| 1  | IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2  | IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO               |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4  | DEPARTMENT 73 HON. JOEL R. WOHLFEIL              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6  | LARRY GERACI, an individual, )                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7  | )  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8  | Plaintiff, )                                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9  | VS., ) CASE NO.                                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | DARRYL COTTON, an individual; ) 00010073-CU-BC-  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | and DOES 1 through 10, ) CT inclusive,           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Defendants. ) )                                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS.                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT                            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2019                         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | APPEARANCES ON NEXT PAGE                         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | LOIC MACON BUOMBCON CCD DDD CDD                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | LOIS MASON THOMPSON, CSR, RPR, CRR CSR NO. 3685  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | lois.mason51@gmail.com                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| 1  | APPEARANCES:  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2  | EOD THE DIVINGTEE 224 CDOCC DEFENDANT INDO  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3  | FOR THE PLAINTIFF and CROSS-DEFENDANT LARRY GERACI AND CROSS-DEFENDANT REBECCA BERRY: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5  | FERRIS & BRITTON BY: MICHAEL R. WEINSTEIN   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6  | 501 WEST BROADWAY SUITE 1450  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7  | SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101<br>619.233.3131   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | FOR THE DEFENDANT AND CROSS-COMPLAINANT DARRYL COTTON, AN INDIVIDUAL                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | THE LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW FLORES   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | BY: ANDREW FLORES 35050 CAMINO DEL RIO SOUTH  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | SUITE 337 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92108   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | 619.356.1556  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | LAW OFFICES OF JACOB P. AUSTIN BY: JACOB P. AUSTIN                                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 1455 FRAZEE ROAD<br>SUITE 500   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92108<br>619.357.6850   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |   |  |  |  |  |  |

## San Diego, California, Friday, February 8, 2019, 1 2 AM Session ---0000---3 THE COURT: Finally, calling Items 7 4 5 through 12, Geraci versus Cotton, Case Number ending 10073. 6 7 MR. WEINSTEIN: Good morning, Your Honor. 8 Michael Weinstein for the plaintiff and cross-defendant 9 Larry Geraci and cross-defendant Rebecca Berry. 10 MR. AUSTIN: Good morning, Your Honor. 11 Jacob Austin on behalf of the defendant and 12 cross-complainant Darryl Cotton. 13 MR. FLORES: And Andrew Flores also on his 14 behalf, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. Good to see all three 16 of you. 17 All right. Let me get the Court's tentative 18 ruling. 19 Let me see. These are the defendant's 20 motions. 21 Counsel, did you get the Court's tentative? 22 MR. AUSTIN: We did, Your Honor. THE COURT: Counsel, did you get the Court's 23 24 tentative. 25 MR. WEINSTEIN: We did, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I guess let's take them in the order that the Court found them. I mean, counsel, this is rapidly becoming one of the more heavily litigated cases that the Court has in this department.

Believe it or not, the most heavily litigated one has now exceeded 2,000 ROAs. You're not quite at 500, but at least you weren't when I last saw it; but there's a lot of filings that the Court has to make its way through just to figure out what the motion is.

So what I did was I worked them up in the order in which I discovered them. And it may appear as if I went backwards, but don't put any weight into the order in which they are reflected. It was just the order in which I managed to find them among all of the other matters that have been filed in this case. So let's start with the first of the matters.

Let me go to defense counsel. What do you think?

MR. FLORES: Your Honor, as a housekeeping matter we are prepared to submit on the Court's tentative with regards to the motions to compel for Rebecca Berry; so that would be Number 1, 2, and 3, on the Court's tentative.

THE COURT: All right. Just give me one

moment here.

And then am I correct that Motions 4, 5, and 6 all relate to Mr. Geraci?

MR. FLORES: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So let's just focus on 1, 2, and 3.

Let me go to the plaintiff's counsel. Did you want to be heard on 1, 2, or 3?

MR. WEINSTEIN: We would submit on 1, 2, and 3 as well.

You had a note, in response to Number 3, about whether -- you know, you wanted to have a discussion about this election to assert the privilege and how it might affect the scope of testimony at trial.

THE COURT: Oh, okay.

MR. WEINSTEIN: And I can address that if the Court wants to address that.

THE COURT: Let me just make a parenthetical comment, and it's not intended to be critical of either side; but there are cases, and this may fall into that, where there is so much law and motion that it becomes difficult for the Court to keep in mind, if it ever has been made clear to the Court, what your respective theories of the case are.

I mean I know each side have taken turns

expressing disappointment at the Court's rulings, but -and the reason I say that, again, I'm not intending to
be critical to either one of you, but -- so the focus of
the third motion is the Court wasn't entirely clear on
how relevant if at all -- I think it's relevant -- the
so-called disavowment allegation is that was the focus
of this part of the discovery. So it seems to me that
presuming it's relevant, if in this case -- is it
Ms. Berry?

MR. WEINSTEIN: Ms. Berry.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WEINSTEIN: And I can -- I think I can short circuit it.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Ms. Berry had some disavowment allegation defined as Mr. Cotton sent an email to Mr. Geraci on November 2nd after they signed a written document. Mr. Geraci responded back.

And Mr. Geraci says he was responding back to the first sentence in that email.

And then the next day they had a telephone conversation in which they discussed the rest of the email.

And he denied that his email sent the night before was an agreement with what was in the rest of the

email. And they had a discussion about it the next day and discussed it and there was no agreement.

Ms. Berry has no personal knowledge of that telephone conversation or the emails and she's not been told anything about it by any nonprivileged source. So there is no testimony that's going to be offered by her regarding what they have defined as the disavowment allegation.

So it might be relevant if she had knowledge, but she doesn't.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Let me go back to the defense side.

And thank you for reminding me that there was a sliver of the third motion that I wanted to hear from counsel.

I don't know whether Ms. Berry does or does not know anything about this allegation or whether there may be a credibility evaluation. I have no clue. But I am satisfied that she is entitled to assert a privilege if the source of her information is based upon a communication with counsel.

So what I am inclined to do is to confirm the Court's tentative as modified. As modified, to the extent that Ms. Berry has chosen to assert a privilege on any issue, in this case it happens to be the

so-called disavowment allegation in discovery, she will be prohibited from testifying to that at trial.

Now, that's not to suggest in this case that the defense can't inquire. I'm not suggesting that you can't conduct a wide ranging cross-examination. But you won't be -- you will not be at risk that Ms. Berry may be able to change what she says in discovery and all of a sudden you're being confronted with her saying something about her knowledge of this so-called disavowment allegation. Unless you choose to go into that area, she would be barred from testifying about it.

That should be reflected, by the way, in the Court's tentative ruling.

So the Court confirms the Court's tentative rulings as to Motions 1, 2, and 3 involving Ms. Berry as is to Number 1, as is to Number 2, and as modified to Number 3.

And I am going to direct counsel for the moving party to serve notice of the Court's ruling.

All right. Let's go to the fourth, fifth and sixth motions.

And again, let me go to defense counsel.

Which ones, if any, would you like to be heard on?

MR. FLORES: Your Honor, I think 16 and 31 on
the special interrogatories for Mr. Geraci is the ones

that we would like to address. 1 THE COURT: Okay. So we are focusing on the 3 fourth motion? 4 MR. FLORES: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. And 16 and 31 --5 MR. FLORES: And I think the Court sustained 6 7 those objections. 8 THE COURT: Right. Let me get the separate statement, counsel. 9 MR. FLORES: Sure. 10 11 THE COURT: By the way, if I didn't indicate 12 at first, thanks for being so patient. It took me 13 almost an hour to get you up here. 14 All right. That's ROA 386. All right. 15 looks like the separate statement is 390. Yeah, that's 16 it. 17 So you want me to look at 16. 18 MR. FLORES: And also Number 31, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let's take 16. All documents relating to the 6176 CUP application reviewed by Jim Bartell.

MR. FLORES: Yes, Your Honor.

Jim Bartell is an agent of Mr. Geraci. He's a lobbyist that has worked for Mr. Geraci in the CUP application on the subject property. And I think the

objection was that he has no personal knowledge of what Mr. Jim Bartell had actually reviewed.

2.2

The problem, the deficiency here, Your Honor, is that under California Code of Civil Procedure 2030.220(c) there's no statement with regards to a reasonable good faith effort to make themselves -- to obtain this knowledge from their agent. Right? So -- THE COURT: Well, when you say -- first of

THE COURT: Well, when you say -- first of all, Mr. Geraci has been named -- or is an individual litigant?

MR. FLORES: That's correct.

