

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Alm & Chum

CLERK OF THE COURT

TED BURKE, et al.

Plaintiffs

CASE NO. A-558629

vs.

LARRY HAHN, et al.

DEPT. NO. XI

Defendants

Transcript of

Proceedings

.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

STATUS CHECK

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2010

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

JENNIFER LANE TAYLOR, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

PATRICK C. CLARY, ESQ. M. NELSON SEGEL, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

JILL HAWKINS

FLORENCE HOYT

District Court

Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

DEC 17 2010

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2010, 9:44 A.M. 1 2 (Court was called to order) 3 MR. CLARY: 'Morning, Your Honor. THE COURT: Good morning. How are you, Mr. Clary? 5 MR. SEGEL: He was on my blind side, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Why is it in your cases, Mr. Segel, I 7 can't get orders? And I'm not blaming you. I'm just saying 8 why is it in your cases. 9 All right. Let me go -- because I had an 10 opportunity to read the status reports, let me ask a couple of questions first before I get to some other issues. 11 12 MS. TAYLOR: And, Your Honor --13 MR. SEGEL: May I make a clarification, Your Honor? I know Ms. Taylor has issues, but one clarification she asked 14 15 me to make, and I think it's apparent, my assistant had an 16 arthroscopy last week. We had agreed to not take the deposition of the custodian until the arthroscopy had been 17 completed. I thought my assistant had notified Ms. Taylor of 18 19 the date of the arthroscopy, she thought I notified her, so 20 it's Ms. Taylor's position that's why she didn't renotice the 21 depositions. And I apologize. 22 THE COURT: And that's the Surplus custodian of 23 records --24 MR. SEGEL: Correct.

25

THE COURT: -- that was my one issue. Well, that

was one of my issues, so we hit that one. Okay. Can I go to my issues first, and then I'll hit yours.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Clary, Mr. Segel asked if I could move your motion for summary judgment which is scheduled for January 4th back so his motion for summary judgment can be heard at the same time. He hasn't filed his yet. Do you have a position related to that?

MR. CLARY: I'm not objecting to that, Your Honor.

I'd like to get the case over with with respect to me

personally if that's going to be possible. It may not be

possible. No assurance of that. But after all this time with

this cloud over me, you know, another couple months, you know,

it's not going to be the end of the world. And so I --

THE COURT: So how long do you think we should move it? Mr. Segel, that means when are you filing your motion is really what I just asked.

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, if you recall, I actually had filed the first motion for summary judgment, then Mr. Clary did a joinder --

THE COURT: Right. But you said you wanted to supplement.

MR. SEGEL: And, well, the issues, Your Honor, that I want to address with the Court, you refused to hear the motion the last time because discovery hadn't been completed.

THE COURT: No. I refused to grant it. And I 1 2 denied it without prejudice because there was a 56(f) request, and I told you you could renew it when we got past that. 3 MR. SEGEL: All right. Well, if the Court's willing 4 to consider it, then, yes, I think late January, early 5 February to give all the parties sufficient time to --6 7 MR. CLARY: That's fine. 8 MR. SEGEL: -- supplement their opposition and 9 whatnot. 10 MR. CLARY: That's fine, Your Honor. THE COURT: How does February 3rd sound? So we're 11 12 going to move, Mr. Clary, your motion as it's scheduled for 13 January 4th to February 3rd. Mr. Segel, you're going to insure your renotice gets 14 15 filed with Master Calendar. 16 MR. SEGEL: Yes. 17 THE COURT: And then you're going to submit a courtesy copy for me of everything that you are assuming is 18 19 part of what is being considered by me for the renoticed 20 motion. 21 MR. CLARY: And I'm going to kind of do the same, 22 Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: No, I assumed you would. 24 Yeah. I'm going to probably have a MR. CLARY:

supplement to it.

25

THE COURT: It's just I'm giving Mr. Segel a hard time today.

MR. CLARY: The thing I do object to is that the

reason that I filed -- that I renoticed the motion, although
Your Honor had ruled that I could renotice my motion for
summary judgment at any time --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. CLARY: -- but I waited till discovery was closed.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. CLARY: And one thing I will object to today is reopening of discovery.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me get to the issue, which is the custodian of record deposition of Surplus.

You've both agreed that that deposition's going to be taken.

