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## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX TO APPELLANT/CROSS-RESPONDENT TODD B. JAKSICK'S APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEF

| DOCUMENT | DATE <br> FILED or ADMITTED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VOL. } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | PAGE NO. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Petition for Confirmation of Trustee and Admission of Trust to the Jurisdiction of the Court, and for Approval of Accountings and other Trust Administration Matters (SSJ's Issue Trust) | 8.2.17 | 1 | TJA000001-000203 |
| Petition for Confirmation of Trustees and Admission of Trust to the Jurisdiction of the Court, and For Approval of Accountings and Other Trust Administration Matters (Family Trust) (Separated) | 8.2.17 | 2 | TJA000204-000401 |
| Petition for Confirmation of Trustees and Admission of Trust to the Jurisdiction of the Court, and For Approval of Accountings and Other Trust Administration Matters (Family Trust) (Separated) | 8.2.17 | 3 | TJA00402-00585 |
| Respondent Wendy A. Jaksick's <br> Opposition and Objection to Petition | 10.10.17 | 4 | TJA000586-000594 |


| for Confirmation of Trustees and Admission of Trust to the Jurisdiction of the Court, and for Approval of Accountings and Other Trust Administration Matters (Family Trust) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Respondent Wendy A. Jaksick's Answer to Petition for Approval of Accounting and Other Trust Administration Matters (Family Trust) | 10.10.17 | 4 | TJA000595-000601 |
| Respondent Wendy A. Jaksick's Answer to Petition for Approval of Accounting and Other Trust Administration Matters (Issue Trust) | 10.10.17 | 4 | TJA000602-000606 |
| Respondent Wendy A. Jaksick's <br> Opposition and Objection to Petition for Confirmation of Trustees and Admission of Trust to the Jurisdiction of the Court, and for Approval of Accountings and Other Trust Administration Matters (Issue Trust) | 10.10.17 | 4 | TJA000607-000614 |
| Commissioner's Recommendation Referring Cases to Probate Judge | 10.12.17 | 4 | TJA000615-000617 |
| Order Accepting Transfer | 10.17.17 | 4 | TJA000618-000620 |


| Notice of Appearance (Todd B. <br> Jaksick, individually) | 11.3 .17 | 4 | TJA000621-000623 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Association of Counsel | 1.2 .18 | 4 | TJA000624-000625 |
| Demand for Jury | 1.3 .18 | 4 | TJA000626-000628 |
| Order Granting Consolidation | 1.5 .18 | 4 | TJA000629-000631 |
| Counter-Petition to Surcharge <br> Trustees for Breach of Fiduciary <br> Duties, for Removal of Trustees and <br> Appointment of Independent <br> Trustee(s), and for Declaratory <br> Judgment and other Relief | 1.19 .18 | 4 | TJA000632-000671 |
| Association of Counsel |  |  |  |
| Association of Counsel | 2.23 .18 | 4 | TJA000672-000692 |
| First Amended Counter-Petition to | 2.23 .18 | 4 | TJA000693-000712 |
| Surcharge Trustees for Breach of |  |  |  |
| Fiduciary Duties, for Removal of |  |  |  |
| Trustee(s), and for Declaratory |  |  | TJA000713-000752 |
| Judgment and Other Relief |  |  |  |


| Duties, For Removal of Trustees |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| and Appointment of Independent |  |  |  |
| Trustee(s) and For Declaratory |  |  |  |
| Judgment and Other Relief |  |  |  |
| Todd B. Jaksick's and Michael S. <br> Kimmel's Answer to First Amended <br> Counter-Petition to Surcharge | 4.13 .18 | 4 | TJA000780-000795 |
| Trustees for Breach of Fiduciary |  |  |  |
| Duties, For Removal of Trustees |  |  |  |
| and Appointment of Independent |  |  |  |
| Trustees, and for Declaratory <br> Judgment and Other Relief |  |  |  |
| Notice of Appearance | 4.17 .18 | 4 | TJA000796-000799 |
| Kevin Riley's Answer to First | 4.17 .18 | 5 | TJA000800-000815 |
| Amended Counter-Petition to |  |  |  |
| Surcharge Trustees for Breach of |  |  |  |
| Fiduciary Duties, For Removal of <br> Trustees and Appointment of |  |  |  |
| Independent Trustee(s), and For |  |  |  |
| Declaratory Judgment and Other <br> Relief | 4.19 .18 | 5 | TJA000816-000819 |
| Errata to Todd B. Jaksick's and |  |  |  |
| Michael S. Kimmel's Answer to |  |  |  |
| First Amended Counter-Petition to |  |  |  |
| Surcharge Trustees for Breach of |  |  |  |
| Fiduciary Duties, For Removal of |  |  |  |


| Trustees and Appointment of <br> Independent Trustees, and for <br> Declaratory Judgment and Other <br> Relief |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Errata to Kevin Riley's Answer to <br> First Amended Counter-Petition to <br> Surcharge Trustees for Breach of <br> Fiduciary Duties, For Removal of <br> Trustees and Appointment of <br> Independent Trustees, and for | 4.19 .18 | 5 | TJA000820-000823 |
| Declaratory Judgment and Other |  |  |  |
| Relief |  |  |  |
| Notice of Appearance |  |  |  |
| Notice of Appearance | 6.4 .18 | 5 | TJA000824-000827 |
| Stanley S. Jaksick's Answer to First | 8.2 .18 | 5 | TJA000832-000844 |
| Amended Counter-petition to |  |  |  |
| Surcharge Trustees for Breach of <br> Fiduciary Duties, For Removal of <br> Trustees and Appointment of <br> Independent Trustee(s), and for <br> Declaratory Judgment and Other <br> Relief |  |  |  |
| Joinder to Stanley S. Jaksick's | 8.7 .18 | 5 | TJA000845-000847 |
| Answer to First Amended Counter- |  |  |  |
| petition to Surcharge Trustees for |  |  |  |
| Breach of Fiduciary Duties, For |  |  |  |


| Removal of Trustees and <br> Appointment of Independent <br> Trustee(s), and for Declaratory <br> Judgment and Other Relief |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wendy Jaksick's Motion for Leave <br> to Join Indispensable Parties | 11.15 .18 | 5 | TJA000848-000855 |
| Todd B. Jaksick's, Individually, <br> Opposition to Wendy Jaksick's <br> Motion for Leave to Join <br> Indispensable Parties | 12.6 .18 | 5 | TJA000856-000872 |
| Opposition to Wendy Jaksick's | 12.6 .18 | 5 | TJA000873-000876 |
| Motion for Leave to Join |  |  |  |
| Indispensable Parties | 12.6 .18 | 5 | TJA000877-000898 |
| Petitioner's Opposition to Wendy <br> Jaksick's Motion for Leave to Join <br> Indispensable Parties | 1.22 .19 | 5 | TJA000949-000953 |
| Wendy Jaksick's Omnibus Reply in <br> Support of Motion for Leave to Join <br> Indispensable Parties | 12.17 .18 | 5 | TJA000899-000933 |
| Request for Submission of Wendy <br> A. Jaksick's Motion for Leave to <br> Join Indispensable Parties <br> In Part Motion for Leave to Join | 12.18 .18 | 5 | TJA000934-000936 |
| Ore-Trial Order Regarding Trial | 1.16 .19 | 5 | TJA000937-000948 |


| Scheduled |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Verdicts | 3.4 .19 | 5 | TJA000954-000957 |
| Motion for Order Awarding Costs <br> and Attorneys' Fees for Todd <br> Jaksick, Individually, Duck Lake <br> Ranch, LLC, and Incline TSS, Ltd. | 3.13 .19 | 6 | TJA000958-001157 |
| Petitioner Wendy A. Jaksick's <br> Opposition to Motion for Attorney <br> Fees | 3.25 .19 | 6 | TJA001158-001175 |
| Reply in Support of Motion for <br> Order Awarding Costs and <br> Attorneys' Fees for Todd Jaksick, <br> Individually, Duck Lake Ranch, <br> LLC and Incline TSS, Ltd. | 4.1 .19 | 7 | TJA001176-001185 |
| Request for Submission of Motion <br> for Order Awarding Costs and <br> Attorneys' Fees | 4.1 .19 | 7 | TJA001186-001189 |
| Trial Transcript | 7.19 |  |  |
| Order Addressing Evidence at <br> Equitable Trial | 5.20 .19 | 7 | TJA001203-001274 |
| Stanley Jaksick's Written Closing <br> Arguments | 7.1 .19 | 7 | TJA001275-001281 |
| Todd B. Jaksick's Closing <br> Argument Brief | 7.19 | 7 | TJA001282-001362 |
| Wendy Jaksick's Brief of Opening <br> Arguments in the Equitable Claims | 7.1 .19 | 8 | TJA001363-001470 |
|  | 5.13 .19 | 7 | TJA001190-001202 |


| Trial |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Petitioner's Trial Brief on Equitable Claims | 7.1.19 | 8 | TJA001471-001535 |
| Todd B. Jaksick's Closing Argument Brief | 7.31 .19 | 9 | TJA001536-001623 |
| Petitioner's Reply to Wendy Jaksick's Trial Brief on Equitable Claims | 7.31 .19 | 9 | TJA001624-001661 |
| Wendy Jaksick's Brief of Closing Arguments in the Equitable Claims Trial | 7.31 .19 | 10 | TJA001662-001757 |
| Stanley Jaksick's Written Closing Reply Brief | 7.31 .19 | 11 | TJA001758-001977 |
| Order for Supplemental Briefing | 2.6.20 | 12 | TJA001978-001979 |
| Todd Jaksick's Supplemental Brief in Response to the Court's February 6, 2020 Order for Supplemental Briefing | 2.18 .20 | 12 | TJA001980-002043 |
| Trustees' Supplemental Brief | 2.18.20 | 12 | TJA002044-002077 |
| Supplemental Brief by Stanley <br> Jaksick, Co-Trustee of the Samuel <br> S. Jaksick, Jr. Family Trust | 2.18 .20 | 12 | TJA002078-002085 |
| Wendy Jaksick's Supplemental <br> Brief in the Equitable Claims Trial | 2.25 .20 | 12 | TJA002086-002093 |
| Order After Equitable Trial | 3.12 .20 | 12 | TJA002094-002118 |
| Notice of Entry of Order | 3.17 .20 | 12 | TJA002119-002146 |


| Memorandum of Costs | 3.17 .20 | 12 | TJA002147-002164 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Verified Memorandum of Costs | 3.23 .20 | 13 | TJA002165-002189 |
| Todd Jaksick's Motion to Strike <br> Wendy Jaksick's Verified <br> Memorandum of Costs or, in the <br> Alternative, Motion to Retax Costs | 3.25 .20 | 13 | TJA002190-002194 |
| Motion to Strike Verified <br> Memorandum of Costs | 3.26 .20 | 13 | TJA002195-002215 |
| Motion to Retax Costs and Joinder <br> to Motions to Strike | 3.26 .20 | 13 | TJA002216-002219 |
| Judgment on Verdict and Order <br> After Equitable Trial | 4.1 .20 | 13 | TJA002220-002254 |
| Notice of Entry of Judgment | 4.1 .20 | 13 | TJA002255-002292 |
| Petitioners' Verified Memorandum |  |  |  |
| of Costs and Disbursements |  |  |  |


| Costs - Kevin Riley |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Motion for Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs - Michael Kimmel | 4.9 .20 | 16 | TJA002616-002769 |
| Omnibus Opposition to Motions to <br> Strike Wendy Jaksick's Verified <br> Memorandum of Costs filed by <br> Trustees | 4.9 .20 | 16 | TJA002770-002776 |
| Motion for Attorney Fees and Costs <br> for Todd Jaksick, Individually, for <br> Trial on Equitable Claims | 4.10 .20 | 16 | TJA002777-002833 |
| Reply in Support of Motion to <br> Strike Verified Memorandum of <br> Costs | 4.13 .20 | 17 | TJA002834-002841 |
| Request for Submission | 4.13 .20 | 17 | TJA002842-002845 |
| Order Denying Wendy Jaksick's <br> Costs | 4.21 .20 | 17 | TJA002846-002847 |
| Notice of Entry of Order | 4.21 .20 | 17 | TJA002848-002857 |
| Memorandum of Attorney's Fees by <br> Stanley Jaksick, as Co-Trustee of <br> the Family Trust | 4.22 .20 | 17 | TJA002858-002910 |
| Request for Submission | 4.22 .20 | 17 | TJA002911-002913 |
| Opposition to Motion for Attorney's | 4.23 .20 | 17 | TJA002914-002930 |
| Fees and Costs of Michael Kimmel, |  |  |  |
| Individually and as Co-Trustee | 4.23 .20 | 17 | TJA002931-002946 |
| Opposition to Motion for Attorney's <br> Fees and Costs of Kevin Riley, |  |  |  |


| Individually and as Co-Trustee of <br> the Family Trust and as Trustee of <br> the BHC Family Trust |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Opposition to Motion for Order <br> Awarding Costs and Attorney's <br> Fees for Todd Jaksick, Individually <br> on Equitable Claims | 4.24 .20 | 17 | TJA002947-002985 |
| Opposition and Motion to Strike <br> Memorandum of Attorney's Fees by <br> Stanley Jaksick as Co-Trustee of the <br> Family Trust | 4.27 .20 | 17 | TJA002986-002992 |
| Motion to Alter or Amend the |  |  |  |
| Judgment | 4.28 .20 | 17 | TJA002993-003000 |
| Trial Transcript | 5.13 .19 | 17 | TJA001190-001202 |
| Order Regarding Costs <br> Claims | 4.30 .20 | 18 | TJA003044-003045 |
| Motion to Alter or Amend <br> Judgment, or Alternatively, Motion <br> for New Trial | 4.30 .20 | 18 | TJA003046-003113 |
| Reply in Support of Motion for |  |  |  |
| Attorney's Fees and Costs | 5.1 .20 | 18 | TJA003114-003126 |
| Request for Submission | 5.1 .20 | 18 | TJA003131-003147 |
| Reply to Opposition to Motion for |  |  |  |


| Request for Submission | 5.1 .20 | 18 | TJA003148-003151 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Todd B. Jaksick's Opposition to <br> Wendy Jaksick's Motion to Alter or <br> Amend Judgment, or, Alternatively, <br> Motion for a New Trial | 5.8 .20 | 18 | TJA003152-003189 |
| Limited Joinder to Todd B. <br> Jaksick's Opposition to Wendy <br> Jaksick's Motion to Alter or Amend <br> Judgment, or, Alternatively, Motion <br> for a New Trial | 5.12 .20 | 18 | TJA003190-003196 |
| Opposition to Alter or Amend the <br> Judgment Award of Attorney's Fees <br> to Wendy | 5.12 .20 | 18 | TJA003197-003205 |
| Supplemental Motion in Support of <br> Award of Attorney's Fees to Wendy <br> Jaksick's Attorneys | 5.12 .20 | 19 | TJA003206-003324 |
| Opposition to Todd B. Jaksick's <br> Motion to Amend the Judgment <br> Memorandum of Attorney's Fees as | 5.13 .20 | 19 | TJA003325-003339 |
| Opposition to Wendy Jaksick's <br> Motion to Alter or Amend <br> Judgment, or in the Alternative, <br> Motion for New Trial | 5.13 .20 | 19 | TJA003340-003344 |
| Reply to Wendy Jaksick's Amended | 5.13 .20 | 19 | TJA003345-003348 |


| Co-Trustee of the Family Trust |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Wendy Jaksick's Reply in Support <br> of her Motion to Alter or Amend <br> Judgment, or, Alternatively, Motion <br> for New Trial | 5.15 .20 | 19 | TJA003349-003357 |
| Request for Submission | 5.18 .20 | 19 | TJA003358-003365 |
| Reply in Support of Motion to Alter <br> or Amend Judgment | 5.19 .20 | 19 | TJA003366-003372 |
| Request for Submission | 5.19 .20 | 19 | TJA003373-003376 |
| Motion to Strike Wendy's <br> Supplemental Motion in Support of <br> Award of Attorney's Fees to Wendy | 5.19 .20 | 19 | TJA003377-003381 |
| Jaksick's Attorneys |  |  |  |
| Reply in Support of Todd B. | 5.19 .20 | 20 | TJA003382-003452 |
| Jaksick's, Individually, Motion to |  |  |  |
| Amend the Judgment |  |  |  |


| Opposition to Wendy Jaksick's <br> Supplemental Motion |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Opposition to Motion to Strike <br> Wendy's Supplemental Motion in <br> Support of Award of Attorney's <br> Fees to Wendy Jaksick's Attorneys |  | 6.1 .20 | 21 |
| TJA003622-003627 |  |  |  |
| Reply in Support of Motion to <br> Strike Wendy's Supplemental <br> Motion in Support of Award of <br> Attorney's Fees to Wendy Jaksick's <br> Attorneys | 6.8 .20 | 21 | TJA003628-003634 |
| Request for Submission |  |  |  |
| Order Resolving Submitted Matters | 6.10 .20 | 22 | TJA003639-003646 |
| Notice of Appeal | 7.10 .20 | 22 | TJA003647-003650 |
| Case Appeal Statement | 7.10 .20 | 22 | TJA003651-003657 |
| Notice of Appeal | 7.10 .20 | 22 | TJA003658-003661 |
| Case Appeal Statement | 7.10 .20 | 22 | TJA003662-003669 |
| Notice of Appeal | 7.13 .20 | 22 | TJA003670-003677 |
| Case Appeal Statement | 7.13 .20 | 22 | TJA003678-003680 |
| Notice of Cross Appeal | 7.21 .20 | 22 | TJA003681-003777 |
| Case Appeal Statement | 7.21 .20 | 22 | TJA003778-003790 |
| Amended Judgment | 7.6 .20 | 22 | TJA003791-003811 |
|  |  |  |  |