THE COURT: There are limits to what you can impose upon an individual litigant to search in order to respond to a discovery request.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  FLORES: And that we understand, Your Honor.

The problem that we have with the response is that there's no -- I mean, literally the Code of Civil Procedure says that it shall state, make a reasonable good faith effort to inquire as to this thing that they have no knowledge of.

And I point out that the Court overruled a similar objection with regards to the plaintiff's personal knowledge of what their attorney reviewed prior to the submission as well.

All we want is an identification of what may or may not have been reviewed.

Now, as far as their supplemental response, they go on to say even though they have no personal knowledge, that they also refer to there may be thousands of documents.

Well, you know, they're, in essence, trying to force us to do what may be, you know, an unfruitful deposition of Mr. Jim Bartell. This is our very first volley of information seeking in this particular instance.

THE COURT: All right. Just let me look at 31. Okay.

Counsel, I know you spent a lot of time waiting in court to be heard and so I don't want to be short with anybody.

I could ask opposing counsel to respond to 16 and 31.

And, by the way, I looked at these. I worked them up. I didn't have somebody else help work these up, so this is the Court's work product truly. And I am just not persuaded -- well, I'm comfortable that the nature and scope of the request is objectionable.

Quite frankly, there may have been other objections that the other side, I guess Mr. Geraci,

could have interposed.

2.2

I'm not inclined to change the Court's tentative on 16 and 31.

MR. FLORES: Your Honor, if I might just address the relevancy of 31 because the Court sustained the objection with regards to relevancy.

In essence, what we are asking for Mr. Geraci to do is to identify any other transactions where he used a non standard real estate contract, which is exactly what's going on here, Your Honor. They used a three sentence document to initiate a sale -- for the purchase and sale of property. So we're trying to establish what exactly -- if that's common practice, that's something that he does, and that may tend to show, you know, a fraud did occur.

THE COURT: Here's how I evaluate -- first of all, let me back up.

Relevancy is a very difficult objection to stand on in discovery. So what I am imagining is

Mr. Geraci is on the witness stand. And one of you two, and I'm looking at defense counsel, are putting a question to him to this effect, and opposing counsel were to leap to his feet and say objection, relevancy, I mean, as it's currently framed, without any context, I would sustain that objection.

It's possible that Mr. Geraci has used this one-page type document a whole bunch of times in the past or he may not have done it at all, but in order to evaluate that relevancy we would have to find out or start looking at all of those other pieces of paper as well as the underlying transactions to see how similar, if at all, they were to the facts of this case. And, folks, we're not going to spend the time doing that.

I don't know if this is an aberration or a common practice by Mr. Geraci, but there's only so much time that we have to allocate to the trial of the case. So I just found myself questioning the relevancy.

So again, counsel, I am not arguing with you, but I did go through that exercise, I can assure you. I just didn't sustain it without giving it any thought whatsoever. So I'm going to confirm that portion of the Court's tentative as well.

MR. FLORES: Fair enough, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And again, we could spend time a hearing from opposing counsel, but I'm just -- you all don't need to hear that right now.

MR. FLORES: Fair enough.

THE COURT: With all due with respect to opposing counsel.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So that's Motion Number 4. 1 2 Are those the two items that you wanted to be 3 heard on, on that portion? MR. FLORES: On that portion, yes. 4 5 THE COURT: Let me go to opposing counsel. What do you think? 6 7 MR. WEINSTEIN: We would submit on 4. 8 THE COURT: All right. So the Court then 9 confirms it's ruling on the fourth motion involving 10 Mr. Geraci and the special interrogatories and directs 11 that counsel for the moving party serve notice of that one as well. 12 13 Let's go on to the fifth motion. Counsel? 14 MR. FLORES: Yes, Your Honor, that was the 15 request for admissions. There's two that we can take 16 together, Your Honor, because I think the objection was 17 sustained as to compound for 29 and 30. 18 THE COURT: All right. Let me get to the 19 separate statement, please. 20 MR. WEINSTEIN: So Number 5 is actually the request for production, not the request for admissions. 21 22 MR. FLORES: My apologies, Your Honor. That's 23 true. 24 THE COURT: I gotcha.

Let me just find it real quick.

25

MR. WEINSTEIN: So 5, Your Honor, had the same 1 2 issue of privilege being asserted and what would be able 3 to be permitted at trial regarding the disavowment allegation by Mr. Geraci. 4 THE COURT: Right. Now, 30 I overruled. 5 You said 29 and 30? 6 7 MR. WEINSTEIN: He was talking about --8 MR. FLORES: I'm sorry. My apologies, Your Honor. I had them out of order. 9 10 THE COURT: Okay. So are we still on 5? 11 MR. FLORES: Yeah, we are. 12 THE COURT: All right. So we are just 13 focusing on 29? 14 MR. FLORES: Sorry, Your Honor. On Number 5 15 we're actually going to submit. 16 The only thing that I would point out, 17 Your Honor, as a housekeeping matter with regards to the 18 disavowment allegation is that we do have -- we have 19 calendared a motion to bind in regards --THE COURT: A motion for what? 20 MR. FLORES: A motion to bind. 21 22 THE COURT: What is --23 MR. FLORES: And if I may, Your Honor, the 24 motion we have calendared is to bind Mr. Geraci's 25 response to a previous response that he had given

regarding the disavowment allegation.

When we first -- when Mr. Cotton first provided Mr. Geraci with form interrogatories, one of the form interrogatories specifically mentioned whether or not there were any amendments. You know, it's basically 50.1, et seq, with regards to the contract.

In those responses he basically said there was no response, you know, there were no modifications.

Now, almost a year later they bring up this disavowment allegation. They respond to it in their interrogatories and other requests for productions. So I guess whatever ruling the Court makes, I would ask for it to hold off on substantively this issue until it's able to hear our motion.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Would the Court like me to address that, Your Honor? Because I have anticipated the motion because they have told us that they were going to bring it.

Fine, they can file a motion. We will seek sanctions.

A motion to bind means that you have served responses to discovery requests and then you served an amended response and the amended response changes the original response and you want to bind them to the original response.

In this case, there is no -- what they are referring to is not an interrogatory response that was amended, so there's nothing to bind. The motion is not even applicable.

2.2

What they are saying is, in his form interrogatory response, is Mr. Geraci said the agreement wasn't amended.

The disavowment allegation says that -- it doesn't say anything about there being an amendment. It talks about discussing the email. And then Mr. Geraci's declaration, which is not a discovery response, goes on to talk about attempts to renegotiate the contract that were never ever consummated. And so the form interrogatory responses and the declaration aren't even inconsistent. But when they're talking about a motion to bind, that's what they're talking about.

They haven't filed it yet. But I am advising the Court our position is going to be that it's not even a motion that the statute applies to.

THE COURT: All right. Now you haven't drawn a judge who discourages parties from filing motions. I have never heard -- and I'm not being flip, I truly have not heard of a motion to bind.

But if I understand the underlying dispute, what the defense is saying is Mr. Geraci said something

at one time and then amended it to say something differently at another time and you want to hold him, if you will, to his original answer.

MR. FLORES: To his original answer.

THE COURT: All right.

Now the way that I imagine it would play out and the way that I see it play out in just about every single case and every single trial is at some point in time, I guess on this side, the defense can present to the jury Mr. Geraci's original response, and I guess you could choose to also present the amended response, that's up to you; but how I see it is one side presents an original response, the other side presents an amended response and the jury decides which one is more credible than the other.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Sure.

THE COURT: But I am not inclined to say that either side -- and this could hold as true for Mr. Cotton as Mr. Geraci, can't file amended response. Now, again, ultimately it becomes a credibility determination by the jury, not by me.

MR. FLORES: And that we understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Just food for thought, counsel.

MR. FLORES: That we understand, Your Honor.

The only issue that we have is that now we're put in a position where we have to defend against basically a frivolous allegation that's being made up.

THE COURT: Well, but that's credibility. And you're not going to get me -- in discovery, you're not going to get me weighing in on that.

The Court's job is to make sure that responses are served, credible or not, and then ultimately you make your pitch to the jury and they decide credibility. Again, if it's of any assistance to you.

MR. FLORES: Right.

And, Your Honor -- actually, one thing I want to mention, Your Honor, I do have a CMC in Department 65 that's supposed to start right now.

THE COURT: It's 65?

MR. AUSTIN: Yes. With Judge Frazier.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's get you out of here so you can get down there.

Now, I have looked back again at 29. The only question that I have is have you gotten the documents or any documents?

