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1 for speculation.
    You can answer.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q Is your name on any of the applications for
the CUP for the marijuana outlets as an owner?
    A No.
    Q Do you have any agents currently that
represent you in that process?
    A No.
    Q Did you have any involvement with Darryl
Cotton, defendant's, CUP for the federal project, 7667?
    MR. TOOTHACRE: Vague as to Darryl Cotton's
CUP.
    To my knowledge, he didn't have one.
    MS. PLASKETT:To the application for the CUP?
Let me rephrase that.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q At any point, did you work with Mr. Darryl
Cotton, who's a defendant in this lawsuit, in his
application for a marijuana outlet?
    A No.
    Q Did you have any involvement with the
application for a CUP for a marijuana outlet for }62
Federal, Mark Magagna?
    MR. AUSTIN: Aaron.
```

```
        MS. PLASKETT: Aaron. I'm sorry.
        THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q Have you ever met Aaron Magagna?
    A Once.
    Q And who introduced you, if you remember?
    A He did.
        MR. TOOTHACRE: He did?
        THE WITNESS:Well, can I describe how I met
him?
    MR. TOOTHACRE:Sure.
    THE WITNESS: He introduced himself after --
at a city council hearing in the council chambers, as he
was walking out.
    THE REPORTER: Can I have you speak up, sir,
please.
    THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MS. PLASKETT
    Q Have you ever done any lobbying for
Mr. Magagna?
    A No.
    Q Do you have any knowledge of Mr. Magagna's CUP
application for a marijuana outlet on 6220 Federal?
    A Yes.
    Q And what was the extent of the work that you
```

1 did for Mr. Magagna?
A I didn't do any work.
MR. TOOTHACRE: Misstates testimony.
THE WITNESS: I stated that I never worked for
him.
6 BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q But you knew about the application?
A Yeah.
Q Okay. Did you understand that Mr. Magagna's
CUP application and approval would then disqualify
Mr. Cotton's CUP application?
MR. TOOTHACRE: Vague and ambiguous.
Do you understand the question?
THE WITNESS: Well, I understand what --
what -- what application are you talking about?
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q The CUP application for a marijuana outlet.
A You said Mr. Cotton.
Q What I'm driving at -- my question is, did you
know that if Mr. Magagna's CUP application for a
marijuana outlet, if approved, would then disqualify
Mr. Cotton's property?
MR. TOOTHACRE: I think the confusion is --
MR. AUSTIN: It's Geraci's. It's Geraci's
application.

```
    MS. PLASKETT: It's Geraci's -- well,
actually, it's Berry's application, but...
    THE WITNESS: Yes.
    MS. PLASKETT:Thank you.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Did you have any knowledge of the denial of
Mr. Geraci's CUP application?
    MR. TOOTHACRE: Vague as to time.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q When did you know of Mr. Geraci's -- that
Mr. Geraci's CUP application for the marijuana outlet
would be denied?
    A At the time that Magagna's was approved.
    Q Prior to his approval, did you believe that
Mr. Geraci's CUP application would be denied for other
reasons?
    MR. TOOTHACRE: Vague and ambiguous. Calls
for speculation.
        But you can answer.
        THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question?
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q At what point did you believe that
Mr. Magagna's -- excuse me. Now I messed up.
        At what point did you believe that
Mr. Geraci's application for the marijuana outlet would
```

1 be denied?
$2 \quad$ A $\quad$ I never did.
3 $\quad$ Q $\quad$ Did you believe that this application could be 1 approved?
be denied?
A I never did.
Q Did you believe that this application could be
pproved?
A Yes.
Q Did you see any problems or defects in
MR. TOOTHACRE: Vague and ambiguous.
ntinuing of issues raised by the City and your ability
THE REPORTER: Sir, please speak up.
Q Was there a point where you believed
Mr. Geraci's CUP application would fail to make it
through the process?
Q Do you know Elizabeth? Have you ever met
Elizabeth White? She's a geotechnical engineer
A No.
Q Did you promote any actions to take any soil
A Did I?
happen, to get the soil samples for the CUP application
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THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question?
2 BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Will the City accept recommendation from a
4 contractor soil engineer when applying for a CUP
5 application throughout the project, prior to the
6 processing of the application?
7 MR. TOOTHACRE: Same objection.
8 BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Basically what I'm asking you is, will the City take that while they're processing other parts of the application?

MR. TOOTHACRE: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: I don't know how to answer that.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
5 Q Do you ever meet with investors interested in
16 submitting a CUP application in San Diego County or the
state of California for marijuana outlets?
A Yes.
Q How long, in your opinion, do you think the
normal CUP application process in San Diego takes?
A Year and a half.
Q Is there any way to expedite that process?
A No.
Q Do you believe, based on your experience, that
the CUP application for 7176 Federal, the Geraci