## ALPHABETICAL INDEX TO APPELLANT/CROSS-RESPONDENT TODD B. JAKSICK'S APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEF

| DOCUMENT | DATE FILED <br> or ADMITTED |  | VOL. <br> NO. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PAGE NO. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Amended Judgment | 7.6 .20 | 22 | TJA003791-003811 |
| Association of Counsel | 1.2 .18 | 4 | TJA000624-000625 |
| Association of Counsel | 2.23 .18 | 4 | TJA000672-000692 |
| Association of Counsel | 2.23 .18 | 4 | TJA000693-000712 |
| Case Appeal Statement | 7.10 .20 | 22 | TJA003651-003657 |
| Case Appeal Statement | 7.10 .20 | 22 | TJA003662-003669 |
| Case Appeal Statement | 7.13 .20 | 22 | TJA003678-003680 |
| Case Appeal Statement | 7.21 .20 | 22 | TJA003778-003790 |
| Commissioner's Recommendation <br> Referring Cases to Probate Judge | 10.12 .17 | 4 | TJA000615-000617 |
| Counter-Petition to Surcharge <br> Trustees for Breach of Fiduciary <br> Duties, for Removal of Trustees <br> and Appointment of Independent <br> Trustee(s), and for Declaratory <br> Judgment and other Relief | 1.19 .18 | 4 | TJA000632-000671 |
| Demand for Jury |  |  |  |


| Trustees and Appointment of Independent Trustees, and for Declaratory Judgment and Other Relief |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Errata to Todd B. Jaksick's and Michael S. Kimmel's Answer to First Amended Counter-Petition to Surcharge Trustees for Breach of Fiduciary Duties, For Removal of Trustees and Appointment of Independent Trustees, and for Declaratory Judgment and Other Relief | 4.19 .18 | 5 | TJA000816-000819 |
| First Amended Counter-Petition to Surcharge Trustees for Breach of Fiduciary Duties, for Removal of Trustee(s), and for Declaratory Judgment and Other Relief | 2.23 .18 | 4 | TJA000713-000752 |
| Joinder to Memorandum of Costs | 4.6.20 | 14 | TJA002443-002445 |
| Joinder to Stanley S. Jaksick's Answer to First Amended Counter-petition to Surcharge Trustees for Breach of Fiduciary Duties, For Removal of Trustees and Appointment of Independent Trustee(s), and for Declaratory | 8.7.18 | 5 | TJA000845-000847 |


| Judgment and Other Relief |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Joinder to Todd B. Jaksick's <br> Opposition to Wendy Jaksick's <br> Supplemental Motion | 6.1 .20 | 21 | TJA003618-003621 |
| Judgment on Verdict and Order <br> After Equitable Trial | 4.1 .20 | 13 | TJA002220-002254 |
| Kevin Riley's Answer to First <br> Amended Counter-Petition to <br> Surcharge Trustees for Breach of <br> Fiduciary Duties, For Removal of <br> Trustees and Appointment of <br> Independent Trustee(s), and For <br> Declaratory Judgment and Other <br> Relief | 4.17 .18 | 5 | TJA000800-000815 |
| Limited Joinder to Todd B. <br> Jaksick's Opposition to Wendy <br> Jaksick's Motion to Alter or <br> Amend Judgment, or, <br> Alternatively, Motion for a New <br> Trial | 5.12 .20 | 4.2 .20 | 17 |
| Memorandum of Attorney's Fees <br> by Stanley Jaksick, as Co-Trustee <br> of the Family Trust | 4.22 .20 | 18 | TJA003190-003196 |
| Memorandum of Costs |  |  |  |
| Memorandum of Costs and <br> Disbursements |  |  |  |


| Memorandum of Costs and <br> Disbursements | 4.2 .20 | 14 | TJA002431-002442 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Motion for Attorney Fees and <br> Costs for Todd Jaksick, <br> Individually, for Trial on <br> Equitable Claims | 4.10 .20 | 16 | TJA002777-002833 |
| Motion for Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs - Michael Kimmel | 4.9 .20 | 16 | TJA002616-002769 |
| Motion for Attorneys' Fees and <br> Costs - Kevin Riley | 4.9 .20 | 15 | TJA002451-002615 |
| Motion for Order Awarding Costs <br> and Attorneys' Fees for Todd <br> Jaksick, Individually, Duck Lake <br> Ranch, LLC, and Incline TSS, <br> Ltd. | 3.13 .19 | 6 | TJA000958-001157 |
| Motion to Alter or Amend <br> Judgment, or Alternatively, <br> Motion for New Trial | 4.30 .20 | 18 | TJA003046-003113 |
| Motion to Alter or Amend the <br> Judgment | 4.28 .20 | 17 | TJA002993-003000 |
| Motion to Retax Costs and Joinder <br> to Motions to Strike | 3.26 .20 | 13 | TJA002216-002219 |
| Motion to Strike Verified <br> Memorandum of Costs | 3.26 .20 | 13 | TJA002195-002215 |
| Motion to Strike Wendy's <br> Supplemental Motion in Support | 5.19 .20 | TJA003377-003381 |  |


| of Award of Attorney's Fees to <br> Wendy Jaksick's Attorneys |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Notice of Appeal | 7.10 .20 | 22 | TJA003647-003650 |
| Notice of Appeal | 7.10 .20 | 22 | TJA003658-003661 |
| Notice of Appeal | 7.13 .20 | 22 | TJA003670-003677 |
| Notice of Appearance | 6.4 .18 | 5 | TJA000824-000827 |
| Notice of Appearance | 6.4 .18 | 5 | TJA000828-000831 |
| Notice of Appearance | 4.17 .18 | 4 | TJA000796-000799 |
| Notice of Appearance (Todd B. | 11.3 .17 | 4 | TJA000621-000623 |
| Jaksick, individually) | 7.21 .20 | 22 | TJA003681-003777 |
| Notice of Cross Appeal | 4.1 .20 | 13 | TJA002255-002292 |
| Notice of Entry of Judgment | 3.13 .18 | 4 | TJA000757-000761 |
| Notice of Entry of Order | 3.13 .18 | 48 | TJA000762-000766 |
| Notice of Entry of Order | 3.17 .20 | 4.21 .20 | 5.20 .20 |


| Judgment Award of Attorney's <br> Fees to Wendy |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Opposition to Motion for <br> Attorney's Fees and Costs of <br> Kevin Riley, Individually and as <br> Co-Trustee of the Family Trust <br> and as Trustee of the BHC Family <br> Trust | 4.23 .20 | 17 | TJA002931-002946 |
| Opposition to Motion for <br> Attorney's Fees and Costs of <br> Michael Kimmel, Individually and <br> as Co-Trustee | 4.23 .20 | 17 | TJA002914-002930 |
| Opposition to Motion for Order <br> Awarding Costs and Attorney's <br> Fees for Todd Jaksick, <br> Individually on Equitable Claims | 4.24 .20 | 17 | TJA002947-002985 |
| Opposition to Motion to Strike <br> Wendy's Supplemental Motion in <br> Support of Award of Attorney's <br> Fees to Wendy Jaksick's <br> Attorneys | 6.1 .20 | 21 | TJA003622-003627 |
| Opposition to Todd B. Jaksick's <br> Motion to Amend the Judgment | 5.13 .20 | 19 | TJA003325-003339 |
| Opposition to Wendy Jaksick's <br> Motion for Leave to Join <br> Indispensable Parties | 12.6 .18 | 5 | TJA000873-000876 |


| Opposition to Wendy Jaksick's <br> Motion to Alter or Amend <br> Judgment, or in the Alternative, <br> Motion for New Trial | 5.13.20 | 19 | TJA003340-003344 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Order Accepting Transfer | 10.17.17 | 4 | TJA000618-000620 |
| Order Addressing Evidence at Equitable Trial | 5.20 .19 | 7 | TJA001203-001274 |
| Order After Equitable Trial | 3.12.20 | 12 | TJA002094-002118 |
| Order Associating Counsel | 3.13 .18 | 4 | TJA000753-000754 |
| Order Associating Counsel | 3.13 .18 | 4 | TJA000755-000756 |
| Order Awarding Costs | 5.19 .20 | 20 | TJA003457 |
| Order Denying Wendy Jaksick's Costs | 4.21 .20 | 17 | TJA002846-002847 |
| Order for Supplemental Briefing | 2.6.20 | 12 | TJA001978-001979 |
| Order Granting Consolidation | 1.5.18 | 4 | TJA000629-000631 |
| Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motion for Leave to Join Indispensable Parties | 1.16.19 | 5 | TJA000937-000948 |
| Order Regarding Costs | 4.30 .20 | 18 | TJA003044-003045 |
| Order Resolving Submitted Matters | 6.10 .20 | 22 | TJA003639-003646 |
| Petition for Confirmation of Trustee and Admission of Trust to the Jurisdiction of the Court, and for Approval of Accountings and other Trust Administration | 8.2.17 | 1 | TJA000001-000203 |


| Matters (SSJ's Issue Trust) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Petition for Confirmation of <br> Trustees and Admission of Trust <br> to the Jurisdiction of the Court, <br> and For Approval of Accountings <br> and Other Trust Administration <br> Matters (Family Trust) <br> (Separated) | 8.2 .17 | 2 | TJA000204-000401 |
| Petition for Confirmation of <br> Trustees and Admission of Trust <br> to the Jurisdiction of the Court, <br> and For Approval of Accountings <br> and Other Trust Administration <br> Matters (Family Trust) | 8.2 .17 | 3 | TJA00402-00585 |
| (Separated) |  |  |  |


| Petitioner's Verified <br> Memorandum of Attorney's Fees | 5.21 .20 | 21 | TJA003462-003608 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Petitioners' Verified <br> Memorandum of Costs and <br> Disbursements | 4.2 .20 | 14 | TJA002293-002409 |
| Pre-Trial Order Regarding Trial <br> Scheduled | 1.22 .19 | 5 | TJA000949-000953 |
| Reply in Support of Motion for <br> Attorney's Fees and Costs | 5.1 .20 | 18 | TJA003114-003126 |
| Reply in Support of Motion for <br> Order Awarding Costs and | 4.1 .19 | 7 | TJA001176-001185 |
| Attorneys' Fees for Todd Jaksick, <br> Individually, Duck Lake Ranch, <br> LLC and Incline TSS, Ltd. | 5.19 | TJA003366-003372 |  |
| Reply in Support of Motion to <br> Alter or Amend Judgment | 5.19 .20 | 17 | TJA002834-002841 |
| Reply in Support of Motion to <br> Strike Verified Memorandum of <br> Costs | 4.13 .20 | 5.19 .20 | 20 |
| Reply in Support of Motion to <br> Strike Wendy's Supplemental <br> Motion in Support of Award of <br> Attorney's Fees to Wendy <br> Jaksick's Attorneys | 6.8 .20 | TJA003382-003452 |  |
| Reply in Support of Todd B. <br> Jaksick's, Individually, Motion to | TJA003628-003634 |  |  |
| \begin{tabular}{l}
\end{tabular} |  |  |  |


| Amend the Judgment |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Reply to Opposition to Motion for <br> Order Awarding Costs and <br> Attorney's Fees for Todd Jaksick, <br> Individually, For Trial on <br> Equitable Claims | 5.1 .20 | 18 | TJA003131-003147 |
| Reply to Wendy Jaksick's <br> Amended Opposition and Motion <br> to Strike Stanley Jaksick's <br> Verified Memorandum of <br> Attorney's Fees as Co-Trustee of <br> the Family Trust | 5.13 .20 | 19 | TJA003345-003348 |
| Request for Submission |  |  |  |
| Request for Submission | 4.13 .20 | 17 | TJA002842-002845 |
| Request for Submission | 5.1 .20 | 17 | TJA002911-002913 |
| Request for Submission | 5.1 .20 | 18 | TJA003127-003130 |
| Request for Submission | 5.18 .20 | 18 | TJA003148-003151 |
| Request for Submission | 5.19 .20 | 19 | TJA003358-003365 |
| Request for Submission | 5.19 .20 | 19 | TJA003373-003376 |
| Request for Submission | 6.8 .20 | 20 | TJA003453-003456 |
| Request for Submission of Motion <br> for Order Awarding Costs and <br> Attorneys' Fees | 4.1 .19 | 7 | TJA001186-001189 |
| Request for Submission of Wendy | 12.18 .18 | 5 | TJA000934-000936 |
| A. Jaksick's Motion for Leave to |  |  |  |
| Join Indispensable Parties |  |  |  |


| Respondent Wendy A. Jaksick's <br> Answer to Petition for Approval <br> of Accounting and Other Trust <br> Administration Matters (Family <br> Trust) | 10.10 .17 | 4 | TJA000595-000601 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Respondent Wendy A. Jaksick's <br> Answer to Petition for Approval <br> of Accounting and Other Trust <br> Administration Matters (Issue <br> Trust) | 10.10 .17 | 4 | TJA000602-000606 |
| Respondent Wendy A. Jaksick's <br> Opposition and Objection to | 10.10 .17 | 4 | TJA000586-000594 |
| Petition for Confirmation of |  |  |  |
| Trustees and Admission of Trust |  |  |  |
| to the Jurisdiction of the Court, |  |  |  |
| and for Approval of Accountings |  |  |  |
| and Other Trust Administration |  |  |  |
| Matters (Family Trust) |  |  |  |$\quad$| Respondent Wendy A. Jaksick's | 10.10 .17 | 4 | TJA000607-000614 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Opposition and Objection to |  |  |  |
| Petition for Confirmation of <br> Trustees and Admission of Trust <br> to the Jurisdiction of the Court, <br> and for Approval of Accountings <br> and Other Trust Administration <br> Matters (Issue Trust) |  |  |  |


| Stanley Jaksick's Written Closing <br> Arguments | 7.1 .19 | 7 | TJA001275-001281 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stanley Jaksick's Written Closing <br> Reply Brief | 7.31 .19 | 11 | TJA001758-001977 |
| Stanley S. Jaksick's Answer to <br> First Amended Counter-petition to <br> Surcharge Trustees for Breach of <br> Fiduciary Duties, For Removal of <br> Trustees and Appointment of <br> Independent Trustee(s), and for <br> Declaratory Judgment and Other <br> Relief | 8.2 .18 | 5 | TJA000832-000844 |
| Supplemental Brief by Stanley <br> Jaksick, Co-Trustee of the Samuel | 2.18 .20 | 12 | TJA002078-002085 |
| S. Jaksick, Jr. Family Trust |  |  |  |


| Relief |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Todd B. Jaksick's Answer and <br> Objections to First Amended <br> Counter-Petition to Surcharge <br> Trustees for Breach of Fiduciary <br> Duties, For Removal of Trustees <br> and Appointment of Independent <br> Trustee(s) and For Declaratory <br> Judgment and Other Relief | 4.9 .18 | 4 | TJA000767-000779 |
| Todd B. Jaksick's Closing <br> Argument Brief | 7.1 .19 | 7 | TJA001282-001362 |
| Todd B. Jaksick's Closing <br> Argument Brief | 7.31 .19 | 9 | TJA001536-001623 |
| Todd B. Jaksick's Opposition to <br> Wendy Jaksick's Motion to Alter <br> or Amend Judgment, or, <br> Alternatively, Motion for a New <br> Trial | 5.8 .20 | 18 | TJA003152-003189 |
| Todd B. Jaksick's Opposition to <br> Wendy Jaksick's Supplemental <br> Motion in Support of Award of <br> Attorney's Fees | 5.21 .20 | 21 | TJA003609-003617 |
| Todd B. Jaksick's, Individually, <br> Opposition to Wendy Jaksick's <br> Motion for Leave to Join <br> Indispensable Parties | 12.6 .18 | 5 | TJA000856-000872 |


| Todd Jaksick's Motion to Strike <br> Wendy Jaksick's Verified <br> Memorandum of Costs or, in the <br> Alternative, Motion to Retax <br> Costs | 3.25 .20 | 13 | TJA002190-002194 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Todd B. Jaksick's Motion to <br> Amend Judgment | 4.29 .20 | 18 | TJA003001-003043 |
| Todd Jaksick's Supplemental <br> Brief in Response to the Court's <br> February 6, 2020 Order for <br> Supplemental Briefing | 2.18 .20 | 12 | TJA001980-002043 |
| Trial Transcript | 5.13 .19 | 7 | TJA001190-001202 |
| Trustees' Supplemental Brief | 2.18 .20 | 12 | TJA002044-002077 |
| Verdicts | 3.4 .19 | 5 | TJA000954-000957 |
| Verified Memorandum of Costs | 3.23 .20 | 13 | TJA002165-002189 |
| Wendy Jaksick's Brief of Closing <br> Arguments in the Equitable <br> Claims Trial | 7.31 .19 | 10 | TJA001662-001757 |
| Wendy Jaksick's Brief of Opening <br> Arguments in the Equitable <br> Claims Trial | 7.1 .19 | 5 | TJA000899-000933 |
| Wendy Jaksick's Motion for <br> Leave to Join Indispensable <br> Parties | 11.15 .18 | 5 | TJA000848-000855 |
| Wendy Jaksick's Omnibus Reply <br> in Support of Motion for Leave to | 12.17 .18 | 5 | TJA001363-001470 |


| Join Indispensable Parties |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wendy Jaksick's Reply in Support <br> of her Motion to Alter or Amend <br> Judgment, or, Alternatively, <br> Motion for New Trial | 5.15 .20 | 19 | TJA003349-003357 |
| Wendy Jaksick's Response to <br> Todd Jaksick's Motion to Strike <br> Wendy Jaksick's Verified <br> Memorandum of Costs, or in the <br> Alternative, Motion to Retax <br> Costs | 4.8 .20 | 14 | TJA002446-002450 |
| Wendy Jaksick's Supplemental <br> Brief in the Equitable Claims Trial | 2.25 .20 | 12 | TJA002086-002093 |
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# IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE 

In the Matter of the Administration of the
SSJ ISSUE TRUST,
In the Matter of the Administration of the
SAMUEL S. JAKSICK, JR. FAMILY TRUST,
WENDY JAKSICK,
Respondent and Counter Petitioner,
v.

TODD B. JAKSICK, Individually, as Co-Trustee of the Samuel S. Jaksick, Jr. Family Trust, and as Trustee of the SSJ's Issue Trust, MICHAEL S. KIMMEL, Individually and as Co-Trustee of the Samuel S. Jaksick, Jr. Family Trust, and STANLEY S. JAKSICK, Individually and as CoTrustee of the Samuel S. Jaksick, Jr. Family Trust, Kevin Riley, Individually and as former Trustee of the Samuel S. Jaksick, Jr. Family Trust and Trustee of the Wendy A. Jaksick 2012 BHC Family Trust,

Petitioners and Counter-Respondents.
STANLEY JAKSICK, Respondent and Counter-Petitioner,
v.

TODD B. JAKSICK, Individually and as Trustee of the Samuel S. Jaksick Jr. Family Trust and SSJ’s Issue Trust.

## STANLEY JAKSICK'S WRITTEN CLOSING REPLY BRIEF

Stanley Jaksick, as Co-Trustee of the Family Trust, hereby submits his Written Closing
Reply Brief in accordance with the procedure defined at the May 17, 2019 hearing and by the Court's June 26, 2019 Order Granting Emergency Motion to Extend Briefing Deadline.

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I. Introduction

After an extended trial, the jury found that Stanley Jaksick ("Stan") did not commit a breach of fiduciary duty, did not commit civil conspiracy and aiding and abetting, and did not aid and abet a breach of fiduciary duty. Verdict, Mar. 4, 2019. This verdict did not resolve all claims in this action as this Court properly bifurcated the claims by Wendy Jaksick ("Wendy"), PreTrial Order re: Trial Schedule, Jan. 22, 2019, reserving nine claims for the equitable portion of the trial. The central question is not whether Wendy theoretically can still assert some of her equitable claims in light of the jury verdict, it is whether her current equitable claims can remain viable as they are simply the same legal claims recast in different verbiage. See Wendy's Brief of Opening Arguments in the Equitable Claims Trial 91 ("Remedies to Redress Breaches of Fiduciary Duties by the Trustees").

The nature of Wendy's claims in large part is not to obtain a remedy for the trusts, but to obtain a benefit for herself or her attorneys based on the same conduct she alleged during the jury trial. Thus, despite the jury's complete exoneration of Stan from any liability as co-Trustee of the Samuel S. Jaksick Jr. Family Trust ("Family Trust"), Wendy nevertheless seeks, through the doctrines of surcharge and unjust enrichment, to obtain an equivalent monetary remedy based on the same alleged but rejected breaches of fiduciary duty. As a Washington court commented: "The distinction between actions at law and those at equity is based on the nature rather than the form of the proceeding . . . Where the beneficiaries seek recovery for themselves personally, the action is considered legal in nature. Where, as in this case, the beneficiaries of a trust sue the trustee in order to restore funds to the trust, the action is considered equitable in nature." Allard v. Pacific National Bank, 99 Wash.2d 394, 400-01, 663 P.2d 104 (1983). Despite 105 pages of argument in Wendy's Opening Brief, her claims against Stan remain unsubstantiated and
demonstrably short of evidentiary support. This was her opportunity to put pen to paper and show how Stan, as co-Trustee of the Family Trust, should be compelled to "restore funds to the trust" or to provide other equitable remedies for harm occasioned by Stan in his capacity as trustee. Wendy's arguments and evidence continue to fall short of the requisite standards of proof.

The reason for Wendy's failure in this regard is due to the evidence, including her own testimony, showing that Stan faithfully performed his duties as co-Trustee of the Family Trust, even going above and beyond to assist Wendy. Stan’s Closing Reply Brief, Exhibit 1, Wendy Dep. Tr. 1114:4-17 ("I think Stan told me what he knew as much as knew . . . I don't believe that he knew the other things that were going on or he would have told me."); Id. 1125:6-9 (stating that Stan has not used his "purported indemnification agreement"); Id. 1141:2-8 (Q: "are you alleging that Stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust participated in an ongoing scheme to minimize distributions to you?" A: "I think Stan did the opposite"); Id. 1146:251147:15 (Q: "do you believe that Stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust breached his fiduciary duty owed to you by failing to fully disclose and account to you the administration of the family trust?: A: "I don't believe that Stan had been given full disclosure himself to know what information to pass on to me, if that was the case . . . I don't believe he - he didn't know much more than I know or knew." Q: "Do you believe Stan disclosed to you what information he had?" A: "Yes, I do"). In the absence of specific evidence by Wendy that Stan committed a breach of trust himself or knowingly assisted in a breach of trust, Wendy cannot prevail on her claims against Stan, who is uniquely situated as a respondent in this action.

On January 4, 2018 during a case management conference, counsel for Stan accepted the consolidation of the Family Trust and Issue Trust cases with the reminder that the roles of the trustees of the two trusts should be kept separate and distinct. One year later, on January 29, 2019, Stan filed a Motion in Limine, granted by this Court, seeking to prohibit "references to the 'Trustees' or the conduct of the 'Trustees' without disaggregation or clarification." Omnibus Mot. 3. Nevertheless, from the very first page of Wendy's Motion to the very last, the "Trustees" are attacked without clear separation between the trustees themselves or between the Family and

Issue Trusts. Wendy's Opening Br. p. 1 ("Trustee’s Failure to Disclose and Adequately Account").

