I'll fall back on what I propose. 2.7 MR. WEINSTEIN: 1 reason that I prefer mine, 28 your Honor, is that it makes reference to the fact that

1 the condition has to be satisfied by 1 plaintiff in 2 order for defendant's performance to be incurred. Their 3 question seems to be based on a confusion about whose condition and whose performance. 4 5 THE COURT: Well, now, be careful what you wish for, because if you go back to Question 3, which they 6 7 wouldn't have gotten to 5 if they hadn't asked about 3, in favor of plaintiff, talks about plaintiff having been 8 9 excused from having to do all or substantially all of 10 the significant things that the contract requires him to 11 do. 12 So they have already gotten past -- in some way, shape, or form, they have already gotten past what 13 you're now trying to build in your answer, Counsel. 14 15 MR. WEINSTEIN: Understood. But the -- that 16 takes us full circle to the original comment, which is 17 whether the question should be in there at all. 18 If they answer Question 3 yes and determine 19 that plaintiff's obligation to substantially perform all 20 1 things that the contract required them to do was 21 excused and they answer yes but they don't answer yes to 22 4 or 5, they stop answering. THE COURT: 1 verdict could be internally 23 inconsistent. 2.4 25 MR. WEINSTEIN: Yes. So they --26 THE COURT: Could be. 2.7 MR. WEINSTEIN: Could be. So what -- I think that's 1 confusion. 28 And why

1 I used 1 language I did is that both 3 and 5 deal with 2 getting approval of the CUP. One is in terms of an 3 affirmative obligation to get it. 1 other one is in terms of assessing a condition to require 1 defendant to 4 5 perform. And so they are essentially ask/answering 1 6 7 same question. THE COURT: All right. Let me go to defense 8 9 counsel. Your comments? 10 MR. AUSTIN: I still feel like either answer, I 11 mean, gets 1 main point across. I think it's just 12 important that they -- that they know 1 --13 THE COURT: Counsel, one thing that, I guess, your side can be assured of, if I thought there was 14 15 anything inaccurate or inappropriate about the proposal, 16 I would not grant it. I'm not seeing that it's 17 inaccurate or inappropriate. It is wordier than what I 18 propose, but maybe those extra words are necessary to 19 convey 1 correct response. 20 So your comments? 21 MR. AUSTIN: I'm willing to stipulate to 22 Mr. Weinstein's proposal. THE COURT: All right. So let me just develop 23 what I understand to be 1 complete answer, adopting 2.4 25 plaintiff's proposal. And then we'll finalize it and 26 give it to the jury. 2.7 All right. Counsel, can you read me your proposal one more time. And I think I tracked it. 28

1 Before I read what I think you said, I want to hear it 2 one more time. 3 MR. WEINSTEIN: I would add I think it should 4 say in Special Verdict Form No. 1, comma. 5 THE COURT: We'll get there. 6 MR. WEINSTEIN: Okay. 1 condition referred to 7 in Question 5 refers to a condition that, comma, unless 8 excused, comma, would have to be satisfied by plaintiff 9 in order for defendant's performance to be required. 10 THE COURT: Okay. The Court accepts, as 11 modified -- and there's one word I'm going to modify --12 1 proposed answer from plaintiff, which I understand 1 13 defense agrees with. 1 condition referred to in Question No. 5 in 14 15 Special Verdict Form No. 1 refers to a condition 16 which -- I'm going to change the word "that" to "which" -- unless excused, would have to be satisfied by 17 18 plaintiff in order for defendant's performance to be 19 required. 20 Any objection from plaintiff? 21 MR. WEINSTEIN: No, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Defense? 23 MR. AUSTIN: No, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. So I'll provide this to 2.4 25 my clerk. She will reduce it to a written answer, which 26 my deputy will then bring it into 1 jury -- 1 jury room. 2.7 And we'll get you a copy of the answer. 28 It looks like they're making some progress on

2.7

the Verdict Form No. 1, but they have got a longer

Verdict Form No. 2. Your guess is as good as mine as to

whether they're going to finish their business and

return a verdict today.

Counsel, because we're so late in the afternoon, I'm going to ask you to stick closer to the courthouse.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: What we usually do is at or about 4:15, without putting any pressure on the jury, my deputy will pop her head into 1 room just to see how they're coming along.

I think in all 1 years I've been doing this, I've agreed to take a verdict as late at 4:30, which means that we're not done until 5:00 or later. So gets to be an awfully long day on everyone. If they're that close at or about 4:15, we'll give them until 4:30 to give a verdict. If not, we'll tell them to come back tomorrow morning, just so you know 1 way we usually handle it.

And then you will not be required to stick around tomorrow morning. We'll call you if need be. But just in case, I'd hate to make them wait any longer than necessary. I do appreciate you coming over here. It's so much easier to develop this answer when you're here rather than me trying to bounce back and forth on the phone. You don't have to be in the courtroom now. Just be close to the courthouse.

Transcript of Proceedings

```
We'll get that to you, Counsel.
 1
     (The proceedings concluded at 3:14 p.m.)
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

1 I, Margaret A. Smith, a Certified Shorthand 2 Reporter, No. 9733, State of California, RPR, CRR, do 3 hereby certify: 4 That I reported stenographically the proceedings held in the above-entitled cause; that my notes were 5 6 thereafter transcribed with Computer-Aided 7 Transcription; and the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages number from 1 to 94, inclusive, is a full, true 8 and correct transcription of my shorthand notes taken 9 10 during the proceeding had on July 15, 2019. 11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 12 this 25th day of July 2019. Margaret A. Somth 13 14 15 Margaret A. Smith, CSR No. 9733, RPR, CRR 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 2.7 28

\$

\$10,000 22:1 23:13 26:26 32:2,4 39:22 52:27 53:9 56:15 59:25 60:6 72:20,23

\$260,109.58 46:21 49:24

\$40,000 54:25

\$5,000 53:9

\$800,000 30:14

1

1 12:15,25 13:23 28:3 46:28 47:1 49:26 82:12 86:17,18,22, 25,27 87:1,2,5,13, 18,21,22,24,28 88:5, 6,7,12,18,25 89:5, 24,27 90:1,20,23,28 91:1,3,4,6,11,12,19, 24 92:4,6,12,14,15, 26 93:1,11,13,19

10 19:8 36:17 53:26 59:2,26 62:10 75:5

10,000 53:9

10,000-dollar 28:21 56:14 66:17

10-percent 19:19,26 25:13,15,21,25 26:20,23 30:15 34:14 35:6,26 36:6, 16,20,22 37:8 40:18 41:4 52:26 56:24 58:17 61:9 72:20

100 71:21

107 23:1

10:33 51:12

10:48 51:12

11 9:16 19:10 53:26 59:2 62:11

118 43:21

119 43:21

11:47 82:6

12 8:12 75:24 76:21, 28 78:23 79:12

12:00 75:17

12th 38:20 42:25 43:5

13 8:10

137 46:11

14 22:12,21 24:2 25:20

14th 22:12 38:3

15 4:1 25:3 51:3,5,9, 10

151 72:17

16th 36:8 41:7

19 38:2 71:7

19th 41:16 59:5

1:30 9:17 75:17,25 81:15

1five 85:27

2

2 13:1 47:1,18 49:27 66:28 93:2

20 21:15 71:7,8,9

2016 11:3 14:4,9,25 15:12 16:14,19,22 18:24 20:10 21:2,6 27:7,15 30:17 32:7, 24 33:12 36:8 37:2 38:3 39:18 47:6 50:10 58:24 62:9,17 64:1

2017 37:26 38:18 39:14 40:10,24 41:7, 20 42:18,25 66:15

2018 22:12 44:11

2019 4:1

208 22:13

20th 18:24 20:28

21st 16:22 41:20,22 42:3,18

22nd 38:20

24th 27:7 30:17 32:6, 24 33:12 37:2 50:10 61:12 62:9.25

25 55:1 75:7

26th 19:5 62:10

27th 40:24

29 42:14

2:44 82:6

2nd 11:3 13:21 14:4, 8,25 15:12 20:28 21:2,6 22:28 23:10, 12 25:16,22,26 26:13,21 27:12,15 30:19 33:23 34:20 37:4,22 39:18 40:25 47:6 48:14,16 54:4 55:12,20,26 58:7 59:7,15 61:17 62:17 63:4,14 64:1,7 66:8 67:14 72:3,22 73:7