MR. FLORES: No, Your Honor. And that's why we would -- as long as the Court is consistent with what the Court decided with the Berry responses as far as them not beating able to testify to the disavowment

allegation if they do choose to --

THE COURT: Well, this is Mr. Geraci now, not Ms. Berry. I mean the analysis is the same.

But let me go back to counsel. Will you be producing or have you produced any documents involving this allegation by Mr. Geraci?

MR. WEINSTEIN: Yes. As reflected in our written response, which is -- and the only documents that we have to directly address this are telephone records. So we have actually produced their telephone bill that they gave us earlier in the case and we have a telephone bill that Mr. Geraci has that reflects the same call as on their client's bill. And I'll double check to make sure that's been produced, but that's it. Otherwise, anything that directly talks about what they term the disavowment allegation, that was verbal.

THE COURT: I gotcha.

Now, let me ask this. Have these documents that one side or the other have produced been Bate stamped?

MR. WEINSTEIN: Absolutely. So, for example, the phone bill, their own phone bill, Mr. Cotton's own phone bill was Bates numbered Geraci and the last three digits are 207.

THE COURT: All right. So here's what I am

inclined to do. Again, I am inclined to sustain

Mr. Geraci's right to assert the privilege, as I would

Mr. Cotton. But there is a price to be paid; he can't

go back and reopen that area once you have narrowed the

scope by asserting the privilege.

However, what I am going to do is confirm as modified this tentative. As modified, the Court will direct Mr. Geraci to serve a further response on the subject of the Request for Production Number 29 to identify the Bates stamp numbers of the documents that you have produced.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: So that in this case the defense side now understands the narrow scope of the nonprivileged documents that are in play in response to this discovery request.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Very good, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And then I'm going to direct counsel for the moving party to serve notice.

That leaves us with the sixth motion.

Counsel, anything that you want to argue on that one?

MR. FLORES: Yes, Your Honor. I started to, but I had them out order.

Basically, 29 and 30, the Court sustained the

```
compound objection on that one. And then 33 as well.
1
              THE COURT: All right. Let me -- I think I
 3
     recall them, but before I say anything -- what time is
     your CMC scheduled?
 4
 5
              MR. AUSTIN: 10:15, Your Honor.
 6
              THE COURT: All right. Well, did you ask them
7
     to trail you?
8
              MR. FLORES: I did not.
9
              THE COURT: All right. What is your case?
10
              MR. FLORES: It is Vidal versus Pick Ax
11
     (phonetic).
12
              THE COURT:
                          Could you call that department and
13
     say we'll send him down real soon.
14
              THE CLERK: Which department was it, again?
15
              THE COURT: Is it 65?
16
              MR. FLORES: I thought it was 65.
17
              THE COURT: 65. All right.
18
              So let's get this -- let me pull up the
19
     separate statement real quick.
20
              All right. Request for admissions. And
21
     it's -- I'm sorry -- 29, 30, and 33?
22
              MR. FLORES: Yes, Your Honor.
23
              THE COURT:
                          All right.
24
              MR. FLORES: We can take 29 and 30 together,
25
     though, Your Honor. It is the same objection.
```

questions are very similar.

THE COURT: All right. Let me just retrieve it really quick.

All right, 29. Okay. You know, there's only so much that you can expect -- and, by the way, again, we'd be having the exact same discussion if you were on the receiving end of this request for admission, I'm confident that I would be looking at it the same way.

But you have asked the other side to admit a fact based upon a timeline that is what? -- nine or ten months broad, encompasses a whole bunch of exhibits.

I mean, there may be a sliver among all of that information that they might admit. There may be a bunch that they might not admit. You're just asking more than any reasonable receiving party should be expected to respond to. It was the breath, among other things.

MR. FLORES: In that vein, Your Honor, I think, though it may be poorly written, I think the subject matter is very simple.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not questioning relevancy, but there's -- generally speaking, requests for admissions should be more narrowly tailored.

If there's a specific fact encompassed within all of that information that you want the other side to

admit, give them that one fact and then admit or deny.

I'm confident the other side would respond accordingly.

But I struggle -- so that is why the Court sustained the objection to 29.

The same with 30.

Let me go to 33. I'm sure there was something about that I thought was -- well, again, you're asking them to look at a declaration of attorney David S. Dimion (phonetic) --

MR. WEINSTEIN: Their former attorney.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Mr. Cotton's former attorney.

THE COURT: Once again, counsel --

MR. FLORES: Once again, as we explained in our meet and confer, the question can be read without that information, Your Honor.

The underlying facts are what we're worried about. We're not asking them -- it's for their own edification. It has nothing to do with specifically identifying this document X, Y, Z, is did you or did you not agree to stipulate.

Now, for the Court's reference, if the Court recalls, Mr. Cotton was here before the Court with a motion for a receiver based on the CUP application that he believed would be sabotaged by the other side and

that there was another competing CUP being sought and that did occur, that did happen, Your Honor.

2.2

THE COURT: All right. Well, again.

The Court's intention is not to be critical, but there may be a more narrowly tailored fact that you could propound to the other side.

But as soon as I saw the reference to "as more fully outlined in the declaration of," again, it becomes -- it does become compound; but the breadth of which I also -- it also strikes me as unreasonable.

MR. FLORES: So is it a compound objection the Court is sustaining? Or relevancy?

THE COURT: Well, I'm not -- oh, I see what you are saying. All right.

Well, I was not focusing so much on relevancy, counsel. It really was the more the compound, conjunctive, disjunctive, the breadth. I mean, I was looking at all them in their totality.

And I'm not suggesting that this might not be a relevant line of inquiry by your side, but as framed, I remain comfortable that one or more of the objections are well taken.

MR. FLORES: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. So the Court -- well, anything else, counsel?

MR. FLORES: I just had some housekeeping matters, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, but on this motion, anything else, counsel?

MR. FLORES: No.

MR. WEINSTEIN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The Court confirms its tentative on Motion Number 6, and then directs the defense counsel to serve notice of the Court's ruling on all of them.

All right. All right. Let's go to housekeeping. May 31, 2019, I'm looking forward to seeing everybody in this trial department. If not this department, I'll have one, I hope, lined up for you. So everything is heading in the right direction.

Counsel, did you have something you wanted to say?

MR. FLORES: Yes, Your Honor.

We're up against a deadline right now to file our motion for summary judgment, which is going to be on the 13th, Your Honor.

Our client would be highly prejudiced if we're not able to include the supplemental responses to that motion, Your Honor. So we may -- and we've set the hearing date, unfortunately, for the very last day

that's possible.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FLORES: So we either have to continue the day or we come in on an ex parte basis for the Court.

But if the opposing side is willing to stipulate to change the dates.

THE COURT: So I think I said to the extent that additional responses are due -- oh, I said ten days?

MR. WEINSTEIN: Their summary judgment motion, Your Honor, would be due to be personally served today.

THE COURT: Oh. Well, I hear this --

MR. WEINSTEIN: I don't have a problem with backing up and avoiding the 30 day. You know, there is a 30 day before trial limitation, which the Court can hear a motion less than 30 days before trial on good cause, I'm okay with that. I just don't want to be shortened on my time to respond.

THE COURT: Right.

So the hearing date on your motion for summary judgment is April 26th. So you're saying you would be willing to stipulate to have that heard 30 days before trial?

MR. WEINSTEIN: Well, yes. I'm thinking on the -- I think the TRC is the 17th, right?

THE COURT: Well, why don't -- and, folks, I know I am pushing you hard to get to trial date, but what I am thinking is for a very limited period of time, no more than 30 days, let's extend those last three dates, the trial call, the TRC, and the law and motion and discovery date.

And as it is, counsel, I only gave you ten days. That's not a lot of time, but you're not complaining about that.

But if the Court were to extend the dates by 30, that would allow you to get your hearing date 30 days later than currently and still have time to incorporate the supplemental responses into your moving papers.

Can you live with that?

MR. FLORES: We can, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And so --

MR. WEINSTEIN: One caveat, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WEINSTEIN: I don't have my calendar so I don't know my client's schedule for trial yet, but I am willing to have you select one and then I'd have to let the Court know if it's an issue, but I'm hoping it won't.

THE COURT: Come on in here. You know where

to find me.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. So here's what the Court is going to do. The Court is going to continue the last three dates as follows: Your trial call will now be June 28th at 8:30 a.m., your trial readiness conference is two weeks before on June 14th at 10:45 a.m., your law and motion and discovery cutoff date including the completion of expert discovery is May 31st.

And the Court is going to direct that the defense serve notice of that as well.