NRS 163.110(1) specifically provides that a "trustee who has not joined in exercising a power is not liable to the beneficiaries or to others for the consequences of the exercise of power and a dissenting trustee is not liable for the consequences of an act in which that trustee joined at the direction of the majority trustees, if the trustee expressed his or her dissent in writing to any of his or her cotrustees at or before the time of the joinder." Furthermore, Art. IV(D) of the Family Trust states that "No Co-Trustee is to be liable for any act, omission, or default of any Co-Trustee provided that the Co-Trustee has not had knowledge of any facts that may reasonably be expected to have put the Co-Trustee on notice in sufficient time to have prevented the act, omission, or default." Stan either did not join or objected in writing to effectively every claim brought by Wendy with respect to the Family Trust: Todd's Indemnification Agreement, Ex. 32; Payments by the Family Trust, Ex. 38; Providing distributions or support to Wendy, Ex. 81; the relevant ACPAs, Ex. 244, Ex. 246. Wendy has proffered no evidence that Stan had knowledge of the facts giving rise to her claims or that he should have been on notice. In fact, her testimony is the exact opposite that Stan did not know any more than she did. On this basis alone, Wendy's claims against Stan fail as he is only in this action in a limited role as co-Trustee of the Family Trust.

While Stan joins in the briefs filed by the other co-Trustees of the Family Trust, to the extent that the arguments apply to him, he further submits the following responses to Wendy's Opening Brief.

## I. Response to "Failure to Disclose and Adequately Account to Compel Accountings" (Wendy's Opening Br. $\mathbb{1 / 1 / 3 5 ) ~}$

Wendy did not demand the accountings at issue in this litigation and therefore cannot access the statutory remedies provided in NRS Chapter 164. There are, however, exceptions "to the common law rule that a trustee is not required to furnish a beneficiary information about the trust in the absence of a request." Bogert's Trusts and Trustees, Grounds for removal, The Law Of Trusts And Trustees § 963. First, if the "trustee is dealing with the beneficiary on its own
account" and second if there is a situation where the beneficiary "needs to know to protect the beneficiary's interest in dealing with a third party." Id. While Wendy raises lots of "questions" and "concerns" with the accountings, in order for her to obtain an equitable remedy - as the accountings have already been provided and are statutorily compliant - she must be able to show which omission or lack of disclosure in the accountings affected her in a concrete fashion or caused her to take an action in reliance thereon. This she cannot do. The Family Trust is extraordinarily complex and there is no duty for a co-Trustee of the Family Trust such as Stan to spend Trust resources on an annual valuation of closely held companies or real property. Stan joins in the responses by the other co-Trustees with respect to the adequacy and sufficiency of the accountings.

Finally, Paragraphs 29-35 relate to the affirmative petitions filed by the other co-Trustees, Todd and Michael Kimmel, and so no response is necessary from Stan. Paragraph 31 specifically notes that "Stan, in his capacity as Co-Trustee of the Family Trust, refused to join the Petition for Confirmation concerning the Family Trust Accountings and actually filed an objection to same." Wendy's Opening Br. థI 28. Stan objects to the statements made in Paragraph 32 concerning the "Trustees" as none of these statements is evidenced at all, let alone with respect to Stan. Id. ๆ 32. Stan objects to Wendy's statements in Paragraph 34 that had "the Trustees prepared and timely delivered adequate accountings that complied with the statutes and provided Wendy additional information to explain the entries owned by the Trusts and their values, some of the substantial issues in this litigation may have been avoided or mitigated." Id. ๆ1 34. Apparently, the only negative effect that can be identified by Wendy is that she may not have brought the meritless claims that she continues to pursue. With respect to Paragraph 35, the " $\$ 4$ million" representation was not made by Stan or Stan's counsel and the discussion concerning this issue will be adequately addressed by Todd or Todd's counsel.

## II. Response to Contest of and Opposition to Ratification and Approval of ACPAs (Wendy's Opening Br. $\|\|$ 36-56)

Stan did not prepare the ACPAs and is not seeking ratification or approval of the ACPAs. Accordingly, as the ACPAs relate to the affirmative claims by Petitioners and are not brought or opposed by Stan, no response from Stan is necessary.

## III.Response to Contest of Purported Indemnification Agreement for Family Trust (Wendy’s Opening Br. ๆף 57-89)

Wendy requests essentially declaratory relief by asking the Court to find that "Stan's Indemnification Agreement was invalid and unenforceable." Wendy’s Opening Br. ๆI 89. She cites to no evidence of this being the case. Instead, she makes conclusory statements that do not affect the validity of the contract. Id. Stan's Indemnification Agreement, Ex. 12, does not become invalid because he "never knew about [it]" or "had no idea about its application." Id. This is insufficient to show that the agreement was invalid. See Transcript Feb. 27, 174:7-24 (wherein Stan admits that it's his signature and that Sam "was always looking out for us" but that he "didn't read" the Stan's Indemnification Agreement). Nor does Wendy show that Stan's Indemnification Agreement was invalidly signed because it was signed by Sam in different capacities as the Family Trust would be the successor in interest to Sam's obligations. Id. Regardless, this issue is not properly before the Court because there is no judiciable controversy concerning Stan's Indemnification Agreement. Stan has not asserted any claims against the Family Trust under Stan’s Indemnification Agreement nor has the Family Trust paid any amounts pursuant to Stan's Indemnification Agreement. There is not a single reference anywhere in the Family Trust financials to payments, debts, or obligations based on Stan's Indemnification Agreement.

Wendy mistakenly claims that the Family Trust has made Jackrabbit capital call payments pursuant to Stan’s Indemnification Agreement. Wendy’s Opening Br. © 163. First, Stan's position was that all of the capital calls for Jackrabbit should be made individually by Todd and Stan, but he actually wanted to benefit Wendy by having the Family Trust pay for her. Transcript Feb. 27, 2019 89:22-90:1; 140:3-17. Second, Stan never made a claim under his
indemnification agreement for the Jackrabbit capital calls. While Todd made an actual claim and insisted on indemnification, Stan did not. What did happen was that the co-Trustees, in large part to protect Wendy from losing her interest in Jackrabbit, paid some but not all of the capital calls for Jackrabbit. If they had not done so, Wendy's interest could have been diluted or lost. As Todd and Stan paid some of their capital calls themselves, they are actually worse off than Wendy. Even though the benefits of these payments were not equal, as the ownership in Jackrabbit was not equal among Todd, Stan, and Wendy, there is still no breach of trust and Wendy's retroactive complaint would have cost her the Jackrabbit interest if it were upheld.

Additionally, Stan is not liable based on any of the claims made by Wendy with regard to Todd's Indemnification Agreement. Wendy admits that Stan was "unaware of" Todd's Indemnification Agreement until 2015 and that he specifically objected to Todd's Indemnification Agreement. Wendy’s Opening Br. 9ף 66, 75. Pursuant to NRS 163.110, this provides Stan with complete immunity as a co-Trustee, in addition to the jury verdict finding that he did not aid and abet any other party's breach of fiduciary duty. Wendy states that the "conspiracy continued when Todd admits the Trust paid his obligation or share of the Ag Credit loan complex . . . and Stan did nothing to stop it at the time." Id. I 77. First, there is no evidence that Stan did nothing to stop it, in fact the very next sentence quoted by Wendy shows the opposite when Kevin Riley wrote that "todd wanted Sam’s trust to pay for both Sam's portion and his portion of the debt and when you refused to transfer funds from your account, bright Holland funds were loaned to Todd to pay down his portion of the debt . . . This is part of the debt in the indemnification agreement." Id. This email shows that Stan was taking active steps with regard to the indemnification agreement but that he was simply circumvented. Second, there was "nothing to stop" according to Todd and Wendy because Todd's testimony left the decision on the indemnification agreement up to the Court. Wendy’s Opening Br. 『/ 68 (citing Transcript, 02/20/2019, 171:19-23) ("If the document is determined to be held up by the Court.")). Finally, there is conclusive evidence that Stan objected to Todd's Indemnification Agreement, Ex. 38, and this is more than sufficient to exclude Stan from this portion of the dispute between Todd and Wendy.

## IV. Response to Contest of Lake Tahoe Transaction (Wendy’s Opening Br. $\boldsymbol{\|} \boldsymbol{\|}$ 90-111)

The Lake Tahoe House was purportedly transferred to Incline TSS on December 27, 2012, Wendy’s Opening Br. $\mathbb{I}$ 92, prior to the time that Stan became a co-Trustee of the Family Trust. There are no allegations with respect to Stan's actions as co-Trustee of the Family Trust. Stan's "buy-in" relates to the Issue Trust, for which Stan is not a fiduciary, and his individual interest in Incline TSS. Id. बीf 103-105. This includes Exhibit 23, an ACPA that related to this "buy-in," but that relates to the Issue Trust and not the Family Trust. Stan has been dismissed as an individual party in this action and has not been sued as a beneficiary of the Issue Trust. There is no basis to impose any liability upon a co-Trustee of the Family Trust for actions that did not involve the Family Trust. Furthermore, Stan was unaware of the facts and circumstances relating to the Lake Tahoe Transaction and believed that his dad "owned 100 percent of Incline TSS." See Transcript Feb. 27, 199:6-10.

## V. Response to Removal of Trustees (Wendy’s Opening Br. 【ी 112-156)

"A court may remove a trustee . . . for a serious breach of trust." Bogert's Trusts and Trustees, Grounds for removal, The Law Of Trusts And Trustees § 527. A serious breach of trust is one that "causes significant harm or involves flagrant misconduct." Id. (noting though that in some circumstances "a series of smaller breaches, considered together, may be sufficient to warrant removal"); see also In re Baird, 2009 MT 81, 349 Mont. 501, 204 P.3d 703 (2009) (holding that a trustee's failure to account was insufficient to justify removal).

## (1) Response to Breach of Trust - Jury Verdict

The jury verdict confirmed that Stan should not be removed as a co-Trustee because he did not commit breaches of any fiduciary duties.

## (2) Response to Breach of Trust - Insufficient Accountings and Failure to Disclose

While Stan did not commit a breach of trust with respect to the accountings, even if there was a breach of trust, this is not a sufficient basis to remove him as a co-trustee of the Family Trust. Wendy states that the "Trustees continue to intentionally refuse to comply with their obligations to account despite this Court's February 6, 2019 Order confirming their obligations to do so." Wendy’s Opening Br. $\mathbb{\text { I }} 116$. To the contrary, the February 6, 2019 Order required the
production of the 2017 annual accounting for the Wendy Subtrust, which has been provided. Stan even voluntarily provided information and documentation concerning the Stanley Subtrust to Wendy, despite the Court's denial of Wendy's motion to compel production of the same.
(3) Response to Breach of Trust - Todd's Purported Indemnification Agreement

As Wendy herself notes, Stan objected to the enforceability and/or scope of the Todd's Indemnification Agreement. Wendy’s Opening Br. If 75. Stan actively took steps to assess and interpret Todd's Indemnification Agreement once he became aware of it and took all necessary legal steps to prevent legal liability. As the co-Trustee Michael Kimmel states, Kimmel will "have no choice but to require that the Trust engage separate legal counsel to issue an opinion letter related to the enforceability and scope of the indemnity." Id. There is no breach of trust by Stan here, when he is objecting pushing the other co-Trustees to seek objective advice before pursuing a course of action.

## (4) Response to Breach of Trust - Failure to Disclose and Overreach on ACPAs

Stan did not prepare the ACPAs for the Family Trust or initiate their preparation. Transcript, Feb. 27, 2019 92:7-13. As above, Stan did not commit a breach of trust with respect to the ACPAs. Wendy argues that Stan "should also be removed for his attempted overreach of Wendy when he and Todd presented and pressured Wendy into signing Exhibit 23, which is the ACPA concerning Stan’s buy in to the entity that owned the Tahoe Property." Wendy's Opening Br. $\mathbb{I}$ 121. Wendy forgets, however, that this ACPA, Exhibit 23, does not relate to the Family Trust and Stan was not acting in his capacity as co-Trustee of the Family Trust in relation to the ACPA. Furthermore, the statement - by Wendy - that Stan was "hounding" her to sign the ACPA does not constitute a breach of trust. In this circumstance, Wendy was once again attempting to extract monetary concessions from Todd or Stan before signing a document that she actually agreed with as she requested to similarly buy-in to Incline TSS.

## (5) Response to Breach of Trust - Transfer of Trust Assets Out of Trust

Wendy objects to the transfer of assets out of the Family Trust related to Jackrabbit and Bronco Billy’s (Pioneer Group). Wendy’s Opening Br. वा 122. She states that "[a]ll of these issues would have been avoided had the Trustees maintained and managed the assets in the

Family Trust or the Subtrusts." Id. © 125. Stan agrees that all of these issues are avoided because the assets remained in the Family Trust or the Subtrusts.

With respect to Jackrabbit, Wendy's interest remains her interest. At a critical point in time, Wendy was refusing to execute necessary documents for a refinancing without extracting monetary concessions. Her associate, Rich Whelan, even contacted the bank to interfere with the refinancing and prevent it based on her interest. Nevertheless, Wendy's interest in Jackrabbit was transferred to Stanley Jaksick II, LLC and then distributed to Wendy’s Subtrust. Transcript Feb. 27, 2019, 210:211:1. Stan understood, based on the advice of his attorneys and accountants, that the distribution from the Family Trust to Stanley Jaksick II, LLC was done in order to refinance and then the interest was "near simultaneously" transferred to Wendy's Subtrust. Id. There is no interest belonging to Wendy that is still in Stanley Jaksick II, LLC or the Family Trust and "every interest in Jackrabbit that Wendy was entitled to [has] been distributed to her sub trust." Id.

With respect to Bronco Billy's, Stan received nothing from the sale of the company, Todd received nothing from the sale of the company, but Wendy received $\$ 75,000$. Id. at 138:35. There is no breach of trust to remedy for Wendy because she is the only beneficiary of the Bronco Billy's transaction. The entirety of the

## (6) Response to Breach of Trust - Miscellaneous Self-Dealing

Wendy's claim and argument does not relate to Stan and there is no evidence that he was aware or should have been aware of these alleged transactions by Todd.

## (7) Response to Breach of Trust - Manipulation of Documents

Wendy's claim and argument does not relate to Stan and there is no evidence that he was aware or should have been aware of these allegations.
(8) Response to Breach of Trust - Refusal to Distribute

This claim and argument is not properly before the Court as there is no admissible evidence concerning these post-trial issues and there has been no opportunity for discovery regarding the same.

## (9) Response to Breach of Trust - Settlement Agreement

Wendy's claims for breach of trust arising from the January 31, 2019 Settlement Agreement between Todd and Stan ("Settlement Agreement") are not properly before the Court. Exhibit 584 (admitted over objections by the May 20, 2019 Order Addressing Evidence at Equitable Trial) (Exhibit 457 at the jury trial). These claims are not part of any pleading in this action, even the belated Second Supplement to First Amended Counter Petition, which was filed by Wendy Jaksick on May 5, 2019, well after she was aware of the Settlement Agreement and after the jury heard testimony regarding the Settlement Agreement in February 2019. Wendy should not be able to introduce these new claims without good cause and after the close of discovery. NRCP 15; NRCP 16.

Legally, Stan is permitted to "compromise, adjust, arbitrate, sue on or defend, abandon or otherwise deal with and settle claims in favor of or against the estate or trust as the fiduciary deems advisable, and the fiduciary's decision shall be conclusive between the fiduciary and the beneficiaries of the estate or trust and the person against or for whom the claim is asserted, in the absence of fraud by such person, and, in the absence of fraud, bad faith or gross negligence of the fiduciary, shall be conclusive between the fiduciary and the beneficiaries of the estate or trust." NRS 163.375; see also Duncan v. Alewine, 273 S.C. 275, 282, 255 S.E.2d 841, 845 (1979) ("The law looks with favor upon an agreement among members of a family and others which avoids a will contest or promotes the settlement and distribution of an estate. Such agreements are not against public policy. They are contractual in nature. Only those parties participating in the agreement are bound thereby.") The Family Trust confirms this power by stating that a trustee of the Family Trust "may compromise or otherwise adjust any claims or litigation against or in favor of the trust estate." Sec. IV(K)(1).

Even if Wendy could procedurally assert this claim, she would be foolhardy to do so as the Settlement Agreement indisputably benefits her interest. Transcript Feb. 27, 76:11-14 (testimony by Stan that the settlement agreement "is a good thing for the family trust and Wendy" as a result of reducing the amount of Todd's indemnification claims).

- Settlement Agreement II. A - Withdrawal of Counterpetitions
o Wendy has no right to force Todd and Stan to keep suing each other. The compromise of these claims also results in dramatic savings in attorney's fees and costs for the Family Trust and Issue Trust. There is only a benefit for Wendy as a beneficiary.
- Settlement Agreement II. B - Exchange of BHC for Jaksick Family, LLC
o Stan exchanging his interest in Bright-Holland Corporation for Todd's interest in Jaksick Family, LLC has no effect on Wendy whatsoever. She has no claim on either of these respective interests and will retain her own interest.
- Settlement Agreement II. C - Family Trust Administration
o Wendy is not harmed by Todd and Stan agreeing that any action will be unanimous among all of the co-Trustees of the Family Trust.
- Settlement Agreement II. D - Incline TSS
o Stan's investment in Incline TSS, LLC adds capital to a company in which Wendy, through the Issue Trust has an interest. The dilution, on paper, of the Issue Trust's interest in Incline TSS, LLC was already agreed to by Wendy via an ACPA. Ex. 23. Furthermore, she had expressed - and likely will continue to express - an interest in a similar buy-in. Ex. 23.28.
- Settlement Agreement II. E - Buckhorn
o Todd's potential acquisition of Stan's Buckhorn interest has no effect on Wendy whatsoever.
- Settlement Agreement II. F - Indemnification Agreement
o The limitations agreed to in the Settlement Agreement with respect to Todd's Indemnification Agreement unmistakably constitute a benefit. Even if Wendy does not prevail on a single claim, the liability of the Family Trust will be reduced by a minimum of $\$ 2.4 \mathrm{~m}$ as Todd removed the Rouge Drive home from his indemnification claims. Furthermore, the other indemnification claims against the Family Trust are reduced as well, as it limits indemnification to a single Ag Credit loan.
o The Settlement Agreement limits the use of Family Trust funds to pay capital calls for Jackrabbit Properties, LLC. The permitted capital calls though benefit Wendy in proportion to her interest in Jackrabbit.
- Settlement Agreement II. G - Indemnification Agreement
o Rather than constitute a windfall, the agreement on attorney's fees constitutes a cap to protect the Family Trust. The $\$ 650,000$ cap on attorney's fees pales in comparison to Wendy's attorneys' request for over $\$ 1.3 \mathrm{~m}$.
- Settlement Agreement II. H - Transfer of Funds
o This provision confirms the transfer of $\$ 75,000$ to Wendy rather than allow it to be clawed back. It also provides that $\$ 325,000$ will be used to fund the Grandchildrens’ Trusts, benefiting Lexi, Wendy’s daughter.
- Settlement Agreement II. I - Distribution
o The Settlement Agreement seeks to distribute the Family Trust by December 31, 2019. This is a benefit to Wendy because it is essentially what she is seeking.
- Settlement Agreement II. J - Luke
o This is a direct benefit for Wendy's son by guaranteeing him an equal distribution to the other grandchildren of Sam Jaksick even though he is not provided with this benefit by the Family Trust.

Rather than contest the Settlement Agreement, Wendy should be seeking to enforce it as she obtains a benefit and there is no restriction on her ability to pursue her current claims.

## (10) Response to Removal

This claim and argument by Wendy is duplicative of the other removal sections advanced by Wendy in the Opening Brief and does not necessitate a response.

## VI.Response to Remedies to Redress Breaches of Fiduciary Duties by the Trustees (Wendy’s Opening Br. $\ddagger$ IT 157-163)

This argument relating to redressing breaches of fiduciary duties is a quintessential attempt to recast Wendy's defeated legal claims as equitable ones. First, Wendy seeks the
disgorgement of trustee fees based on "numerous, repeated and often intentional willful breaches of trust and fiduciary duties" and further alleges that the Trustees "have been paying themselves compensation over and above that permitted by the Trusts and for purposes which did not benefit the Trusts or their beneficiaries." Wendy's Opening Br. I 161. While there is no basis to support any of these claims against Stan, based on the financial statements, Stan received only \$26,472.50 in trustee fees over a four-year period from 2013 to 2017. For a trust of this size and complexity, an annual trustee fee of approximately \$6,618 is hardly improper.