When are you going to have it done? Because I'm going to give

MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, I don't know. I mean, I have issues that I would like to talk about before we talk about any other discovery issues, including this custodian of records issue. But I can say it's -- I'd like to maybe say the first week of January just because of the holidays.

THE COURT: January 7th?

you a last day that it has to be completed by.

MS. TAYLOR: That's fine.

THE COURT: Okay. So we're going to complete the

custodian of records deposition of the Surplus custodian that both parties agree was agreed to be taken after whatever discovery cutoff was appropriate.

All right. Now we have other issues. I've covered the ones that I had, except for the request about supplemental expert report, and I assume you're going to tell me now about that.

MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, I have to tell you about a number of things that are in Mr. Segel's report, because it was very troubling to me. We have had these repeated adversarial in nature status reports filed that are riddled with inaccuracies and with omissions to --

THE COURT: That's why we have hearings.

MS. TAYLOR: Thank you, Your Honor. It's just frustrating that you get something in writing and I get it at 1:00 and I don't have necessarily time to adequately prepare. So I don't have something in writing for you, but I do have a stack of emails. And I just need to make a very clear record for this Court for future proceedings, whether it's here or in front of any other entity, as to what's --

THE COURT: You mean Carson City.

MS. TAYLOR: Possibly. Or other governing entities for our profession as to what is actually going on.

MR. CLARY: Your Honor, I'm going to object to that.

I mean, she's the one that's creating the extra adversarial

attitude by making statements like that.

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Clary. Let me hear from her before I make a decision as to what we're going to do, because I do need to resolve the issue about the additional documents I ordered to be produced, the review by her expert, the copy of the documents, some issues about some confidentiality, and then the supplemental report, and potentially deposition of that expert if you guys want to take it. And you guys can fight all you want, but don't do it in front of me. That's --

MR. CLARY: But her clients went to the Bar
Association on me one time already, and they didn't succeed.
So I don't think I have --

involved with the Bar's governing activities. I try real hard, because they've got their jurisdiction. My jurisdiction is very different. And I've never referred an attorney to the Bar. I have once asked Bar counsel to come sit through a hearing I conducted, but I've never referred an attorney to a Bar, and I'm probably not going to do that unless something very unusual occurs in front of me, because I respect that the members of the Bar are self governing in large part, and I'm going to stay out of your self-governing activities. And if the Bar thinks something's been done that's inappropriate, I am certain they will take appropriate action.

Now, can you tell me what the discovery issue is.

And I don't really care, I just want to get through it.

MS. TAYLOR: I know. And, Your Honor, I very much want to get through it, too. But everything that I have tried to do has been met with a series of roadblocks, a series of delays, representations to you that then don't occur for a month.

THE COURT: Did you get Litigation Services over to copy the documents?

MS. TAYLOR: I had the documents taken to Litigation Services. There were 24 boxes with lots of receipts. They are still copying them. They are down --

THE COURT: They haven't finished?

MS. TAYLOR: Well, it was October 25th. They haven't finished.

THE COURT: Well, but it's December 9th.

MS. TAYLOR: I know. And I have been on them, Your Honor, and I have talked to Ben on a regular basis to see what the status is. And part of the frustration is that the order in which the boxes could be copied and the process in which boxes could be copied were delayed by this issue that was raised about redacting credit account numbers and redacting checking account numbers. This is one of the things we've been fighting about. It's going to cost my client \$10,000 more to have Lit Services -- and a lot of time to have Lit Services sit and draw the electronic redaction boxes over the

It took them a week from discussions onsite to raise records. 1 this issue, and then Mr. Segel took it upon himself to call 2 Ben and say, well, you have to reorder the copying, you can 3 move forward with this but you can't move forward with that, and we've never been able to reach a resolve. And I --5 THE COURT: When is the estimated date that 6 Litigation Services will have the copy job, understanding 7 there is a confidentiality issue and you guys will never trust 8 each other enough to enter into a confidentiality agreement, 9 so redactions must be done? So when's it going to be ready? 10 Ben Ross has to give me a date. 11 12 MS. TAYLOR: Okay. 13 THE COURT: It's Ben Ross; right? MS. TAYLOR: Ben Ross. 14 15 THE COURT: Ben Ross has to give me a date. I will tell Ben, because the last time 16 MS. TAYLOR: 17 I talked to him he was down to a couple of boxes, and it's all the receipts. So I would imagine I can tell Ben he will have 18 it done in a week. 19 20 THE COURT: That's good. All right. 21 MS. TAYLOR: I will tell Ben that that was at your 22 discretion.

direction is really the word I was looking for.