All right. Any other clean-up items from the defense side?

MR. FLORES: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me go to the plaintiff's side. Are there any other issues?

MR. WEINSTEIN: No.

But just so there's clarity, you have moved the motion cutoff date to May 31st, which means probably that the summary judgment motion would have to be heard May 24th to be more than 30 days before trial, which is still nearly 30 days from when it would be heard now, which is fine. But do they need to calendar a hearing date for May 24th.

THE COURT: Well, all right. Let me to this. 1 2 Do you object if a hearing on the motion for 3 summary judgment is heard as late or as close to the trial as May 31st? 4 5 MR. WEINSTEIN: I do not. 6 THE COURT: All right. So all motions 7 including a motion for summary judgment filed by either 8 side can be heard within less than 30 days before trial, 9 namely, as late as May 31st. 10 And that also should be reflected in your 11 notice of ruling. 12 MR. WEINSTEIN: Fair enough. THE COURT: All right. Counsel, that takes 13 14 care of everything. 15 Thank you all very much. 16 MR. FLORES: Thank you, Your Honor. 17 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. AUSTIN: 18 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. WEINSTEIN: 19 20 (Proceedings adjourned at 10:28 a.m.) ---0000---21 22 23 24

25

# 1 CERTIFICATE 2 State of California 3 County of San Diego 4 5 I, Lois Mason Thompson, CSR No. 3685, a pro tem reporter in the Superior Court of the State of 6 7 California, in and for the County of San Diego, hereby 8 certify that I reported in machine shorthand the proceedings held on February 8, 2019, that my notes were 9 transcribed into typewriting under my direction, that 10 11 the foregoing transcript, pages 1 through 31 is a full, 12 true, and correct transcript of the said proceedings. 13 Dated at San Diego, California, February 18, 2019 14 15 16 17 CSR No. 3685 18 19 20 Government Code Section 69954(D): Any court, party, or person who has purchased a transcript may, 21 without paying a further fee to the reporter, reproduce a copy or portion thereof as an exhibit pursuant to 22 court order or rule, or for internal use, but shall not otherwise provide or sell a copy or copies to any other 23 party or person.

24

25

| 0  | <b>37-2017</b> [1] - 1:9<br><b>386</b> [1] - 9:14        | 23:23<br>admit [5] - 23:9,                                   | <b>Ax</b> [1] - 22:10                                     | 31:1<br>certify [1] - 31:8                                  |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| <b>000</b> [2] - 3:3; 30:21                            | <b>390</b> [1] - 9:15                                    | 13-14; 24:1  | В   | <b>change</b> [3] - 8:7; 12:2;                              |
| <b>00010073-CU-BC</b> [1] - 1:10                       | 4  | advising [1] - 17:17<br>affect [1] - 5:14                    | backing [1] - 27:14                                       | 27:6<br><b>changes</b> [1] - 16:23                          |
| 1  | <b>4</b> [3] - 5:2; 14:1, 7                              | agent [2] - 9:23; 10:7<br>agree [1] - 24:21                  | backwards [1] - 4:13<br>barred [1] - 8:11                 | <b>check</b> [1] - 20:14 <b>choose</b> [3] - 8:10;          |
|  |  | agreement [3] - 6:25;  | Bartell [4] - 9:21, 23;                                   | 18:11; 20:1   |
| <b>1</b> [8] - 1:10; 4:23; 5:6, 8-9; 8:15; 31:11       | 5  | 7:2; 17:6<br>allegation [15] - 6:6,                          | 10:2; 11:9<br><b>based</b> [3] - 7:20;                    | chosen [1] - 7:24<br>circuit [1] - 6:13                     |
| <b>10</b> [1] - 1:10                                   | <b>5</b> [5] - 5:2; 14:20; 15:1, 10, 14                  | 16; 7:8, 17; 8:1, 10;  | 23:10; 24:24  | Civil [2] - 10:4, 18  |
| <b>10073</b> [1] - 3:6<br><b>10:15</b> [1] - 22:5      | <b>50.1</b> [1] - 16:6                                   | 15:4, 18; 16:1, 10;<br>17:8; 19:3; 20:1, 6,                  | basis [1] - 27:4<br>Bate [1] - 20:19                      | clarity [1] - 29:19<br>clean [1] - 29:13                    |
| <b>10:28</b> [1] - 30:20                               | <b>500</b> [2] <b>-</b> 2:19; 4:8                        | 16   | Bates [2] - 20:23;  | clean-up [1] - 29:13  |
| <b>10:45</b> [1] - 29:8<br><b>12</b> [1] - 3:5         | <b>501</b> [1] <b>-</b> 2:5                              | allocate [1] - 13:11<br>allow [1] - 28:11                    | 21:10<br>beating [1] - 19:25                              | clear [2] - 5:23; 6:4                                       |
| <b>13th</b> [1] - 26:21                                | 6  | almost [2] - 9:13; 16:9                                      | <b>become</b> [1] - 25:9                                  | CLERK [1] - 22:14<br>client [1] - 26:22                     |
| <b>1450</b> [1] - 2:6                                  | <b>6</b> [2] <b>-</b> 5:2; 26:8                          | <b>AM</b> [1] - 3:2  | becomes [3] - 5:21;                                       | client's [2] - 20:13;                                       |
| <b>1455</b> [1] - 2:18<br><b>14th</b> [1] - 29:7       | <b>6176</b> [1] - 9:21                                   | <b>amended</b> [8] - 16:23;<br>17:3, 7; 18:1, 11, 13,        | 18:20; 25:8 <b>becoming</b> [1] - 4:3                     | 28:21<br>close [1] - 30:3                                   |
| <b>16</b> [6] <b>-</b> 8:24; 9:5, 17,                  | <b>619.233.3131</b> [1] - 2:7 <b>619.356.1556</b> [1] -  | 19   | behalf [2] - 3:11, 14                                     | <b>clue</b> [1] - 7:18                                      |
| 20; 11:17; 12:3<br><b>17th</b> [1] - 27:25             | 2:15   | amendment [1] - 17:9<br>amendments [1] -                     | <b>BERRY</b> [1] - 2:3<br><b>Berry</b> [12] - 3:9; 4:23;  | <b>CMC</b> [2] - 19:13; 22:4<br><b>Code</b> [3] - 10:4, 18; |
| <b>18</b> [1] - 31:13                                  | <b>619.357.6850</b> [1] - 2:20                           | 16:5   | 6:9, 15; 7:3, 16, 24;                                     | 31:20   |
| 2  | <b>65</b> [5] <b>-</b> 19:13, 15;                        | <b>AN</b> [1] - 2:11<br><b>analysis</b> [1] - 20:3           | 8:6, 15; 19:24; 20:3 <b>bill</b> [6] - 20:11-13, 22       | comfortable [2] -   |
|  | 22:15  | <b>AND</b> [4] - 1:2, 14; 2:3,                               | <b>bind</b> [8] - 15:19, 21,                              | 11:22; 25:21<br>comment [1] - 5:19                          |
| <b>2</b> [6] - 4:23; 5:6, 8-9; 8:15                    | <b>69954(D</b> [1] - 31:20                               | 10   | 24; 16:21, 24; 17:3,<br>16, 23                            | <b>common</b> [2] - 12:13;                                  |
| <b>2,000</b> [1] - 4:7                                 | 7  | Andrew [1] - 3:13<br>ANDREW [2] - 2:13                       | breadth [2] - 25:9, 17                                    | 13:10 communication [1] -                                   |
| <b>2019</b> [5] - 1:17; 3:1; 26:12; 31:9, 13           | <b>7</b> [1] - 3:4                                       | answer [2] - 18:3  | breath [1] - 23:16  | 7:21  |
| <b>2030.220(c</b> [1] - 10:5                           | <b>73</b> [1] - 1:4                                      | anticipated [1] - 16:16<br>apologies [2] - 14:22;            | <b>bring</b> [2] - 16:9, 18<br><b>BRITTON</b> [1] - 2:4   | compel [1] - 4:22<br>competing [1] - 25:1                   |
| <b>207</b> [1] - 20:24                                 | 8  | 15:8   | broad [1] - 23:11   | complainant [1] - 3:12                                      |
| <b>24th</b> [2] - 29:22, 25<br><b>26th</b> [1] - 27:21 |  | appear [1] - 4:12<br>APPEARANCES[2] -                        | <b>BROADWAY</b> [1] - 2:5 <b>bunch</b> [3] - 13:2;        | COMPLAINANT[1] -  |
| <b>28th</b> [1] - 29:6                                 | <b>8</b> [3] - 1:17; 3:1; 31:9<br><b>8:30</b> [1] - 29:6 | 1:21; 2:1  | 23:11, 14   | 2:10 complaining [1] - 28:9                                 |
| <b>29</b> [10] - 14:17; 15:6, 13; 19:19; 21:9, 25;     |  | applicable [1] - 17:4  | <b>BY</b> [3] - 2:5, 13, 18                               | completion [1] - 29:9                                       |
| 22:21, 24; 23:4; 24:4                                  | 9  | application [3] - 9:21,<br>25; 24:24                         | С   | <b>compound</b> [5] - 14:17; 22:1; 25:9, 11, 16             |
| <b>2nd</b> [1] - 6:17                                  | <b>92101</b> [1] - 2:6                                   | applies [1] - 17:19  | calendar [2] - 28:20;                                     | conduct [1] - 8:5   |
| 3  | <b>92108</b> [2] - 2:15, 19                              | April [1] - 27:21<br>area [2] - 8:11; 21:4                   | 29:24   | confer [1] - 24:15<br>conference [1] - 29:7                 |
| <b>3</b> [7] - 4:23; 5:6, 8-9,                         | Α  | argue [1] - 21:21  | calendared [2] -  | confident [2] - 23:8;                                       |
| 11; 8:15, 17   | <b>a.m</b> [3] - 29:6, 8; 30:20                          | arguing [1] - 13:13<br>assert [4] - 5:13; 7:19,              | 15:19, 24 <b>California</b> [5] - 3:1;                    | 24:2  |
| <b>30</b> [17] - 14:17; 15:5;                          | <b>aberration</b> [1] - 13:9                             | 24; 21:2   | 10:4; 31:2, 7, 13   | <b>confirm</b> [3] <b>-</b> 7:22;<br>13:16; 21:6            |
| 21:25; 22:21, 24;<br>24:5; 27:14-16, 22;               | <b>able</b> [5] - 8:7; 15:2;<br>16:14; 19:25; 26:23      | asserted [1] - 15:2  | <b>CALIFORNIA</b> [4] - 1:1;<br>2:6, 15, 19               | <b>confirms</b> [3] - 8:14;                                 |
| 28:4, 11; 29:22; 30:8                                  | absolutely [1] - 20:21                                   | <b>asserting</b> [1] - 21:5<br><b>assistance</b> [1] - 19:10 | <b>CAMINO</b> [1] - 2:14                                  | 14:9; 26:7<br>confronted [1] - 8:8                          |
| <b>31</b> [9] - 8:24; 9:5, 18; 11:13, 18; 12:3, 5;     | accordingly [1] - 24:2                                   | <b>assure</b> [1] - 13:14                                    | <b>care</b> [1] - 30:14<br><b>case</b> [12] - 4:16; 5:24; | conjunctive [1] -   |
| 26:12; 31:11   | ACTIONS [1] - 1:14<br>additional [1] - 27:8              | attempts [1] - 17:12<br>attorney [4] - 10:24;                | 6:8; 7:25; 8:3; 13:7,                                     | 25:17 <b>consistent</b> [1] - 19:23                         |
| <b>31st</b> [4] - 29:10, 20; 30:4, 9                   | address [6] - 5:16;                                      | 24:8, 10, 12   | 11; 17:1; 18:8;   | consummated [1] -   |
| <b>33</b> [3] - 22:1, 21; 24:6                         | 9:1; 12:5; 16:16;<br>20:9                                | Austin [1] - 3:11<br>AUSTIN [7] - 2:17;                      | 20:11; 21:13; 22:9 <b>Case</b> [1] - 3:5                  | 17:13   |
| <b>337</b> [1] - 2:14<br><b>35050</b> [1] - 2:14       | adjourned [1] - 30:20                                    | 3:10, 22; 19:16;   | CASE [1] - 1:9  | context [1] - 12:24<br>continue [2] - 27:3;                 |
| <b>3685</b> [3] - 1:24; 31:5,                          | admission [1] - 23:7<br>admissions [4] -                 | 22:5; 30:17  | cases [2] - 4:4; 5:20<br>caveat [1] - 28:18               | 29:5  |
| 18   | 14:15, 21; 22:20;  | avoiding [1] - 27:14   | CERTIFICATE [1] -   | contract [3] - 12:9;  |
|  |  |  |   |   |