3

3 21:5 47:19,20 85:4 90:6,7,18 91:1

30 20:11 23:24 24:6, 8,25 54:7 71:8,9 77:24

30-minute 24:4 25:1 64:13

30-second 62:17

302 54:18 64:5

303 13:16,18 14:11

31st 20:10 38:18,21

325 45:8

361 46:5

3712 30:1

38 11:5 21:2 24:21 28:13,14

39 21:6

3:03 21:9

3:05 21:8

3:14 94:2

3rd 35:24 37:6,10 39:19

4

4 49:2 83:5,7,9 84:11, 16 85:18,27 86:6 87:26 90:22

40 22:3 58:14 59:3 77:24 79:1

41 34:8 58:14 59:3

42 58:14 59:3

43 34:27,28

45 78:9

4:15 93:10,17

4:30 75:21,25 93:14, 17

5

5 16:20 37:15 38:2

Index: \$10,000-5

48:5 49:2 55:1 57:6 59:1 72:8 82:11 83:7,10,11 84:12 85:18,28 86:22 87:13 88:12,18,26 89:6 90:7,22 91:1 92:7,14 **50,000-dollar** 26:16 53:16 72:21 **59** 40:23 **5:00** 93:15 6 6 83:8 85:28 **6176** 10:26 28:23 44:16,28 59:9 **62** 40:26 **6220** 44:27 45:22

52:7 69:17 64 72:12 65-inch 21:18 **681** 44:6 **69** 36:7 41:6 55:6 59:3 7

7/15/19 82:14 7th 39:14 57:17

8 49:6 **800,000** 17:17 19:25 28:20 **85** 42:14 **8:30** 81:27

8

8:49 4:1 9 **9** 19:4 49:15 75:23,24 **90-day** 71:26 9:00 35:10 81:28 9:11 34:28

9:30 4:27

9:45 5:1

Α a.m. 4:1 51:12 82:6

Abhay 45:2

ability 18:13 able 11:22 38:13 41:2 52:11,28 53:23 59:6 75:12 79:8 81:26 abstract 13:10 accept 38:4 43:12 accepted 38:7 accepts 92:10

access 41:28 42:11,

18 43:8,14,19,22

44:21

accurately 75:12 acknowledgment 21:7 acquire 16:15 52:3 acquiring 52:13 56:1 act 70:13 72:13 **acting** 20:18 action 35:15 49:8 59:11 68:7 84:22

acts 69:25 actual 49:23 51:26 53:24 58:7 68:10,27 70:16 add 27:11,13 92:3

addition 75:14

added 34:15

additional 16:26 20:7 41:8 74:12 83:16 adjourn 81:11

admit 26:12.27 admitted 11:15 16:20

25:11 32:1,15 34:1 41:10 42:16.17 admitting 65:15

admonition 76:5 admonitions 7:28 74:11,12 81:16

adopting 91:24 Adult 72:13

adults 76:9

adverse 68:7 advise 79:4,15

affirmative 91:3

affirmatively 36:19

afford 39:23 40:6

afternoon 75:21 77:21 93:6

agenda 38:16

agent 20:19,20 27:21 56:6 71:12

agents 27:23 60:14

ago 22:21 58:24 59:15

agree 19:25 30:7,11

37:8 40:20 41:13 63:9,24 84:8 87:15, 18,25 88:8 89:23

agreed 16:17 21:25 25:7 26:15,16,24 27:9 30:13,16 32:7 33:11 35:6,25 50:9 60:17 61:6 64:8 67:19 93:14

agreeing 24:23 62:23 63:14 64:17

agreement 11:4 14:15,28 15:17,20 19:8,18,23 21:3,16 24:13,19 25:6,12 27:4,5,14,16,18,20 28:8,26 29:3,19,20, 22,23,24,25 30:9,19, 21,25 31:23,27 32:19 33:3,4,6,8,9, 10,15,18,25 34:2,4, 13,17,21 35:27 36:5, 24,28 37:4,5,13,20, 21 40:2,7,20,24,26 41:2,3,14,15,19,23 42:7,8 46:7 48:14,16 50:8,9,11,12,13 52:23 54:2 55:12,27 56:25 57:2 58:6,9 59:2,7 60:20 62:8, 13,15,20,25 63:3,4, 10,16,18,27 64:2,3, 6,8,9,13,18,19 65:4, 6,16,18 66:10,24 67:14,15,26 68:16, 19,20,22 69:2,7,9 72:6,19,26 73:8,23, 25

agreements 19:12 20:1 28:15 29:17 32:24 40:15,17,23 53:24 62:9 69:8 73:14,19

40:14,17 41:8 42:11

agrees 92:13 ahead 19:2 29:12 44:27 49:1 52:12 alleged 29:21,25 30:9,20 31:23,27 32:19 33:4,9,17 37:5 50:7,8 52:13 65:6 67:13 68:27 allegedly 67:13 alleges 30:12 69:5 alleging 27:3 30:25 alleviated 61:19 **allow** 5:19,20 43:2 44:21 74:1 allowed 10:7 17:22, 28 77:10 alternate 5:16 74:12 **alternates** 76:22,26 80:4 alternative 15:22 70:4 amendment 38:13 39:3.5 42:26 43:6 amount 49:23 **ample** 57:3 answer 11:21 12:12, 22 25:17,27 31:6,10, 16,19 37:9 47:9,11, 12,15,18,27 48:5,8, 21,27 49:4,10,16 50:6,14,24,25 67:28 68:8,10 70:15 80:25 83:7,8,9 84:26 86:21 88:11 90:14,18,21 91:10,24 92:12,25, 27 93:25 answered 31:22 47:3

49:2 75:2,10,11 83:2

answering 11:27 14:7 | 87:5 90:22 answers 13:6 60:26 75:13 anticipate 56:15 anticipated 53:18 anticipatorily 48:12 anybody 15:21 20:25 anymore 54:21 **Anyway** 17:15 apart 61:22 apologies 79:27 apologize 36:12 57:13 apparently 34:7 **appeal** 44:13 appeared 44:12 applicant 20:18 application 16:3 17:4 20:14 37:18,25 38:4, 5 41:25 42:1,13,20, 24,26 43:2,25 44:3, 7,9,11,14,16,27 45:16,20,22 46:8,10, 14 47:26 48:8,21 49:12,14 51:28 52:6, 16 54:23 59:21 60:4 65:9,10,11,26 67:8 69:17,20,24 70:19 88:7 applications 16:9 67:10 apply 50:23 applying 16:6 20:20 appreciate 51:23 70:23 77:3 93:24 apprising 39:10,12

appropriate 21:25 47:11 50:22 75:11 approval 28:22 65:3 82:22,25 85:24 86:5 87:3 91:2 approved 19:22 42:13 43:7 45:4 46:10 52:16 54:24 64:28 65:17 66:4,5 69:16,26 71:8,9,27 84:10 85:8 approximately 16:18 77:19 argue 27:15 45:18,22 65:20,28 argued 50:7 63:7 64:21,22 66:7 67:12 arguing 63:13 argument 5:4,6 10:5, 11,17 11:6,17,25 13:4,25 23:20 46:16 50:28 51:5,15,17,18 62:2,4,14,22,26 64:25 67:3,6 70:25, 26 85:22 **arguments** 5:10 9:12 10:8 74:7 arrange 7:24 arranged 7:7 arrested 42:16 arrive 78:6 arrived 23:23 ascertain 67:2 aside 44:22 ask/answering 91:6 asked 14:18 16:28 18:28 23:24 25:6,8, 15 26:17,21,27 31:2, 13,20 36:14,21 38:3

84:28 90:7 **asking** 57:20 61:9 72:10 78:20 asks 12:22 45:14 48:6 49:7 **aspect** 72:27 assembled 15:27 17:3 60:14 asserted 73:4 assertions 53:14 assessing 91:4 assessment 84:8 assignee 28:19 assist 15:27 assumes 69:6 **assuming** 5:16 7:2 19:21 assumption 60:6 **assurances** 61:17,19 62:22,23 63:14,23 **assure** 64:17 89:20 assured 52:20 72:5 91:14 attached 34:5 attaches 33:24 attempt 26:6 40:8,15 45:19 66:19 attempting 29:19 40:13 43:12 attempts 23:9 41:11 **attention** 23:17,19 24:16 76:16 attorney 46:15 57:6, 15 66:12 71:8

attorneys 52:20 August 55:3 Austin 4:8,19 6:2 8:25 16:3 35:18,21 38:28 39:3 40:5,10 51:20 54:2 57:7,13, 18 60:3 66:12 18 22

18 60:3 66:12,18,22, 23 70:25,28 71:8 73:20 80:14 81:20 84:8 87:19,26 88:2,9 89:16 91:10,21 92:23

Austin's 27:14 40:22 authorship 89:20 avoid 50:18 aware 18:4

В

awfully 5:18 93:16

back 5:12 6:5 17:15 33:21 36:10 37:21 55:14 58:13 73:27 77:17,20 83:4 86:6 88:7,10 89:26 90:6 93:18,26

back-and-forth

61:11,15

backup 64:24

bad 69:25

baffling 63:6

BAILIFF 8:10

balance 28:21

Bartell 15:28 17:6,9 38:12,28 39:10 43:10 44:24,26 46:23 52:10 71:7,25

Bartell's 71:18

based 6:16 27:14 31:18 47:3 62:21 68:23 90:3

baseline 53:27 54:1 62:12,15 63:26 64:19

basic 49:4

basically 42:13 51:25 84:10

basis 68:17

bears 10:6

beat 44:16 69:18

beaten 65:25

began 82:8

beginning 49:1 60:18

begins 78:3

behalf 10:17 51:18 62:4 70:26

belief 54:16.17

believable 21:13 38:6

believe 20:2 22:8 23:2,11,15,16 35:2 42:28 46:15 47:9 50:25 52:17,24 53:15 55:26 57:27 60:19 63:1 67:21,28 68:26 70:8 72:19 73:12 82:20 86:18

belongings 76:23

bench 7:1

benefit 49:18 71:6

benefits 45:17,26 49:9

Berry 20:16,17,20 27:21,25 56:6

best 77:28

better 22:21 45:3 57:28 89:3

better-word 89:21

big 8:11 87:6

bind 30:10

binding 27:21 33:8,9, 13 36:28 63:2 68:16, 19

bit 63:6 86:21 87:12 89:17

blame 35:28 59:9 71:19

blamed 65:9

blocks 75:24

boring 44:1

bottom 14:14

Boulevard 10:26 28:23

bounce 93:26

boy 85:28

brain 83:21

branding 72:16

breach 12:27 13:2,14, 20 14:2 45:6,12,24 46:4 48:23,26,28 49:3,5 50:2,26 59:12 85:17

breached 13:22 48:12

break 5:2,4,5,8,10,12 51:2 75:26 76:17

breaks 75:18,19

breath 8:11

brief 66:12

bring 7:8 54:10 81:13,14 92:26

bringing 75:14

brings 7:21

broke 53:21

broker 56:7

budget 17:18

build 90:14

bulletin 18:1

burden 10:6 12:2,6,7, 8,11 67:24

business 30:6,11,22 31:9,14,21,25,27 32:5,27 53:8 60:4 93:3

businesses 53:13

buyer 57:26

buying 16:15,25

C

CACI 14:11 45:8 54:18 64:5 84:27

calculation 46:13

California 4:1

call 5:21 16:23 35:24 37:7,10 39:17,19 40:11 42:15 46:3 68:1 77:19,23 78:4, 22 79:2,5,6,8 86:14 93:22

called 19:7,9 28:2 34:2 62:11

calls 40:27

cannabis 31:7 32:14 53:1 72:15

cannabis-based

32:13

capacity 20:18

Index: attorneys-capacity

care 71:21

careful 4:21 90:5