```
application, took longer than the normal process?
    A Yes.
    Q Do you have any opinion as to why it took
longer?
    A Yes.
    Q And what is your opinion regarding what took
longer in Mr. Geraci's CUP application?
    A I would say the controversy between Mr. Geraci
and Mr. Cotton.
    Q Did that controversy between them have to do
with the necessary grant deed the City required to
process the application?
    A I don't know.
    Q Do you have any opinion as to why the CUP
application for 7220 Federal, the Magagna application --
            MR. TOOTHACRE: }6220
            MS. PLASKETT: 6220. Thank you.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q -- Federal, took less time than the
application for Geraci's 7176 Federal?
            MR. TOOTHACRE: Calls for speculation.
            But you can answer.
            THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q Is Mr. Magagna represented by any of your
```

1 application for a marijuana outlet in San Diego County?
MR. TOOTHACRE: Vague as to time.
THE WITNESS: No.
4 BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q In 2017, 18.
A No.
Q Okay. Did you know that her CUP application
8 was recently approved for the marijuana outlet in
9 La Mesa?
A I don't know. I knew she was an investor. I
didn't know which CUP. I never dealt with her on any
application, per se.
Q Okay.
A I remember one time. That was it.
Q You met her just the one time?
A Uh-huh.
MR. TOOTHACRE: Is that yes?
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Did Ms. Young tell you that she was
considering financing Defendant, Mr. Cotton's litigation
against Plaintiff, Mr. Geraci?
A No.
Q Did she tell you that she was interested in
participating with Defendant, Mr. Cotton and Geraci, CUP
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```
application?
    A I don't recall.
    Q Did you give her any -- did you provide
```

Ms. Young with your opinion on investing in any CUP
5 applications?
A I don't recall.
Q Do you recall telling Ms. Young not to invest
in Mr. Geraci's, slash, Cotton CUP application?
A No.
Q Did you ever tell Ms. Young that everybody
hates Darryl? Meaning, Mr. Cotton?
A I don't recall.
MS. PLASKETT: I would like to show you an
email from Ms. Young regarding her meeting with you, and
submit it into evidence as Exhibit 1.
(Exhibit 1 was marked.)
MR. TOOTHACRE: Who is this purported in the
claim?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, what --
MS. PLASKETT: It's between Ms. Young and
Joe -- how do you pronounce that.
MR. TOOTHACRE: Hurtado?
MS. PLASKETT: Hurtado.
MR. TOOTHACRE: Okay.
THE WITNESS: And who is he?

```
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q Joe Hurtado is a litigation investor in
Mr. Cotton's CUP application and lawsuits.
    MR. TOOTHACRE: Is this a complete document?
It looks like they start -- look, I don't know what to
say. It looks like it should have been something
previous.
    MS. PLASKETT:It does look like there's
something prior to this.
    MR. AUSTIN: It could have been that they were
having --
    MS. PLASKETT:A conversation on the subject.
    MR. TOOTHACRE: I'm just going to put an
objection on the record, that there's no foundation for
this document. It appears to be an incomplete document.
It's purported to be between Corina Young and Joe
Hurtado, but Mr. Hurtado's name is not on here anywhere.
And I don't see a phone number which could be linked to
him.
    So based on that objection, we object to the
document.
    But you can go ahead and question him on it so
that -- for what it's worth.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Does reading through those text messages help
```

```
    A Yes, I'm familiar with it.
    Q I'm}\mathrm{ going to enter this into evidence as
Exhibit 2.
A So what's the question?
Q Do you have -- in your opinion, do you have
6 any idea of why this timeline couldn't be followed?
MR. TOOTHACRE: Assumes facts. Calls for
speculation.
But you can answer.
THE WITNESS: Let me see it again.
Well, this is February 2017. I would say that
something happened at cycle 2 that caused further delays.
BY MS. PLASKETT
        Q And did you say in cycle 2?
        A I reference -- in the timeline I reference
that we'd be getting cycle 2 from the City in
April 24th. This was done in February, two months
earlier. So cycle 2 must have raised issues that it
caused the project to be extended.
    MS. PLASKETT:Thank you.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q Back to Ms. Young.
            Did you know that Mr. Magagna had offered
Ms. Young money to say that she dreamt of the
conversation with you?
```
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```
A No.
    MR. TOOTHACRE: Assumes facts. Lacks
```

foundation.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
6 Q Do you know why Mr. Geraci's application
7 listed Rebecca Berry as the owner instead of himself?
A No.
Q Do you know if Geraci was ever fined by the
0 City for operating illegal pot operations?
A No.
Q So you had no idea that he had been fined
previously?
A No.
MR. TOOTHACRE: Assumes facts.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q In the Geraci application, did you see that
Ms. Berry was listed as both an owner and as a lessee of
the property?
MR. TOOTHACRE: Assumes facts. Misstates the
document.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q There's two different documents.
A I'm not aware of that, no.
Q Can you -- is it legal to lobby for a project