MS. TAYLOR: Your order. Sorry. Thank you.

No. It was just my order.

Your

23

24

25

THE COURT:

THE COURT: All right. Here's the next step. So, assuming you get the redacted copies of the records that were made available in November, October-November, assume you got them, I ordered these produced so your expert could review them and provide a supplemental report. I anticipated that those documents would have been in your expert's possession for review a month ago or so.

MS. TAYLOR: And if I can go back, Your Honor, let me just clarify. Because if you want me to get those records redacted, I don't know that Ben can do that in a week.

THE COURT: I thought you said he had two boxes left.

MS. TAYLOR: He had two -- I haven't been having him redact, because I was not going to agree to that --

THE COURT: He has to redact.

MS. TAYLOR: But, Your Honor, I was looking at the Southwest Exchange. We discussed Southwest Exchange. It's similar situations where you've got third parties and their account numbers.

THE COURT: This isn't similar to Southwest Exchange, sorry.

MS. TAYLOR: So -- all right. Well, then I don't know the answer. I'm going to have to go back to Ben and ask him how long it's going to take for him to redact, because he's been just doing the copies --

THE COURT: Mr. Segel, do you have confidence that a confidentiality agreement could be entered between the parties which would alleviate an additional delay that appears to be obvious to me?

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, I have serious concerns.

And the -- I don't think --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SEGEL: I don't think there's an issue of Ms. Taylor --

THE COURT: All you have to do is tell me that they're not going to be able to work out a confidentiality agreement, because I'm not going to enforce one.

MR. SEGEL: But what I'm concerned about is -- it's not that -- I think we can do one. I think we can get an agreement. My concern is if we allow them to copy those without redacting and somehow these individuals' information gets out and they're having -- they have credit card fraud, that we've got liability. And that's my big, big concern.

THE COURT: I understand, Mr. Segel.

MR. SEGEL: I'm more concerned, Your Honor, that I've just -- you know, Ms. Taylor and I had a conversation with Ben where they weren't going to do anything with the confidential information without having Ms. Taylor and I work out an arrangement. Now we're told they've already copied it without redacting. That's a very serious concern for me.

MS. TAYLOR: Redaction is something that can be done after it's -- after it's copied, Your Honor. You're aware of that, and I told Mr. Segel that.

THE COURT: I am aware of that. The issue is before it's released to you it has to be redacted unless you have a confidentiality agreement.

MS. TAYLOR: Right. And we did not have anything released to us. It's just been put on record at Lit Services.

THE COURT: Mr. Segel, here's the issue. And it's not -- I'm not blaming anyone, because I'm not going to get into any fault issues today other than I still don't have an order and it's another one of your cases.

I am going to let her expert do what I said I was going to let her expert do the last time you were here, which is I'm going to give him about a month to review the documents once he has them. If there not a confidentiality agreement that you all agree to, it is going to cause a greater delay in when that month period will conclude. I am giving you and your side some discretion related to when that period will potentially end, because I can't make him review the documents if I can't get them to him because it's got confidential information that hasn't been redacted. So do you guys want a few minutes to talk to each other, and then I'll come back to whether in fact we got finished?

MR. SEGEL: Well, I think, Your Honor, I do need to

talk to my client --1 THE COURT: I know you do. 2 -- because I'm very concerned about what 3 MR. SEGEL: 4 if something happens. If they want to give us indemnification -- well, I'm not -- they can't indemnify anything, so --5 THE COURT: Doesn't help you. 6 So we could have a few minutes, Your MR. SEGEL: 7 8 Honor. I think we need it. 9 THE COURT: You may. MR. SEGEL: Is there anything else you want to cover 10 11 now, or do you want us to come back after that? That is in my opinion your biggest 12 THE COURT: 13 I'm sure Ms. Taylor has other issues, but that is my When I granted the motion to compel my plan was the 14 issue. expert would get the documents, the expert would review the 15 documents, the expert would submit a supplemental report, and 16 17 if you wanted to depose him you'd get to, and were done. 18 doesn't mean that Ms. Taylor can't show good cause that 19 something else should happen, but that wasn't my plan. 20 I'll give you a few minutes to work this out, because without 21 a confidentiality agreement it slows the process down. 22 MR. SEGEL: Understood. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: So wave at me when you've had a chance 23 to talk. 24 (Court recessed at 9:56 a.m., until 10:13 a.m.) 25

THE COURT: Come on back up.