16:6; 17:12 conversation [2] -6:22; 7:4 copies [1] - 31:22 copy [2] - 31:21 **correct** [4] - 5:2, 4; 10:11; 31:12 **COTTON**[2] - 1:10; 2:11 Cotton [7] - 3:5, 12; 6:16; 16:2; 18:19; 21:3; 24:23 Cotton's [2] - 20:22; 24:12 counsel [32] - 3:21, 23; 4:3, 18; 5:7; 7:15, 21; 8:18, 22; 9:9; 11:14, 17; 12:21; 13:13, 20, 24; 14:5, 11, 13; 18:24; 20:4; 21:19, 21; 24:13; 25:16, 25; 26:4, 9, 16; 28:7; 30.13 County [2] - 31:3, 7 **COUNTY** [1] - 1:2 court [3] - 11:15; 31:20, 22 Court [33] - 4:2, 4, 9; 5:17, 22-23; 6:4; 8:14; 9:6; 10:22; 12:5; 14:8; 16:12, 15; 17:18; 19:23; 21:7, 25; 24:3, 22-23; 25:12, 24; 26:7; 27:4, 15; 28:10, 23; 29:4, 11; COURT [74] - 1:1; 3:4, 15, 23; 4:1, 25; 5:5, 15, 18; 6:11, 14; 7:11; 9:2, 5, 8, 11, 19; 10:8, 12; 11:12; 12:16; 13:19, 23; 14:1, 5, 8, 18, 24; 15:5, 10, 12, 20, 22; 17:20; 18:5, 17, 24; 19:4, 15, 17; 20:2, 17, 25; 21:13, 18; 22:2, 6, 9, 12, 15, 17, 23; 23:2, 21; 24:11, 13; 25:3, 13, 24; 26:3, 7; 27:2, 7, 12, 19; 28:1, 17, 19, 25; 29:3, 16; 30:1, 6, Court's [17] - 3:17, 21, 23; 4:21, 24; 6:1; 7:23; 8:13, 19; 11:21; 12:2; 13:17;

19:7; 24:22; 25:4; credibility [4] - 7:18; 18:20; 19:4, 9 credible [2] - 18:14; 19.8 critical [3] - 5:19; 6:3; 25:4 cross [4] - 3:8, 12; 8:5 **CROSS** [4] - 1:14; 2:2, CROSS-ACTIONS [1] - 1:14 cross-complainant [1] - 3:12 CROSS-COMPLAINANT[1] -2:10 CROSS-DEFENDANT [2] -2:2 cross-defendant [2] -3:8 cross-examination [1] - 8:5 CRR [1] - 1:23 CSR [4] - 1:23; 31:5, CT [1] - 1:10 CUP [4] - 9:21, 24; 24:24; 25:1 cutoff [2] - 29:8, 20 D **DARRYL**[2] - 1:10; 2:10 **Darryl** [1] - 3:12 date [8] - 26:25; 27:20; 28:2, 6, 11; 29:9, 20, **Dated** [1] - 31:13 dates [4] - 27:6; 28:5, 10; 29:5 David [1] - 24:8 days [9] - 27:9, 16, 22;

28:4, 8, 12; 29:22;

deadline [1] - 26:19

decided [1] - 19:24

decides [1] - 18:14

17:11, 14; 24:8; 25:8

defendant [3] - 3:8, 11

**DEFENDANT**[3] - 2:2,

defendant's [1] - 3:19

**Defendants** [1] - 1:12

declaration [4] -

defend [1] - 19:2

decide [1] - 19:9

determination [1] -18:21 **Diego** [4] - 3:1; 31:3, 7, 13 **DIEGO** [4] - 1:2; 2:6, 15, 19 differently [1] - 18:2 difficult [2] - 5:22; 12:18 digits [1] - 20:24 dimion [1] - 24:9 direct [4] - 8:18; 21:8, 19; 29:11 direction [2] - 26:15; 31:10 directly [2] - 20:9, 15 directs [2] - 14:10; disappointment [1] disavowment [12] -6:6, 15; 7:7; 8:1, 10; 15:3. 18: 16:1. 10: 17:8; 19:25; 20:16 discourages [1] -17:21 discovered [1] - 4:12 discovery [12] - 6:7; 8:1, 7; 10:14; 12:19; 16:22; 17:11; 19:5; 21:16; 28:6; 29:8 discussed [2] - 6:22; 7:2 discussing [1] - 17:10 discussion [3] - 5:12; 7:1; 23:6 disjunctive [1] - 25:17 dispute [1] - 17:24 document [4] - 6:18; 12:11; 13:2; 24:20 documents [9] - 9:20; 11:6; 19:20; 20:5, 8, 18; 21:10, 15 **DOES** [1] - 1:10

defense [11] - 4:18;