Second, Wendy seeks to surcharge Stan's beneficial interest based on nine alleged payments. Id. © 163.
(a) Lake Tahoe House transaction - This does not involve any actions by the co-Trustees of the Family Trust.
(b) Issue Trust proceeds - This does not involve any actions by the coTrustees of the Family Trust.
(c) Duck Lake Ranch LLC - Stan did not benefit from this transaction and objected to this transaction. Ex. 244.
(d) Todd's Indemnification Agreement - Stan did not benefit from this transaction and objected to this transaction. Ex. 32.
(e) Stan's Indemnification Agreement - There were no payments made pursuant to Stan's Indemnification Agreement. As shown above, Wendy is incorrect concerning the capital calls and loans.
(f) Todd's loans - Stan did not benefit from these loans and objected. Ex. 32.
(g) Trustees' Fees - As above, there is no basis to surcharge or disgorge the trustee fees received by Stan.
(h) Attorney's Fees - There is no basis to deny Stan, a co-Trustee who consistently sought to protect Wendy, his entitlement to attorney's fees under the Family Trust for Wendy’s frivolous claims against him.
(i) Wendy's Attorney's Fees - There is no legal basis to surcharge a trustee for a beneficiary's attorney's fees. This is barred by the language of the Family Trust as well as Stan did not act "without reason, in bad faith, or in violation of specific provisions of" the Family Trust. Section IV(L) of the Family Trust.

Finally, Wendy cites to case law and secondary authority supporting the premise that a "party who knowingly participates in another's breach of fiduciary duty may be liable for breach as a joint tortfeasor." Wendy’s Opening Br. ๆ 163 n. 37. She has provided no evidence that Stan participated in any breach of fiduciary duty and the jury verdict bars this position.

## VII. Response to Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust (Wendy's Opening Br. IT\| 164-167)

Wendy's claim and arguments with respect to unjust enrichment and constructive trust do not relate to any assets held by Stan or his entities therefore no response is required. No assertion of unjust enrichment or constructive trust is made against Stan.

## VIII. Response to Enjoin Trustees From Using Trust Assets to Defend This Matter (Wendy's Opening Br. $\mathbb{\|}$ 168-169)

Wendy argues that the "Trusts should not bear the burden of the significant legal fees and costs in this case to defend the breach of fiduciary duties by the Trustees." Wendy's Opening Br. - I 168. As the jury found that Stan did not commit a breach of fiduciary duties, Wendy's argument fails immediately with respect to him. Section IV(L) of the Family Trust specifically states that the "The Trustee is entitled to indemnification against any claims, liabilities, and expenses, including attorney's fees and amounts paid in settlement, resulting from the acts or omissions of the Trustee, so long as the Trustee's acts or omissions are not without reason, are not in bad faith, and are not in violation of specific provisions of this Trust Agreement. Grantor intends to provide the Trustee with indemnification to the maximum extent allowed by law." The entitlement to using trust assets in the defense of claims by Wendy is completely warranted based on the exculpatory jury verdict and her scattershot approach to ligation, including in the Opening Brief, where everyone is at fault for everything.

## IX. Response to Attorneys’ Fees and Costs (Wendy’s Opening Br. $\| \mathbb{I} 170-179)$

Pursuant to NRS 153.031(3), if the Court grants any relief to a petitioner, the Court "may, in its discretion, order any or all of the following additional relief if the court determines that such additional relief is appropriate to redress or avoid an injustice . . . Order the trustee to pay to the petitioner or any other party all reasonable costs incurred by the party to adjudicate the affairs of the trust pursuant to this section, including, without limitation, reasonable attorney's fees." However, the "trustee may not be held personally liable for the payment of such costs unless the court determines that the trustee was negligent in the performance of or breached his or her fiduciary duties." Id. Furthermore, Section IV(L) of the Family Trust further restricts these statutory conditions and provides that a Trustee "is to be personally liable or subject to surcharge only if the Trustee should act without reason, in bad faith, or in violation of specific provisions of this Trust Agreement."

First, as the predicate requirement is that the Court grants relief to Wendy, any determination of her attorney's fees and costs is premature as the parties cannot assess the ultimate result. Accordingly, Stan requests that this Court hold Wendy's request for attorney's fees and costs in abeyance.

Second, Wendy is wholly incorrect and misleading when she states that because Todd "breached his fiduciary duties . . . [b]y implication, all of the Trustees are liable." Wendy’s Opening Br. $\mathbb{1} 171$. This is the opposite of truthful. The jury specifically found that Stan did not aid and abet any other trustee's breach of fiduciary duty and therefore not just by implication but by fact found that Stan should not be liable for any other trustee's breach. Despite the jury verdict, Wendy still states that the "payment of attorney's fees is clearly warranted given the Trustees' breaches of fiduciary duty and refusals to remedy such breaches." Id.

Third, none of the justification for the substantial attorney's fees and costs is blamed on Stan by Wendy. Id. $\mathbb{1}$ 172. He was already found not to have breached his fiduciary duties and there is no evidence that he acted "without reason, in bad faith, or in violation of" the Family Trust.
X. Response to Declaratory Judgment - Todd and Michael Kimmel Violated No Contest Provision (Wendy’s Opening Br. ๆף 180-184)

Wendy's claim and arguments with respect to this declaratory judgment request have no bearing on Stan and therefore no response is required.
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RENO, NEVADA, FRIDAY, AUGUST 10, 2018, 9:02 A.M. -000-

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going on record. The date is Friday, August 10, 2018, and the monitor time is approximately 9:02 a.m.

This is the Video Deposition of Wendy Jaksick, Volume $V$, in the matter of SSJ's Issue Trust. The case number is PR17-00445, Department No. 15, as filed in the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of washoe.

This deposition is being held at Robison, Sharp, Sullivan \& Brust, 71 Washington Street, Reno, Nevada. The court reporter is Becky Van Auken of Captions Unlimited.

I am a certified court video specialist.
My name is Dejon Durio of A Corrao Video. My address is 5375 Kietzke Lane, Reno, Nevada.

Please note the audio and video will
continue to record unless all parties have agreed to go off record. Microphones are sensitive and will pick up whispers, private conversations, and cell phone interference.

Counsel will now introduce yourselves, the name of your firm, and whom you represent.

MR. KREITLEIN: Philip Kreitlein from
Kreitlein Leeder Moss representing Stanley Jaksick in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust.

MR. LATTIN: Don Lattin from Maupin, Cox \& LeGoy representing Todd Jaksick and Mike Kimmel and Kevin Riley as co-trustees of the family trust and Todd Jaksick as trustee of the SSJ Issue Trust.

MS. SHANKS: Therese Shanks from Robison, Sharp, Sullivan \& Brust representing Todd Jaksick in his individual capacity.

MR. JOHNSON: Zachary Johnson on behalf of Spencer \& Johnson here with Wendy Jaksick.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Also joining us today?
MR. STANLEY JAKSICK: Stan Jaksick.
MR. MICHAEL KIMMEL: Michael Kimmel.
MR. TODD JAKSICK: Todd Jaksick.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you.
Counsel may proceed.
MR. KREITLEIN: Thank you.
/ / / / /
/ / / / /
/ / / / /
/ / / / /

WENDY JAKSICK,
having been previously sworn, testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Good morning, Ms. Jaksick. Is it okay if I refer to you as Wendy during your deposition this morning?

A Please.
Q Thank you.
My name is Philip Kreitlein. You know that
I'm here representing stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust.

What I'd like to do this morning is go through some of the allegations of the first amended counterpetition that was filed by you, by your attorneys -- filed by your attorneys on behalf of you.

I know that we've looked at some of the allegations in relation to some of the other parties in this litigation. I would like to go through some of the allegations that were made in that counterpetition as they specifically relate to my client, stan, in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust. All right?

## A Okay.

Q So can $I$ have you turn in the exhibit binders to Exhibit 5, I believe is your counterpetition or your first amended counterpetition.

A Okay.
Q We're going to go through this kind of as these paragraphs appear in the counterpetition. All right?

A Okay.
Q Let me have you first turn to paragraph 21. I believe it's on page 6 of 40 under the general allegations.

Can I have you read paragraph 21 into the record, please.

A "As demonstrated herein, Counter-Respondents have failed to provide Wendy the information to which she is entitled, and Counter-Respondents are also the persons with knowledge of the facts, as well as the documents, that underlie each of their acts or omissions.

Accordingly, Wendy is unable to determine at this time the entire scope and extent of the Counter-Respondents' breaches and other acts or omissions, and Wendy reserves the right to amend her Counterpetition as discovery proceeds.
"Subject to this disclaimer and the
reservation of Wendy's right to amend this Counterpetition, Wendy alleges the following." Q All right. Thank you.

Let me point your attention specifically to the phrase kind of in the center of paragraph 21 where it reads "Accordingly, Wendy is unable to determine at this time the entire scope and extent of Counter-Respondents' breaches and/or acts or omissions."

Since the filing of this counterpetition back in February, have you discovered any fact, document, or evidence that would give rise to any new or additional claims against $S t a n$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust?

A Well, as I understand it, the co-trustees all had an obligation to the beneficiaries when they took that responsibility as a co-trustee. And I'm a primary beneficiary, and $I$ have learned more things that have gone on since the date of this filing, and $I$ still don't know everything that has happened as far as the co-trustees not acting in the beneficiaries' best interest.

So, yes, I do think there are things that have happened that Stan, as a co-trustee, is responsible for.

Q And what would some of those new facts or allegations or claims be against Stan?

A Well, Stan, as a co-trustee, the disclosure of the information that $I$ received -- now, granted, Stan -- I don't think Stan knew a lot of them. I'm learning from his deposition that he didn't know what was going on either.

I don't know whose responsibility that is to know what's going on and what your co-trustees are doing or how that works legally, but to me, the co-trustees should know, I mean, or they're going to be responsible to answer to somebody if they don't know what's going on.

So I believe that Stan should have stepped in and -- and made some -- stopped some things from happening if he knew they were going on.

Q And do you believe that you have discovered, through the course of discovery or during Stan's deposition, that Stan knew of things that he should have stepped in and stopped?

A From Stan's deposition I learned that he knew a lot less than $I$ thought he knew. And $I$ don't think he knew -- I don't think he knew very much.

Q Okay. What I'm trying to determine is whether or not the first amended counterpetition
contains all of your claims against stan in his capacity as co-trustee, or have new and additional claims arisen through this process?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I don't believe I know -- I'm still in the dark in a lot of areas. So that's difficult for me to answer because I don't know if new things will arise during these depositions and since this day.

But since the filing of this, there have been transactions that have happened in the family trust that $I$ was unaware of, at this time of the filing, that -- that -- Stan disclosed some things to me, but $I$ don't think he -- I don't know if he didn't know the rest or didn't want me to know the rest or whatever, but there's definitely been some things that have happened that are not listed here.

So as a co-trustee, $I$ guess it depends on what Stan knew. You know, I mean, if Stan knew what was going on -- I don't know the law, obviously, but I know that Stan did -- he was the only one that was giving me any information.

And so I think that either he just gave me part of it or he knew more and didn't -- didn't want
to give it to me, but he was -- he acted like he was giving me everything he knew.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q So let me try to summarize. And please correct me if I'm mischaracterizing your testimony. As you sit here today you're not aware of any specific new claims that are not already contained in the first amended counterpetition that -- that would be assertible against stan? Or do you have any knowledge of any new or specific claims that you will be asserting against $S t a n$ in that capacity?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. Compound.

THE WITNESS: I'm leaving that open; I
would assume in case something else comes up.
But, I mean -- what is the definition of an actual claim that we're -- can $I$-- can you tell me that?

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Well --
A Like a charge? Is that --
Q -- I'm not your attorney. But you've got a number of counts --

A Counts, okay.
Q -- spelled out in your counterpetition.

A Okay. I know what you're talking about. I mean, I just want to make sure $I$ understood what that meant.

Q Sure.
A So at this time, no, $I$ do not have anything that $I$ know specifically that has changed Stan's -but I don't -- that could change tomorrow. You know, things happen. I learn new things now every day. I'm finally learning some things from the trust.

Q I understand.
Let me have you turn to page 8 of
Exhibit 5, and let me have you read the first sentence of paragraph 29.

A "Based on Wendy's understanding of Samuel's intent, she does not believe Samuel would ever have signed" -- "ever have or did sign the purported Second Amendment. Based on information and belief, it is Wendy's understanding that Stan's" -- I mean, excuse me, "that Sam's secretary often signed Samuel's name."

> Do you want me to keep going?

Q Oh, no. That's fine. That's fine.
So specifically with regards to
paragraph 29 and the information that you read into the record, do you have any claims against stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust that arise
out of the execution by your father of the second amendment to the family trust?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: Again, as a co-trustee, I don't -- my understanding is that all the co-trustees are supposed to know what the other ones are doing or they're, you know, liable for that too, but $I$ do not believe Stan knew what was going on.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q With regards to --
A With regards to the second amendment and the signing of it by Jess -- by whoever, it not being signed properly.

From the conversations I've had with Stan and what Stan has disclosed to me over time -- and I believe him -- is that he had absolutely no idea what was going on with the second amendment.

Q All right. Thank you.
A Forging.
Q So you've questioned the validity of the second amendment to the family trust.

Do you believe Stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust played any role in the drafting or execution of the second amendment to the
family trust?
A I do not.
Q All right. Let me have you turn the page to paragraph 30 .

A What page -- oh, okay.
Q Paragraph 30 -- I'm sorry -- on page 9.
A Yes.
Q Let me just --
A Read it?
Q Yes, please.
A Okay. (As read): "SSJ's Issue Trust.
Samuel executed the SSJ Issue Trust Agreement, the Issue Trust Agreement, establishing the SSJ Issue Trust, the Issue Trust, on February 21, 2007. A copy of the Issue Trust Agreement is attached as Exhibit 1 to the petition."

Q All right. Do you have any claims against Stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust that relate to the creation or administration of the issue trust?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I don't believe Stan had anything -- well, he wasn't a trustee of the issue trust.

So you're asking me if he had any involvement in the creation of it? Is that what -BY MR. KREITLEIN:

Q I want to know if you have any claims that you are asserting against Stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust in relation to the formation or the administration of the issue trust.

A $\quad$ No.
Q All right. Okay. Let me have you turn next to paragraph 35 which is on page 10 of 40 . And let me -- let me have you read just the first full sentence there.

A Okay. "The Family Trust Co-Trustees and the Issue Trust have refused to keep Wendy informed and failed to fully disclose to her information concerning the assets and property of the respective trusts, their administration of the respective trusts, and the transactions that were conducting [sic] on behalf of the respective trusts."

Q All right. Thank you.
So as you sit here today, based on the discovery that's been exchanged and based on the testimony offered by Stan in this deposition, do you believe that $S t a n$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust refused to keep you informed or failed to
fully disclose information to you that he had concerning the assets and the property of the family trust?

A From your -- from your wording, what you've just said, I don't believe Stan -- I think Stan told me what he knew as much as he knew. So I was given partial information through Stan disclosing -- telling me what was going on as much as he knew, I believe. I don't believe that he knew the other things that were going on or he would have told me.

Stan didn't try and hide things from me, I don't believe, because we talked a lot. But he never -- $I$ never was told the information about the family trust because $I$ don't believe Stan knew what was going on in the family trust other than what $\operatorname{stan}$ was running, the companies he was running that were part of it. That's what I've learned through his deposition.

Q Now, you testified yesterday that at -- at some point in time that Todd was your primary contact with regards to the trust administration. Are we talking about just the issue trust or the issue trust and the family trust that Todd was your primary point of contact?

A Todd was the one in control, if you want to
use those words, or the -- and the primary contact. If I asked Stan something, 99 percent of the time he'd say, "You have to ask Todd."

So Todd was the one making decisions, in my
mind. Kevin was involved as well. The three of them together as the co-trustees -- started off it was all -- I thought they were all, you know, giving me all the information. Come to find out $I$ was getting maybe 1 -- 2 percent, and that information would be from Stan. But most of the time Stan didn't know.

Q So did you feel as though Todd supplied you with much information? You indicated that he was your primary point of contact. Did you try to communicate with him regarding trust administration issues, both of these trusts, the family trust and the issue trust?

A Yes, I did. And there was times when Todd would give me information. Come to find out that most of it was not true. But he'd give me information that I relied on.

Q Okay. Did any information regarding the administration of these trusts come from any other sources?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.

THE WITNESS: Kevin also.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. With regards to the allegation that's contained in paragraph 35, that first sentence, what time frame are we talking about? Are we talking about from the date of your father's death through the filing of this counterpetition?

A Yes.
Q So it's your allegation that during that entire period of time there was a backlog of information getting supplied to you by all of the co-trustees; is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: What does "backlog" mean?
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q You weren't getting information -- there was a bottleneck; the information wasn't flowing through to you like you would have liked, like you would have wanted, and like you requested?

A That is correct.
Q All right. Can $I$ have you go ahead and read, then, the second sentence of paragraph 35 .

A "The Family Trust Co-Trustees and the Issue Trust used their positions to control and utilize the assets and property of the respective trusts for their personal benefit at the expense of the trust, Wendy,
and Wendy's interest in the trusts."
Q All right. Thank you.
As you sit here today do you believe that Stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust used his position to control and utilize the assets and property of the family trust to his benefit at your expense?

A I do not.
Q So the allegation that's contain in the second sentence in paragraph 35 , that's really directed towards other co-trustees and not specifically to Stan?

A From my knowledge -- from what $I$ know as I sit here today, I have not been -- I have not seen anything where stan benefitted and it affected me personally -- well, I guess I -- other than the Bronco Billy's situation. So $I$ guess $I$ probably should put that back in there, because the Bronco Billy's situation $I$ believe Stan participated in, and it negatively affected me. So that is the family trust. So, yes, I need to say that.

Q All right. So aside from the Bronco Billy's issue, which we've discussed --

A Right.
Q -- ad nauseam -- and it's probably going to
be the subject of much discussion throughout the day -- aside from the Bronco Billy's situation, that's the only transaction that you take issue with with regards to Stan and his administration?

A Other than the fact that $I$ think that he should have been more involved and gotten in the other co-trustees', you know, faces or whatever and said, "We need to get" -- "What's going on here?"

So I -- and I guess -- I don't know if you can -- if he's -- if that's something that is -- he's responsible to do, but $I$ don't think, even at this point now, that if Stan would have done that, they would have -- he wouldn't have gotten accurate information anyway.

Q All right. Let me have you turn to page 11 of 40 , paragraph $37 . \quad$ Can $I$ have you read that first sentence into the record?

A Yes. "On December 5, 2011, the Tahoe property was apparently transferred from the Family Trust to SSJ LLC, a single-member limited liability company, wholly owned by Samuel."

Q So as you sit here today, what role do you believe Stan, in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust, played in the transfer of the Lake Tahoe property from the family trust to $S$ SJ LLC in December
of 2011?
A I don't believe he had anything to do with that.

Q So no role whatsoever?
A $\quad$ No.
Q All right. As you sit here today what role do you believe Stan, as co-trustee of the family trust, played in the transfer of the Lake Tahoe property from SSJ LLC to Incline TSS in December of 2012?

A None. He had no knowledge of it.
Q All right. Are you claiming that Stan, as co-trustee of the family trust, breached any fiduciary duty owed to you relating to the transfers of the Lake Tahoe property to Incline TSS?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I don't believe Stan knew
about it, so $I$ don't know how he could breach things if he didn't know about it. He knew what I knew, which was nothing.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q So would that be a no, then?
A That would be a no.
Q All right. Thank you.
Let me have you turn to the next page,
paragraph 38, and have you read that first sentence into the record.

A $\quad$ At some point Todd and his family purportedly acquired 46 percent interest in the Tahoe property."

Q Did Stan, as co-trustee of the family trust, play any role in Todd and his family acquiring 46 percent interest in the Tahoe property based on your knowledge today?

A $\quad$ No.
Q So do you have any claims against Stan with regards to the transfer of the 46 percent interest in the Tahoe property to Todd and his family?

A No.
Q Let me have you turn next -- the next paragraph, paragraph 39.

A "When Sam died just four months after the purported transfer of the Tahoe property to Incline TSS, Todd realized he could or did not want to make his and his family's portion of the payments owed on approximately a $\$ 6$ million loan on the Tahoe property."

Q Let me have you go ahead and read the next sentence.