```
that doesn't have the actual owner's name on it?
2 MR. TOOTHACRE: Calls for a legal conclusion
3 and speculation.
4 THE WITNESS: Ask the question again.
5 BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q When lobbying -- is it legal to lobby for a
CUP marijuana outlet application when the projects --
8 where the name on the project is not the owner's name?
            MR. TOOTHACRE: Same objection.
            THE WITNESS: I -- I don't know.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q Did you know that it is illegal to process an
application that doesn't -- that fails to have the
person's -- the owner -- the person who's owner -- as
the owner's name on it?
            MR. TOOTHACRE: Same objections. Assumes
facts. Calls for legal conclusion.
    THE WITNESS: I'm not an attorney, so I
    don't -- I wouldn't get involved in those issues.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q Okay. Did you know that all owners' names
must be disclosed on a CUP application for a marijuana
outlet?
    MR. TOOTHACRE: Assumes facts not in evidence.
    THE WITNESS:That's a legal issue that I
```

```
A Yes.
Q And how did you meet Mr. Dutta?
A Through Mr. Geraci.
    MR. TOOTHACRE: Through who?
    THE WITNESS: Mr. Geraci.
6 BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Okay. Did Mr. Dutta claim a 10 percent
finder's fee?
    THE WITNESS: I have no idea.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q Do you know if there's any liens or holds on
the Geraci application because of a finder's fee?
    A I have no idea.
    Q Do you know if anybody was promised a finder's
fee on the Geraci project?
    A No.
        MR. TOOTHACRE: Calls for speculation.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q Do you work with a company called T-e-c-h-n-e,
Techne?
    A Yes.
    Q And do you work with a man named Greg Kenneth
Mills?
    A No.
    Q And do you have a primary point of contact
```

wouldn't be involved in.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Do you ever cross-check to make sure that the
owners' names on the application are the true owners of
the property?
A No. That's not my role.
Q Do you ask your clients if they're
representing themself as the owner? Or if they're using
an agent?
A No.
Q In Mr. Geraci's CUP application for a
marijuana outlet, did you ever see any part of the
application with his name on it?
A No.
Q Do you know if Mr. Geraci chose to use an
agent because of his history of fines?
MR. TOOTHACRE: Calls for speculation. Also
assumes facts.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Do you know who discovered the Geraci property
for a CUP, a possible CUP application for a marijuana
outlet?
A No.
Q Do you know Neil Dutta?
Page 29
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| 1 with working with Techne? |
| :---: |
| A Abhay Schweitzer. |
| MR. TOOTHACRE: Can you spell Abhay for the |
| 4 court reporter. |
| THE WITNESS: A-b-h-a-y. |
| THE REPORTER: And the last name also, please. |
| THE WITNESS: S-c-h-w-e-i-t-z-e-r. |
| 8 BY MS. PLASKETT: |
| Q Did Mr. Schweitzer, in 2017 -- did |
| 0 Mr . Schweitzer ask for your assistant [sic] regarding |
| 1 the geological review, the geotechnical investigation |
| 2 for the Geraci property in CUP application? |
| A Ask my -- in what context? |
| MS. PLASKETT: We'll mark this as Exhibit 3. |
| 5 It's a email from Mr. Bartell to Mr. Schweitzer, July |
| 6 24th of 2017. |
| (Exhibit 3 was marked.) |
| THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 9 BY MS. PLASKETT: |
| $0 \quad$ Q Did you assist them -- I see a response to |
| 1 your email was, "Good morning. I will set it up." |
| 2 A Asking me to set up the meeting with the City. |
| 3 Q With the City. |
| 4 Were you able to set up that meeting, if you |
| 5 recall? |

with working with Techne?
A Abhay Schweitzer.
MR. TOOTHACRE: Can you spell Abhay for the
court reporter.
THE WITNESS: A-b-h-a-y.
THE REPORTER: And the last name also, please.
THE WITNESS: S-c-h-w-e-i-t-z-e-r.
8 BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Did Mr. Schweitzer, in 2017 -- did
0 Mr. Schweitzer ask for your assistant [sic] regarding
the geological review, the geotechnical investigation
for the Geraci property in CUP application?
A Ask my -- in what context?
MS. PLASKETT: We'll mark this as Exhibit 3.
5 It's a email from Mr. Bartell to Mr. Schweitzer, July
24th of 2017.
(Exhibit 3 was marked.)
THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Did you assist them -- I see a response to
your email was, "Good morning. I will set it up."
A Asking me to set up the meeting with the City.
Q With the City.
Were you able to set up that meeting, if you
recall?

Page 32