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, during the break we did discuss with our client the issue of a confidentiality agreement, and we're -- we can agree in principle to allow that. We have some concern. This is a pretty ugly case, as the Court is well aware.

THE COURT: Really?

MR. SEGEL: Unfortunately, counsel's not --

THE COURT: You're not as ugly as some of the

others.

MR. SEGEL: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm glad to hear that. And unfortunately, we've had issues that have gone back and forth. Sometimes we can get along, sometimes we can't.

I have some concerns. I would like the Court to enter an order that initially would allow their expert, Mr. Stringham and his staff based on signing a confidentiality agreement that they would be able to see this information and the confidential stuff, that it not be initially disclosed to counsel, that if Mr. Stringham can come up with something he thinks is supportive of the position the nefarious conduct has occurred by Hahn Surplus, that then we can have an agreement to either come back to court or have some other written agreement with counsel.

I'm concerned, if the Court recalls, that there was initially subpoenas that were improperly issued where Hahn

Surplus and the Hahns' individual information was provided without notice to us, and we -- that was delivered to us after the plaintiffs had received it from the banks. We had a disagreement, as well, as to whether or not I knew that they had reviewed those disks. It was my understanding they never review those disks. But they were in the 16.1, we found out, and they did return the disks to us. We have since the last hearing returned the Hahn's Surplus disks to them and have kept the ones -- I guess they were not actually ever delivered for the Hahns individually, but --

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question.

MR. SEGEL: Sure.

THE COURT: Typically I don't have an expert-only confidentiality agreement. I may have an attorney-only confidentiality agreement. I can't keep the documents from counsel if we're going to have people do their job. I am happy to limit, usually, the access of material that's confidential and make people sign a special acknowledgement of their duties under the confidentiality agreement that you stipulate to. But I have never, although I'm not going to say it won't happen, I have never yet done a confidentiality agreement where the only one who gets to see them is an expert for the party and not counsel for the party. I have limited it from the parties seeing it frequently. But, you know, you're asking me to do something unusual. So if you want me

to force someone to agree to this unusual procedure, you've got to give me more than I've heard so far.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SEGEL: All right. Well, let me explain. Generally -- the general business records of Surplus I don't have an issue with confidentiality. It's fine. And I have no problem with Ms. Taylor's office having that documentation. The things that I'm concerned about, which I don't even think we should have had to disclose, but we didn't fight that 22question disclosure, we did agree -- Ms. Taylor and I were able to agree to reduce it to a certain amount, but there are still 24 boxes. I'm concerned about Mr. Stringham believes he needs every single record of the business operations of Surplus from 2004 to 2009. That includes credit card slips from customers. How that's going to show that Mr. Hahn stole money from Kokoweef is beyond me, but I'm not a forensic expert. And so that type of documentation, I don't see how it's going to be of any benefit whatsoever to the plaintiff or is going to prove anything. If Mr. Stringham can say, yes, these documents here that are third-party documents are meaningful and would show something, then I think, yes, it may make sense to let counsel see them. But if it's -- if it's -you know, this is an unusual situation where financial records have to be disclosed in a litigation. In a derivative action it's not so unusual.

THE COURT: It's not unusual at all.

1	MR. SEGEL: Say again.
2	THE COURT: It's not unusual at all.
3	MR. SEGEL: Well, I think that there are the
4	items that we're considering I mean, all we've agreed
5	Ms. Taylor and I have agreed that everything is confidential,
6	quote, unquote, and then we realize that
7	THE COURT: Of these particular boxes that are being
8	produced.
9	MR. SEGEL: Of all the boxes. We agreed all the
10	THE COURT: That's fine.
11	MR. SEGEL: Hahn and that only her firm and
12	Mr. Stringham would be able to see them. I'm okay with that.
13	THE COURT: Without a further order of the Court?
14	MR. SEGEL: Right. Well, we're going to do a
15	written agreement on that. And what I have concerns about is
16	this third-party information that may or may not
17	THE COURT: That's what I usually refer to as backup
18	information.
19	MR. SEGEL: Okay. Well, it's far from backup, but
20	if that's what
21	THE COURT: Well, no, it's not.
22	MR. SEGEL: Okay.
23	THE COURT: It's actually what I define as backup
24	when I order the backup to be provided.
25	MR. SEGEL: It's that documentation I'm concerned