26:9; 29:12, 14

**DEL** [1] - 2:14

deny [1] - 24:1

denied [1] - 6:24

Department [1] -

19:13

**DEPARTMENT**[1] -

department [5] - 4:5:

22:12. 14: 26:13

deposition [1] - 11:9

**deficiency** [1] - 10:3

defined [2] - 6:16; 7:7

7:12; 8:4, 22; 12:21;

17:25; 18:9; 21:13;

done [1] - 13:3 double [1] - 20:13 down [2] - 19:18; 22:13 drawn [1] - 17:20 due [3] - 13:23; 27:8, 11

#### Ε

edification [1] - 24:19 effect [1] - 12:22 effort [2] - 10:6, 20 either [5] - 5:19; 6:3; 18:18; 27:3; 30:7 **election** [1] - 5:13 email [6] - 6:16, 20, 23-24; 7:1; 17:10 emails [1] - 7:4 encompassed [1] -23:24 encompasses [1] -23:11 end [1] - 23:7 ending [1] - 3:5 entirely [1] - 6:4 entitled [1] - 7:19 essence [2] - 11:7; 12.7 establish [1] - 12:13 estate [1] - 12:9 et [1] - 16:6 evaluate [2] - 12:16; 13:4 **evaluation** [1] - 7:18 ex [1] - 27:4 exact [1] - 23:6 exactly [2] - 12:10, 13 examination [1] - 8:5 example [1] - 20:21 exceeded [1] - 4:7 **exercise** [1] - 13:14 exhibit [1] - 31:21 exhibits [1] - 23:11 expect [1] - 23:5 **expected** [1] - 23:16 expert [1] - 29:9 **explained** [1] - 24:14 expressing [1] - 6:1 extend [2] - 28:4, 10 extent [2] - 7:24; 27:7

### F

fact [4] - 23:10, 24; 24:1; 25:5 facts [2] - 13:7; 24:17 fair [3] - 13:18, 22; 30:12 faith [2] - 10:6, 20 fall [1] - 5:20 far [2] - 11:3; 19:24 February [3] - 3:1; 31:9, 13 **FEBRUARY**[1] - 1:17 fee [1] - 31:21 feet [1] - 12:23 FERRIS [1] - 2:4 fifth [2] - 8:20; 14:13 figure [1] - 4:10 file [3] - 16:19; 18:19; 26:19 filed [3] - 4:16; 17:17; 30:7 filing [1] - 17:21 filings [1] - 4:9 finally [1] - 3:4 fine [2] - 16:19; 29:24 first [8] - 4:17; 6:20; 9:12; 10:8; 11:9; 12:16; 16:2 flip [1] - 17:22 FLORES [46] - 2:13; 3:13; 4:20; 5:4; 8:24; 9:4, 6, 10, 18, 22; 10:11, 15; 12:4; 13:18, 22; 14:4, 14, 22; 15:8, 11, 14, 21, 23; 18:4, 22, 25; 19:11, 22; 21:23; 22:8, 10, 16, 22, 24; 23:18; 24:14; 25:11, 23; 26:1, 5, 18; 27:3; 28:16; 29:15; 30:16 Flores [1] - 3:13 **focus** [3] - 5:5; 6:3, 6 focusing [3] - 9:2; 15:13; 25:15 folks [2] - 13:8; 28:1 follows [1] - 29:5 food [1] - 18:24 **FOR** [3] - 1:2; 2:2, 10 force [1] - 11:8 foregoing [1] - 31:11 form [4] - 16:3; 17:5, former [2] - 24:10, 12 forward [1] - 26:12 fourth [3] - 8:20; 9:3; 14:9 framed [2] - 12:24; 25:20 frankly [1] - 11:24 fraud [1] - 12:15

FRAZEE [1] - 2:18

Frazier [1] - 19:16

FRIDAY [1] - 1:17

frivolous [1] - 19:3

Friday [1] - 3:1

full [1] - 31:11

25:21; 26:14; 28:18,

fully [1] - 25:8 housekeeping [4] judge [1] - 17:21 15:17; 23:20 Ν 4:20; 15:17; 26:1, 12 Judge [1] - 19:16 matters [3] - 4:16; named [1] - 10:9 judgment [6] - 26:20; 26:2 G 27:10, 21; 29:21; mean [7] - 4:2; 5:25; **namely** [1] - 30:9 generally [1] - 23:22 10:18; 12:24; 20:3; narrow [1] - 21:14 30:3.7 identification [1] -Geraci [26] - 3:5, 9; June [2] - 29:6 23:12: 25:17 narrowed [1] - 21:4 5:3; 6:17-19; 8:25; 11:1 jury [4] - 18:10, 14, 21; means [2] - 16:21; narrowly [2] - 23:23; 9:23; 10:9; 11:25; identify [2] - 12:8; 29:20 19:9 25:5 12:7, 20; 13:1, 10; 21:10 meet [1] - 24:15 nature [1] - 11:23 14:10; 15:4; 16:3; identifying [1] - 24:20 K mention [1] - 19:13 nearly [1] - 29:23 17:6, 25; 18:19; imagine [1] - 18:6 **mentioned** [1] - 16:4 need [2] - 13:21; 29:24 20:2, 6, 12, 23; 21:8 imagining [1] - 12:19 keep[1] - 5:22 MICHAEL [1] - 2:5 never [2] - 17:13, 22 **GERACI** [2] - 1:6; 2:3 **impose** [1] - 10:13 knowledge [8] - 7:3, Michael [1] - 3:8 next [2] - 6:21; 7:1 Geraci's [4] - 15:24; **IN** [2] - 1:1 9; 8:9; 10:1, 7, 21, might [6] - 5:14: 7:9: **NEXT** [1] - 1:21 17:10; 18:10; 21:2 24; 11:5 inclined [5] - 7:22; 12:4; 23:13; 25:19 night [1] - 6:24 given [1] - 15:25 12:2; 18:17; 21:1 mind [1] - 5:22 nine [1] - 23:10 gotcha [2] - 14:24; L include [1] - 26:23 modifications [1] -**NO** [2] - 1:9, 24 20.17 including [2] - 29:9; 16:8 non [1] - 12:9 **Larry** [1] - 3:9 Government [1] -30:7 modified [5] - 7:23; nonprivileged [2] -**LARRY** [2] - 1:6; 2:2 31:20 inclusive [1] - 1:11 8:16; 21:7 7:5: 21:15 last [5] - 4:8; 20:23; guess [5] - 4:1; 11:25; inconsistent [1] moment [1] - 5:1 note [1] - 5:11 26:25; 28:4; 29:5 16:12; 18:9 17:15 months [1] - 23:11 notes [1] - 31:9 late [2] - 30:3, 9 incorporate [1] morning [2] - 3:7, 10 nothing [2] - 17:3; law [3] - 5:21; 28:5; н 28:13 most [1] - 4:6 24:19 29:8 indicate [1] - 9:11 Motion [2] - 14:1; 26:8 **notice** [6] - 8:19; hard [1] - 28:2 LAW [2] - 2:13, 17 **INDIVIDUAL** [1] - 2:11 motion [33] - 4:10; 14:11; 21:19; 26:9; heading [1] - 26:15 leap [1] - 12:23 individual [4] - 1:6, 5:21; 6:4; 7:14; 9:3; 29:12; 30:11 **hear** [5] - 7:14; 13:21; least [1] - 4:8 10; 10:9, 13 14:9, 13; 15:19-21, November [1] - 6:17 16:14; 27:12, 16 leaves [1] - 21:20 **information** [5] - 7:20; 24; 16:14, 17, 19, Number [12] - 3:5; heard [11] - 5:8; 8:23; less [2] - 27:16; 30:8 11:10; 23:13, 25; 21; 17:3, 15, 19, 23; 4:23; 5:11; 8:16; 11:15; 14:3; 17:22; **limitation** [1] - 27:15 24:16 21:20; 24:24; 26:4, 9:18; 14:1, 20; 27:22; 29:21, 23; limited [1] - 28:3 initiate [1] - 12:11 20, 24; 27:10, 16, 15:14; 21:9; 26:8 limits [1] - 10:12 inquire [2] - 8:4; 10:20 20; 28:5; 29:8, numbered [1] - 20:23 hearing [6] - 13:20; inquiry [1] - 25:20 line [1] - 25:20 20-21; 30:2, 7 numbers [1] - 21:10 26:25; 27:20; 28:11; lined [1] - 26:14 instance [1] - 11:11 motions [5] - 3:20; 29:24; 30:2 literally [1] - 10:18 intended [1] - 5:19 4:22; 8:21; 17:21; 0 heavily [2] - 4:4, 6 litigant [2] - 10:10, 13 intending [1] - 6:2 30:6 held [1] - 31:9 litigated [2] - 4:4, 6 intention [1] - 25:4 Motions [2] - 5:2; 8:15 object [1] - 30:2 help [1] - 11:20 live [1] - 28:15 internal [1] - 31:22 moved [1] - 29:19 **objection** [11] - 10:1, hereby [1] - 31:7 lobbyist [1] - 9:24 interposed [1] - 12:1 moving [4] - 8:19; 23; 12:6, 18, 23, 25; highly [1] - 26:22 Lois [2] - 31:5, 17 14:11; 21:19; 28:13 interrogatories [5] -14:16; 22:1, 25; hold [3] - 16:13; 18:2, LOIS [1] - 1:23 8:25; 14:10; 16:3, 11 **MR** [80] - 3:7, 10, 13, 24:4; 25:11 18 lois.mason51@ 22, 25; 4:20; 5:4, 9, objectionable [1] interrogatory [3] -HON [1] - 1:4 17:2, 6, 14 gmail.com [1] - 1:24 16; 6:10, 12, 15; 11.23 Honor [51] - 3:7, 10, look [3] - 9:17; 11:12; 8:24; 9:4, 6, 10, 18, involving [3] - 8:15; **objections** [3] - 9:7; 14, 22, 25; 4:20; 5:4; 22; 10:11, 15; 12:4; 14:9; 20:5 24:8 11:25; 25:21 8:24; 9:4, 18, 22; 13:18, 22, 25; 14:4, looked [2] - 11:19; issue [5] - 7:25; 15:2; obtain [1] - 10:7 10:3, 16; 12:4, 10; 7, 14, 20, 22; 15:1, 19:19 16:13; 19:1; 28:23 occur [2] - 12:15; 25:2 13:18, 25; 14:14, 16, looking [5] - 12:21; 7-8, 11, 14, 21, 23; issues [1] - 29:17 **OF** [5] - 1:1; 2:13, 17 22; 15:1, 9, 14, 17, 13:5; 23:8; 25:18; 16:15; 18:4, 16, 22, Items [1] - 3:4 offered [1] - 7:6 23; 16:16; 18:23, 25; items [2] - 14:2; 29:13 26:12 25; 19:11, 16, 22; **OFFICE** [1] - 2:13 19:12, 22; 21:17, 23; 20:7, 21; 21:12, 17, looks [1] - 9:15 **OFFICES** [1] - 2:17 22:5, 22, 25; 23:18; 23; 22:5, 8, 10, 16, J **ON**[1] - 1:21 24:16; 25:2; 26:2, 6, 22, 24; 23:18; 24:10, М once [3] - 21:4; 24:13 18, 21, 24; 27:11; 12, 14; 25:11, 23; Jacob [1] - 3:11 one [20] - 4:3, 7, 25; 28:16, 18; 29:15; machine [1] - 31:8 26:1, 5-6, 18; 27:3, **JACOB** [2] - 2:17 6:3; 12:20; 13:2; 30:16 managed [1] - 4:15 10, 13, 24; 28:16, **Jim** [4] - 9:21, 23; 14:12; 16:3; 18:1, hope [1] - 26:14 MASON [1] - 1:23 18, 20; 29:2, 15, 18; 10:2; 11:9 12, 14; 19:12; 20:19; hoping [1] - 28:23 30:5, 12, 16 Mason [2] - 31:5, 17 job [1] - 19:7 21:22; 22:1; 24:1; hour [1] - 9:13