```
1 BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q Okay. Thank you.
            Matt Shapiro, did you know if Mr. Shapiro
worked on the Magagna application?
    A No.
    Q You don't know?
    A I didn't know that.
    Q So you have no idea who worked with Magagna?
    A No.
    Q Okay. Just to clarify. Thank you.
            Is it commonplace in your industry for the
same attorneys and players to be involved in this
process?
            MR. TOOTHACRE: Vague and ambiguous.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q What I'm}\mathrm{ seeing is a lot of the same names
keep popping up.
    A Uh-huh.
    Q Is it like a group of you that are in the C
application process, common players?
    A Yeah.
    Q Do you know if anybody intentionally did
anything to slow down the process of the Geraci CUP
application?
    A I would say Mr. Cotton.
```

1 the marijuana outlet?
A No.
Q Do you believe that you had Mr. Geraci's best
4 interest in getting the CUP application approved?
A Yes.
6 Q Have you ever reviewed the initial document
7 between Mr. Cotton and Mr. Geraci regarding the
8 potential sale of the real property?
A No.
Q Do you have any idea of what that litigation
is about, generally speaking?
A Generally speaking. I'm not privy to the --
Q You haven't read the complaint?
A No.
Q And you haven't looked at the supporting
documents?
A No.
Q Thank you.
Were you paid by Mr. Geraci to assist him in
processing the CUP application?
A Yes.
Q And are you paid after? Like on success, if
you successfully get it --
A No.
5 Q -- does that amount change?
Q And what do you believe Mr. Cotton did that
Page 39
Page 41
slowed down the CUP application for Mr. Geraci?
A No. 1, confusion. He created confusion as to
who the applicant actually was with the City. Confusion
with the City as to who the applicant was.
Q Okay.
A He delayed our ability to access the property
to do the geological study. He misrepresented himself
to the committee planning group in terms of who the
applicant was. Those are the primary issues.
Q Do you have any -- I'm going to ask this
politely.
Have you heard of any conspiracy theories
regarding stopping the Geraci CUP application?
A Conspiracy theories?
Q Conspiracy theories.
A Can you define that better?
Q What is -- did you hear of anything that would
lead you to believe that people were backing the Magagna
CUP application, and while trying to stall or stop the
Geraci application?
A What's the question again. Am I aware of --
Q Are you aware of anything.
Besides Mr. Cotton, do you believe that
anybody interfered with the Geraci CUP application for
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```
A No.
Q It's a flat fee?
A Monthly retainer.
Q Do you lobby for anything, in addition to the
5 \text { CUP application for marijuana outlets? Or is that}
s solely your practice now?
    A No. It's about 20 percent of my practice.
    Q Are there any contingencies in the contract
between you and Mr. Geraci if he fails to get approval
for his CUP application?
    A No.
    Q And for the monthly fees, what services does
that cover?
    A Assisting with the processing of the
application.
    Q And does that include working with the City?
    A Yes.
    Q Who at the City, when you're processing a CUP
application, do you primarily work with?
    A Whatever project manager is assigned to that
project.
    Q So to clarify, once a CUP application has been
submitted to the City, what is the process at that
point?
Is it assigned to a proper project manager?
```
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```
A Yes.
    Q And the project manager, do you reach out to
him to work with?
    A Or her. Um, usually it's -- it's a direct
point of contact for efficiency reasons between the
project manager and the -- something like Abhay
Schweitzer, who's actually doing the detail application.
I get involved when we hit a bump in the road.
I'm}\mathrm{ at all the meetings for the City, but they generally
1 0 \text { like a one point of contact. That's Abhay or someone}
like him.
    Q So Abhay is one of several project managers
that work for the City?
    A No. Abhay is on our team. He's our designer.
    Q Can you describe what a designer does?
Because I personally was confused by that term.
    A Someone like Abhay?
    Q Yes.
    A He works with other consultants like him.
Engineers and geotechnical people, landscapers, traffic
engineers, whatever we need to assist with preparing our
application and responding to City cycle issues.
    Q Do you know if Abhay worked with Mr. Magagna
on his CUP applications?
    A I'm not aware of that.
```

    Q Do you know what project manager was assigned
    to Mr. Magagna's CUP application?
A No.
Q And Abhay was your designer that worked on the
Geraci?
A Yes.
Q Was Abhay the one who primarily worked with
the soil engineers on the Geraci project?
A Yes.
Q Does Abhay have the ability to either expedite
or slow down when the City requires the soil analysis?
A No.
Q The City is -- is the only person that can
speed up or slow down when they want the soil
information?
A They don't speed up or slow down. They --
whenever they request a document, like a soil study,
geotechnical report, then we find somebody who can do
that, prepare it and resubmit it to the City to meet
that requirement.
Q Okay. And in Geraci's CUP application, it was
Abhay who worked with Techne?
A Well, Abhay is Techne.
Q Okay. All right.
A Abhay worked with the geotechnical engineer to
Page 44

1 prepare the study that the City was requiring.

## 2 Q And was it submitted timely?

3 MR. TOOTHACRE: Vague and ambiguous.
4 BY MS. PLASKETT:
5 Q Was the soil samples --
6 A It was delayed, because we couldn't get access
7 to the property because of Mr . Cotton.
$8 \quad$ Q And the delay in -- when the City requests a 9 document like the soil sample, does that stop the
0 process from continuing until they receive the document
requested?
A You can't resubmit to the -- cycle reviews are
around 12 or 13 different disciplines that review your
application.
The project manager oversees those different
departments. So they review your landscaping plan, they
17 review your traffic study. There's 12 or 13 different
8 disciplines they do that at the City. They send you a
9 cycle review with their comments that you have to
respond to.
You can't respond to those comments until
everything that they've requested is resubmitted. So we
can't -- if we're missing the geological study, we can't
resubmit -- we have everything else prepared, we can't
resubmit until that's done.