Carlos 71:11 carried 67:23 carry 30:6,10 case 5:14 6:20 7:20 8:19 9:13,19,24 10:24 12:4 13:8 15:1 23:15 29:9 50:23 51:24,27 54:23 64:22,26 66:6 74:11. 13 76:15,19 77:10 80:6 87:21 93:23 cash 22:1 56:14,15 72:23 **catch** 4:15 6:11,12 80:1 categorically 30:24 caught 25:23 26:9 cause 22:26 45:21 59:11 65:8 69:24 70:5,6 84:22 85:23 caused 49:13 65:25. 27 66:2 69:14,21 70:18 cell 76:7,12,19 **Center** 80:11 certain 55:28 **certainly** 13:9 25:3 37:26 challenge 32:25 challenging 16:12 chance 6:28 chances 45:2 **change** 24:11 25:24 38:15.22 39:4.7 41:13 92:16

changed 22:17 39:7, 28 43:6 changes 21:24 22:24 23:7,9 39:13 changing 40:20 41:18 characterize 29:19 50:17 64:16 characterized 62:18 characterizes 29:24 characterizing 34:24 **chart** 46:12 **chase** 51:24 **chat** 6:9 choose 23:4 chronology 33:22 **circle** 90:16 circumstances 71:14 **City** 16:2 18:2 38:14, 16,19 41:24 43:2,12, 15,16 civil 17:22 claim 10:5,7 13:20 14:3 33:17 45:6,9, 13,24 46:2 48:24,26, 28 49:3,6 50:1,2,26, 27 68:3,4,5 70:5 claimed 38:5 claiming 35:14 claims 11:20 12:18, 21,23,24,26,27 13:1, 15 14:24 15:2,4,5,7 32:19 46:5,25 49:5, 22 50:3 66:28 68:2.5 clarity 72:2 clear 7:5 29:22 52:15 58:11,18 64:6 72:7,

24 comes 5:12 20:11 21:1 51:25 63:20 clearing 81:25 70:28 71:26 80:20 clearly 47:16 64:4 comfortable 73:23 72:28 clerk 7:11 9:26 10:1 74:15,20 76:2 77:12 79:3 80:1,4,19 81:8, 10 82:2 92:25 7,8 client 10:20 11:2 58:25 60:10 64:13, 23,27 **close** 52:5 55:16 93:17,28 20 closer 4:27 5:1 93:6 **closing** 5:1,10 9:12 10:17 11:6,17 13:4, 25 14:23 51:4,14,18 62:1,4,7,11 70:25,26 74:6 closings 7:9 co-branding 32:12 code 38:13,23 39:3,5, coincided 54:17 coincidentally 24:5 colleagues 10:20 76:6 collecting 60:5 combination 46:22 combine 30:5 combining 30:21 32:5 **come** 5:22 6:5 17:23 41:2 42:7,15 44:8 53:23 54:4 56:7 57:28 60:27 73:14 77:17,20 78:25 79:1, 2.10 81:26 93:18

coming 78:16 82:1 88:6 93:12,24 comma 89:6,8,9 92:4, comment 83:16 90:16 comments 19:13 82:16,18 84:7 91:9, commission 39:5 44:13 commitments 54:27 **common** 73:17 communicate 76:18 77:16 communications 32:22 36:10 55:15 compasses 64:19 compels 13:7 competing 14:24 15:2,3 44:13,15,28 49:13 52:6 65:9.10. 26 71:12 complainant 50:2,3 complaint 6:19 complete 11:22 27:17 42:25 43:23 91:24 completed 52:7 completely 33:19 completeness 43:3 completes 74:6 completing 74:27

computer 21:17,18 conceivable 6:18 concerned 9:23 34:3 76:9 83:1 concerning 22:27 concise 89:22 conclude 22:23 concluded 94:2 conclusion 73:3 conclusions 15:9 concoct 29:26 59:6 condition 36:15 45:23 47:16 48:3 52:12 65:1,4,5,15,19 66:1 82:12,13,20,22, 24,26 83:14,27 85:10,11,22,26 86:1, 4,9,14,22,23 87:1,2, 3,13,14,15,16,21,24, 28 88:2,7,12,13,18, 19.26.27 89:5.6 90:1,4 91:4 92:6,7, 14,15 conditional 15:25 18:5,13,16 69:10 conditions 27:5,6 33:11 37:1,12,20 48:1 62:24 63:11,17, 25 64:12 82:21 83:5, 12,23 84:9,16,23 86:7,14 **confer** 80:28 confirm 36:15,17 77:14 confirmation 35:5 36:5,19,22,24 confirmed 17:26

confiscate 76:7

conflict 17:27 18:2 conflicting 21:11 54:5 confronted 22:16 24:7 36:8 38:2 confusing 13:9 confusion 90:3,28 connection 14:26 31:25 conscientious 5:18 consent 41:9 54:14 **consider** 22:14,15 23:4,6 43:15 consideration 54:19 consistent 24:15,25 25:1 55:4 64:21 consistently 57:22 constitute 72:6 constitutes 45:24 consulted 80:24 consumer 16:27 18:1 contact 16:2 17:15 75:28 79:7 contacted 16:15 41:23,24 contain 61:9 containing 37:1 contains 11:19 28:6 31:23 66:28 75:5,7 contend 64:1 65:4 69:22 contending 62:8 contends 11:2,7 contention 65:23

contentions 11:11

continue 43:24 13 80:23,25 82:9 92:27 continued 41:4 correct 7:10 26:22,28 contract 11:8 12:27 27:12 31:10,15,16, 13:2,14,21,22 14:3, 18,19,21 84:20 5,9,24,25 15:2,3,7, 86:12 89:24 91:19 13 16:18 23:11,12, correctly 77:26 14,16 26:14 27:20 28:4,17 29:6 33:16 corroborated 16:19 34:6 42:2 45:13,17, cost 59:21 23,24,26 46:4 47:6, 14,16,22,23 48:10, Cotton 10:25 11:7 12,13,15,18,26 49:3, 12:24 14:4,8,12,14 9 50:2,5,18,20,26 15:7,14 16:11,17,21, 52:14 54:16 55:17 24,28 17:2,8,16,19, 56:5,8 57:5,25 58:8, 21,24 18:9,14,17,26, 12 59:12 65:13 66:8 28 19:6,17,19,24,28 73:7 84:4,5 90:10,20 20:2,3,11,15,25 21:1,8,10,17,21 contracts 27:22 22:5,9,16 24:1,8,11, 48:17 57:16,18 13 25:4,7,24,28 66:14 26:5,12 27:15 28:19 contradicted 33:19 29:18 30:9,20 32:18 55:8 73:5 33:16,24,26 34:2,6, contradictory 62:27 7,9,19 35:2,4,6,25, 27 36:3,26 37:7,24 contrary 22:11 39:12,17 40:13 41:4, control 30:7,12 31:26 17,22 42:22 43:8 32:6,8 65:12 44:19,23 45:15,25 46:1 47:5,26 48:11 conveniently 47:7 50:4 52:17,24 53:7, conversation 18:18 10,13,17,21,26 54:4, 20:3 55:4 57:15 16,23 55:6 56:13,18, 66:13 26 57:3,6,17,20,24, conversations 17:16, 27 58:3,7,11 59:10, 25 55:10 14,18,19,24 60:5,16, 20 61:3,18,24 62:8, **convey** 89:24 91:19 14,18 63:20 64:15, convince 23:18 33:5, 27 65:6,7,27,28 66:16 67:5,17,19,23 68:7,11 71:1 72:2,5, cooperative 16:27 10,11,14,25 73:4,15, 18:1 23,28 74:3 84:18,23 **copy** 7:24,26 9:21 86:10 88:4,15 22:4 33:25 34:5 38:24 74:23,25 75:9,

Cotton's 10:26 11:13 13:1 16:13 22:6,21 23:7 26:2 33:4 35:9 45:19 46:15 48:7 50:3 55:4,17 57:14 58:16 63:2,10,12 72:18,22 84:17

Council 38:16,19

counsel 4:14,18,28 5:26 6:1,8,14 7:5,13, 19 8:15,16,22,28 9:16 10:15 11:13 51:8,16 53:28 54:10 55:23 57:12 59:6 60:1 61:28 62:11 63:7 64:5,22 66:7 70:20 73:6 74:5 80:6,13,21 81:17,19 82:4,7,17,18 83:20, 22 84:6 87:8,25 89:15 90:14 91:9,13, 27 93:5 94:1

counsel's 5:4,6 10:5, 11 51:4,14 81:25

couple 10:22 31:1 56:16 66:8,10 74:10

course 19:20 42:21 57:4 60:12 73:1,11

court 4:4,9,18,20,25 6:1,3,9 7:13 8:7,11, 16,18,26 9:5,8 10:1 27:26 30:2 43:18,22 44:20 46:26 51:1,7, 13 57:12 59:16 60:1 61:28 70:20,22,25 74:5,18 76:5 77:25, 28 78:3,10,12,14,20 79:19,21,23,25 80:1, 10,12,16 81:9,11,19, 21 82:7,28 83:4,13, 20 84:14,21 85:14, 19 86:6,13,16,20 87:4,21 88:1,3,10,24 89:2,7,11,15,19 90:5,23,26 91:8,13, 23 92:5,10,22,24 93:9

Court's 84:27

courthouse 5:19 56:27 80:17 93:7,28

courtroom 51:8 74:28 76:10,25 77:6, 12 79:14 80:8,17 93:27

covenant 12:28 45:7 46:4 48:24,28 49:5 85:17

cover 38:9

crack 71:7

created 31:24 67:16

creates 40:22

credibility 22:27

credible 21:14 60:28

criminal 12:4

crocodile 53:22

cross 50:2,3

cross-claim 10:6

cross-complaint 6:19

cross-defendant

50:4

cross-examination

35:18

crux 10:27

CUP 16:2,6 17:4 19:21 20:14,20 28:22 29:7,13 37:18, 24 38:4,5 39:28 41:25 42:1,6,12,19, 24 43:25,27 44:3,7, 9,11,13,15 45:16,20 46:8,9,14,22 47:15, 24,26 48:2,8,20 49:11,13 51:28 52:6, 13,15,25,28 54:23 56:1 59:8,18,19,24 60:3,11,13,15 64:24, 28 65:2,3,9,10,11, 13,17,21,23,25,26 66:4 67:7 69:2,10, 13,15,20,23,26 70:1, 2,8,19,28 71:5,6,12, 14,27 74:1 82:22,25 83:26 84:10 85:8,24 86:5,11,17,27 87:3, 22,24 88:5,6,7 91:2

CUPS 52:3 71:8,9

cut 60:7

cycle 71:21

D

damage 46:20 69:14

damages 45:27 46:3, 6 49:21 69:24,27 71:1

Darryl 10:25 14:8 25:7 50:3 54:26 71:19

Darryl's 57:10,11

date 26:25 39:14 62:14 67:26

dated 16:22 27:7

dates 38:25

day 6:20 7:3 9:13 35:24 57:17 63:15, 27 73:14 93:16

days 40:25 43:7 55:12 59:4

deal 38:21 39:9,26 40:8,16 41:27 49:5

53:3 59:26 66:19 85:3 91:1

dealing 12:28 45:7

December 44:11 55:3

decide 12:26 22:8 75:26

decided 40:5

decision 6:18 34:18, 23 44:13 60:28 78:24

declined 35:21

deemed 42:24

defend 56:28

defendant 14:8 48:9 83:15,25,28 84:13, 18 85:24 86:1,8,10, 24 88:14,15,20 91:4

defendant's 82:12,13 83:6,18 84:11 85:6 87:1,27 88:28 89:10, 13 90:2 92:9.18

defendant/crosscomplainant 51:19 70:27

defense 4:18 5:6 6:1 51:4,14 82:17 83:21 84:6 87:18 89:15 91:8 92:13,22

definition 50:22

delay 44:20,21,23,24 45:20 65:8 66:2 69:28

delayed 65:22 69:26

delays 65:15,27

deliberated 8:15

deliberating 76:16, 17,20

Index: Cotton's-deliberating