matter [3] - 4:21;

**JOEL** [1] - 1:4

22 one-page [1] - 13:2 ones [2] - 8:23, 25 opposing [6] - 11:17; 12:22; 13:20, 24; 14:5; 27:5 order [9] - 4:2, 12, 14-15; 10:13; 13:3; 15:9; 21:24; 31:22 original [6] - 16:24; 18:3, 10, 13 otherwise [2] - 20:15; 31:22 outlined [1] - 25:8 overruled [2] - 10:22; own [3] - 20:22; 24:18

## Ρ

PAGE [1] - 1:21 page [1] - 13:2 pages [1] - 31:11 paid [1] - 21:3 paper [1] - 13:5 papers [1] - 28:14 parenthetical [1] -5:18 part [1] - 6:7 parte [1] - 27:4 particular [1] - 11:10 parties [1] - 17:21 party [6] - 8:19; 14:11; 21:19; 23:15; 31:20, past [1] - 13:3 patient [1] - 9:12 paying [1] - 31:21 period [1] - 28:3 permitted [1] - 15:3 person [2] - 31:20, 23 personal [4] - 7:3; 10:1, 24; 11:4 personally [1] - 27:11 persuaded [1] - 11:22 phone [3] - 20:22 phonetic [1] - 24:9 phonetic) [1] - 22:11 Pick [1] - 22:10 pieces [1] - 13:5 pitch [1] - 19:9 **plaintiff** [1] - 3:8 **Plaintiff** [1] - 1:7 **PLAINTIFF** [1] - 2:2 **plaintiff's** [3] - 5:7; 10:23; 29:16 play [3] - 18:6; 21:15 point [3] - 10:22; 15:16; 18:8

poorly [1] - 23:19

position [2] - 17:18; 19.2 possible [2] - 13:1; 27.1 practice [2] - 12:13; 13:10 prejudiced [1] - 26:22 prepared [1] - 4:21 present [2] - 18:9, 11 presents [2] - 18:12 **presuming** [1] - 6:8 previous [1] - 15:25 price [1] - 21:3 privilege [6] - 5:13; 7:19, 24; 15:2; 21:2, **pro** [1] - 31:5 **problem** [3] - 10:3, 17; 27:13 Procedure [2] - 10:4, Proceedings [1] -30:20 proceedings [2] -31.9 12 produced [5] - 20:5, 10, 14, 19; 21:11 producing [1] - 20:5 product [1] - 11:21 **Production** [1] - 21:9 production [1] - 14:21 productions [1] -16:11 prohibited [1] - 8:2 property [2] - 9:25; 12:12 propound [1] - 25:6 **provide** [1] - 31:22 **provided** [1] - 16:3 **pull** [1] - 22:18 purchase [1] - 12:12 purchased [1] - 31:20 pursuant [1] - 31:21 **pushing** [1] - 28:2 put [2] - 4:13; 19:2 putting [1] - 12:21

portion [4] - 13:16;

14:3; 31:21

#### Q

questioning [2] -13:12; 23:21 questions [1] - 23:1 quick [3] - 14:25; 22:19; 23:3 quite [2] - 4:7; 11:24

## R

ranging [1] - 8:5

rapidly [1] - 4:3

read [1] - 24:15

readiness [1] - 29:7 real [4] - 12:9; 14:25; 22:13, 19 really [2] - 23:3; 25:16 reason [1] - 6:2 reasonable [3] - 10:6, 19: 23:15 **REBECCA** [1] - 2:3 Rebecca [2] - 3:9; 4:23 receiver [1] - 24:24 receiving [2] - 23:7, 15 records [1] - 20:10 refer [1] - 11:5 reference [2] - 24:22; 25.7 referring [1] - 17:2 reflected [4] - 4:14; 8:12; 20:7; 30:10 reflects [1] - 20:12 regarding [3] - 7:7; 15:3; 16:1 regards [7] - 4:22; 10:5, 23; 12:6; 15:17, 19; 16:6 relate [1] - 5:3 **RELATED**[1] - 1:14 relating [1] - 9:20 relevancy [9] - 12:5, 18, 23; 13:4, 12; 23:22; 25:12, 15 relevant [5] - 6:5, 8; 7:9; 25:20 remain [1] - 25:21 **reminding** [1] - 7:13 renegotiate [1] - 17:12 reopen [1] - 21:4 reported [1] - 31:8 reporter [2] - 31:6, 21 REPORTER'S [1] -1:16 reproduce [1] - 31:21 request [8] - 10:14; 11:23; 14:15, 21; 21:16; 22:20; 23:7 Request [1] - 21:9 requests [3] - 16:11, 22; 23:22 respect [1] - 13:23 respective [1] - 5:23 respond [6] - 10:14;