```
Q All right. Thank you. That clarified a lot.
    This is an odd question for me personally, but
if somebody accused you of being the mastermind of
4 getting the Geraci CUP denied so Magagna could get his,
5 how would you respond to that allegation?
    A That's ludicrous.
    Q Thank you.
        What is your relationship with Matt Shapiro?
    A I have no relationship with him. I just know
him.
    Q Have you worked on projects together?
    A No.
    Q Why would he bring Ms. Young into your office?
        MR. TOOTHACRE: Calls for speculation.
        THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q As a potential client possibly?
            MR. TOOTHACRE: Same.
            THE WITNESS: It could be. Investor.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q And you don't remember telling Ms. Young not
to invest in the Geraci --
    A I don't recall, no.
    Q -- litigation or application?
    A I don't recall.
```


## 1

Q All right. Thank you. That clarified a lot.
This is an odd question for me personally, but
getting the Geraci CUP denied so Magagna could get his, 5 how would you respond to that allegation?

A That's ludicrous.
Q Thank you.
I have no relationship with him. I just know
0 him.

A No.

MR. TOOTHACRE: Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MS. PLASKETT:

18 MR. TOOTHACRE: Same.
THE WITNESS: It could be. Investor.
BY MS. PLASKETT:

22 to invest in the Geraci --

24 Q -- litigation or application?
25 A I don't recall.

```
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| Page |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 |
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1 Mr. Magagna are closely connected to Mr. Bartell and
2 Mrs. Austin, both of whom are agents of Mr. Geraci.
3 $\quad$ Are you closely connected to Mr. Shapiro?

A I'm not aware.
Q Okay. Are you aware of whether or not
3 Mr. Cotton attempted to submit his own CUP after
4 Mr. Geraci's CUP application was in on the 6176 Federal
5 Boulevard?
A I'm not aware that.
7 MS. PLASKETT: Can you repeat what you just
8 asked him?
9 MR. TOOTHACRE: If he was aware whether or not
0 Mr . Cotton submitted a second -- or attempted to submit
1 a second CUP on the property.
THE WITNESS: He did. In addition to
3 misrepresenting himself to the City staff, he also
4 misrepresented himself to the community planning group,
15 chairman.
6 BY MR. TOOTHACRE:
7 Q And was that Mr. Ken Malbrough?
A Yes, it was.
Q And in what way did Mr. Cotton misrepresent
himself to Mr. Malbrough.
A He had communication with Mr. Malbrough to --
representing himself as the applicant for the site and
arrange for the community planning group to vote on that, in support.
25 Q And did the community planning group actually

1 report until they had access to the property.
Q Are you aware from any source that Mr. Cotton
was preventing access to the property?
A We attempted to get access to the property.
Q Are you aware of whether or not Mr. Weinstein
had to go to court to obtain a court order to have
access to the property?
A Yes.
Q Do you recall how many weeks or months this
denial of access to the property caused delay in
Mr. Geraci's CUP application?
A I would guess roughly three to four months.
Q Do you think that was a factor in the Magagna
CUP application getting through to the City vote before
Mr. Geraci's CUP application?
A Yes, it was.
Q What did you mean by there were some confusion
down at the City about the identity of who had the CUP
on the Geraci property?
A Because Mr. Cotton was representing himself as the applicant with City staff.