deliberations 5:15 7:21 9:25 75:16 76:12 82:8 **deliver** 85:7,8 demand 40:1 66:20 demanded 39:17.19 demands 66:16 **denial** 58:19 denied 17:8 20:2.4 23:25 30:24 59:9 67:23 deny 17:24 41:28 55:11 department 77:13 79:26 80:5 82:1 depending 5:8 deposit 22:2 23:14 26:16 28:21 29:4,11 53:16 54:25 56:3,14 72:21 deposition 17:10,11 22:11,14,17,19 24:2, 3,7 25:19 26:9 depriving 45:25 deputy 7:8,21 8:8 9:11 10:3 74:8,18 75:14 76:1,3,4,24 81:13 92:26 93:11 **described** 23:25,26 24:28 32:18 37:10 50:15,16 71:17 description 28:10,23 designer 16:1 desk 21:20 detail 17:8 29:8 details 22:10 54:9

55:24,28

determine 12:23 58:6 60:8 90:18 determining 22:8 **develop** 15:25,26 16:27 80:25 91:23 93:25 developed 53:20 devices 76:8 Diego 4:1 different 22:7 45:13 diligently 44:3 46:8 dim 9:26 direct 6:15 76:11 directed 6:17,24 7:19 83:17 discharge 5:20 6:7 discharged 5:24 6:8 77:9 disclosure 20:12 discretion 23:2 75:25 discuss 11:9 25:21 50:27 discussed 4:13 17:4, 25 25:15,17,26 26:1, 7,15,20 29:10 41:10 discussing 32:27 55:22 72:4 discussion 6:22 9:7 18:10,11 40:4 51:6 58:9 60:11 72:23 discussions 32:12.26 dispensary 15:26 18:5,8 19:20,21,22, 27 20:5,6 25:14 26:27 28:22 30:26, 27 31:4.25 32:15.16 34:15 35:7 38:15

51:28 dropping 24:26 due 28:21 52:17 dispensary's 31:28 53:18 displaying 8:3 dull 43:28 displays 35:20 duly 76:4 dispute 10:24,27 29:9,10,11 69:8 **Dunbar** 76:27 78:10, 11,13 79:23,24,28 disputed 34:8 disputing 57:20 Ε distract 60:12 e-mail 42:27 disturbing 39:16 earlier 17:11 24:2 document 11:4 21:4, 25:20 42:23 11,26 22:1 23:19,23 24:16,22 25:1,9 **early** 9:13 26:4,18,22,28 27:13 earnest 22:2 29:14 34:1,4,16,20, 21 46:23 55:20,22, easier 80:28 89:18 26 56:9,19 58:12,18 93:25 59:16 61:7 63:22,28 easy 33:2 64:11 72:24 73:13 edits 19:13 61:15 documentation 46:19 effect 42:26,28 62:21 documents 11:15 84:21 19:7,14,15 20:9 **effective** 38:20,27 27:6,10 30:18 32:6 33:12 37:2 40:26 **effort** 71:28 50:10,16 61:13 efforts 30:22 44:10 63:12 66:19 67:16 69:19 doing 38:17 47:25 eight 43:7 48:19 87:23 93:13 either 5:7 41:2 69:27 dollars 52:1 73:11 75:1 85:18,27 91:10 doubt 12:4 electronic 76:7 downtown 77:20,22 element 34:18 dozens 73:20 elements 13:28 45:9, draft 40:14,24 56:4 11 57:18 73:19 **email** 19:7,13,17 22:3 drafted 21:11,19 32:26 33:24 34:4,9, drafts 40:17,21,22 19,22,23,28 35:9,14, 16,19,23 36:7,11,15 drop-in 25:3 41:16,23 42:9,14

56:19 58:13 61:8,12 emailed 19:6 22:4 62:10 emails 18:21 37:12. 14,16 40:28 41:25 55:6,19 59:3 73:3 employee 71:11 **empty** 73:8 encompass 73:13 encourage 80:22 **ended** 58:9 ends 50:26 engineers 17:22 43:23 **ensure** 56:23 **entail** 73:13 enter 14:8 47:6 48:16 50:4,20 **entered** 11:3,8 13:21 14:4,15,26 15:12,16, 20 33:15,17,19 42:2 61:8 65:5 entering 32:28 57:25 enterprise 30:23 entire 35:23 39:5 55:5 entirely 75:20 81:4 87:8 entirety 49:25 entitled 23:4 epiphany 34:7 equally 28:28 equity 19:20,26 25:13,16,21,25 26:20,23 30:15 34:14 35:6,26 36:6,

16,20,23 37:8 40:18

41:5 52:26 56:24 58:17 61:10 72:20 errata 38:14 especially 56:24 essential 28:6,7,11, 18,24 29:1,13 55:20 61:8 63:18 64:12 66:9 essentially 39:9 41:18 43:21 47:2 52:12.22 91:6 establishes 63:17 establishing 71:1 **estate** 27:19,21,23 28:8 29:17 52:19 56:6,7 64:12 66:10 73:7 **estimate** 77:28 78:8 evaluate 10:12 evaluating 15:3,5 evening 33:27 event 6:27 19:23 57:7 events 22:6,28 33:22 59:7 68:21,23 everybody 4:5 9:8 **evidence** 10:12,13 11:9,13,14,16 13:7,8 15:1,4,8,10,14 30:8 35:7 36:2 43:27 44:5 45:19 46:6 47:4 54:5 58:28 63:7,10,28 65:10,24 66:4 67:4, 8,21 69:12,16,18 evident 10:27 eviscerated 52:12 ex 81:27 exactly 12:5 30:23

examination 22:16 examine 23:22 exchange 43:13 61:11,16 exchanged 37:14 40:28 excluding 76:22 **excuse** 45:22 86:3 **excused** 47:20.25 48:6,7 82:26 83:12, 15,24 84:24 85:5,11, 26 86:1,17,24,27 87:23 88:6,13,19,27 89:8 90:9,21 92:8,17 executed 34:12 **exhibit** 11:5 16:20 19:4,8,10 20:11 21:2,6 22:3 24:21 28:13,14 34:8,27,28 36:7 37:15 38:2 40:23,25 41:6 42:14 46:11 55:1,6 57:6 59:1 72:8 81:7 82:3 **exhibits** 7:7,21 43:20 53:26 58:14 59:2 62:10 75:15 existing 40:7,20 41:3, 19 42:8 exists 30:3,4 **expect** 5:17,18 27:15 expectation 5:25 59:13,15 expectations 59:4 **expected** 7:5 55:7 72:3 73:21 76:27 expended 46:16 64:24 expenditures 46:18

expenses 46:13 49:24 **experience** 16:6,8,12 27:22,24 58:2 67:7 77:1 experienced 17:3 **expert** 53:12 expertise 58:2 explain 7:27 explained 39:23 40:11 42:10 explaining 72:11 explanation 66:2 71:18 expression 55:27 57:1 **extensive** 16:9 56:8 extensively 67:9 **extent** 23:18 extort 40:13,14 extorted 39:24 extra 54:24 91:18 **extras** 55:9 F face-to-face 18:23 19:5 20:24,26 facility 53:4 fact 30:23 33:8 34:1 36:6 37:23 41:3 44:4,10 46:15 57:21 65:2 69:5 70:7 89:28 factored 34:18

factual 11:26

fail 48:9

fair 12:28 45:7 58:21 60:17 79:11

failed 15:15 41:12

fairly 25:27 60:22

faith 12:28 45:7 48:20 71:28

fall 83:4 89:26

false 13:3 22:26 67:1, 11 68:4,6,13,14,27 69:5 70:5,13,17

falsehood 25:22

falsehoods 23:7

falsely 23:3,5 26:6 67:4.13.17

familiar 23:16

familiarity 23:10,20

far 72:2 76:9 80:6,7, 13 84:9

Farms 72:17

fast 36:12 52:11

favor 12:7 90:8

feared 66:20

feasibility 17:20,23 18:19,27

feasible 15:24 16:14

February 38:20 39:14 40:10,24 55:4 66:15

Federal 10:26 28:23

feel 36:18,22 60:28 76:17 91:10

fell 61:22

felt 73:23

fight 61:5

figure 69:17

file 8:19

filed 8:18,19 37:25 41:21 42:7 43:8 44:4 55:13 61:21

filing 59:5

filled 20:15 47:7

final 21:28 54:2 55:27 56:25 57:4 58:17 59:7 61:9 62:13 70:25 73:17 76:5

finalize 91:25

finalized 41:27

Finally 33:1

find 32:25 80:15 81:26

findings 6:25

fine 80:16

finish 5:13 44:17 52:6 93:3

firm 40:22

Firouzeh 41:24 42:28

first 4:14,26 5:2,7
8:22 12:16 13:9 14:6
16:18,22 17:9 18:17,
24 22:20 25:5 28:14
34:2 35:8,10,13,15,
20 40:24 43:5 45:4,
11 47:5 49:26 50:1,7
51:2,22 53:7 57:12
68:1 70:1,17 75:4
76:28 80:22 81:15,
22 82:8 84:18 85:3

Fitzgerald 76:26 77:19,24 79:16,18

five 83:16 86:13

five-year 52:28

focus 56:21

focusing 87:14

folks 17:22 51:1 55:14 74:7 76:5,13 78:21 80:3 81:26 87:5

follow 13:12 27:27 76:24

followed 18:15 19:16

following 15:9 19:5 26:12

follows 82:9

force 43:19 55:17,18

foreperson 74:26 82:14

forget 65:3

form 6:16,26 7:27 11:8 12:10,15,17,21, 23,25 13:1,6,10,13, 19,23 14:6,16,17,19, 28 15:17 29:20 30:22 33:6 39:2 45:10 46:28 49:25, 27 50:5 52:21 66:28 70:10 74:25,27 75:3, 4,6,9,13 82:11,15 83:23 84:3,18,22 85:3 90:13 92:4,15 93:1,2

formed 84:4

forms 11:1,19,27 12:14 13:27 45:28 60:25 66:26 74:23

forth 27:6,27 36:10 58:14 93:26

forthcoming 57:16 66:14

fortunately 26:7 29:27

forward 9:1 20:10 41:19 42:12 53:18 61:20 **found** 55:15

four 33:7 75:4 76:26 87:20

Fourth 36:2

frame 60:2

frankly 46:20 64:20

frauds 28:3 50:19

free 6:15 76:17

friends 53:23

friendship 53:20

front 44:12 59:16

Frye 76:26 77:25,27 78:1,14,17 79:19,20

full 53:16 57:1 90:16

fully 59:3 71:15

further 83:21

G

gained 71:6

gee 65:28

general 38:12

generally 28:8

gentlemen 10:19 27:18 29:27 51:20 62:6

geotechnical 43:22 45:1

Geraci 10:25 11:2 13:15,19 14:2,3,7 15:7,10,23 16:15,17, 21,24 17:2,5,16,18, 19 18:11,18,26 19:1, 2,6,11,16,24,28 20:17,21 21:8,10,15, 16,20,28 22:4,16 24:6,18,28 26:17,21,

Index: failed-Geraci

28 27:4,12 28:19 29:12,20 31:14 32:23 33:10,16 34:3, 5,6,27 35:3,5,8,14, 18,22 37:7,10 38:4 39:10,12,16,21,22, 24 40:11 41:13,16, 27 42:12,19 43:21 44:2 45:6,14,19 46:2,7,18 47:5,13 49:8 50:4 52:17,24 53:1,5,10,15,19 54:20 55:8,11,21,25 56:5 57:1,3,5,19 58:1,4,7,15,19 59:5, 27 60:9,13 61:2,13, 18,21,23 62:16,23 63:13,22 65:12 66:18,23 67:13,17, 23 69:19 71:5 72:1, 4,6,16,18,28 73:15, 28 84:19 86:11,16 88:5

Geraci's 12:21,26 17:22 18:24 21:1,13 22:7 26:2 30:22 33:24 40:3 45:9,23 52:3,13 54:5,17 55:23 66:28 86:26 87:22 88:5

get all 8:28

get-go 44:3

getting 40:1 59:9 70:7 74:1 84:10 91:2

Gina 16:3 40:5,22 57:7 66:11

give 4:24 10:7 12:13 19:26 24:16 31:26 39:22 53:15 54:24 55:18 57:4 59:14 61:4 63:13 74:2 76:15 77:14,19,23 80:18,23,24 83:19 86:20 89:3,25 91:26 93:17,18

given 10:14 11:22,23 33:28 62:22 72:23 77:15 81:16 84:4