A "As a result, Todd came up with a scheme to
pay down the debt with the funds from the $\$ 6$ million life insurance policy payable to the Issue Trust."

Q All right. As you sit here today do you believe that $S t a n$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust participated in the scheme that's identified in this paragraph to pay down the debt on the Tahoe property by using the life insurance proceeds payable to the issue trust?

A Well, first let me clarify that this actually is not accurate as we sit here today. More information has been found out, because actually the ownership of Incline TSS was a hundred percent Todd at this time. It was not anything with stan and I.

So during the year of 2013, according to Todd's -- or the Incline TSS tax returns, they owned it a hundred percent solely. So, yes, it definitely was a scheme that Stan and $I$ had no idea about.

Q So your testimony is that stan did not participate in this scheme?

A No. Definitely not.
Q All right. Let me have you turn to page 14 of 40 , paragraph 43. Can $I$ have you read the first complete sentence there?

A Yes. "Samuel S. Jaksick, Jr., individually of the Family Trust and on behalf of his
representative, executors, trustees, successors and assigns, and Todd B. Jaksick and Dawn Jaksick, individually, TBJSC Trust and TBJ Investment Trust, and on behalf of their representatives, executors, trustees, successors and assigns purportedly executed the indemnification and contribution agreement on January 1, 2008."

Q So we're talking about Todd's indemnification agreement; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q All right. As you sit here today -- based on the evidence that's been presented, based on the documentation, based on the testimony of $\operatorname{stan}--\quad$ as you sit here today do you believe that Stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust played any role in the formation or execution of Todd's purported indemnification agreement?

A $\quad$ No.
Q As you sit here today do you believe that Stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust breached any fiduciary duty he owed to you in relation to Todd's purported indemnification?

MR. JOHNSON: Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: Considering he didn't know it, $I$ don't know how he could have given me
information on it, so no. BY MR. KREITLEIN:

Q All right. Thank you.
Let me have you -- let me have you read the first full sentence of paragraph 44 down at the bottom, Wendy.

A "It appears Todd manufactured the purported indemnification agreement and is using it to pay off any obligation he incurs in relation to the Trust, in addition to his personal obligations."

Q So as we sit here today have you seen any evidence that $S t a n$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust aided, abetted, or assisted Todd in his attempts to utilize his purported indemnification to avoid personal or business debts?

A $\quad$ No.
MR. JOHNSON: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. No.
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Do you believe that Stan played any role whatsoever in -- or aided Todd in Todd's use of the purported indemnification?

A Not to my knowledge.
Q Let me have you turn to paragraph 46 .

That's on page 16 of 40 . Let me have you read that first sentence, Wendy.

A "Wendy was very recently informed that an alleged indemnification contribution agreement similarly" -- "similar" -- excuse me -- "to Todd's may have been executed in favor of Stanley, Stanley's purported indemnification. Because Wendy" -- oh --

Q You can go ahead.
A Okay. "Because Wendy believes that she and other family members would have been aware of such indemnity agreement long before now, pending the discovery of additional information concerning same, Wendy contends any such indemnity agreement is invalid and contests same."

Q So based on the documents and based on the testimony of Stan in his deposition, as you sit here today do you believe that $S$ tan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust breached any fiduciary duty owed to you in relation to his purported indemnification?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Stan told me about his -- his indemnification agreement when he found out about it, which was -- well, $I$ don't remember when, but it was a year or so after my dad died -- and said that he had
never heard of it or -- so Stan -- I don't see he could have when he didn't know about it. BY MR. KREITLEIN:

Q So that would be a no?
A Yes.
Q Do you have any knowledge of Stan
attempting to utilize his purported indemnification agreement to avoid any business or personal debts?

A He has not.
Q All right. Let me have you read the first full sentence of paragraph 47.

A $\quad$ In 2016 Todd negotiated the sale of certain property owned by Bright Holland Company, known as Fly Ranch, the Fly Ranch Property, to the Burning Man Project."

Q All right. Again, based on the testimony, based on the documents that you've seen in this case produced thus far, as you sit here today do you believe that $S t a n$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust breached any fiduciary duty owed to you in relation to the sale of the Fly Ranch by Todd in 2016?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: Again, other than the fact that $I$ was not given any information, Stan -- other
than what $S t a n$ had, $S t a n$ did not have all the information. So I think he gave me what he knew. So he did not breach, no.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q And what information did he know that he disclosed to you?

A He said that Fly Geyser -- well, I said -I read about it and actually -- I read it -- well, he didn't have this disclosure, $I$ guess. But I read about it in the newspaper, that Fly Geyser had been sold. No one told me. None of the trustees told me that it sold or was even in escrow.

So when I brought it up, Stan said, "Yes, Fly Geyser sold, and you and I each have a 13 percent," you know, "interest in that, in the Bright Holland company, so Todd owes us 13 percent of the sale."

Q And what did you do in relation to that information once you received it from Stan?

A I asked Todd and Kevin about it as well.
Q And what information did you get back from Todd and Kevin?

A Kevin told me that Todd was putting -leaving the money in an escrow account for 125 or -35 days, something like that, and that they could --
they would discuss with me what was going to happen to it after that.

So then I contacted Kevin on the 140 th day, or whatever it was, and said, "Okay. Time has gone by now. What's happening with that distribution" -- or, I mean, "the sale of Fly Geyser?" And he said that "Todd has decided not to distribute any of the money at this time to the beneficiaries."

Q At that point had you calculated what your share of that transaction should have netted you?

A I was -- yeah, I think so. I don't remember what it was, but it was around $\$ 785,000$. Something like that.

Q So based on the information that you received from Kevin, what did you do?

A I called Stan and asked Stan -- and told Stan what $I$ was told, and he said there was nothing -that Todd was the one running it, and he figured that that was ridiculous.
He also said that -- I think -- during this whole conversation about Fly Geyser, he had told me that even the attorneys that they talked to every Monday, the Maupin, Cox group, had said, "This is a great way to get Wendy some money and release her some money, and so we should do that," and that Todd
ignored that.
Q Did you attempt to make any contact with Maupin, Cox regarding this issue?

A No. They made it clear to me in the first letter that they wrote me after my dad's death that they represented Todd and Stan on behalf of my dad's trust, not me.

Q So they refused to communicate with you? Is that your testimony?

MR. LATTIN: I'm going to object. That's not what she said, and that mischaracterizes the testimony.

THE WITNESS: Well, we can -- we can look at the document they sent me.

But, no, I did still -- I communicated with
them. I sent them emails when $I$ wanted to ask, you know, a question or so forth, and they -- I think they responded to me a couple of times and I think they respond -- then they would respond through my attorneys. But $I$ never thought, after probably the first year, that they were on my side.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q But they were another source of information, were they not?

A Yes.

MR. LATTIN: I'm going to object. It mischaracterizes the evidence.

Also, our firm doesn't represent BHC at that time. It was represented by Nick Palmer. So when you're talking about this, you're making misrepresentations about who represented who.

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.

MR. KREITLEIN: Okay. I'm trying to get out of the witness exactly who she communicated with or what information and how many sources of information she had regarding this transaction. She said that she contacted your firm. So, I mean, it is what it is. And whatever that response is, that's her story to tell.

And I apologize if $I$ mischaracterized.
I'll try to correct that, Don.
THE WITNESS: I never knew Nick Palmer was involved in anything.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q So you didn't attempt to try to contact Nick Palmer regarding this transaction?

A I didn't have any information knowing he was even involved.

> Q All right. Did you ever try to contact

Todd directly with regards to the decision that you were informed?

A Yes.
Q And?
A He wouldn't respond. He would have Kevin respond or he would wait maybe several weeks or so and then give me an email that was purported -- he would always, in his email, say, "We've discussed this a hundred times, like in," and he would, like, relate to a date.

And I didn't understand why he would do that all the time when it wasn't true. But now after the lawsuit is started, I get it. He would do it so that -- try to protect him about what -- things that he'd never told me, because he never told me the things that he said that he did in his emails.

Q All right. Let me have you turn to paragraph 49 on page 17 . This is regarding the Bronco Billy's sale. Let me have you read paragraph 49 into the record, please.

A "The sale of Bronco Billy's Casino, base information and belief. Samuel, through the Family Trust, owned 18 percent interest in Bronco Billy's Casino. In 2015 Bronco Billy's was apparently sold for approximately 30 million, netting about
5.4 million for the Family Trust interest."

Do you want me to continue?
Q Yes, please.
A Okay. "Wendy expected her share of the Family Trust would be" -- "substantially benefit from its one-third interest in the sale proceeds. However, despite Samuel's interest being held in the Family Trust, it was represented to Wendy that she and her share of the family Trust did not have an interest in Bronco Billy's. Instead, apparently Todd and Stanley, directly or in trust, each owned 50 percent of Samuel's interest in Bronco Billy's at the time of the sale.
"When Wendy complained about the Bronco Billy's transaction, she was told she did not have an interest in Bronco Billy's and she and her share of the Family Trust were not entitled to any of the proceeds of the sale because she did not have a gaming license from the Colorado Division of Gaming, a ridiculous response.
"In essence, Todd and Stanley stole Wendy's interest in the trust, in turn, in the sale proceeds from Bronco Billy's."

Q All right. Thank you.
So based on the documentation that's been
produced in this case and based on the testimony of Stan that's been provided thus far, do you believe that the allegations contained in paragraph 49 are a true and accurate description of the transaction involving Bronco Billy's?

A Well, no, I didn't -- as an example, I didn't have the right information at that point when we filed this. That's my -- an interpretation of what I have been told from the co-trustees, that the sale, you know -- regarding the sale, and that those numbers and everything are not accurate that I've learned now.

Q All right. So the numbers and the transactions described in paragraph 49, that's not necessarily what you believe today as you sit here?

A That's correct.
Q All right. So the last sentence of paragraph 49 reads, in essence: Todd and Stanley stole Wendy's interest in the trust and, in turn, the sale proceeds from Bronco Billy's.

As you sit here today do you believe that Stan in his capacity as co-trustee stole your interest in the trust in the sales proceeds from Bronco Billy's?

A No. I have learned differently now.
Q As you sit here today do you believe that
you now know what happened to the proceeds from the sale of Bronco Billy's that were owned by the family trust?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
Ambiguous.
THE WITNESS: Well, I have a pretty good idea, after the depositions and so forth and finding out exactly what interest my dad owned and how it was -- Kevin sent me an email saying he took it out of the trust and gave it to them individually, which, of course, I didn't know. And I also know that you don't need to have gaming license in order to receive proceeds of a sale.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q How do you know that?
A I know that from talking to the Colorado Board of Gaming.

Q So you contacted the Colorado Gaming
Control Board yourself?
A I did.
Q Was that in writing or was that over the phone?

A Over the phone.
Q And detail that conversation for us.
A It was very simple. I asked if a casino in
the state of Colorado sold, are the laws that you have to have a gaming license to receive the proceeds from a sale; not from everyday business stuff and business income but from the sale.

And they said no, it can go to -- she gave me an example. The lady gave me an example that people -- there have been people that have given their -- have been -- it's been donated to the animal shelter or -- I can't remember exactly what -- ACP -ASPCA when -- when a casino has a sale. Different from casino income.

Q And what did you do with that information? Did you contact Stan? Did you contact Todd?

A Oh, yeah. We talked about it several times.

Q And what was the response? Who did you talk to and --

A I talked to -- well, I didn't talk to Kevin. I believe my stuff with Kevin was email. But I talked to Stan, and Stan said that wasn't his understanding from what Todd and Kevin had told him.

And Todd basically said, "We've discussed this with you numerous times. We can't believe you can't figure it out still. We'll have to have another meeting to discuss it." That was his way of acting
like they told me it numerous times, but they never told me numerous times what was going on. They never told me it was for sale.

Q So what is your understanding -- as you sit here today, what is your understanding as to where those proceeds went and where they are today?

A Well, from the sale or from all of Bronco Billy's?

Q All of Bronco Billy's.
A Okay. Well, $I$ know that the casino board -- the Bronco Billy's board held onto the proceeds that should have been -- if my dad was still alive, he would have received as income, his income from his ownership of the casino. They held those until the boys got licensed.

Once the boys were licensed, then they released those funds -- and I believe they were somewhere around a million dollars -- and that went into the family trust to pay debt. That's what -that's what I've been told.

And then -- I don't -- I was told that that continued to happen until the sale happened. So the money was put into the family trust to pay bills.

And then the sale came about. Kevin told me that it was not going to go through, that they were
not a strong enough company -- in an email this is what he told me -- so that it was -- and I said, "Well it says it's gonna close in 10 days." And it ended up closing, like, a month or two later. But he said he didn't believe it was going to go through.

And actually what Kevin sent me was the -how strong the company was, a link to how strong the company was and their financial situation, or whatever, compared to what they would need to do to qualify to buy the place.

And $I$ read it, and it said that they were going to extend the -- the offer for 60 days or something like that. So Kevin sent me that information. And then he said, below it, he didn't believe that it would ever go through again.

Then the sale happened and -- they didn't tell me when it closed escrow, but stan did. Stan then told me that, "No, Bronco Billy's is closed escrow." So Stan gave me that information.

And then $I$ said, "Well, where's my share of it?"

He said, "Well, you're going to have to ask Kevin."

I contacted Kevin, and Kevin said, "There's no reason for us to discuss this issue anymore because
as of now, Bronco Billy's is no longer a part of the family trust. It is outside the family trust. The ownership of Bronco Billy's is outside the family trust now and is owned by Stan and Todd individually." Q Okay. My question was regarding the sales proceeds, where the money went. That's what I'm trying to figure out. What's your understanding --

A Oh, I'm sorry.
Q That's all right.
MR. JOHNSON: Slow down, Wendy.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q I'm trying to find out your understanding as far as where the actual proceeds went and where they are.

A From the sale.
Q From the sale.
A Okay. So they went into half Stan's and half Todd's accounts. And then -- I don't know how long they were there, but then they were -- they were going to put them back into the family trust. And I don't -- from what $I$ know, $I$ think -- I don't know if this is correct or not -- but that Todd put his portion into the family trust, or at least some of it -- I don't know about the exact amount -- and that

Stan put in a portion of it, but at this time he was concerned about me not ever getting anything, and he didn't think that was right, after we had discussed this transaction. He said, "That wasn't fair that Wendy got completely screwed on Bronco Billy's," so he put money -- $\$ 400,000$ into a trust aside for me.

Q So as we sit here today do you believe that Stan in his capacity a co-trustee of the family trust breached any fiduciary duty that he owed to you in relation to the sale of the shares of Bronco Billy's?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I don't think Stan
intentionally did, but $I$ do believe that there was -that, yes, there was a breach there; maybe not intentional, because he was listening to the other co-trustees.

And $I$ guess that, you know, really -- I don't know if it's percentage that they vote on or if everybody gets a vote. I don't know how that works really with the co-trustees. But I think that no matter what -- they were upset that Stan -- or at least $I$ know Todd was upset -- that Stan was holding back that money for me. So Stan was trying to help me is what I'm trying to say.
/////

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q You're not claiming that was a breach by withholding that $\$ 400,000$ out for you?

A Not at all.
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: I thanked him for it.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. Let me have you turn next to paragraph 51. Let me have you read the first complete sentence there.

A "Despite Wendy's request, Co-Trustees have further breached their fiduciary duties to Wendy by refusing to provide her with full disclosure and accounting concerning the Bronco Billy's transaction."

Q Do you believe that $\operatorname{stan}$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust breached his fiduciary duty by refusing to provide you with full disclosure and accounting with regard to the Bronco Billy's transaction?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I don't think that Stan --
Stan was not -- $\quad$ believe that stan was not given information either. Maybe it's because they knew that he would talk to me.

But $I$ believe Stan did what he could to not
breach. But $I$ guess it depends on the definition of
"breach" because I didn't get the full disclosure, so -- but $I$ don't blame $S t a n$ for that.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. So then any claim arising out of this paragraph would not be directed towards Stan; it would be directed at some of the other co-trustees?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: In my opinion, yes.
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. Thank you.
Let me have you read the first complete sentence of paragraph 52, please.

A "This transaction is a perfect example of the co-trustees' continued efforts to manipulate the Family Trust and its property, and to use their position of authority and control over same for their personal benefit at the expense of the Trust, the Beneficiaries of the Trust, and particularly at the expense of Wendy and her family."

Q As you sit here today are you alleging that through the Bronco Billy's transaction, Stan used his position as co-trustee of the family trust to his personal benefit at the expense of you and the family trust?

A No.
Q All right. As you sit here today are you alleging that $S t a n$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust participated in an ongoing scheme to minimize distributions to you?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I think Stan did the
opposite.
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Well, let me have you read the second sentence of paragraph 52.

A "It is also consistent with and appears to be a part of the Co-Trustees' ongoing scheme to minimize distributions to Wendy in an effort to force her to agree to settle her interest in the Trust."

Q So let me ask you that question again after you've read that -- or after you've read that sentence.

Are you alleging that Stan in his individual capacity -- I'm sorry, in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust participated in an ongoing scheme to minimize distributions to you?

A In what you just said, no.
Q All right. Thank you.
Beginning there at the bottom of page 18,
paragraph 53, can $I$ have you read that paragraph, paragraph 53, into the record, please? This is relating to the purported second amendment to the family trust.

A Can $I$-- $I$ don't know if $I$ can -- in the last thing -- the last sentence that $I$ just read, when you asked me the question, you asked me a different question than exactly what it read, what it says in the -- on the page.

Q All right.
A And $I$ just wanted to clarify that $I$ do know that -- that the other co-trustees, as well as counsel, their counsel, had tried to have Stan discuss settlement with me because he was the closest one to me. They thought that was the easiest way to get -get me, during those times, to settle. I know that. So I wanted to clarify that they were using Stan as a tool, I believe.

Q And are you suggesting that that was -that amounted to stan participating in an ongoing scheme to minimize distributions?

A No, but that he was involved in the settlement discussions, trying to get me to settle and so forth. But $I$ don't believe that $S t a n--n o$, he did not minimize distribution scheme, no.

Q So at whatever point you're talking about -- and $I$ don't want to put words in your mouth because I don't know what period of time you're talking about -- was stan your primary point of contact, your only point of contact? What was stan in relation to these settlement discussions?<br>A Stan was --<br>MR. LATTIN: I'm going to object in that settlement discussions should not be a subject of communication.<br>BY MR. KREITLEIN:<br>Q At the point of time where these settlement discussions supposedly took place, were you talking to anybody other than Stan? Were you talking to Todd? Were you talking to Kevin? Were you talking to Maupin, Cox? Were you talking to Nick Palmer?<br>MR. LATTIN: Objection to form. It's compound.<br>THE WITNESS: Talking to, no. At this stage they were -- nobody -- nobody wanted to talk to me. I believe that what Stan was -- Stan was talking to me about -- about settling. And then he -- he said that -- he wasn't telling me $I$ needed to do that; he was saying here's -- if you want some money right now --

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q I don't want to talk about the specifics of --

A All right. So --
Q -- anything. I just want to talk about generally.

Who was -- who were you talking to?
A Stan.
Q And was Stan the only person that you were talking to at this time?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Who else were you talking to?
A Through emails, Kevin, maybe once or twice.
Q All right. So Kevin was supplying you with information regarding what at this point? And -- do you recall --

A Nothing. BHC -- I asked him a question about -- oh, I guess that's different, the BHC trust, because he's a trustee.

So the family trust, Stan was my -- Stan.
Q All right. Thank you for that clarification. I understand.

So moving now to paragraph 53.
A Okay. Do you want me to read?
Q Yes, please.

A "The purported second amendment to the Family Trust on December 10th, 2012. Sam S. Jaksick, Jr., purportedly executed the purported second Amendment."

Continue?
Q Yes.
A "Although the purported Second Amendment was allegedly executed in 2012, Wendy was not aware of its existence until it was produced to her after she retained counsel in 2016 . The purported Second Amendment, like many other documents created during Todd's involvement with Samuel's trust and various businesses, came out of nowhere and appears to be contrary to Sam's intent concerning Wendy and expressed by Samuel over the years."

Q So I know that we touched on this because there's reference to the purported second amendment earlier in the counterpetition. But what role do you understand Stan played in the formation, drafting, or execution of the purported second amendment?

A Zero.
Q All right. So as you sit here today are you claiming that $S t a n$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust breached any fiduciary duty that he owed to you in the drafting, execution, or
administration of the purported second amendment?
MR. JOHNSON: Object to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I don't think that -- no, I don't.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. Let's take a look at some of the causes of action that have been asserted against the co-trustees in the counterpetition.