1 about. THE COURT: All right. And your concern is that you 2 don't want Ms. Taylor to have it because she's an officer of 3 4 the court and you think she's going to not honor the 5 confidentiality agreement she signs so that you guys can then 6 go to the Bar and fight with her about it? MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, that's not right. I have --7 I have --8 THE COURT: Or I'm mean to her. 9 MR. SEGEL: I have faith in Ms. Taylor doing her 10 We've been at odds. I think her back office has issues. 11 job. THE COURT: Her back office? 12 13 MR. SEGEL: Yeah. Her staff. I don't think that things have been done as well as they should have been done, 14 15 that's all. THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. SEGEL: That's a concern. 17 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Taylor. 18 I can make this very easy, Your Honor. 19 MS. TAYLOR: My clients have said they would rather just pay for the 20 21 redaction than have to deal with all of this, because it -you know, what was -- what he reported to you about this 22 23 concern he has about inadvertent disclosure is, as most of the things that he's presented in the status report, not accurate 24

and -- or relevant and solely --

25

THE COURT: So, in other words, you're not agreeing to have only your expert be the one who looks at the documents that are of concern.

MS. TAYLOR: That is correct, Your Honor. I think

MS. TAYLOR: That is correct, Your Honor. I think it would be --

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. That's all I needed to hear.

MS. TAYLOR: Okay.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Segel, as I said, I'm not going to enforce a confidentiality agreement unless you guys agree to it. I will enforce the redaction, because that's within my discretion. If you guys can't agree to a confidentiality order, that's okay. But it sounds like it's going to delay your proceedings further. I don't know that it delays the motion related to Mr. Clary, but it delays everything else.

MR. SEGEL: Delay our motion, Your Honor?

THE COURT: It's going to clearly delay your motion.

MR. SEGEL: Well, Your Honor, our motion relates to the claim for negligent misrepresentation, which is a securities claim which is unrelated to the claim that in fact Mr. Hahn has diverted funds from the company. We have -- Hahn's Surplus has been sued for unjust enrichment, Mr. Hahn has been sued for two other claims of -- purportedly derivative in nature.

MR. CLARY: I agree with that.

MS. TAYLOR: And all those claims are subject to his motion for summary judgment.

THE COURT: I understand that.

MS. TAYLOR: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Which is why I said it may not affect Mr. Clary's motion, because it does deal with some discrete issues that are not necessarily related to this, but it clearly will relate to Mr. Segel's issues.

MR. CLARY: Well, the motion's also on behalf of Kokoweef, and Kokoweef is the ultimate victim here in my view. And I represent Kokoweef. And if the securities fraud was committed or any securities fraud was committed, it's Kokoweef that is the involved party on that, really the more -- even more so perhaps than I, although it's affected me personally in my profession. So I think those issues could go forward, and the thing --

THE COURT: Well, I understand.

MR. CLARY: -- I'm not objecting to having her have her deposition once she gets those records. I'm not objecting to that. But I am objecting -- I think while she was having all these problems on this other issue she let the time slide on the issue of my motion and the issue of Kokoweef's motion with respect to the securities fraud issues, and she has run out of time to do more discovery on that issue.

THE COURT: Mr. Clary, you're already winning on

1 your motion. You're already winning your part.

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor --

THE COURT: I may move you back to January 4th if I can't get this done.

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, my clients are willing -they would like to proceed as we've talked earlier. We will
do a standard nondisclosure agreement with each of the parties
signing specifically.

THE COURT: Anybody who reviews any of the documents is going to have to sign the acknowledgement.

MS. TAYLOR: That is fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. TAYLOR: And that was what we talked about on September 14th, and that's what I anticipated would happen.

THE COURT: So that means there won't be redactions, and Mr. Ross at Litigation Services can have the documents to you in a week or so.

MS. TAYLOR: Mr. Ross and I spoke, because I thought I would take advantage of them being -- I called him, I asked him how many boxes he still had, they're all those hand placement receipts. He's got seven boxes, and he says it's going to take him three weeks. And he had to put a break in his copying to wait for -- to start this copying on the third-party issues, Your Honor, because he didn't have an answer from us. And I'm sorry. And I said, the Judge is going to be

1 very unhappy when I come back in and tell her that.