gives 23:2 38:25 61:13

go 4:14 5:20,26 6:14, 15 7:6,11 8:22 10:4 12:9,19 13:6,11,23 14:10,19 15:4 17:7 19:2,8 21:12 29:12 31:11 36:11 38:25 39:4 41:19 43:2,3, 21,23 47:1,7,12,18, 28 48:5,24 49:1,4, 15,26 52:22 54:26 57:6 59:18,19 60:24 70:10 71:3,5,6 73:28 77:8 78:7,18 79:14, 16 80:21 84:6 88:15, 21 89:15 90:6 91:8

goes 34:11 52:4 57:14 73:27

going 9:9,20,22 10:4, 7,10 11:26 12:13,18, 20 15:3 18:21 19:25 20:1,8,18 21:12,21 24:22 31:1,13,14,17 32:28 33:18 36:12, 19,23 37:27 38:9 39:1 41:19 42:15 43:17 45:18,28 46:16,25 47:1,2 49:26 50:10,27 51:1, 2 52:28 53:6,18 54:16 55:19 58:13, 22 59:14 60:22 61:3, 4,6 63:8,24 66:27 67:18 68:2 69:10 72:8,27 73:9 75:8 76:11 77:5,7,12,14 78:23 81:11,24

82:20 92:11,16 93:3, 6

Gonzales 71:12

good 4:4,6,7,8 9:8 10:20 12:28 45:7 48:20 51:20 57:23 71:28 78:21 93:2

gotten 29:28 36:22 45:4 65:21 69:1 70:2 90:7,12,13

grant 44:13 91:16

greed 51:27 64:23,26, 27

Group 57:18 73:20

guaranteed 26:26 30:15 32:2 39:20 40:19 41:5 66:17

guess 62:21 65:15 70:3 78:21 81:13,27 85:2 91:13 93:2

guide 11:25

guy 35:28

guys 51:22

Н

half 13:19 14:11,14 24:9 27:16

hallway 6:13 77:13

hand 11:7 24:18 25:28 26:3 55:17

handle 17:4,6 93:20

happen 80:26

happened 37:3,6 41:20 65:11 66:25 79:6,8

happening 36:10 40:12 85:25

happens 20:9

happy 7:4 88:17

hard 80:26 82:9

harm 68:28 69:21 70:6,18

harmed 49:16,17 68:28 70:14

hate 93:23

head 93:11

hear 18:9 51:4 53:28 67:3,8 83:21 87:17 92:1

heard 10:13 11:14 13:7 15:23 17:9 24:8 38:11 41:23 43:10, 18,27 44:15,17 52:1, 9 55:21 57:9 59:8,20 60:26 62:22,27,28 63:1 71:10,20

hearing 9:17 39:6

heart 53:22

heavily 78:24

held 59:16

help 10:12

helps 23:15,20

hi 34:11

hidden 54:19,21 58:1 64:2,4 73:27

Highlight 13:17

highlighted 14:13

highly 39:1

hired 15:27,28 16:3 17:6

Hmm-mm 77:27

home 4:9

Hon 4:2

Index: Geraci's-Hon

honest 22:25 23:8 **Honor** 4:6,7,8,19 5:28 6:2 7:12 8:13 9:2 10:16 46:24 59:28 62:3 81:18,20 88:9 89:28 92:21,23 hope 15:19 77:26 hopefully 60:15 hour 51:8 75:17 78:1, 11,13,15,17,19 79:9 81:14 hours 44:6 56:18 78:16 **Hurtado** 57:10,14 66:12,13,22 Ī idea 56:26 77:22 identified 16:13 28:11 identifies 28:18 illegal 18:7 imagine 79:13 immediately 56:19 impeached 17:10 24:1 25:19 26:11 implied 12:28 45:7 46:4 48:20,23,28 49:5 85:17 important 14:22 22:20 25:14 26:5 27:2 28:28 38:10 45:9 76:15 91:12 importantly 22:23 27:25 46:6 impression 72:15

inaccurate 89:24 91:15,17 inactivity 71:26 inappropriate 91:15, inclined 87:4 include 8:17 27:1 40:17,18 44:10 included 19:7 26:3 29:14 30:25 56:24 58:17 includes 28:9,22 including 7:25 18:27 inclusive 56:8 incongruous 25:27 inconsistency 54:10 inconsistent 4:12 58:26 66:21 90:24 incredible 44:22 incurred 90:2 indicating 64:11 **induced** 72:18 inference 35:8 information 18:1 61:12 informed 20:17 inherently 64:21 initial 16:23 17:15,16, 25 18:19 19:5 initially 62:18 insignificant 71:23 insist 24:9 41:4 80:20 81:1 insisting 53:21 instruct 4:25

instructed 46:1 66:18 interference 45:25 47:25 48:7 49:11 instruction 13:16,18 66:3 70:19 14:11,14 22:13 28:2, 28 29:16,28 33:2 internally 90:23 45:8 46:5 48:13 interpret 82:21 54:18 interpreting 83:3 instructions 7:25 8:3, invalid 28:5 29:25 14,17,23 9:10,21,28 10:28 11:23,24,25, invalidity 50:18 28 13:12,26 14:1,21 invested 46:9 78:24 27:26 28:25 60:25 74:10,17,24 investment 40:6,9 66:21,24 intelligent 61:3 investor 57:9 intend 58:11 74:2 invite 8:2 23:1 intended 27:17 33:8. 13 35:3 42:12 55:26 involved 30:21 38:12 73:28 52:2 53:11 intention 40:19 involvement 30:26 54:24,25 56:10 31:4 72:8 58:18 72:25 involves 10:24 intentional 13:2 involving 10:25 12:25 22:24 67:1 27:23 82:3 intentions 51:26 irrespective 32:2,3 54:13,20,21 58:1 issue 17:6 87:16,21 64:3 73:28 issued 38:18,22,26 interest 19:20,26 39:6 69:11,13 25:14,16,21,25 26:20,23 30:15,27 issues 15:5 18:27 31:20 35:7,26 36:6, 38:9 51:25 71:21,23 20,23 37:8 40:18 41:5 J interested 15:23 16:24 17:17 72:14 jacket 57:8 interestingly 20:4 **January** 38:18,21 interfere 42:6 45:20, 55:3 21 48:20 65:8 Jim 17:6 71:7 interfered 45:15.16 **Joe** 57:10 66:12 49:8 65:23 69:23 Joel 4:2 70:3,7

John 42:4 joint 11:9 14:16,28 15:17 29:20,26,28 30:3,4 31:3 32:19, 22,23 33:2,6 50:5, 17,21,22 52:22 58:10 63:4 72:6,19, 25 judge 11:18,28 22:13 judgment 6:17,25 **July** 4:1 16:14,18,22 53:19 55:2 58:24 jump 29:15 51:24 52:12 jumps 52:7 juror 74:26 77:24,27 78:1,9,17 79:18,20, 22 jurors 5:17,20,23 6:11,14 7:6 8:9,28 51:14 74:13 76:25 **JURORY** 78:11,13 79:24,28 jury 4:24 5:12,14,23 6:4,5,7,20,28 7:1,18, 20,24 8:14,18,21 9:28 10:20,27 11:23, 25 13:16,18,26 14:1, 14,20 22:13 23:2 27:26 28:1,25 45:8 46:5 48:13 51:7,21, 22 54:18 60:25 74:11,17,24 77:5,9, 11,17 78:5 79:3 80:20 81:1,23 82:8 91:26 92:26 93:10 justice 12:5 K

keep 22:9 56:5,18

61:23 88:6 keeping 10:9 kept 41:17 72:28 kind 15:21 31:25 41:9 43:28 63:3 71:19 80:25 84:12 knew 17:27 18:6,17 38:5,7,11 39:1 53:10 68:18,20 72:27 know 10:22 21:6 22:22 37:24 56:14 59:11 60:27 68:17 69:6 77:20 78:25 79:8,26 83:2,23 91:12 93:19 knowing 73:24 knowledge 30:6,10 52:18 known 39:15 42:23 knows 68:23 **Koll** 80:11 L labeled 28:3 34:6 ladies 10:19 27:18 29:27 51:20 62:6 laid 73:19 language 34:15,17 52:23 91:1 **Larry** 10:24 14:7 34:11 50:4 late 4:13,26 93:5,14

law 10:14 11:24 27:27

29:16 52:18 57:18

59:16 63:17 72:12

73:20

lawsuit 41:21 42:6 literally 26:1 36:12 43:7 44:4 55:13 59:5 43:19 67:24 61:22,23 litigation 57:9 **lawyers** 10:11 76:13 little 4:22 13:9 20:8 lays 55:6 59:3 61:14 48:24 54:10 87:12 89:17 leave 5:19 55:28 80:2 lives 5:21 led 52:17,24 60:18 lobbyists 52:19 left 5:13 7:3 23:28 51:7.9 62:20 76:25 location 38:16 80:4 logic 13:25 14:10 legal 11:20 logical 73:3 87:9 length 11:9 24:5,12 logically 83:17 27:21 75:4,6 long 24:21,22 25:2 lengthy 56:20 41:1 54:6 59:14 72:4 let's 13:14 15:8 23:22 75:19,27 76:18 47:1 65:2 77:18 83:4 77:22 79:9 93:16 84:14 86:14 longer 79:1 93:1,23 liabilities 73:19 look 9:24 23:1 28:13, liability 59:17 14,17 38:1 41:6 51:26 54:13,28 55:5 life 73:11 56:10,11 57:21 light 74:16 58:14 59:23 61:12 63:6 64:5 73:2 84:27 lightheartedly 35:27 89:16 lights 9:27 10:2 74:21 **looked** 55:16 limit 59:17 60:1 looking 16:25 20:7 limitations 10:8 55:19 limited 87:22 looks 92:28 line 24:20,21,22 25:5 lose 40:6 45:21 49:13 44:17 52:6 76:28 lines 35:20 55:14 loser 59:23 list 12:18 losing 59:25 66:20 listed 28:25 71:12 losses 30:7,12 31:28 listening 10:21 62:7 32:3,4,9 lists 28:20 lost 77:1 literal 48:3 **lot** 43:27 44:7 59:8 71:13 73:8 76:14

M

78:20 lots 44:1 46:9 lunch 82:6 **Madam** 8:8,26 9:11, 26 10:1,3 74:8,15, 18,20 76:2 **Maggie** 51:11 main 16:1 91:11 making 87:8 92:28 manage 53:5 managed 53:13 manager 53:6 manner 28:9 maps 44:1 59:5

March 36:8 37:26 38:20 40:25 41:7,16, 20,22 42:3,14,18,25 43:5 55:2,4 57:17

marijuana 15:26 16:7,27 18:1,7 51:28 53:4 72:10,13 73:10

Martin 42:4

Matt 53:7

matter 9:17 28:20

matters 37:19 56:2

Mcknight 76:27 78:7, 9 79:21,22

mean 73:25 89:16 91:11

meaning 88:3

means 69:6 83:3 93:15

meant 9:3 42:16

medical 15:25 16:27 17:28 18:7 53:1 72:14

meet 54:22 77:12

meeting 9:15 17:9 18:28 19:6 20:24,28 21:15 22:10 23:24, 25,26 24:4,6,12,15, 25 25:1,2,16,18,22, 26 26:7,17,21,25,28 27:11 33:23 34:10, 12 35:11 43:11.16 54:15 56:22 60:8 62:17 64:13,15 66:11

meetings 20:27

member 7:24

members 77:11

memorandum 19:9 59:1

memory 22:21 75:11

mention 25:13 32:21. 23 55:11

mentioned 4:26 11:28 36:27 66:11 74:22

mentions 19:23

merely 23:13,21 24:17 30:12 32:1 36:27 48:28

messages 16:19,21 38:1 39:11 55:1 57:5,22 58:28 72:7 73:2

met 4:26 12:8 17:12 18:10,23 73:7

millions 52:1 73:11

mind 22:9 41:18 56:5, 18 61:23 77:18

mindful 84:27

minds 54:15 60:8

mine 78:21 89:22,27 93:2

minimize 23:10,19 24:12

minimum 26:25 30:15 39:19 52:27 59:25 60:5 66:17

minor 54:9 58:25

minority 41:9