Let me have you turn to Count -- Count II. Count II is failure to disclose and adequately account to compel accounting.

Let me have you turn to page 24 of 40 , paragraph 68. Let me have you read that first sentence there.

A $\quad$ The Counter-Respondents have failed to fully disclose and account to Wendy for many years."

Q All right. Now, we've sat through a number of days of depositions where you've given testimony, and you've talked repeatedly about the co-trustees having failed to supply you with information, but you've also given numerous examples of communication going back and forth between yourself and the co-trustees.

> As you sit here today do you believe that

Stan in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust breached his fiduciary duty owed to you by failing to fully disclose and account to you the administration of the family trust?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: I know that -- I don't
believe that Stan had been given full disclosure himself to know what information to pass on to me, if that was the case. After sitting here, I don't believe he -- he didn't know much more than $I$ know or knew.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Do you believe Stan disclosed to you what information he had?

A Yes, I do.
Q And that he fully and completely disclosed to you any information that he had?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: I'm not sure of that, but I
know that -- I believe he gave me the information, yeah, that he knew. But I don't know fully because I don't know what -- what fully was out there.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Well, you've heard his -- you've heard his deposition testimony?

A Yes.
Q You've heard what information he had?
A Yes.
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
Ambiguous.
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Was there anything in his testimony, as far as disclosures, that came new to you?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
Ambiguous.
THE WITNESS: No. I think Stan -- you mean in his deposition? I think he told me everything -all of that before.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. Let me have you turn to page 25 of 40. We're looking at Count III for civil conspiracy and aiding and abetting.

Can $I$ have you read the first full sentence of paragraph 73?

A "Wendy asserts that the Trustees, acting in their individual and trustee capacities, have conspired and/or aided and abetted the Trustees to the extent that they undertook any actions which resulted in a breach of the Trustees' fiduciary duties."
Q So as you sit here today do you believe
that $\operatorname{stan}$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust breached his fiduciary duty owed to you by conspiring, aiding and abetting the other co-trustees in the administration of the family trust?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. Compound.

THE WITNESS: No, I do not believe he was involved in that.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Next page, under Count IV, aiding and abetting, breaches of fiduciary duty, paragraph 80. Can you read that into the record, please?

A "The Counter-Respondents provided substantial assistance to each other in breaching their fiduciary duties by, and among other things, aiding and abetting, participating in, and/or assisting with their fraudulent actions or statements and other wrongful conduct."

Q All right. As we sit here today do you believe that $S t a n$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust provided substantial assistance to each other -- to the other co-trustees in the breaching of their fiduciary duties?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I think that Stan should have
been -- when he took on the role of co-trustee, I think he should have made sure he knew more -- that's what I think -- so that he could have been -- he could have helped disclose more information to the beneficiaries; not just me, but other beneficiaries as well.

I believe that Todd withheld that information from Stan at this point. After listening to Stan's testimony, I don't believe that Stan was responsible for -- he didn't know anything. I mean, he knew what he knew. So I don't believe that he was responsible for these things in that way.

As a co-trustee -- I don't know the law, but I know that they should know what each other are doing or they should stand up and say stop doing it. But I don't think Stan knew what was going on. BY MR. KREITLEIN:

Q And why do you think Stan didn't know what was going on? Because he wasn't fulfilling his duties as a fiduciary to ask more questions or because the information that he was being supplied was not accurate?

MR. LATTIN: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: The information he was being supplied was not accurate.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. Let me have you read paragraph 84 under Count $V$, actual fraud. We're going to go through the elements of intentional
misrepresentation. Let me have you read paragraph 84 into the record, please.

A $\quad$ The elements of intentional misrepresentation are, one, a false representation made" --

Q I'm sorry. Can I interrupt you there?
A Yeah.
Q Let me just have you stop after you read -after you read subparagraph 1.

A Okay.
Q Go ahead.
A "A false representation made by the Defendant."

Q So in this case, let's assume the defendant would be Stan. Do you believe that Stan made any false representations to you in the administration of the family trust?

MR. JOHNSON: Object to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: Not that $I$ know of that he was aware of, no.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. Go ahead. Number 2.
A $\quad$ Defendant's knowledge or belief that its representation was false or that the Defendant has an insufficient basis of information for making the representation."

Q Do you believe that Stan breached his fiduciary duties in this regard?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge.
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. Subsection 3 .
A "Defendant intended to induce Plaintiff to act or refrain from acting upon the misrepresentation."

Q All right. So we're assuming that misrepresentations were made. But you've already indicated, $I$ believe -- and correct me if I'm wrong -that you don't believe that Stan knowingly made any misrepresentations to you. Is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON: Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I don't believe Stan knew more than $I$ did much. That's correct. BY MR. KREITLEIN:

Q All right. We don't need to go through the
rest of it, then, if you don't believe --
A Okay.
Q -- that Stan made any misrepresentations to you.

MR. JOHNSON: Legal conclusion.
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Let me have you take a look now at paragraph 90 down at the bottom of page 27. Can $I$ have you read first full sentence into the record?

A $\quad$ Wendy requests the Trustees to be removed by the Court for the breaches of fiduciary duty and other actions described herein, as well as their strong bias against Wendy and her family, that has created an irreconcilable conflict in their administration of the Trust."

Q Do you believe that Stan should be removed as co-trustee of the family trust?

A Yes.
Q Why?
A Because $I$ believe it should be -- I think the co-trustees should be someone that is completely independent from the -- everything that's gone on and so forth. It's too -- I just -- yes, I do. He should be removed.

Q And is that based on -- on your belief that
there was any wrongdoing on behalf of Stan or just your general belief that trustees should be third-party independents with no skin in the game, so to speak?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Well, I believe that -- Stan and $I$ had had this discussion before, and he was willing to step down. He didn't -- he was -everything was going so crazy; he did not care if he was the -- a trustee of the issue trust because of the -- what was happening with the lawsuit pending.

And so the -- by Stan staying in as a trustee over all these companies, if Todd was to stay in these companies, would -- we'd be in the same position, because Todd would not be giving stan the accurate information and it would just be -- we'd be in a lawsuit forever probably.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Okay. Let me have you turn to page 28 of 40, paragraph 92, under count VII of your counterpetition, unjust enrichment and constructive trust. Do you have that?

A Oh, yeah, right here. I'm sorry.
Q Can you read paragraph 92, the definition of unjust enrichment, into the record?

A "Unjust enrichment occurs when a person has and retains a benefit which, in equity and good conscience, belongs to another."

Q Go ahead.
A Oh. "Unjust enrichment is the unjust retention of a benefit to the loss of another, or the retention of money or property of another against the fundamental principles of justice or equity and good conscience."

Q So do you believe that you understand the definition of unjust enrichment?

A Yes.
Q Do you believe that $\operatorname{stan}$ in his capacity as co-trustee of the family trust was unjustly enriched in any way through his actions as administrator or co-trustee of the administration of that trust?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: At this point, not to my
knowledge.
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q The last issue that $I$ want to talk to you about is -- there's been a lot of discussion regarding disclosure and your attempts to gain information and your claim that you were not supplied adequate information by the various co-trustees or other
parties, including co-trustees' counsel.
As alleged in your counterpetition, one of the specific allegations is that there was not full disclosure to you. And that counterpetition was filed, I believe -- the initial counterpetition -- the original counterpetition might have been filed in January of 2018 .

So as of January 2018 you did not believe that there had been full disclosure to you; is that correct?

A I still don't believe there has been.
Q All right.
(Exhibit 82 was marked.)
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Let me hand you what's been marked as Exhibit 82. Take just a minute to review that.

A Okay.
Q Have you seen this document before, Wendy?
A Yes, I have.
Q What is this document? Describe it for the record, please.

A The document is the initial communication or the early communication between Maupin, Cox \& LeGoy and my previous counsel, Dana Dwiggins, when $I$ was living in Las Vegas.

Q What's the date of this correspondence?
A January 27 th, 2017 -- wait a minute. Yeah, that's correct.

Q And you believe that to be accurate as to when -- approximately when your prior counsel would have received it?

A Yes.
Q And what is attached to this letter dated January 27, 2017?

A There are documents that she requested -that she asked be supplied for my benefit from the trusts.

Q And are you aware as to whether or not the documents that are identified on WJOOO445 through 449 -- in the far right-hand column are a number of documents that are identified by Bates stamp number. The center column, of course, identifies a particular document.

Do you know whether or not these documents were actually provided to your prior counsel?

A I believe -- yes. I don't know -- I'd have to go through every one of them, but $I$ believe they were.

Q Okay. So what -- can you take a look, then, at what is contained on these pages in the far
left-hand column. What do these -- what information is contained in the far left-hand column? Do you know?

A The documents that we had requested.
Q Okay. So these are the documents that were requested by your prior counsel to Maupin, Cox \& LeGoy. And then the center column is Maupin, Cox \& LeGoy's response to those document requests?

A Yes.
Q And then the Bates stamp number that was stamped on the documents themselves.

So you recall receiving this attachment?
A Oh, I was -- yes, the attachment. But on the far right-hand side there's many that were not supplied because they were blank.

Q And we're going to talk about those.
A Okay.
Q Okay. So the documents that are identified, JSK0001 through the end, 744, were you able to confirm that there were in fact 744 pages of documents that were provided by Maupin, Cox \& LeGoy that were attached to this correspondence?

A I don't know the numbers of -- number of pages. I don't recall.

Q Was there a -- were the documents provided
pretty voluminous? Was there a lot of documents that Maupin, Cox \& LeGoy provided?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: In January -- I never -- I didn't physically see the documents. I was already living in Texas, so it was by communication from me and Dana Dwiggins over the telephone. So I don't know what the stack looked like or, um -- she just looked at -- we started going through them, the documents that they had provided.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q You were not provided copies of these documents yourself?

A Well, copies, like physical copies --
Q Yes.
A -- or you mean like --
Q Yes. Either physical copies or on a CD that you could pull up on a computer. Anything like that.

A Well, you could pull it up on -- you could pull -- the ones that she sent to me, you could pull up -- a lot of them anyway -- on, like -- in that Dropbox, you know. You could connect to the Dropbox, or whatever it was, and then you could view them that way. So the physical -- no, I never saw any physical.

Q So the documents that were requested by your prior counsel, did you aid her in the preparation of this list of documents that were prepared?

A No.
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Compound. Vague.
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q When looking through this list of documents that she requested -- I understand that this attachment was prepared by Maupin, Cox.

A Oh, I see what you're saying. I'm sorry.
Q Let's operate on that assumption, because it appears to have been attached to this correspondence.

A Okay.
Q Looking through that list of documents that Maupin, Cox is representing through this correspondence that your prior counsel prepared, does this list of documents requested appear to be all the documents that you wanted and/or needed regarding the administration of these trusts, or were there other documents that you would have liked to have had that weren't requested?

Does that make sense?
A Yes.
Q I kind of went on and on there, but --

A I can't recall. I -- I know that she and I had discussed things that $I$ was very concerned about. MR. JOHNSON: Don't talk about what you discussed with your attorney.

THE WITNESS: Oh. Okay.
BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Looking through --
A Okay.
Q -- looking through this attachment --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- does this appear to be -- under the "Document Requested" column, does this appear to be all the documents that you would have needed or wanted?

A Okay. Let me -- can I review them?
Q Absolutely. Take all the time you need.
A Okay.
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
Ambiguous.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Can you ask your question again? I'm sorry.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Now that you've had an opportunity to
review the documents that are identified as the requested documents, were there other documents that
you felt you needed that were not either provided or identified on this -- on this spreadsheet relating to the administration of the trusts --

A Yes.
Q -- the family trust or the issue trust?
A Yes.
Q And what other documents would you be looking for that are not identified here?

A Well, I mean, I don't have a -- I can't tell you off the top of my head, but $I$ know that there are things that are on there, as I sit here today, we did not -- that we would have requested information on the -- the first amendment to -- what happened to the first amendment that -- we never got a copy of the third one or second one. I don't remember which one we never got a copy of.

But in the second amendment it relates -it goes back to talking about "this replaces such and such one, such and such one," and there was -- we didn't have copies of those. We just had the 2006 one that was the restated one.

Q Do you know whether or not your attorney requested those documents from anyone?

A Well, $I$ know that -- that was the first time that $I$ had understood that there was a second
amendment that did away with, you know, a lot of the restated one. So, yes, I definitely know that that was something that we were talking about, so -- we needed that information.

Q My question was: Do you know whether or not --

A Oh, she --
Q -- there was a formal request?
A I have no idea.
Q All right. Anything else, just off the top of your head, that you can think of?

A Yes. The operating agreements for several of the other companies that are not listed here.

Q That were inside the family trust or the issue trust or outside the family trust and issue trust?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Inside.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Okay. And do you know whether or not a formal request was made by your counsel for those documents?

A I don't know. I don't know.
Q All right. Anything else that you can
think of? And I'm not trying to trip you up --

A No, I know.
Q -- or pin you into a corner --
A No, not that - no, not that $I$ can think of. The section -- I don't know -- the section that was empty I'm sure was requested. We asked again, I would assume.

And then, like I said, I was in Dallas. So at that time, then we decided it was best for me to get counsel that was local so that $I$ could work with someone.

Q All right. So you've made reference to blank sections that are in this spreadsheet. And it would indicate on this spreadsheet that there was a former request made. By way of example, item No. 2, a copy of the option agreement relating to Todd's purchase of the Tahoe residence.

The response apparently -- if I'm reading
this right -- from Maupin, Cox \& LeGoy is "You will need to request documents from Kent Robison, Esq., who is Todd's personal attorney."

Do you know, sitting here today, for
certain whether or not there was a request made to Kent Robison for that particular document?

A At this moment?
Q Yes.

A I do not know.
Q Have you seen any request coming from Dana Dwiggins' office to Kent Robison asking for a copy of that document?

A I did not see one. I -- just from what she verbally told me.

MR. JOHNSON: Don't -- don't talk about -THE WITNESS: Oh. Okay.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. Did you see the email dated November 18 th of 2016 that Dana Dwiggins had apparently sent to Maupin, Cox requesting these documents? Did you ever see that email?

A I'm sure that $I$-- I can't recall, but I'm sure I have. I'm sure that it was forwarded to me.

Q All right. Do you happen to know if there was a similar email ever sent to stan or anyone purportedly representing Stan?

A Well, we assumed that stan was being represented by Maupin, Cox \& LeGoy.

Q All right. Okay. So this is the only -the email dated November 18 th that you believe you've seen a copy of, that's the only request that you're actually aware of having gone out for -- for documents?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
Ambiguous.
THE WITNESS: I know there was follow-up ones asking for "we still are looking for this" or whatever, but $I$ don't know -- yeah, so there was definitely follow-up on -- regarding the ones that they were looking for. I know that there was -- there was --

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Counsel, I'm sorry to interrupt. We're going to need to go off record.

MR. KREITLEIN: All right.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the end of video disc No. 1 in the Video Deposition of Wendy Jaksick, Volume V. We are going off record, and the monitor time is approximately 10:19 a.m.
(A recess was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back on record. The monitor time is approximately 10:40 a.m.

This marks the beginning of video disc No. 2 in the Video Deposition of Wendy Jaksick, Volume V, in matter of SSJ's Issue Trust.

This deposition is being taken at Robison, Sharp, Sullivan \& Brust, 71 Washington Street, Reno, Nevada. My name is Dejon Durio of A Corrao Video.

Counsel may proceed.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Wendy, before the break we were -- we were talking about what's been marked as Exhibit 82. Do you still have that document in front of you?

A Yes.
Q What we were trying to establish is the - what documents were actually produced to your prior counsel, what documents had been requested by your prior counsel, and whether or not you had had an opportunity to review those documents.

Do you recall that?
A Yes.
Q All right. So I believe you testified that you don't really know the exact number of documents that were produced by Maupin, cox in accordance with this January 27,2017 , letter, but there were a large volume of documents that were produced? Is that -- is that your testimony?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: I guess it depends on what
"large volume" is. But $I$ know -- if you go through these -- I mean, they're only limited to a few things. So, I mean, I know that there's a lot of things that we asked for.

This was just -- we didn't even know where
to begin because we had not been given -- you know, we didn't know things. So this was kind of like, I would assume, our beginning of starting to look at stuff and review the tax returns, the -- those kinds of things we'd never -- I'd never seen before.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q But those were produced in accordance with this letter that you recall?

A I think they were. I think the -- yes, I think they were. I don't know -- for Dad's they were, you know. We asked for his tax returns, that 7 -whatever it's called -- 06 -- is that right? -- or -I don't know. Whatever it is. But $I$ know that that -- I remember that those came.

And then we wanted individual ones for the different companies and stuff. We got some things, and some things we didn't.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q All right. Well, this letter indicates that there were some 793 pages that were produced. Do you have reason to doubt that there were actually 793 pages produced?

A I have no idea the numbers that was produced.

Q All right. And I apologize if we've
already touched over this, but $I$ can't recall if $I$ asked or $I$ intended to ask, so I'll just ask again.

There were a number of documents that were identified in the spreadsheet that those requests would have to go straight to Kent Robison.

And do you recall seeing any communication
from Dana Dwiggins' office to Mr. Robison's office requesting these missing documents?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: I don't. I remember her asking why he had individual counsel for something that was under the trust. That's all I remember her asking.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q But you don't know if she actually took the next step and went back to Mr. Robison and asked for those documents?

A I do not know.
Q Okay. Do you recall seeing follow-up emails or follow-up letters back to Maupin, Cox asking for additional documents other than the ones that are detailed on this exhibit?

A Yes.
Q And did Maupin, Cox respond to those
document requests in providing additional documents?
A I think they did at -- I mean, I can't -- I don't know exactly what the documents were. But I do remember her always saying to me, like, we're --

MR. JOHNSON: Stop.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry. I'm not
supposed to talk about that.
Yes, $I$ think that there was follow-up -- I mean backup. Or additional. BY MR. KREITLEIN:

Q Okay. So additional requests by Dana Dwiggins' office and additional responses by Maupin, Cox's office?

A Correct.
Q All right. But yet in your petition you've indicated that there's not been full disclosure. Would these efforts not constitute an attempt by the co-trustees at full disclosure?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. Vague.

THE WITNESS: That's -- I don't think these documents even start -- they might start touching the surface, but they're definitely not full disclosure of everything that's taken place.
/////

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Okay. But you had an opportunity to request other documents regarding other transactions. Did you take that opportunity?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: We didn't know what the opportunity or the transactions were. We had to start somewhere.

BY MR. KREITLEIN:
Q Okay. I understand. With regards to the original petition filed by the co-trustees, not including stan, do you recall having any communications with stan regarding that original petition, the petition for approval that was filed by the Maupin, Cox firm with the Court that initiated this -- this action? Do you recall having any communications with Stan regarding the filing of that petition?

A The filing of it?
Q Yes.
A We discussed it at some point. I don't know if it was before or after the filing of it.

Q What was the nature of that discussion?
A Stan did not agree with the filing. He did not agree with the filing that the trust had
submitted, the accounting and whatever else it's called -- I can't remember what it's called, but -- in October -- on October 2nd -- I mean August 2nd. I know it's -- $I$ know the date of it. I don't -- but I know Stan said that he did not agree with it.

Q He didn't agree with the proposed actions that were attached to that original petition? You had that discussion with him, with Stan?

A I think it must have been after the filing. Yes. We did.

Q Okay. Anything else that you can recall regarding those discussions about that initial petition or the approvals that were sought by way of that original petition?

A Stan hadn't seen a whole bunch of things that were in there.

Q All right. Did you ever ask Stan to file -- join in with you in the filing of a counterpetition in opposition to that initial petition that was filed by the Maupin, Cox firm?

A $\quad$ No.
Q You didn't have any discussion with Stan along those lines at all?

A To file a --
Q To join with you in your filing of an
opposition to that original petition.
A No.
Q Okay.
A Not that $I$ recall, unless I'm missing something that $I$ don't understand.

Q All right.
MR. KREITLEIN: That's all I have for Wendy. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. HOSMER-HENNER: Are you okay with not taking a break?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. We just had one.

## CONTINUED EXAMINATION

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Welcome back -- welcome back to me -Wendy.

A Thank you.
Q I wanted to turn your attention to Exhibit 11, please, in your binder.

A Okay.
Q And do you recall speaking about this document earlier in the case, earlier during your deposition?

A Let me just -- oh. Yes.