THE COURT: Irritated. Irritated. Not unhappy, irritated.

MS. TAYLOR: Irritated. I chose the wrong adjective. I apologize. So that is what Mr. Ross reports to me. I said, gotta get them done by the first of the year.

THE COURT: Well, here's the deal. You've got a confidentiality agreement. Those that are done he has to release to you now. As they're done he will deliver them to you.

MS. TAYLOR: Great.

THE COURT: I'm only giving your expert 40 days from today to supplement his report, because he's going to have the bulk of the documents by the time you guys sign this confidentiality order, which should be by today or tomorrow, because it's a really standard document. Please reference the Nevada Supreme Court rule for any filing with me.

MR. SEGEL: Okay.

THE COURT: So your expert's going to have a supplemental report, if he's going to do one, 40 days from today, which is about January 19th.

Is that about right, Kathy?

THE CLERK: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: About January 19th. You're going to take the depo maybe, and then you're done with discovery

unless you file a separate motion that tells me you have good cause as a result of these newly discovered documents for which I had previously granted the motion to compel.

MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, this is where I would like to at least put on the record Mr. Segel's failure to accurately represent to you what was being discussed prior to his filing his status report. On November 18th, and I have emails, he solicited me to ask would I like to extend the discovery cutoff because -- and I'm going to quote him -- this case was not ready for discovery to be closed. And I said, sure, we can discuss it, I will stipulate. He also said, you see, "Also, additionally I want to take the deposition of our PMK in the December. That was represented to me.

[Unintelligible] expert's report, and we are clearly not in a position to close discovery." That was on November 18th. And I emailed him and I said, "I'm happy to stipulate to a discovery extension."

He also emailed me and said -- part of this was "Please let me know whether you can stipulate to an extension of the discovery deadline. If so, we need to have it presented to the Judge by Friday. We also need to discuss the practicality of maintaining the present trial stack. I am inclined to request a new date," this is Mr. Segel, "and obtain a date certain. If you're not able to stipulate, I will file the motion Friday."

And I responded, "How far out do you want to continue the trial? Please advise so we can try to stipulate. We have a status check the first weeks of December. We can probably discuss the trial date then."

I never heard back from him, Your Honor. So imagine my shock to get his status report that now demands that you deem discovery closed. And this is where I believe that he's violated certain rules that obligate to maintain candor to the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's skip that part.

MS. TAYLOR: Okay.

will be completed. That discovery is the custodian of records of the Surplus that I've said must be completed by January 7th. It is the delivery of the documents that are subject to the motion to compel that I ordered be produced a long time ago, the review of those documents by plaintiffs' expert, the supplemental expert report by plaintiffs' expert if he chooses to supplement his report, and the taking of that one deposition by the defendants. If you guys decide to stipulate to do anything else, I'm not going to stop you. However, if you don't stipulate, somebody needs to file a motion very, very quickly.

MR. CLARY: Your Honor, I just want to make one quick statement, and that is, assuming that what Ms. Taylor

has said is true with their dealings with Mr. Segel, I never 1 2 agreed to stipulate --THE COURT: I understand, Mr. Clary. 3 4 MR. CLARY: -- to anything. Mr. Clary, I understand. You already 5 THE COURT: won. 6 MR. CLARY: Thank you. 7 All right. 8 THE COURT: Your Honor, if I may, there's a few 9 MR. SEGEL: Issue number one is that I would be shocked if 10 plaintiffs want to take the deposition of our custodian of 11 records on January 7th. They've got until January 19th to 12 13 actually produce a report. But that's up to them. THE COURT: Custodian of records has nothing to do 14 15 with the report. MR. SEGEL: Well, they need the records --16 THE COURT: The custodian of records is who has your 17 records, how were they stored, where are they, are these them, 18 are the ones that went to the copy service the right records, 19 20 are there any more records, so I can go tell the Judge I don't have all the records and I need to do something. 21 22 That's what you intend to ask a custodian of records? 23 MS. TAYLOR: Correct, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: You're not asking substantive issues.

MS. TAYLOR: Correct, Your Honor.