minute 30:4 85:20

minutes 21:16 22:2 23:24 24:6,8,25 25:3 46:24 51:3,5,9,10 54:7 77:8,24 78:9 79:1 81:12

mirror 13:27 14:20

mischaracterize 29:23

mislead 26:6

misremembering 22:25 23:8

misrepresentation

13:2,3 67:1,2 68:3,4 70:17

missed 4:15

missing 34:17

misstatement 26:10

mistake 35:15

mistakes 22:25 23:8

MMCC 16:26

modified 87:11 92:11

modify 92:11

moment 4:25 83:19 85:15 88:22 89:7

moments 4:28 9:10

money 22:2 23:28 24:14,24 44:7 46:9 49:17 52:25 54:22 62:20 64:23 76:14

monitor 21:18

month 26:26 27:8 30:18 32:2 39:22 52:27 53:9 59:25 60:6 72:20

monthly 40:19 41:5

months 17:12 22:12, 21 24:2 25:20 33:26 37:9,11 39:18 44:25 52:8 53:8 57:4,19 73:1

morning 4:4,6,7,8 5:2,8 9:8,16 10:20 28:2 35:23 50:7 51:2,20 75:22 77:21 81:22,27 93:19,22

motivated 79:13

move 5:1,6 9:1,9 20:10 42:12 45:27 48:23 61:20

moved 35:28

moves 40:21

moving 20:22 43:26

multiple 12:17

Municipal 38:23 39:3,

mutual 54:14

Ν

name 60:13,15

named 53:7 57:10

names 57:12

near 13:4

nearby 43:13

nearly 9:18 22:12

necessary 21:24 29:2,6 63:18 85:11 91:18 93:24

need 8:2 12:22 48:24 58:20 60:24 66:9 75:16 77:16 78:4,22 79:6 84:23 93:22

needed 17:20 18:4,16 38:15 40:7 43:17 83:24,26,27,28 86:9, 11

needs 20:13

negligent 13:3 67:2 68:4

neighboring 44:14

never 18:14 19:14 26:17,21,27 27:10 33:7,13,15 35:25 37:3 41:1,10,15,26 55:7 57:19 59:24 63:2 65:16,17 67:16 68:15 73:5 76:27

new 40:8,23 41:2,14 53:21 72:12

night 34:9,28

nine 75:6

nonrefundable 26:16 29:11

nonsense 27:19

noon 5:11,12 74:14 75:17 81:12,14

normally 4:21

notary 21:5,7 24:24

note 34:19 75:9 82:8

notebooks 76:23 80:2 82:3

notice 25:12 26:3 54:18 71:25

noticed 19:18 34:14

notify 81:4

notion 18:16 29:26

November 11:3 13:21 14:4,8,25 15:12 20:28 21:2,6 22:28 23:10,12 25:16,22, 26 26:13,21 27:12, 15 30:19 33:23 34:20 35:24 37:4,6, 10,22 38:3 39:18,19 47:6 48:14,16 54:4 55:3,12,20,26 58:7 59:7,15 61:17 62:17 63:4,14 64:1,7 66:8 67:14 72:3,22 73:7

number 16:9 22:10 37:16 45:12 50:13 77:15 80:19 84:11

0

o'clock 9:16 21:5 75:23

o0o 4:3

objection 59:28 92:20

obligated 86:10,24 88:14,15,20

obligation 6:8 29:12 31:24 32:15 48:20 85:6 86:26 87:22 88:5 90:19 91:3

obligations 85:4

obtain 15:25 16:26 18:13 29:13 45:17 47:24,26 82:25 87:3, 22 88:6

obtained 43:19 48:2 65:14 70:1 82:23 83:26,27 86:11,17

obtaining 16:6 29:7 67:7 69:23

obvious 6:23 15:20 23:9 25:27 33:1

obviously 12:3

occasionally 80:27

occasions 33:7

occur 48:2 83:6,12 84:17 85:9,25 86:8

occurred 16:18 39:23,25 65:16 86:9, 23

occurrence 86:25

October 20:10 55:3

offer 64:24

offered 35:21 59:21 65:10 66:3

offering 66:2

office 18:25 20:12 21:1,19,22 24:20 26:2 34:13 54:5,8,9 55:22 80:14

official 74:27

oftentimes 6:10

oh 55:23 57:13 58:21 80:10

okay 4:20 31:13 78:3, 14 79:19 80:4,16 81:19 85:5 86:13,15

89:7 92:6,10 93:8

once 5:12 6:5 9:24 26:26 39:2 42:6,7 75:16,18 78:22 79:12

ones 12:26 27:7

open-minded 89:21

opened 19:22 26:27

opening 5:1,4,6 10:5, 11 27:14 51:4,27

operate 16:26 18:5 31:14

operated 18:8

operating 30:27 31:21

operation 20:6 30:26 31:4,9,26

operations 53:4,12

operative 83:11

opportunities 32:12,

opportunity 6:11 57:3,28 80:22

opposed 22:24 68:9

opposing 54:9 73:6

opposite 30:24 36:7

oral 11:8 14:15,27 15:16,17 27:3,5 29:20,21,23,24 30:9, 21,24 31:23,27 32:19 33:4,6,9,17 37:5 50:5 58:9,20 62:22 63:4,10,23 64:18 65:6 67:15,22 69:8 73:22

orally 27:9 30:13 32:7 50:9

Index: named-orally

plaintiff's 4:14,28

order 43:19 88:28 89:9,12 90:2 92:9,18 orders 43:18 44:21 ordinance 18:3 38:18,24 organized 7:8 original 90:16 out-of-pocket 49:23 outlay 54:21 outlet 73:10 outset 13:24 17:12 outside 77:13 overall 58:27 overhead 9:23 overseeing 71:2 overwhelming 44:5 overwhelmingly 69:18 owes 46:23 owners 27:23 ownership 20:12 owning 74:2 Ρ

p.m. 21:5,8,9 35:10 82:6 94:2 page 12:16 27:16 38:2,25 47:7 pages 12:17 55:1 75:4,6 paid 46:13 53:9 paragraph 25:7 36:13 part 31:24 35:16,26 46:28 49:26 55:7

77:5,17 78:5,15,24 79:3,10 86:25 87:19 parte 81:27 particular 27:20 29:5, 8 38:15 49:12 55:24 56:11 particularly 25:2 particulars 28:12 29:2,10 parties 11:10,21 15:12,16 18:23 28:6, 9,19 29:3,9,18 30:13 33:8 36:25 38:11 50:13 54:14,15 56:11 64:1,11 65:5 76:13 partner 19:27 20:4 partnership 52:22 party 12:2,7 14:25 51:26 54:20 58:21 60:9 61:2 83:13

party's 12:18

passed 37:11 38:19,
 26 39:2 44:9,28 60:4
 72:12

patience 10:21

patient 51:23

pay 23:17,19 36:5

payment 28:9,21
 30:13

payments 26:26
 30:16 39:20 40:19
 41:5 56:2 66:17

pays 46:22

PDF 22:4 34:5,6

people 16:4 18:21

39:21 76:18 82:1

percent 36:17 perform 83:14 84:25 85:12,24 86:2,4,24 88:14,15,20 90:19 91:5 performance 45:23 48:1 83:6,18,25 84:12,17 86:8 87:27 89:1,10,13 90:2,4 92:9,18 **performed** 83:15,24 84:24 period 37:15 52:27 59:26 71:26 permit 15:25 16:26 18:5,14,17 permits 16:6 permitting 5:9 person 16:1 23:4 61:3 personal 10:25 persons 16:5 17:3 30:5 **phone** 35:19,21 39:16 58:22 78:22 80:27 93:27 **phones** 76:7,12,19 **pick** 76:22 piece 52:25 pieces 31:1 place 20:3 57:11 70:1,17 **plaintiff** 10:4 14:7 47:20 82:13,16,25,

26 84:1 85:5 86:4

87:3,17 88:28 89:9,

12 90:1,8 92:8,12,

18,20

5:3,26 8:22 10:10 62:1 82:15,20 83:18, 25 84:21 85:4 87:1 88:21 89:23 90:19 91:25 plaintiff/crossdefendant 10:18 62:5 planning 38:13 39:5 44:12 players 52:2 pleasant 51:23 **please** 9:11,27 10:15 11:12 13:17 19:4 21:3 36:14 51:16 57:12 74:16 75:9 76:19,22,24 80:1 pleasure 56:21 **plus** 30:14,15,16 point 7:28 14:22 17:21 37:24 43:1 54:11 66:15 75:28 76:6,21 91:11 pointing 41:17 police 42:15 poll 6:6 75:1 pop 93:11 position 34:15 63:2 possession 76:8 possibility 15:19 possible 7:9 61:21 75:15 77:4 79:7 **possibly** 9:13 54:11 78:16 potential 17:26 32:12,13 39:7 40:23 68:3

Index: order-potential

potentially 16:14 39:27 52:1 73:10 practice 7:28 Pre-instruction 23:1 pre-instructions 7:26 precedent 52:13 precisely 51:8 prefer 89:22,27 prepare 6:17,24 66:19 **prepared** 23:23 24:13 38:22 preposterously 33:28 present 8:18 74:28 78:3 79:13 80:21 81:1,3 presented 8:20 11:10 15:2 16:11 47:4 65:24 69:12,16,19 presiding 74:26 pressure 93:10 presumably 22:20 52:27 60:3 presumption 87:7,8 pretending 56:28 57:1 **pretty** 4:21 6:23 89:16 prevailed 6:16,24 prevent 57:25 preventing 61:25 preview 12:13 previously 7:23 16:10 18:6 27:8 63:25

price 17:1,17 19:25 28:20 34:13,22 pride 89:20 primarily 43:11 principals 16:7 53:11 prior 25:17 27:10 proactive 79:5 proactively 79:15 probably 71:23 **problem** 17:5 20:19 35:1,5,12 39:15 58:16 78:4 problems 17:26 proceed 9:12 proceedings 76:6 94:2 process 5:27 17:4 39:5 40:21 42:6,20 43:4,27 44:26,28 45:1,16,20 48:8 49:12 65:22,24 70:4 79:17 **product** 32:16,17 **products** 32:13,14 profits 30:7,12 31:28 32:3,9 progress 92:28 **prohibited** 48:18,19 project 15:28 17:21 71:16 projector 8:2 9:11 10:3 74:9,19 **promise** 13:3 67:1 68:4 promised 74:3

pronouncing 77:26 proof 12:2,8,11 69:28 properties 43:13 property 10:26 14:27 15:13,24 16:13,14, 16,25,28 17:23 18:8, 22 19:2 23:15 28:5, 10,15,23,27 29:25 30:5,10,14 34:14,18, 22,23,25 39:27 41:28 42:3,11,15,19 43:9,20,22,23 44:14, 22 50:20 52:16.26 55:18 58:8 59:20,24 61:4,6,25,26 63:19 64:25,28 69:10 71:13 73:9 74:2 84:1,11 85:7,8 86:11 87:28 proposal 19:1 89:21, 23 91:15,22,25,28 propose 89:26 91:18 proposed 19:12,14, 15 20:1 38:22 39:3 53:6 83:22 86:21 88:11 92:12 **Proposition** 72:12 prove 12:2,3 13:19,28 14:3,12,15 45:11,14 65:12 proved 13:27 15:11 proven 47:9 proves 46:2 **provide** 8:17 18:28 19:19 35:6 42:11 92:24 **provided** 27:27 30:1 43:20 82:10 provides 29:16 40:21