11:17; 16:10; 23:16;

24:2; 27:18

responded [1] - 6:18 responding [1] - 6:19 response [21] - 5:11; 10:17; 11:3; 15:25; 16:8, 23-25; 17:2, 6, 11; 18:10, 13-14, 19; 20:8; 21:8, 15 responses [8] - 16:7, 22; 17:14; 19:7, 24; 26:23; 27:8; 28:13 rest [2] - 6:22, 25 retrieve [1] - 23:2 reviewed [4] - 9:21; 10:2, 24; 11:2 RIO [1] - 2:14 risk [1] - 8:6 **ROA**[1] - 9:14 **ROAD** [1] - 2:18 **ROAs**[1] - 4:7 **RPR** [1] - 1:23 rule [1] - 31:22 ruling [7] - 3:18; 8:13, 19; 14:9; 16:12; 26:9; 30:11 rulings [2] - 6:1; 8:15

## S

sabotaged [1] - 24:25

San [4] - 3:1; 31:3, 7,

sale [2] - 12:11

13 **SAN**[4] - 1:2; 2:6, 15, sanctions [1] - 16:20 **satisfied** [1] - 7:19 saw [2] - 4:8; 25:7 schedule [1] - 28:21 scheduled [1] - 22:4 scope [4] - 5:14; 11:23; 21:5, 14 search [1] - 10:13 Section [1] - 31:20 see [6] - 3:15, 19; 13:6; 18:7, 12; 25:13 seeing [1] - 26:13 seek [1] - 16:19 seeking [1] - 11:10 select [1] - 28:22 sell [1] - 31:22 send [1] - 22:13 sent [2] - 6:16, 24 **sentence** [2] - 6:20; 12:11 **separate** [4] - 9:8, 15; 14:19; 22:19 seq [1] - 16:6 **serve** [6] - 8:19; 14:11; 21:8, 19; 26:9; 29:12 served [4] - 16:21;

19:8; 27:11 Session [1] - 3:2 set [1] - 26:24 shall [2] - 10:19; 31:22 **short** [2] - 6:13; 11:16 **shortened** [1] - 27:18 **shorthand** [1] - 31:8 **show** [1] - 12:15 side [20] - 5:20, 25; 7:12; 11:25; 18:9, 12-13, 18; 20:19; 21:14; 23:9, 25; 24:2, 25; 25:6, 20; 27:5; 29:14, 16; 30:8 signed [1] - 6:17 similar [3] - 10:23; 13:6; 23:1 simple [1] - 23:20 single [2] - 18:8 sixth [2] - 8:21; 21:20 sliver [2] - 7:14; 23:12 so-called [3] - 6:6; 8:1, 9 soon [2] - 22:13; 25:7 sorry [3] - 15:8, 14; 22:21 sought [1] - 25:1 source [2] - 7:5, 20 **SOUTH** [1] - 2:14 **speaking** [1] - 23:22 special [2] - 8:25; 14:10 specific [1] - 23:24 specifically [2] - 16:4; 24:19 spend [2] - 13:8, 19 spent [1] - 11:14 stamp [1] - 21:10 stamped [1] - 20:20 stand [2] - 12:19 standard [1] - 12:9 start [3] - 4:17; 13:5; 19:14 started [1] - 21:23 **STATE**[1] - 1:1 State [1] - 31:6 **state** [2] - 10:19; 31:2 **statement** [5] - 9:9, 15; 10:5; 14:19; 22:19 statute [1] - 17:19 still [3] - 15:10; 28:12; 29:23 stipulate [3] - 24:21; 27:5, 22 strikes [1] - 25:10 **struggle** [1] - 24:3

subject [3] - 9:25;

21:9; 23:20

submission [1] -10:25 submit [4] - 4:21; 5:9; 14:7; 15:15 substantively [1] -16:13 sudden [1] - 8:8 suggest [1] - 8:3 **suggesting** [2] - 8:4; 25:19 **SUITE** [3] - 2:6, 14, 19 **summary** [6] - 26:20; 27:10, 20; 29:21; 30:3, 7 **SUPERIOR** [1] - 1:1 **Superior** [1] - 31:6 supplemental [3] -11:3; 26:23; 28:13 supposed [1] - 19:14 **sustain** [3] - 12:25; 13:15; 21:1 sustained [5] - 9:6; 12:5; 14:17; 21:25; 24:3 sustaining [1] - 25:12

### Т

tailored [2] - 23:23;

talks [2] - 17:10; 20:15

25:5

telephone [5] - 6:21; 7:4; 20:9, 12 tem [1] - 31:5 ten [3] - 23:10; 27:8; 28:7 tend [1] - 12:14 tentative [12] - 3:17, 21, 24; 4:22, 24; 7:23; 8:13; 12:3; 13:17; 21:7; 26:8 term [1] - 20:16 testify [1] - 19:25 testifying [2] - 8:2, 11 testimony [2] - 5:14; **THE** [80] - 1:1; 2:2, 10, 13; 3:4, 15, 23; 4:1, 25; 5:5, 15, 18; 6:11, 14; 7:11; 9:2, 5, 8, 11, 19; 10:8, 12; 11:12; 12:16; 13:19, 23; 14:1, 5, 8, 18, 24; 15:5, 10, 12, 20, 22; 17:20; 18:5, 17, 24; 19:4, 15, 17; 20:2, 17, 25; 21:13, 18; 22:2, 6, 9, 12, 14-15, 17, 23; 23:2, 21; 24:11, 13; 25:3,

30:1, 6, 13 themselves [1] - 10:6 theories [1] - 5:24 thereof [1] - 31:21 thinking [2] - 27:24; 28:3 third [2] - 6:4; 7:14 **THOMPSON**[1] - 1:23 **Thompson** [2] - 31:5, thousands [1] - 11:6 three [5] - 3:15; 12:11; 20:23; 28:4; 29:5 timeline [1] - 23:10 today [1] - 27:11 together [2] - 14:16; 22:24 took [1] - 9:12 totality [1] - 25:18 trail [1] - 22:7 transactions [2] -12:8; 13:6 transcribed [1] - 31:10 TRANSCRIPT[1] -1:16 transcript [3] - 31:11, TRC [2] - 27:25; 28:5 trial [17] - 5:14; 8:2; 13:11; 15:3; 18:8; 26:13; 27:15, 23; 28:2, 5, 21; 29:5, 22; 30:4, 8 true [3] - 14:23; 18:18; 31:12 truly [2] - 11:21; 17:22 trying [2] - 11:7; 12:12 turns [1] - 5:25 two [4] - 12:20; 14:2, 15; 29:7 **type** [1] - 13:2 typewriting [1] - 31:10

13, 24; 26:3, 7; 27:2,

7, 12, 19; 28:1, 17,

19, 25; 29:3, 16;

# U

ultimately [2] - 18:20; 19:8 under [2] - 10:4; 31:10 underlying [3] - 13:6; 17:24; 24:17 understood [1] -13:25 unfortunately [1] -26:25 unfruitful [1] - 11:8 unless [1] - 8:10 unreasonable [1] - 25:10 up [13] - 4:11; 9:13; 11:20; 12:17; 16:9; 18:12; 19:3; 22:18; 26:14, 19; 27:14; 29:13

#### V

vein [1] - 23:18 verbal [1] - 20:16 versus [2] - 3:5; 22:10 Vidal [1] - 22:10 volley [1] - 11:10 VS [1] - 1:8

### W

waiting [1] - 11:15 wants [1] - 5:17 weeks [1] - 29:7 weighing [1] - 19:6 weight [1] - 4:13 **WEINSTEIN** [32] - 2:5; 3:7, 25; 5:9, 16; 6:10, 12, 15; 13:25; 14:7, 20; 15:1, 7; 16:15; 18:16; 20:7, 21; 21:12, 17; 24:10, 12; 26:6; 27:10, 13, 24; 28:18, 20; 29:2, 18; 30:5, 12, 18 Weinstein [1] - 3:8 **WEST** [1] - 2:5 whatsoever [1] -13:16 whole [2] - 13:2; 23:11 **wide** [1] - 8:5 willing [3] - 27:5, 22; 28:22 witness [1] - 12:20 **WOHLFEIL** [1] - 1:4 worried [1] - 24:17 written [3] - 6:17; 20:8: 23:19

## Υ

year [1] - 16:9