Q Are you aware of whether or not Mr. Cotton attempted to have Mr. Geraci's CUP withdrawn?

A I'm not aware of that.
Q You're not aware?
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## 1 vote --

A Yes.
Q -- on Mr. Cotton's --
A Yes.
Q -- project?
A Yes.
Q Do you know what that result of the vote was?
A In support.
Q Okay. Do you know whether or not
0 Mr. Malbrough ever ceased communications with
Mr. Cotton?
A Yes, because at the time that I called to set
up -- to arrange for a future community planning group
4 consideration of Mr. Geraci's project, I was told that
5 he had already been voted on through, Mr. Cotton, his
6 project.
1 He was confused that he thought that
8 Mr . Cotton was the owner, not Mr. Geraci or the
applicant -- excuse me, not owner.
Q So did you ever get Mr. Geraci's CUP
application in front of Mr. Malbrough and the community
planning group for a vote?
A No.
Q Did Mr. Malbrough indicate to you why he was
ceasing communications with Mr. Cotton?

the project based on that.
Q So did you have to resubmit after some change
in zoning?
A We had to go through a process of getting the
municipal code amended by the city council to reflect
the correct --
Q And are you aware that -- do you recall
what -- how -- what length of time that took?
A Uh, a couple months.
Q Okay. Are you aware of whether or not the
Magagna $\mathbf{6 2 2 0}$ CUP had to go through that process?
A They didn't have to, because we corrected it.
We got it corrected.
Q So in other words, they benefited from your work on the Geraci matter?

A Yes.
Q Go to No. 2 at the bottom of Page 8 there. It says, "Plaintiff is attempting to sabotage the CUP on the property with soils analysis."

Do you have any information to support that
allegation?
A No.
Q It says, "Evidence produced during discovery, information provided by the City, and third-party testimony supports the conclusion that Plaintiff's

1 be getting it denied, 'because everyone hates Darryl.'"
Is there any truth in any of that statement?
A No.
Q Then it says, "Young, at some point
5 thereafter, also hired Bartell to have a CUP on a
6 separate property approved."
Were you ever hired by Corina Young on a
8 separate CUP application?
A No. She may have been an investor with one of
0 my clients, but she never -- I never had an agreement
with her specifically.
Q Did you know that she was an investor in one of your projects?

A I don't recall. I have many -- many people
get involved with investing and --
THE REPORTER: Many people get involved with 7 what?

THE WITNESS: Investing. And I only deal with the principals.
BY MR. TOOTHACRE:
Q So to the best of your knowledge, as you sit
here today, you didn't know she was a investor in one of the projects?

A No.
Q Do you know which project she was invested in?

[^0]1 Mr. Geraci's CUP denied?
$2 \quad$ A No.
$3 \quad$ Q On line 25 he says, "The CUP application
4 process is highly suspect given Bartell's deep political
5 connections with the City, his comments to Young, and
6 the fact that the CUP on the property should already
7 have been approved, per Plaintiff's own experts."
$8 \quad$ You didn't use your deep political connection
9 with the City to delay Mr. Geraci's application?
$10 \quad$ A No.
$11 \quad$ Q Page 11, line 7. It says, "To the extent it
12 could be argued that Magagna did not submit the
13 competing CUP, with knowledge of Plaintiff's unlawful
14 scheme and that neither Shapiro nor Austin communicated
15 to him that Bartell was getting the CUP denied on
16 Defendant's property was because 'everyone hates
17 Darryl,' Magagna joined the conspiracy when he took
18 knowing and unlawful steps to profit from thereby."
19 Do you know of any ongoing conspiracy with
20 regard to getting Magagna's CUP approved?
$21 \quad$ A No.
22 Q Is there any conspiracy to get Geraci's CUP
23 denied?
$24 \quad$ A No.
$25 \quad$ Q Were you aware of any unlawful scheme that any

Q Were you aware of any unlawful scheme that any
of those parties are involved with?
A No.
Q On line 19, same page, Page 11 it says, "In
other words, after being made aware that Plaintiff was
effectuating a fraud against Defendant, via Bartell,
Magagna took knowing and willful steps to unlawfully
benefit from said conspiracy and became a conspirator by
ratifying Plaintiff's unlawful scheme and seeking to
tamper with Young's testimony."
Were you -- was Mr. Geraci effectuating a
fraud through you?
A No.
Q Do you know of any knowing and willful steps
Magagna took to unlawfully benefit from some conspiracy?
A No.
MR. TOOTHACRE: Next one in order.
We're up to 6 ?
THE REPORTER: Yes.
MR. TOOTHACRE: For the record, this is a
document on City of San Diego letterhead, Development
Services Department, dated May 19, 2017.
(Exhibit 6 was marked.)
MS. PLASKETT: Can you show me what your --
MR. TOOTHACRE: Yeah.
Sent to Abhay Schweitzer.