provision 19:19 26:1 32:8 **provisions** 27:12,13 **pull** 60:10 purchase 14:26 15:13 16:25 19:1,25 23:14 27:17,20,22 28:4,8,26 29:17 32:16 34:13,20 37:13 40:24 50:20 64:12 purchasing 15:24 purported 53:12 purpose 44:1 purposes 15:5 42:19 pursue 44:11 46:21 72:16,26 74:1 pursued 44:3 46:8 71:15 pursuing 46:13 **pushed** 52:11 **put** 12:14 13:5,16,24 18:1 19:4 20:11 21:2 26:17 27:9 30:28 33:14 34:9,27 36:24 37:27 39:2,6 40:16 46:12 66:26 67:15, 18 76:14 putting 44:22 61:5 93:10 Q qualifications 16:9, 12 52:18 **qualified** 17:3 18:12 67:7 question 13:11 14:6,

18 22:27 31:8,17

promises 73:15

45:13 47:5,11,12,18, 19,20,27,28 48:5 49:2,6,19,20 50:24, 25 68:8,24 80:6,23 82:9,11,23 83:4,7,8, 9,10,11,17 84:2,16, 28 85:4,10,18,27 86:6,22 87:5,13 88:12,18,26 89:6 90:3,6,17,18 91:7 92:7,14

questioned 26:13

questioning 25:5 31:12

questions 5:27
11:19,26 12:9,12,18,
19,22 47:2 48:26,27
49:4 68:1,10,12,25
70:9,11,15 75:2,5,7,
10 79:17,19,21,23
80:20,27 81:2,17
83:22 84:3 85:6

quick 37:23 61:21

quickly 7:9 20:22 38:10 43:26 45:27 71:24 75:15

quite 9:9 36:6 46:20 64:20

R

range 71:22

reach 77:16 80:19

reading 8:3,23 9:3

reads 82:9 83:5,11

ready 8:5,6,7 10:15 51:16 61:24

real 27:19,21,23 28:4, 8,15,27 29:17,25 52:19 54:27 56:6,7 64:12 66:10 73:7 84:14

reality 42:24 54:13 60:16

realize 20:22 36:11 43:26

realized 60:21

really 14:23 15:21 16:1 24:9 45:10,13 49:1 50:19 58:5 59:23 62:7,27 71:23, 27

reason 13:24 50:14, 15 52:5 53:14,15 57:27 58:3,21 59:10 71:3 73:18 89:27

reasonable 12:4 56:12 60:9 68:11,27 70:13,16 87:9

reasonably 27:17 68:14 79:7

reasoning 71:11

reasons 49:10 50:6

Rebecca 20:16,17 56:6

rebuttal 5:10 49:28 50:28 51:9 62:1,4 70:26

recall 9:20 10:11 17:7 20:25,27 25:16 27:3 78:15 recalled 20:26 24:9

recalls 39:16

receipt 23:13,21 24:17 36:27 56:13, 26

receive 11:1 30:14 57:18 71:25

received 23:13 35:19 73:20

receiver 71:2

receives 33:24 39:16 56:19

receiving 32:1 41:4 49:9 56:15

recess 51:3,5,10,12 74:14 81:14 82:5,6

recitation 36:9

recite 88:16

recommendation 62:15

recommendations

53:27 54:1 62:12 63:26 64:19

record 8:16,20 9:7 51:6 82:4

recording 9:5

recover 46:2,3 65:17

red 57:8

reduce 69:3 92:25

reduced 73:17,24

refer 11:24 75:12 82:12

reference 89:28

referred 64:5 86:22 87:2,13 88:12,18,26 89:5 92:6,14 referring 82:22 86:3

refers 34:20,22 58:19 82:19 86:23 87:14 88:7,13,19,26 89:6 92:7,15

reflected 6:25

refundable 29:4

refusal 44:21

refusing 42:18 43:8

regarding 11:24 18:26 22:10 37:12, 17

regular 5:23

relate 11:20

relates 11:10 12:21 15:2

reliance 46:3,5,7,20 49:18 68:11,17,27 69:14,22,25 70:16, 17 72:18

relied 67:5,19 68:6 70:12,13 73:15

relief 4:20 8:12

rely 40:3 53:14 56:13 58:1,3 67:14 68:5, 13,14 70:14

relying 68:17,22 69:2 75:11

remain 6:9 77:6

remainder 49:27 72:21

remember 41:7 42:9 50:8 65:22 66:15

remind 6:10

reminded 11:12

reminding 12:10

renegotiate 40:8,15 41:14 42:8 66:19,24 renegotiation 41:3,11 66:25 replace 5:22 **Reporter** 8:13,27 9:2 53:28 reporting 8:14 9:3,6, 28 74:17 reports 43:13 representation 67:10,11,22,25 68:6, 13,14,18 69:4,22 70:6 representations 68:12,28 represented 67:4,18 request 58:16 requested 36:17 73:16 require 31:27 91:4 required 12:2 28:24, 26 47:14,22,24 48:1, 10 83:6,12,25 84:1, 17,24 85:7,10,11,12, 22,23 86:2,7,13 87:2 89:1,10,14 90:20 92:9,19 93:21 requirement 27:19 requirements 43:14 requires 33:3 90:10 reserve 46:25 resolve 38:11 resolved 39:15 71:24 respect 12:11 13:20 14:2 16:2

respond 19:11 36:14,

16 responded 34:28 35:11,15,27 42:10 responding 35:12 responds 34:9 response 35:5 36:14, 18 56:20 58:13 89:25 91:19 responsibilities 54:22 responsible 29:7 56:1 74:27 83:14 responsive 10:6 rest 5:21 66:27 restate 87:19 result 29:23 65:26 resulted 79:15 **resume** 81:15 retail 31:6 53:4 retainer 53:16 retake 7:1 return 33:21 50:28 51:3 75:20,22 81:23 93:4 returned 7:2 81:23 returns 5:23 6:20 revenue 20:7 31:17 32:1 review 15:8 43:3,4 46:19 reviewed 4:12 19:18 Richard 42:3 **right** 4:4,9,18 6:3 8:11,26 9:5 10:1 31:8 39:25 41:27 45:17 48:24 49:1

51:1,7,13 52:7 55:18 60:23 61:28 62:1 74:6.22 76:25 77:25 78:26 79:28 80:26 81:21 82:4,7,28 85:2 86:20,28 88:1,10 89:2,5 91:8,23,27 92:24 **rights** 41:9 73:18 room 80:28 81:26 92:26 93:11 row 9:26 74:16 running 31:25 S sale 10:25 14:26 15:13 19:1 27:18 28:4 30:13 34:13,22, 25 36:15 37:13 50:20 65:1 69:9 sample 71:3 San 4:1 satisfied 7:16 66:1 81:7 83:28 85:23 92:8,17 82:26 66:24

satisfied 7:16 66:1
81:7 83:28 85:23
88:28 89:9,11 90:1
92:8,17

satisfy 43:14 65:18
82:26

save 40:8 49:27
66:24

saw 18:20,21 19:6
22:3 41:25 46:11
53:22

saying 59:12 65:7
87:17

says 11:13 14:25,27
24:13 25:7 26:14,19,
24 28:12 30:16 32:7
33:11,12 34:11 36:3,

12,14 42:14 47:20 48:16,28 49:2 54:6, 19 55:8 56:23 57:15, 19 58:15 63:21,27 69:2,28 70:2 73:6 scale 12:5

Schweitzer 15:28 42:27 43:10,11 44:6, 9 45:2 52:10 71:9,20

Schweitzer's 71:11

screen 13:5 54:12 60:12

se 80:17

second 5:7,10 14:11 25:7 36:11,13 45:9 61:24 75:6

secretary 56:6

section 56:22

see 9:22 13:10,25 14:2,12,13,20 28:1 33:26 35:9 39:11 45:10 48:12 52:4,23 54:25,28 55:2,6 57:6 58:15 71:3 89:23 93:11

seeing 91:16

seen 7:18 11:4 21:7 37:16

sell 17:1 25:8 28:15, 26 29:24 32:14 34:18,23 42:2 48:15 58:8 60:21 61:24 63:18 64:25 84:1 86:10 87:28

selling 17:17 32:13 84:10

sense 52:10 55:28 62:26 63:20 64:10 67:24 73:17 84:12 sent 27:7 35:14 38:3 41:16,26 61:8 62:15 **sentence** 21:20,23,25 35:10,13,16 36:13 sentences 24:23 separate 15:6 separately 15:6 September 18:24 19:5 20:28 27:7 30:17 32:6,24 33:12 37:2 50:10 55:3 61:12 62:9,10,25 serious 57:26 seriously 22:26 service 77:9 services 19:8 59:2 set 4:28 7:25 11:22 20:23 27:6,27 40:26 73:9 74:23 **sets** 56:12 **sham** 59:11 **shape** 90:13 **share** 30:7,11 31:28 60:17 **shared** 61:13 sharing 32:9 **sheet** 38:14 **shift** 59:9 **shoots** 56:20 **short** 23:27 24:15,26, 28 27:16,24 37:28 41:1 62:19 63:21 64:15 80:15 shorten 86:21

shorter 89:17

shortly 41:26

show 5:17 15:10,14, 15 23:9,26 30:1 31:1 35:21 44:2 45:28 46:27 66:27 69:1 showed 36:7 37:26 44:20 **shown** 11:5 46:23 **shows** 21:8 36:2 sic 8:23 24:19 **side** 6:16,23,24 40:26 72:15 73:22 88:21 91:14 sides 52:15 75:1 **sigh** 8:12 sign 20:1 61:6 signature 64:9 signed 19:15 20:10, 16 21:5,8,28 22:3 23:11,14,27 24:14, 24 25:10 27:10 28:5 29:18 30:19 33:14 34:3 36:25,28 40:2, 27 48:13,15 50:12 62:20 63:16,22,26, 28 64:1,11 67:17,26 68:19,21 69:6,7 72:24 82:14 significant 47:21,23 90:10 significantly 45:3 signing 24:27 56:13, 16 signs 20:12 21:3 similar 68:3 89:16 simply 22:25 32:21 61:18 **single** 30:6,11,22

32:5 72:27 87:24

sit 5:8 7:6 site-specific 43:17 sitting 24:20 situation 68:23 six 22:2 33:26 44:25 46:24 52:8 53:8 skill 30:5,10 56:11 slightly 12:6 slip 7:17 **slowly** 84:15 89:4 **smoke** 54:11 60:12 **sneak** 12:13 soils 42:21,23 43:12, 24 45:21 49:12 71:3 sold 28:10 somebody 23:3 24:26 42:3 48:15 somewhat 33:28 52:21 soon 6:7,14 8:28 61:21 79:7 sophisticated 61:2 sorry 51:11 53:28 74:23 78:12 sort 13:25 20:23 33:21 **special** 10:28 11:18, 27 12:10,14,16,25 13:1,5,23,27 14:17, 19 28:2 46:27,28 49:25.27 53:20 82:11 92:4,15 **specific** 11:19 63:16 87:5,10 specifically 25:8 48:16 58:15 61:14

specifics 20:27 **specify** 29:3 73:21 specifying 53:24 speculate 71:28 **spell** 29:7 spells 64:4 spent 44:6,7 46:9,21 49:17 76:14 split 6:18 59:21 **spoke** 19:17 **staff** 44:6 **stake** 36:16 52:26 56:24 58:17 61:10 72:20 **stand** 8:1,8 17:14 32:10 36:21 42:17 standard 12:1 standing 21:21 78:6 **start** 10:10 13:14 47:1 60:5 77:18 82:16 started 42:5 58:24 60:5 starting 81:22 **starts** 81:28 stated 13:28 28:12 29:1 44:26 **statement** 20:12 25:9 44:22 58:20 84:28 statements 22:26 58:26 **states** 34:21 stating 26:6 **status** 18:27 37:18 39:10 statute 28:3 50:19

Index: sent-statute

stead 57:14 stick 93:6,21 stipulate 91:21 stipulation 89:25 **stop** 75:17,18,19,21 90:22 stories 22:24 23:7 **story** 22:17 24:11 47:17 straight 60:7 strain 83:20 stream 20:7 31:18 32:1 **street** 80:9 stretch 4:10 **string** 54:26 stringing 57:24 **strung** 60:18 **study** 45:1 stuff 69:3 82:3 **submit** 15:9 21:12 22:23 65:20 submitted 20:13 38:7,8,14 53:26 63:25 substantial 16:5 substantially 47:21 90:9,19 substitute 5:22 successful 38:17 53:13 **sudden** 39:26 **sued** 18:6 61:25 suggest 25:26 47:2