Q And do you know this to be Todd's purported indemnification agreement?

A Yes, I do.
Q Will you remind me of the first time that you saw this document?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: Oh, boy. When Stan emailed it to me. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q Was that in approximately April of 2015?
A Possibly. I don't know exactly.
Q Can you turn to Exhibit A, which is TJ0866.
A A -- right here? A?
Q No. Sorry. It's Exhibit A to Exhibit 11.
A Oh. Where is that? I'm sorry.
Oh, take it out?
Oh, Exhibit A. I'm sorry. Okay. It was on the top.

Q And you've had the chance, since this litigation began, to go through these documents -- to go through this list?

A Yes.
Q Had you seen Exhibit A at any time prior to April of 2015 when you saw the entire agreement?

A No.
Q And you understand that these are the obligations that Todd is seeking indemnification from the family trust for?

A Payment, yes.
Q And let me rephrase that.
A Okay.
Q Some of these obligations are the ones that Todd is seeking payment from the family trust for.

A On Exhibit A? Yes.
Q There are 21 of these, and I'm just going to ask you briefly about each one to see if you have a specific recollection about them, but --

A Okay.
Q -- do you recall a promissory note jointly entered into by Todd and Sam or by the family trust for Duck Lake Ranch in item No. 1?

A No.
Q Do you recall the entry in the promissory note mentioned in item No. 2?

A $\quad$ No.
Q The promissory note mentioned in item
No. 3?
A $\quad$ No.
Q The promissory note in item No. 4?


A $\quad$ No.
Q And the promissory note in item No. 5?
A No.
Q Were you provided with any of these promissory notes prior to April of 2015?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Have you seen these promissory notes since April of 2015?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Could you please turn to TJ0867.
Have you seen any -- do you recall any of the promissory notes or option agreements mentioned on this page?

A Yes.
Q Which ones?
A Number 6 .
Q And that was a promissory note related to

A Yes. Through Jackrabbit.
Q And do you understand that to still be an outstanding obligation?

A Well, it depends on who you ask, I guess.
Q Let's focus on just you --
A Do I think it's an outstanding -- my
portion of it?

Q Yes.
A Part -- part -- part of it. Not all of it, but part of it, yes.

Q And any other promissory notes on this page?

A The Jackrabbit -- oh, wait. Hang on a minute. The six -- this one -- oh, no. None of the other ones.

Q Were you provided with any of these notes or option agreements prior to 2015?

A Just No. 6. None of the others.
Q And you did see the promissory note? Do you recall approximately what time it was?

A On No. 6?
Q Uh-huh.
A Oh, I saw it when it was first established in 1995 and then again when my dad redid it, extending it and so forth, in probably 2011.

Q And based on your understanding of that life insurance trust, what would be the explanation for Todd to be indemnified for that obligation?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I have no idea.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Do you understand that that was an
obligation that Todd and Sam were jointly liable on?
MR. JOHNSON: Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Is it your understanding that this was an obligation of the family trust exclusively?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I thought it was an
obligation to Jackrabbit, and I didn't know who Jack -- I thought Jackrabbit was my dad at that time. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q And what did you understand the bracketed paragraph or bracketed sentence to mean where it says "to be assigned by Jackrabbit to Sam Jaksick individually as new debtor"?

A Well, when $I$ saw that, then $I$-- that they were -- that he was -- it was being assigned from Jackrabbit back to my dad individually. That's what it sounded like to me.

Q Turn to page TJ0868. And do you -- have you seen any of the loans, notes, or option agreements mentioned on this page in items 12 through 19?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Everything on this page, with the exception of item 18, seems to be an individual obligation of

Todd Jaksick or his TBJ Investment Trust?
A Yes.
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q Are you aware of any of these line items that have been used by Todd as collateral for any notes or obligations?

A I don't know.
Q So on 4505 Office Way in item 12 , are you aware that that's been put up for collateral for any obligation?

A $\quad$ I don't know, no.
Q On 17, the Cadillac automobile loan?
A The what?
Q On item 17, the Cadillac automobile loan.
A The car? Yes.
Q Do you understand that to be used as an obligation for -- to be used as collateral for any family trust entity?

A $\quad$ No.
Q And I'll ask you a very simple question, which is: Do you have any understanding for why your dad would have agreed to indemnify Todd for the loan on the Cadillac?

A $\quad$ No.

Q Turn to TJ0869. Do you recall either of those promissory notes?

A Nope.
Q Would it be fair to say that, with the exception of the life insurance trust that is referenced in item 6, that you were not provided with any of the promissory notes or other, we'll say, supporting documentation for any of these obligations prior to April 2015?

A None.
Q Have you been provided with any information or these notes since April 2015?

A I don't believe so.
Q At the time that you were entering into the ACPAs, did you have any information to allow you to assess the amount of this -- of these indemnification obligations?

A No. As a matter of fact, they weren't -they weren't even given an amount in the financials. It just said "unknown."

Q Would your opinion about those ACPAs and the use of the family trust proceeds have changed if you had -- if you'd been provided with Exhibit A?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q And would your opinion have changed concerning every action you took with the family trust if you had known the extent of this indemnification obligation?

A To the best of my knowledge, I would say pretty close. I mean, yes, it -- to the best of my knowledge, what this does is it leaves -- it gives me actually an explanation why every time I asked about a distribution, that they would say to me that there are outstanding debts, because there would be forever.

Q And your understanding was that you would eventually be getting a cash distribution from the family trust?

A I -- it depends on what entity we're talking about. But $I$ believed that -- that my money would go into trust and would be there for my lifetime to take care of me.

Q How did you understand that Luke's subtrust would be funded?

A From the family trust.
Q And if there were no assets remaining in the family trust after debts or expenses were paid, how did you understand that Luke's trust -- did you understand that Luke's subtrust could be funded?

A Well, I was told -- what I read in my dad's trust was that no one was to receive anything until the grandchildren's trusts were fully funded. So I believed that that had already -- had happened, I mean, or would have happened immediately the first time that Bronco Billy's -- or we got any money for anything and the -- the debts were paid off. But that didn't happen, so of course I did not know that Luke would not get any money.

Q And could you turn to Exhibit 74, which is a financial statement of the family trust.

A Page what?
Q Exhibit 74 .
A Oh. Right here. Okay.
Q I'd like you to turn to page 14 of this exhibit.

A $\quad 13$ or 14?
Q Page 14 of the exhibit, please.
A Okay. I'm there.
Q Do you see the two entries at the bottom,
"Total assets on hand, March 31st, 2016"?
A Yes, I see that.
Q And do you see the "Fiduciary Acquisition Value" column and the "Estimated Value" column?

A Yes.

Q And they're both approximately 3.3 million?
A Yes.
Q Is that your understanding that this
financial statement indicates that the total assets, the plus column of the trust, is approximately
3.3 million in March 31st, 2016 ?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, $I$ don't believe any of that -- any of these numbers. Is that -- were you asking me if $I$--

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q If that's just what you understood was the representation.

A That's what they're representing, yes.
Q And if you turn two pages, you see "Notes Receivable" on JSK001245?

A On page 16?
Q On page 17 of the family trust report.
A Okay.
Q That shows notes and other receivables as approximately 1 million?

A Yes.
Q And if you turn to page 18, it lists the closely held businesses?

A Correct.

Q And so is it your understanding that those are all in the assets versus liabilities; if we divide everything into assets and liabilities, that those would be all in the things the family trust has, the assets? Is that right?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe that.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Other than the notes receivable, the closely held businesses and the assets, are there any other categories of assets or resources that you believe the family trust has?

A Are you saying it has -- what - -
Q That it's represented to you that it has on the plus side of the accounting ledger.

A Yes, I believe there's a lot more.
Q And how -- in what form?
A In form of -- well, for one thing, notes that are payable from the indemnification, if, you know, we're not using the indemnification. I mean, there's a ton of notes payable to the trust.

I also believe that there's a lot of water rights, extensive amount of water rights, that were never even listed on my dad's assets that my dad owned, and $I$ don't know how they never got listed.

```
Q My question is: Based on these representations, would you say it's fair to say that the trust on the plus side of the ledger sheet has approximately the 3.3 million in assets, the 1 million in notes receivable and approximately 1.5 million in closely held businesses?
A \(\quad\) No.
Q Are those the representations, though, that were made to you --
A Yes.
Q -- based on this?
A Yes.
Q And so that total is approximately
6.87 million? Is that what you would understand if you were just to read this?
A That's what \(I\) would understand.
Q If you turn to page 31, JSK001259, do you see the total contingent trust obligations of approximately 9 million?
A Yes.
Q And I'm not asking you whether you believe these numbers but only whether these were the numbers that were presented to you via this financial statement.
A Yes.

Q And of that 9 million, if you look above in the column, there's 4.3 million for Jackrabbit, 598,000 for Winnemucca Ranch and 2.3 million for Buckhorn. Do you see those entries?

A I do.
Q And those are all under Todd's indemnification agreement?

A Yes.
Q And so if you total those up -- and I'm sorry for involving math -- but that's approximately 8 million? Is that right?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. The calculation is whatever it is.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q What is your understanding of the total contingent amounts requested under the indemnification? Are those those three entries?

A I remember it to -- to be around 8 million.
Q And the total contingent trust obligations would be 9 million. And your understanding or what you've been told is that you're not entitled to a distribution until all debts are satisfied, including those contingent trust obligations?

A Correct.
Q And Luke's subtrust couldn't be funded
until all debts are satisfied?
A That is correct.
Q And so if these contingent obligations came due, that there would be more liabilities in the trust than assets based on our earlier comparison of the numbers?

A That's correct.
Q So that means if Todd's indemnification was enforced, you would not receive anything from the family trust, nor would Luke?

A That is correct.
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: That's correct.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Can I refer you back to Exhibit 1 now, please.

And you remember the discussion about this December 11, 2017, agreement with Rich Whelan?

A Yes.
Q Who is Rich Whelan?
MR. JOHNSON: Asked and answered.
THE WITNESS: A friend.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Do you still talk to him?
A \(\quad\) No.

answered.
THE WITNESS: Rich Whelan.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Did you review any drafts of this agreement prior to this final document?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: This was the only document.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q And did you see this before Stan signed it? MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Asked and answered.
```