25

MR. SEGEL: Okay. Number two, Your Honor, is that obviously I would like to take the deposition of their expert.

THE COURT: Discovery is closed with the exception of the items I just listed. That includes your ability to take their expert.

MR. SEGEL: Okay. Well, then we also --

THE COURT: That was one of the specific things I told you.

MR. SEGEL: Okay. We need a rebuttal expert. We have a rebuttal expert who I've identified. We need a rebuttal expert report that we have to be able to present.

THE COURT: Discovery is closed with the exception of those items I have identified. He's already provided a report, Mr. Segel. This is a supplemental report.

MR. SEGEL: No, Your Honor, he did not provide a report. They submitted -- they submit nothing. They submitted the notice that he was going to be their expert. They did not submit a report.

MS. TAYLOR: And on September 14th what you directed is was get the bank records, which took -- just even the ones he had in his possession took more than a month for him to turn over to us, get the bank records, get those records, and then that was the date you would start the clock running. And that was your language. And so Mr. Segel's correct -- see, we agree on something -- my experts have not filed a report.

Your direction to us was they would file something after that 1 clock ran, you know, three weeks, and then if they needed to 2 supplement I could bring it to you. 3 THE COURT: So are you agreeing he cannot file a 4 5 rebuttal expert? MS. TAYLOR: I would not seek to prejudice him in 6 7 such a way, Your Honor. THE COURT: So then, yes, you may have a rebuttal 8 The rebuttal expert needs to be disclosed three weeks 9 after the plaintiffs' expert report is delivered to you. 10 MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, it was disclosed. In fact, 11 you ordered that we identify our experts in the middle of --12 Okay. The report needs to be disclosed 13 THE COURT: three weeks after the expert report from the plaintiffs. 14 15 MR. SEGEL: Three weeks, Your Honor? THE COURT: 16 Yep. 17 MR. SEGEL: Okay. MS. TAYLOR: And, Your Honor, then I'm assuming that 18 19 I --Yes, you can take that deposition. 20 THE COURT: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 MS. TAYLOR: THE COURT: Anything else? All other discovery is 22 closed unless you stipulate, and that means all of you 23 stipulate, or someone files a motion. 24

25

MR. SEGEL: The only other thing, Your Honor, is we

go back to that September order, or just leave that in limbo 1 or -- I think we probably just -- the order to take -- oh. I 2 don't have to do that. 3 THE COURT: You know, there's no reason to submit it 4 to me anymore, because we've sort of gutted it today, haven't 5 6 we? MR. SEGEL: Probably so. 7 THE COURT: 8 Yeah. MR. SEGEL: Just make sure the record's clear. 9 THE COURT: So again the fact that a case involving 10 Nelson -- because it's not always his fault -- has taken over 11 a -- well, no, it's not a year this time. 12 MR. CLARY: You might want do as you did in the 13 previous case and order a quick transcript, because I can see 14 arguments going on about what the new order's going to look 15 like. I've seen --16 If you guys want to order a transcript, 17 THE COURT: 18 call Jill. It's not something I have to direct an inspector of elections to do something on. 19 MR. CLARY: All right. That's fine. 20 THE COURT: Have a lovely holiday if I don't see 21 you. 22 I am still move Mr. Clary's motion to the February 23

date, because that way everything will be worked out. And if

Mr. Segel's issues still aren't resolved, we'll probably deal

24

1	with Mr. Segel's issues later. But because Mr. Clary's issues
2	deal with different issues, or at least arguably different
3	issues, I want to hear it at the time we've talked about
4	scheduling it.
5	MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, so I guess am I going to
6	renotice mine for that same time, as well, or
7	THE COURT: If you want to. But your problem is
8	you've got to supplement, and it sounds like there may be
9	problems getting the supplement to me of everything you need.
10	MR. SEGEL: Well, that was why I wanted to ask for a
11	briefing schedule.
12	THE COURT: But I don't want to move Mr. Clary's
13	more than 30 days. I was willing to move his motion 30 days
14	so I could have them heard together, but your issues are
15	slightly different than hers or his.
16	MR. SEGEL: All right, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Have a great holiday.
18	MR. SEGEL: Thanks.
19	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
20	THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 10:30 A.M.
21	* * * *
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

<u>AFFIRMATION</u>

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

FLORENCE HOYT Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

FLORENCE HOYT, TRANSCRIBER DATE