60:25

suggested 19:13 42:22 suggestion 57:10 suggestions 61:15 superior 52:18 **support** 15:9 35:8 supporting 46:19 suppose 67:12 supposed 73:13 supposedly 62:16,21 **sure** 4:11 7:13,15,16 31:13 34:16 42:9 62:7 64:25 68:9 79:6 80:18 88:24 surprise 68:20 surprised 4:22 surprising 37:20 surprisingly 44:19 **survey** 18:20 suspicion 78:23 suspicious 71:13 sustained 12:6 60:1 swear 76:2 **sweet** 23:27 24:15,26 62:19 63:21 64:15 **sworn** 76:4 Т table 81:25 take 5:2,5,7 6:6 49:7 51:2 54:19 56:27

59:13 68:7 75:19,26

77:22 79:1 81:6

89:19 93:14

takes 4:27,28 49:3 90:16 talk 6:4,12,28 20:8 31:2 55:25 77:10 82:2 talked 16:7,8 17:26 39:21 50:1 64:22 67:9 talking 14:24 19:21 31:3 48:14 50:8 54:8 64:2 65:2 82:23 84:9,13 87:24 talks 12:23 14:12 47:28 64:6 82:23 90:8 tax 52:18 team 15:27 17:3,19 44:2 46:8 52:3,19,21 58:2 60:14 67:6 69:19 71:7 team's 16:12 tears 53:22 telephone 16:23 19:17 20:3 35:24 37:7,10 39:19 77:15 tell 5:22 13:26 29:21 32:11 77:3 93:18 telling 18:9 33:10 37:14 65:14 78:28 tells 22:14 28:3,7,14, 28 32:21 33:2 34:10 45:8 57:6 tenant 18:11,12,14 tenants 18:7 tens 73:10 term 58:23 terminated 41:22

taken 71:21 83:22

Geraci vs. Cotton, et al. 48:11 60:20 terms 27:4,5 28:6,7, 11,18,24 29:1,13 33:11 37:1,12,19 41:14 49:11 53:21, 25 55:20 56:17,23 61:5,8,19 62:24 63:11,16,18,25 64:4, 12 66:3,8,9,10 69:8, 9 72:5 73:6,21 91:2, testified 17:11 19:16, 24 20:5,15,19,26 21:23 22:9,11 23:3, 5,22 24:6,18,19 25:4,12,20 26:8 27:22 30:23 35:8,12, 23 36:20,26 38:28 39:1 40:5,10 43:1 44:6,10,19 45:2 46:17,18 53:2,19 64:14 66:13,22 71:1 testify 25:6 30:20 38:12 43:11 53:3 55:21 59:20 testimony 10:22 11:14 16:11 17:10 20:8 21:13 22:14,15, 17,27,28 23:22,27 24:2,8 25:20,24 26:12 27:8 31:2 33:7,19 38:6 40:4 41:7 44:17,23 45:1,5 50:16 52:2,9 57:9 59:8 60:26 62:28 63:1.12 67:22 68:15 71:10 testing 42:22,23 43:17,24 45:21 49:12 text 16:19,20 19:13 32:26 38:1,3 39:11 55:1 57:5,22 58:28

Transcript of Proceedings

72:7 73:2 texts 37:11,14,16 40:28 thank 8:26 9:27 10:16,21,23 34:10, 11 35:11 50:28 51:21 61:27,28 62:3 70:22,23 74:4,5 78:27 80:2 82:5 thanks 51:21 theory 66:5 69:25 thing 7:16 27:28 47:23 55:16 78:27 81:15,22 91:13 things 17:24 20:13 23:5 27:9 30:16 41:8,9,10 42:5 47:13,22 53:17 58:20,27 63:8,9,15 70:14 72:11 78:25 79:14 82:3 90:10,20 think 7:7,23 13:6 15:10,14 20:25 29:18 33:28 36:26 37:25 42:22 43:11 45:3 48:21 60:26 62:12,27 66:13 70:15 81:16 82:21, 27 83:3 85:14,19 86:3 87:15,17,27 90:28 91:11,28 92:1, 3 93:13 **thinking** 70:12 78:18 79:25 third 15:19 35:22 third-party 71:2 thought 23:12 24:17 26:8 34:3 40:13

44:24 52:28 53:19

56:8 59:14 79:26

91:14

three 17:12 37:9,11 38:25 39:18 53:11 58:23.24 three-sentence 56:9 58:6,12 61:7 73:12 throw 87:12 Thursday 9:16 time 5:9,24 6:3,21 7:2,19 9:18 10:8 13:11 18:17,24 4,18 37:27 43:2,5 51:14 53:18 54:7 55:5 56:4,5 57:24 59:14,26 60:1,3 73:26 75:22 76:14, timeline 20:23 times 26:11 75:24 76:1 timing 56:2 58:26 tiny 54:10 tipped 12:7 Tirandazi 41:24 42:28 52:9 today 7:3 22:22 78:1 93:4 told 7:23 11:18 16:24 17:2,5,13,16,18,19 21:10,15,16,28 35:25 37:7,24 39:4,

21:20 24:10 25:9,12 26:8 28:9 35:4 36:2, 66:16,18 70:23 72:4 21 81:8,9 91:28 92:2 34:10,12 56:22 58:5 18:12 19:2,17,24,28 21,22,24 40:5,12,16 49:11 51:26 58:22, 23 66:14,22 67:6,13 tomorrow 7:3 75:22 78:2,18 81:22,27

19 93:19,22 ton 76:14 twice 34:24 **TOOTHACRE** 4:7 two 10:7 11:2,8,18 84:20 12:27 17:12 19:7 24:19 27:6.9 30:4 top 13:18 35:20 43:18 51:25 topographical 18:20 52:5 55:12 59:4 67:16 71:16 78:2.16 tort 46:25 68:1 84:3 85:6 89:23 town 78:15 typed 21:16,24 track 10:9 83:17 typing 21:21 55:22 tracked 91:28 tracking 44:27 U transaction 32:27 34:24 ultimate 78:24 79:4 treat 60:22 ultimately 43:16 80:24 trial 22:12,15,18,22 25:25 26:5,9 35:3 **un-** 49:7 38:2 59:13 62:18 unable 42:7 81:22,28 unclear 54:6 64:7 tricky 48:25 uncontradicted tried 50:17 61:24 44:17,18 46:6,14 64:15,16 uncontroverted triggered 34:7 44:24 45:5 trouble 87:6 uncontrovertible true 12:1 15:11.15.16 30:8 25:9 58:23 67:9,10 understand 12:20 89:21 13:11 14:23 36:3,4 truly 72:1 76:28 56:12 64:20 71:10, 17 78:14,20 89:18 try 33:18 41:24 50:18 91:24 92:12 55:17 59:9,22 73:21 82:20 88:23 understanding 19:9 31:18 58:27 59:1 trying 20:23 33:5 72:22 35:28 46:9,21 47:26 52:3 57:24 59:10 understood 35:4 60:10 65:8 66:23 90:15 67:2 90:14 93:26 undertaking 30:6,11 turn 9:11 10:2,3 15:8 undisputed 19:11,14 74:8,16,20 76:12,18,

21:4 34:26 undivided 76:16 unequivocal 33:15 unfair 45:25 unfairly 45:15,16 49:8 65:23 69:23 unrelated 37:18 unsigned 30:17 33:12 62:24 63:11 unusual 77:1 **update** 38:13 updated 18:26 72:28 updates 37:17 **urge** 75:8 use 8:2 15:25 16:26 18:5,13,16 25:5 **User** 72:13 uses 32:22 usually 6:23 93:9,19 ٧

value 61:26 various 12:11 33:11 vendor 32:17 venture 11:9 14:16, 28 15:18 29:20,26, 28 30:3,4 31:3 32:20,22,23 33:3,6 50:5,17,21,22 52:23 58:10 63:5 72:6,19, 25 verdict 5:23 6:5,6,16, 21,26 7:2,27 10:28

validly 60:20

valuable 39:27

11:18,27 12:10,14, 15,16,25 13:1,5,10, 23,27 14:6,17,19 15:6 45:10,28 46:28 49:25,27 60:25 66:26,27 70:10 74:23,25,27,28 75:2, 4,6,9,13,21 79:4,10, 12,15 80:7 81:3,23 82:11,15 83:23 84:18,22 85:3 90:23 92:4,15 93:1,2,4,14, 18

version 22:6 52:14 59:6 61:9 68:21,23

versions 21:11

view 37:3

virtue 48:7

volume 7:14

volumes 81:7,25

wait 79:9 93:23

W

waiting 78:5 waive 8:23 9:2,3,5 waived 8:24,25 9:28 74:17 waiving 8:14 walk 80:15 84:14 wall 21:18 want 7:1,5,13,16 19:27 46:27 51:24 52:15 53:3,5 54:21 56:21,23 60:16 73:18 81:3 82:2 84:26 88:16 92:1

wanted 20:4,5 31:6,8 34:16 55:9 59:19

60:13,23 61:11,15, 18,19,20 71:2,3,5 79:11

wants 23:11

washes 64:26

wasn't 23:16 26:3 29:2 38:19,20 41:13 42:22 48:2 58:22 66:4 67:8 72:27 73:8

watched 21:17,19

way 7:6 9:15 22:15 44:2 59:13,17 63:22, 26 69:27 73:12 84:4, 5 85:2,26,27 86:18 90:13 93:19

we'll 5:2,5,6,9,13 6:3 7:23 12:19 23:26 30:3 44:8 45:22 51:5,9 74:13 75:21 78:22,28 79:5,6 80:15,22,23,24 81:14 82:15 91:25 92:5.27 93:17.18.22 94:1

we're 4:9 5:3 8:6 9:9, 20 10:4,10 14:23 19:20 20:7 34:16 47:1 48:14 50:8 51:1,2 58:5 64:2 70:5 74:13 76:9 77:7 78:5,20 80:9,28 81:11 82:5 87:14 93:5,15

we've 5:13 7:7 47:9 51:13 60:7 78:26 80:24 82:10

wearing 57:8

week 4:13,16,26 9:19 22:22

weekend 4:15

weeks 10:22

WEINSTEIN 4:6,17 5:28 8:6,24 10:16,19 46:27 51:11 59:28 62:3,6 70:21,23 80:9,11 81:18 82:19 83:1,19 84:26 85:16, 21 86:12,15,18,28 88:22,25 89:5,8,13, 27 90:15,25,27 92:3, 6.21 93:8

Weinstein's 91:22

went 18:19 21:19.26 24:20 36:9 41:11 43:28 55:14 57:10 64:14,16 71:19

weren't 43:16 46:16 53:23 79:26

whatsoever 31:22

wide 71:22

willing 17:1 41:13 59:22 91:21

wish 6:11 90:5

withdrawn 41:25

witness 17:13 32:10 42:17

witnesses 10:13 11:15 46:17

Wohlfeil 4:2

wondering 86:26

word 32:22 40:12 80:7 92:11,16

worded 84:5

wordier 91:17

wording 57:22

words 25:5 29:2 32:25 58:19 62:11, 20 69:4 85:21 91:18

Index: undivided-words

Transcript of Proceedings		Geraci vs. Cotton, et al
work 17:20,23 18:19 43:28 53:1 59:22 78:18	12,15,26,28 42:25, 26 43:6	
worked 16:10 59:27 71:4		
works 14:10		
world 75:26		
worth 9:15,19 51:28 73:10		
wouldn't 43:2 70:3 79:11 86:1 90:7		
write 49:23		
writing 19:12 28:5,16 29:17 33:14 54:28 58:20,28 61:20 63:8, 9 67:19 69:3 73:17, 24		
written 11:3 13:21 14:4,9,25 15:12 19:1,12 23:10 26:14, 18 28:17,26 33:16 37:21 50:11 53:24 57:5 62:24 63:3,16, 23,27,28 64:2,3,7,18 65:4 66:8 67:14,16, 26 69:7 92:25		
wrong 85:2		
wrote 35:1		
Υ		
Yeah 80:11 82:19		
years 52:5 58:24 59:26 71:16 93:13		
z		
zoning 17:5,26,28 18:3,27 37:17 38:9, 11,15,17,24 39:4,11,		

Index: work-zoning