1 BY MR. TOOTHACRE:

| Q | Have you seen this document before? |
| :--- | :--- |
| A | Have I seen it? |
| Q | Yes. |
| A | Yes. |
| Q | About halfway down it says, "City staff has |

7 been informed that the project site has been sold."
Do you know what that's regarding?
A That's part of the -- I would imagine, that's
10 part of the confusion created by Mr. Cotton, as to who
the applicant was.
Q Did you take any action, in regard to this --
well, what is this actually? Is this --
A This is the initial cycle reviews. It's the
first response we got from the City after resubmitting
the application.
Q Okay. And then on the second page, Required
Approval. It says, "Your project as currently proposed
requires a Process Three. Conditional Use Permit for
the proposed Medical Marijuana Consumer Cooperative,
pursuant to San Diego Municipal Code," and it states the
code.

And then the next paragraph talks about the zoning issue, I think; is that correct?

A Yes.

[^1]

1
2
3
4 B
5 Q Mr. Bartell, during the break you were looking
6 at Exhibit 7, and you came to some realization as to what that was.
8 A Yeah. I was reading -- I was trying to figure 9 out --

MS. PLASKETT: That block thing?
THE WITNESS: Yeah. So that block is from
bulletin 170. And that's the CO 2 -- our property is CO 2
dash 1. And that's allowed under the bulletin. That's
what we relied on when we submitted the application.
A And then Page 3 is a municipal code. And that
16 shows where it was inconsistent with the municipal code,
17 down at the bottom where it says "Medical Marijuana
18 Consumer Cooperative," go to the CO section, all dashes.
Which means they're not allowed.
So that's what it stands for is the issue.
Municipal code doesn't allowed that zone. So I went
back to get that corrected. It was never corrected to represent.
Q Okay.
A We had that corrected through an errata sheet
1 brought to the city council for amendment. So they
2 amended the municipal code to reflect the CO 2 dash 1,
3 wasn't an allowed zone.

3 wasn't an allowed zone.
MR. TOOTHACRE: Okay. I have nothing further.
MS. PLASKETT: I have a couple follow-up
6 questions.

EXAMINATION (RESUMED)
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q How was Mr. Cotton able to get a vote from the
planning commission?
A Who?
Q Mr. Cotton? You had mention that he --
A The planning group.
Q The planning group.
How was he able to get a vote through the
planning group without going through the process first?
A I don't know.
Q Have you ever seen that before?
A No. People usually don't misrepresent
themselves.
Q But he got it to the vote and was given a yes?
A That's my understanding. I've never seen the
actual minutes of the minute.
MR. TOOTHACRE: I'm sorry. I've never seen
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```
1 the actual --
    THE WITNESS: Minutes of the meeting.
    MR. TOOTHACRE: Oh, okay. Is that -- I'm
sorry.
THE WITNESS: That was based on the
conversation I had with Mr. Malbrough, the chairman of
the group. That was my understanding. And he was very
upset that, you know, he was having various
communications with Mr. Cotton and he -- thinking that
10 he was the applicant. When it was clarified, I think he
terminated his discussions with Cotton at that point.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
    Q But the yes vote, would the yes vote give him
14 approval to actually have the marijuana out of there?
    A No. No. That's just a recommendation.
    Q So the recommendation. Do you still have to
go through the same process that --
    A Yes.
    Q Okay. So that's just preliminary?
    A Yes. It's just a recommendation.
    Q Okay. Do you have any idea why Ms. Corina
Young would lie and makes these statements that she had
this conversation with you?
MR. TOOTHACRE: Calls for speculation.
But you can answer.
    THE WITNESS: That was based on the
```

1 THE WITNESS: I don't understand. I don't
recall the context of the -- I don't recall the context
of the discussion.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q So do you not recall or do you deny that it
happened?
A I don't recall that discussion.
Q Okay. When you recommend an applicant for a
CUP application, do you owe them a fiduciary duty?
MR. TOOTHACRE: Calls for a legal conclusion.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q In your contract with potential CUP applicants
in your monthly retainer, is there any language about
4 owing them a fiduciary duty?
A What does that mean?
Q Like a duty -- for instance, if you represent
a CUP applicant, can you also represent a competing CUP
applicant at the same time?
A No.
Q And is that your firm's decision? Or is that
by some type of --
A There's no law.
Q No law?
A That I'm aware of. I would never agree to a
5 project if I had a competing project.

| THE WITNESS: I don't understand. I don't |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 recall the context of the -- I don't recall the context |  |
| 3 of the discussion. |  |
| 4 BY MS. PLASKETT: |  |
| 5 Q So do you not recall or do you deny that it 6 happened? |  |
|  |  |
| 7 A I don't recall that discussion. |  |
| 8 Q Okay. When you recommend an applicant for a |  |
| 9 CUP application, do you owe them a fiduciary duty? |  |
| 10 MR. TOOTHACRE: Calls for a legal conclusion. |  |
| 11 BY MS. PLASKETT: |  |
| 12 Q In your contract with potential CUP applicants |  |
| 13 in your monthly retainer, is there any language about |  |
| 14 owing them a fiduciary duty? |  |
| 15 A What does that mean? |  |
| 16 Q Like a duty -- for instance, if you represent |  |
| 17 a CUP applicant, can you also represent a competing CUP |  |
| 18 applicant at the same time? |  |
| 19 A No. |  |
| 20 Q And is that your firm's decision? Or is that |  |
| 21 by some type of -- |  |
| 22 A There's no law. |  |
| 23 Q No law? |  |
| 24 A That I'm aware of. I would never agree to a |  |
|  | project if I had a competing project. |
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```
Q Is she considered part of your team?
    MR. TOOTHACRE: Vague and ambiguous.
    THE WITNESS: My team for what project?
```

BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q For a CUP for a medical -- for a marijuana
6 outlet?
A Sometimes.
MR. TOOTHACRE: Same objection.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Does she have an office or a desk in your
office?
A No.
Q Does Gina work for an outside firm, other than
you?
MR. TOOTHACRE: Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MS. PLASKETT:
Q Do you happen to know what the name of the
firm is?
A What kind of firm?
Q That Gina works for, in addition to you?
A Well, she doesn't work for me. She works for
our clients.
Q So if you have a client come in, does Gina
automatically become part of the --

```
    Q Do you know who A & M Industries is?
    A No.
    Q Okay. Do you know that Gina Austin -- do you
4 know if Gina Austin represented Mr. Magagna in any
capacity?
A I don't know.
    Q Is getting a license for -- a cultivation
8 license, a cannabis cultivation license, considered
9 competition for a CUP license for a marijuana outlet
license?
    A They're both CUP's. CUP stands for
Conditional Use Permit.
    You can have CUP's for marijuana outlets. You
can have CUP's for cultivation. CUP's for
manufacturing. They're all CUP's
    Q Okay. Would the CUP for cultivation be
considered a conflict if it were somebody trying to get
a cultivation license when there's a competitor trying
to get a marijuana outlet license?
    A No.
    Q So there's no conflict there?
    A No.
    Q Does Gina Austin work solely for your company
for you?
A No
```
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[^0]:    A No.
    Q Line 10. She -- Mr. Austin says,
    3 "Additionally, Young also communicated that Shapiro has
    4 stated he has a deep relationship with Bartell and it is
    5 being 'groomed' by him to inherit his political
    6 relationships and connections."
    You laugh.
    Did you have a deep relationship with
    Mr. Shapiro?
    A No, I don't.
    Q Are you grooming Mr. Shapiro to inherit your
    political relationships and connections?
    A No.
    Q And line 19 states, "The most material point
    here is that Young's testimony provides support for the
    conclusion that Plaintiff" -- that would be Mr. Geraci
    -- "is using his agent, Bartell to influence the City to
    have the CUP on the property denied. And it is
    reasonable to assume Bartell is using his influence to
    have the competing CUP approved."
    $I$ assume that is related to the $\mathbf{6 2 2 0}$.
    Did you use your influence to have 6220
    approved?
    A No.
    25 Q And did you use your influence to have

[^1]:    Q Is that the zoning issue you were referencing 2 earlier?

    A Not specifically, no.
    Q That's not the same one?
    A No.
    Q And what is that in regards to?
    A They deem the project application complete in
    8 March of -- I don't recall when the issue came up. I
    9 don't know at what point I had to go through the
    process. I don't recall specifically when that was.
    Q Okay. But what was the process you went
    through, to get the zoning ordinance updated?
    A I had talked to the director of the department
    4 of that do all the services. Make them aware of the
    5 discrepancy between the municipal code and the bulletin
    170.

    They looked at it and said you're correct.
    They had to prepare an errata sheet to attach the
    municipal code and submit that to city council for their
    review and to change -- to make them consistent. Make
    the municipal code consistent with the bulletin.
    Q Okay. And ultimately that was made consistent
    3 with the municipal code with the bulletin?
    A Yes.
    Q And then did Abhay resubmit the CUP