THE WITNESS: I don't recall.

```

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Did you ask Mr. Whelan to draft this?
A I asked him to talk to Stan about helping me out. I didn't ask -- and he said he'd put together something.

Q Did you receive funds under this agreement from Stan?

A Yes.
Q Did you voluntarily enter into this agreement?

A I needed money horribly, so --
voluntarily -- yes, I did.

Q You agree you did not comply with this agreement?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: Under the terms of what this agreement says -- looked at it as an advance of the money that he was holding for me, that \(I\) was going to receive it that way.

So did I -- what was the question? Did I not follow the terms of it?

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Yes.
MR. JOHNSON: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry.
Well, it says that \(I\) will not sue \(S t a n\), and then -- I have to -- yeah, so I did not follow through with it.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Did you return the funds that stan provided to you pursuant to this agreement?

A \(\quad\) No.
Q Why not?
A Because I looked at it as an advance of the money that he was holding for me. That was the purpose of it, initially anyway. And \(I\) had not --my
counsel had not seen this when this was done. So they weren't -- they didn't -- not that \(I\) meant to keep it from them, but they didn't see -- Rich did the document, and after my counsel saw it, then we reviewed it the right way.

So, no, I did not pay back Stan.
Q Did they see it prior to you filing your counterpetition?

A \(\quad\) No.
Q Did you understand that Stan had an obligation to distribute those funds to you at the time that he did?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
Vague.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Let me rephrase. Were you entitled to the distributions that Stan made at the time that you received them? MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. Vague. Ambiguous.

THE WITNESS: I believed that that was my money that -- being held and that he was holding. I don't know if we're talking about legally or -- you know, or -- is that what you mean, legally was I allowed -- it was supposed to happen?

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Well, your understanding was that distributions would only really occur after all debts were satisfied?

A Oh, I see. I'm sorry. Yes, that's what I understood.

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q So if Stan had not advanced you some monies, there was the potential that Todd's indemnification would wipe out all those monies that you thought were yours?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. Speculation.

THE WITNESS: That -- I don't know about all of the monies and so forth. But that was what Stan must have thought when he put the 400 aside for me so that he would -- because \(I\) would have something left.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q And did you come to understand that without that, there was the potential for you not to receive anything?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Speculation.
Legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: After -- after the
indemnification letter -- I understood the
indemnification letter from -- to my knowledge, it
looked to me like that was the case. And the letter that \(I\) received from Mr. Lattin.
(Exhibit 83 was marked.)
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q I'm showing you what I've now marked as Exhibit 83 .

Would you take a look at that? Let me know if you recognize this document.

A Vaguely, yes. Let me look at it -- well, wait a minute here.

I take that back. No.
Q You have no recollection of this document?
A I have recollection of part of this -- a portion of this document, but not all of it.

Q Do you recall drafting this document?
A \(\quad\) No.
Q On the first page of this exhibit, it appears that you sent this document to stan.

A Yes.
Q Do you know who would have drafted this document?

A Well, I can tell that it would -- Rich
would have drafted it and then sent it to me to send. So \(I\) probably didn't even read the whole thing at that time.

Q And was this an attempt to transfer your ownership in Bright Holland to Stan?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: Or is it Buckhorn? I
didn't -- it was an attempt to make -- to get a loan -- to get a loan -- or exchange interest for -in something for money or to sell, yeah, it would be. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q A loan from Stan?
A Yes.
Q And do you know if this was ever executed?
A It was never executed.
Q Did you have any follow-up discussions with Stan about this?

A No.
(Exhibit 84 was marked.)
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q I'm going to show you Exhibit 84. Let me know if you recognize this document.

A Yes.
Q Can you describe this document for me, please?

A That was -- again, knowing that Stan was the only one that would possibly help me out -- a way for me -- which it never was executed -- but was a way for me to give him something as security in order to help me pay my bills since the trust had cut me off.

Q And do you know if -- do you know who drafted this document?

A I think I did this one.
Q You previously testified about your
experience in business and development. Do you feel
capable of drafting option agreements like this?
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
Ambiguous.
THE WITNESS: Am I capable? You mean -what do you mean?

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q That you -- that you felt confident that this would protect your interests in exchange for the loan.

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
Ambiguous.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Did you seek independent counsel about this?

A
Did \(I\) have counsel at this time? Oh, I had -- I didn't have this counsel, but, yes, I did have counsel.

Q Did you ask them to review this document?
A \(\quad\) No.
Q Is it fair to say these documents, 83 and 84, were attempts by to you structure some deal with Stan to obtain money after the trust cut you off from living expenses?

A Absolutely.
Q And 83 and 84 were not executed?
A \(\quad\) No.
Q Did you have discussions with Stan about the option agreements?

A Yes.
Q And did Stan tell you that he couldn't financially enter these agreements or didn't want to? Or what was the explanation these were never executed?

A He just -- he wasn't -- he wanted to help me, but he didn't know if this was the way to do it because of the fact that he owned an interest in the companies and it would have to go through the -- he'd have to do the -- it would have to go through the line of -- the chain of -- whatever you want to call it -through the trust, and that it wouldn't be easy to do,
basically.
Q Would you say that you desperately needed money in July 2017?

A No. But I'd gotten a letter from the -Maupin, Cox saying that \(I\) was not going to receive any more money in August. So \(I\) was preparing for that.

Q And is it fair to say that you had provided 83, 84 and the ultimate Whelan document to Stan for his signature just sort of as documents that he would be providing you some money under?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: I would have pretty much signed anything or sent anything in that \(I\) could in order to help my family.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q But all three of those were your suggestions to try to get something from Stan?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Or Rich Whelan's. But, yes, I mean, Stan did not call me up and go, "Hey, what are you doing today? Do you want some money?" No. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q And in all three of those documents, either you or Rich Whelan were the ones proposing the transaction?

A Yes.
Q Could you turn to Exhibit 42, please.
A Let's see here. Okay. Okay.
Q Do you recognize this email?
A Yes.
Q Do you recall this conversation between Whelan and Stan?

A I think \(I\) was in on the actual conversation.

Q You did participate on the call?
A I believe I did on this, yes. There was a couple telephone conversations. I think I was -- I'm not sure, but I think so.

Q Do you have any reason to believe that Rich's statements in this email are inaccurate with respect to the call?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't -- yes.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q So, for instance, it says a payment of \$1 million would be made to Stan -- to Wendy as goodwill payment -- as a goodwill payment.

A Yes. That's something we never discussed.
Q And do you recall Stan ever agreeing to
that?
A Not to my knowledge.
Q And so if you were on the call, these statements in here would be inaccurate?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Some would be.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Do you recall stan saying, "I don't know" -- refusing to speak to Whelan anymore?

A Refuse -- I don't -- what --
Q At some point in time do you recall Stan being confused about why he was talking to this guy?

A Yes.
Q And do you recall Stan not wanting to deal with him anymore?

A Yes.
Q Was anything agreed to as a result of this conversation?

A That he would provide the accounting for my grand- -- and get me a copy of my grandmother's will.

Q Did that happen?
A Yes.
Q Do you know if Stan had any follow-up with Mr. Whelan?

A Not that \(I\) know of.
Q You mentioned that Wendy's legal team write a letter to Stan -- or, excuse me, this letter mentions that Wendy's legal team should write a letter to Stan and his lawyer immediately.

Who was your legal team at this point in time in September 2017?

A I'm not -- they may have just been hired. I don't know the exact date. But we didn't discuss that.

Q And did you know who Stan's lawyer was at that time?

A No.
Q And you've sued Stan in this litigation, correct, in both his capacity as trustee and as co-trustee?

A Yes.
Q So clearly that puts you in an adverse position?

A Yes.
Q You have no agreement with Stan to divide the proceeds of this litigation if either of you were to prevail?

A Between me and Stan?
Q Yes.

A \(\quad\) No.
Q Or share expenses in this litigation?
A No, obviously.
Q No agreement to alter your testimony?
A To alter my under-oath testimony?
Q Correct.
A No.
Q No agreement with respect to your or Stan's testimony in any respect?

A Nothing.
Q And your statements in this case are based on your personal knowledge?

A Yes.
Q Stan's provided you with personal funds over the years. Correct?

A Yes, he has.
Q Has he ever required that these be spent on attorneys?

A No.
Q And those with respect to the Dwiggins firm, that was your request for funds for attorneys. Correct?

A Yes. I asked him several times, and he -I know my dad asked Stan to help me if \(I\) needed it.

Q And were there ever any written
restrictions by Stan on the use of the funds that he was providing to you?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Either orally or in writing, did he ever require that monies he gave you be spent on legal fees?

A Never.
Q And your current attorneys in this case are on a contingency; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q So since you're not paying them anything, obviously Stan can't be paying them anything.

A Obviously, yes.
Q And you would agree that your actions in this litigation are completely independent from Stan?

A Completely.
Q And you don't believe you're bound by any agreement between the two of you with respect to the course of this litigation?

A Nothing.
Q Would you turn to Exhibit 25 in your binder, please.

A Thank you.

Okay. Is it starting -- oh, I see it.
Never mind.
Q Can you turn to response No. 36.
A Response -- what page is it?
Q It's on page 32 of 52 .
A Oh, okay. Okay.
Q Do you recall answering this interrogatory?
A Yes.
Q And do you agree with the responses that you made in this interrogatory?

A Yes.
Q Would you agree that you owe Lakeridge for your car lease payments?

A That \(I\) owe them?
Q Correct.
A Well, they paid for it.
Q Did you have an agreement to repay
Lakeridge?
A \(\quad\) No.
Q Would you agree that you owe \(\operatorname{stan} 20,000\) from 2016 to 2017?

A Yes.
Q And would you agree that you owe Stan
37,500 from December 2017 through May 2018?
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I -- I owe it to him. How it would be -- my understanding was that it would come out of the money that he was holding for me, but, yes, I definitely owe it to him.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Are there any other amounts that you believe you owe Stan, his entities?

A \(\quad\) No.
Q Are these amounts what you would consider past due?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague. Legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: The -- no. Stan knows my financial situation, so -- I mean, past due -- if I had a whole bunch of money sitting around, I would think they would be past due. I think he should be paid when \(I\) can -- as soon as \(I\) can pay him. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q Understood. So because he's your brother rather than a bank, the payment terms --

A Correct.
Q -- may be a little more flexible?
A Correct.
Q And would you have any objection to stan withholding or offsetting these owed amounts by - -
from any distributions from his entities or the family trust?

A No. I think -- I think that's -- I treated those, at least the last ones, as advances, so -absolutely not.

Q Can you turn to response No. 42 in this case, which is on page 38 of -- the response No. 42 in this exhibit which is on page 38 of 52.

A Okay.
Q Do you remember preparing this response?
A Yes.
Q And in this you were asked to describe the reasons why you did not apply for a gaming license, and you respond: Todd told me that \(I\) would be denied if I applied. He also told me that I would have to come up with the 10,000 to pay for the application process and it would hold up Todd and Stan getting their licenses. Todd told me \(I\) would get an equal share of the sales proceeds so not to worry about getting the license.

Is that a correct -- are those correct statements?

A Yes.
Q Do you have any reason to update this statement or correct it as you sit here today?

A No.
Q Did Stan tell you anything concerning the Bronco Billy's Casino as to why you wouldn't be able to get a gaming license?

A We may have talked about it. He said "You better look" -- "You better make sure about your taxes" or something like that. He might have said something like that. But he didn't tell me that \(I\) had to pay for it by myself. I never asked him.

Q And you were relying upon Todd's representations when you made the decision not to apply for a gaming license?

A Yes.
Q You had previously raised some concern about the 6 percent gifts that were made to Todd and Stan by your dad?

A Yes.
Q And was your concern that those were improper gifts that weren't actually made by your dad prior to his death?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Well, my concerns are that there's been so many documents altered and changed and who knows what that \(I\) rely on what my dad and \(I\) had discussed and that -- a lot of my -- I rely on that,
and my dad never discussed that.
And I would have understand if they had to pay for their attorney fees out of their own pockets to get a gaming license, but they didn't. The trust paid for it. So, yeah, I had a concern. I'm not -- I just didn't think that that was something my dad would have put in there, but \(I\) don't have proof of that. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q Do you have any reason to believe that Stan orchestrated that transaction or was responsible for making that -- for documenting those gifts?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Compound.
THE WITNESS: Not -- not to my knowledge. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q Do you have any reason to believe that Stan altered documents concerning that 6 percent gift to him and Todd?

A Not to my knowledge.
Q Do you have any reason to believe that that gift in April 2013 was made without your dad's knowledge?

A I'm not -- I'm not sure. I believe -- I believe that -- yes, \(I\) believe that it was something my dad possibly did not know about. I didn't -- I don't have -- I don't know. But \(I\) don't think that he
knew.
Q Did you have a conversation with him about gaming licenses at any point, with Sam?

A Yes.
Q And did Sam say that in order to continue the Pioneer Group interest, someone in the family would have to obtain a gaming license?

A He did.
Q And you understood that your dad had a gaming license?

A I did.
Q Did you understand that it was not possible to obtain a gaming license without an additional distribution of shares to one of the other family members?

A No.
Q So you thought either Stan or Todd could obtain a gaming license without ownership of any shares?

A Yes. I just -- I -- ownership of shares in the company?

Q Correct.
A I did not know that.
Q Did you believe it was not necessary for Todd to get a gaming license for him to -- let me just
start over.
Did you believe it was necessary to get a gaming license for either Todd or Stan if they were the personal owners of shares of the casino?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: What \(I\) understood is that in order for us to -- for them -- for us to receive the -- the money that the casino was holding on my dad's half -- my dad's behalf since he had passed away, that they could not be released until one of the boys or both of the boys had a gaming license or -- I think one. I don't know if it was both, but -BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q And that was your conversation with Sam?
A He had told me that, yes.
Q And so it would have been consistent with his intention, in order to get something out of that casino, that someone in the family get a gaming license?

A Well, I knew that somebody had to get a gaming license, yes.

Q And did Sam ever ask you to get a gaming license?

A I don't think he asked me, no.
Q Did he ever indicate that you should get a
gaming license or that he needed you to get a gaming license at some point?

A No, he told me that once that -- that the boys, is what he said, had a gaming license, that they would -- that \(I\) would receive my equal share.

Q And so \(I\) just want to be clear about your objection.

It doesn't seem, unless I'm wrong, that it's more to that gift and the ownership in the company; it's that you weren't equalized after the fact. Is that correct?

A Yes. And I didn't -- and I was not aware -- my dad never told me about any 6 percent additional that he'd give the boys.

Q That could have been consistent with his wishes given that they needed to obtain a gaming license?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: It could have been, yes.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q So if the family had received legal advice from a gaming attorney saying that that distribution was necessary, then that would have been consistent with your dad's wishes for the boys to obtain a gaming license?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: I wouldn't -- well, the amount -- is 6 percent what is necessary for them to -- you have to own at least 6 percent in order to get a gaming license? Is that what you're saying? BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q I'm not making that representation.
A Okay.
Q If they had received that advice, then that distribution would have been consistent with your dad's wishes?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: I could see -- I could see a distribution -- him giving them something for it. I think that 6 percent is a little steep, but \(I\) do see my dad giving them something for, you know, doing it. I just had never heard about the 12 percent. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q And you understand that -- even if you may dispute it -- that that 6 percent gift is memorialized in the second amendment?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: It's in there, yes.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q And that's the same document that also
includes a \(\$ 1.5\) million benefit for you; is that correct?

A That's correct.
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q And so did you understand -- do you have any knowledge about what the value of that 6 percent interest was?

A I don't know it right off the top of my head.

Q But without going to the validity of any documents, if you receive a \(\$ 1.5\) million benefit and each of the two boys receives the 6 percent interest, could that have been your dad's way of equalizing the three of you?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
Ambiguous. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: It possibly could. I'm not -- I don't have knowledge of that, but, yes, it possibly could.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q There no specific discussions you had with Sam about that?

A No.
Q And did you have specific discussions with
him about the 1.5 million deduction in the second amendment?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q And were those discussions tied in any way at the time to the Bronco Billy's Pioneer Group?

A \(\quad\) No.
Q So they were all separate, but around the same time period?

A He was discussing things that -- you know, that he wanted to do in order to help us out in case -- because he had found out, you know, whatever -- that he wasn't -- that his heart wasn't perfect.

Q Uh-huh. And did you understand that Stan had any role in the preparation of the second amendment?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: The preparation? I don't --
I don't believe he did.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Are you accusing Stan of forging any
documents in this case?
A No.
Q Are you accusing him of altering any documents in this case?

A Not to my knowledge at this point, no.
Q So if that 6 percent was included in the second amendment and you're challenging either that provision or the entire second amendment, is that a challenge to what \(S t a n d i d ?\)

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Not -- not to my knowledge.
I don't believe that Stan did -- did that document -I mean created it. No, I do not believe that, from what I've been told by everyone.
(Exhibit 85 was marked.)
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q I'm handing you Exhibit 85.
MR. HOSMER-HENNER: And \(I\) just have a few time questions because Counsel has a flight, and I know you have a tape. Do you know approximately how much time left we have on this tape?

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: An hour.
MR. HOSMER-HENNER: An hour left on this?
And would that be acceptable for you?
MR. JOHNSON: I need to leave at 12:30.

MR. HOSMER-HENNER: At 12:30?
MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.
MR. HOSMER-HENNER: Wendy, do you, or does anyone else, need a break in between now? Because I think \(I\) can be finished at 12:30.

THE WITNESS: I don't need a break.
MR. HOSMER-HENNER: Are you intending to have redirect questions?

MR. LATTIN: I have a couple, and \(I\) believe that she has some as well.

MR. HOSMER-HENNER: Approximately how much time do you need for those?

MS. SHANKS: I don't think we'll get done before he has to leave for his flight.

MR. HOSMER-HENNER: Do you know how much time your side has already taken up in this deposition?

MS. SHANKS: Yes.
MR. HOSMER-HENNER: Okay.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Do you recognize this document, Wendy?
A Yes.
Q And what does this appear to be?
A This was an email from me to Kevin Riley
asking for answers on -- we had a meeting, a
previously -- around this time, and \(I\) was very confused.

Q Confused about what?
A Well, this was when I learned about the indemnification, \(I\) believe. There's an email that Todd follows up with and tells me, "Wendy, I just" -"What you're asking Kevin about is something that Dad had signed for me" that Todd says he just found.

So I didn't understand the debt and obligations and why -- I didn't understand what was going on at all, how Todd was -- we were paying for Todd's things.

Q Well, let's start with paragraph 1, which was the "sale of the 1.5 mil that Lexi and \(I\) were needing." What does that refer to, the 1.5 million?

A I didn't know. Todd just put that in an email that said that -- or had told Kevin that I was refusing to sign something that required our signatures for a sale, and I didn't know what he was talking about.

Q And do you see where it says "Todd said if we didn't get that sale done, that he would have to sue the trust for not only our obligation but his 51 percent portion. What is the status?"

A Yes, Todd said that if we did not pay his
portion of some of the debts out there, that he was going to have to sue the trust and therefore bankrupt the trust.

Q And in January of 2016 that was your understanding, that Todd was threatening to sue the trust?

A Yes.
Q And what did you understand it would mean that he would bankrupt the trust?

A That's why I was asking these questions. I was -- I didn't know what that -- I didn't know what was going on.

Q Did you understand this to be related to the indemnification agreement?

A Now I do. But at that point I didn't until Todd sent me a letter saying that he had an agreement he had just found from my dad.

Q Kevin said he had just found the agreement?
A No, Todd said to me -- I kept asking Kevin these questions because Kevin was the one that would respond the quickest and give me some information, whether it was right or wrong, but he would respond.

And so I asked Kevin these questions, because we had just had a meeting, and in the meeting we were going over financials; and the financials
showed on that one column, in the amount of things that were related to Todd's indemnification, "unknown amounts." It didn't say what they were -- how much they were, you know, worth.

And so I kept saying, "Why do we owe Todd's portion?" I was confused. And that is in Todd's indemnification. But \(I\) was asking Kevin, "Why are we paying Todd's portion?"

Q Do you recall receiving a response to this email?

A Yes. And I believe it came -- this one came -- that response came from Todd.

Q This doesn't appear that you addressed it to Todd in 2016 .

A Oh, okay. Then maybe -- I just remember that Todd sent me an email regarding this.

Q And is there a reason that you didn't copy Todd on this?

A No. I would have thought I did. I mean, it was probably by mistake.

Q What do you mean, "by mistake"?
A Just typing in the names and not -- because usually when \(I\) sent them out, things on any of this, they were all copied.

Q Okay. And then you say, "I need" -- in
paragraph 4, "I need an accounting of what has been paid to Stan and Todd from Bronco Billy's and the dates they were paid to them"?

A Yes.
Q And I believe Mr. Kreitlein earlier asked you about whether that was ever received.

A Well -- received after this letter?
Q Right.
A Yes.
Q And you did receive an accounting and those dates?

A My attorneys did, yes.
Q And the insurance note, just so I understand, is that the subtrust note related to Jackrabbit in paragraph 5?

A No, that -- oh, yes. The -- yes, the Jackrabbit note that my dad assumed or that my dad -was given to my dad? Is that the one we're talking about?

Q I'm asking you, is that --
A The 1995 insurance note is what I'm talking about.

Q Okay. So I have a question about the paragraph where you say, "Again" -- could you review that -- where it says "it is not in the best interest
of the trust."
A "Again, it is not in the best interest for the trust to bring on another or continued liability on a piece of ranch property worth nothing. For what? In hope that it will have value someday in the future? It will never be worth what Todd is trying to convince us of. I have researched it. Not a chance."

Q And what's the ranch property that you understood that to be about?

A It was where the loan was -- it was -- I think it was a Bright Holl- -- Bright Holland piece of property.

But come to find out that that property wasn't even in -- where Todd said it was. I mean, I researched stuff that wasn't even right to research. I know that now.

The property was actually owned by \(I\) think Jackrabbit possibly, Jackrabbit or Buckhorn. But it wasn't what \(I\) thought it was.

Q And so you say, "It will never be worth what Todd is trying to convince us of." What did you understand that Todd was trying to convince you about?

A He was trying to say that we had to keep this debt -- there was like a \(\$ 5\) million debt to MetLife, I believe it was, or something. He was
trying -- and that debt, he was trying to tell us that we need to keep it current and that we needed to pay his 51 percent of it.

And I said, "Well, what's it worth?"
Q Uh-huh.
A And he said, "Well, it's upside down now, but at some point in the future it's going to be worth" -- "it could be worth millions," I think it was -- you know, an outrageous amount of money, and so -- that we needed to keep it current because that money would eventually benefit all of us.

Well, that wasn't the case. And I
didn't -- this is the first time I started realizing that there was a whole bunch of interest that Todd owned in companies that he wanted us to pay his portion of so that he got the property and the assets and the return for free.

Q And there's a sentence in this paragraph where it says -- it begins with "that Todd would be watched carefully by you and stan and not be able to pull his greedy and shady deals if Dad died."

A Yes.
Q Did Sam tell you that Todd wag going to be watched over by Kevin and Sam?

A Yeah -- well, no, what my dad said to me is
that he believed that nothing bad could happen or that -- yes, I guess he did say that, in so many words.

Q Did you express a concern about Todd having control over your financial future?

A I did.
Q And that was prior to Sam's death?
A Yes.
Q And Sam reassured you that Kevin and Stan would keep Todd in check, essentially?

A He said that Stan was going -- Stan was getting divorced. As soon as Stan's divorce was over, my dad was planning on making some changes to -- and \(I\) don't know what they were, but he was planning on making some changes to who was going to be in control of what.

Q And was that a result of your dad's changed feelings toward Stan or Todd or simply a result of the divorce?

MR. LATTIN: I'm going to object. It calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: Both.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q And what did you understand about your dad's changed feelings towards Stan and Todd?

A He didn't have any changed feelings towards Stan that \(I\) know of. He never -- never told me about any other than he wished that he would get on with his divorce and not be so slow with that.

My dad was -- my dad just had some -- maybe it was -- I don't know why. Maybe it was because they worked together every day and saw each other every day, but he definitely had some, you know, issues with the way Todd was handing some things.

Q And can you be any -- can you provide any specifics of that?

A That -- the companies that my dad was involved in -- and \(I\) believe Jackrabbit was one of them -- were -- these people had partners in them that were my dad's very close friends from -- you know, since he was a child. And they were contemplating suing him or they were suing him or contemplated it because of Todd's management of certain of those companies.

And then his best friend, Dave Jamieson, there was a deal that was done wrong that my dad had agreed to because -- with Todd, on Todd's side of it, and it was something with Bright Holland. I can't remember -- I know it, but it's -- I can't remember it off the top of my head -- but Todd convinced him to
purchase some property, that \(T o d d\) was supposed to buy it back from him, but he never did; just some things that were coming around back to my dad, and that he, you know, did not -- my dad hated confrontations. He did not want to get into it with anybody, with the family. He just hated that.

But then that's -- he also told me that he was -- he didn't even know where his bank account stood.

Q And did he tell you that he was beginning to lose trust in Todd?

A He didn't say those words, but he said that Todd was making him very stressed out.

Q Stressed out because of financial dealings or because of his, you know, mismanagement of companies?

A Both.
MS. SHANKS: Objection. Calls for
speculation.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q What was the -- what do you mean by "both"? What was Todd doing that was stressing out your dad?

A He just said Todd was controlling -- trying to control everything that he's worked so hard to -to contain.

Q You also state in this email to Kevin that "I know you work for the trust, but you are also a trustee."

A I was never notified that Kevin resigned.
Q So at this time in January 2016 you still believed Kevin was a trustee of the family trust?

A Yes.
Q When did you learn that Kevin was no longer a trustee?

A I think in the following email Kevin says, "I am not the trustee of the family trust. I am the trustee of the Bright Holland and kids'." (Exhibit 86 was marked.)

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q I'm showing you Exhibit 86 .
A Okay.
Q Do you recognize this document?
A Yes.
Q And you sent this to Kevin Riley in July of 2017?

A Yes.
Q And do you recall what you were asking Kevin to do with respect to the -- with respect to Bright Holland?

A I was asking him -- sorry -- I was asking
him about the third -- the Fly Geyser Burning Man money and saying what's -- now it's been three years or whatever, two years -- "What's happening with that money?" And he said that Todd was not going to distribute any of it.

And so then I asked him what my interest was worth, could he give me a financial statement on what my interest in the Bright Holland trust was worth. And he did supply me with one.

And then he said that -- I said, "Well, can I sell my interest in it?"

And he said, "Well, you'd have to talk to Todd."

And I said, "Well, will you talk to Todd" -- "Since you're my trustee, will you talk to Todd?"

And he said, "I will, but \(I\) don't know if he has any interest in purchasing it."

And that's when \(I\) was saying, "Well, he doesn't have to. He doesn't have to do anything. It would just be worth nothing to me because he controls it, so he'll never give me a distribution in it."

That's what it was regarding.
Q Did you ever have follow-up conversations with Todd about the purchase of your Bright Holland
interest?
A Kevin responded and said, in an email, "I've discussed with Todd about the" -- "about him buying out your interest in Bright Holland, and he said that he is" -- "that that's a possibility, but he wants there to be a full settlement made, not just that. He wants everything included," of my dad's trust -- will and trust.

Q In 2017 he was seeking a full settlement of everything that he had done for the trust?

A To buy me out. That's what he was saying is, like, he wants me to settle in order -- if he wants me just to buy out the 13 percent, that won't happen, but we could do a buyout of everything.

Q Were you contemplating litigation at this time in July 2017?

A Yes.
Q And had you made that known to Todd?
A He knew.
Q But to be fair, you had been threatening litigation for several years; is that right?

A Not for several years, but I had been threatening it since \(I\) stopped trusting him. So it probably -- I don't know when that started. Probably 2016 or the end of '15.

Q Let's quickly go to Exhibit 87, then.
A Okay.
(Exhibit 87 was marked.)
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q This is Exhibit 87 .
A Oh, I thought you were talking about the Bright Holland buyout -- I'm sorry -- on the last question.

Q No problem.
So you -- it would be fair to say that you had been essentially threatening litigation since at least 2014?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
Ambiguous.
THE WITNESS: I think that from the day Dad died \(I\) was -- not threatening, but \(I\) was saying that \(I\) needed to know things; and if I didn't, I was getting an attorney, yes.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q And you had mentioned that Todd was making the distributions to you contingent upon your monthly maintenance payments, is that correct, or contingent on you signing documents?

A Now, that -- \(I\) would say probably
95 percent. There were some times that didn't happen.

Q Sure.

On the flip side, and just to be fair, you were also asking for information in exchange for not suing frequently?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: That's true.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q And so if you look on the second page of this document, 87, there's a sentence near the bottom after your signature where it says "Stan, I will be picking up the thousand you said would be ready to go before noon on Saturday. Todd, do not continue to blackmail me into signing things in order to receive monies."

A Yes.
Q And is that what you just referred to, that Todd was making things contingent upon your signature?

A Well, I mean, I trusted Todd still at this point, I really did, because \(I\) just thought he was being stubborn about things. I thought he was trying to, you know, like -- I don't know -- control, just be a control freak.

But it didn't seem like anything was going wrong with -- you know, I didn't know anything about, like, the Tahoe house or anything like that. So I
just thought he was just being really controlling.
So yes. And he did make me always do that, sign documents.

Q And earlier in the page you ask, "Is Bob LeGoy your attorney, Todd?"

A Right.
Q "And, Stan, who is yours? They will be sent the filings from my attorney."

A Yes. I didn't have one. I was just saying that.

Q It was a bluff?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And so there were no filings?
A \(\quad\) No.
Q If you go up a little bit further, it also says "We are moving to Vegas ASAP and my attorney will be addressing that to you."

And that was a bluff as well?
A Yeah.
Q Okay. When you talk about Buckhorn closing again a little bit higher, what do you mean by Buckhorn -- "I'm glad the Buckhorn closed in 2014"?

A Oh. Todd -- that's what I'm saying. I still believed that Todd was doing good with the businesses at that time. He had just closed an
easement with Buckhorn that was -- I don't know. He had several of them. I think they equaled up to be, like, \(\$ 19\) million or something. But he had all these easements that he was in the process of securing with the State.

And I don't know how much Buckhorn's was. It might have been a couple million or whatever. But there's an email, \(I\) think the first email we ever received after my dad's death, that Todd sent all of us that says -- and it's been produced -- that says "I just want" -- "Hi, guys, \(I\) want to inform you of what's going on," and he told us that he had just closed the Bright Holland easement and was trying to do Buckhorn's and several other easements -- I can't remember which companies -- but that he was making money.

Q And did you understand that to be a conservation easement?

A I believe that's what it was maybe, yeah.
Q Was that a payment from the federal
government?
A Or the State. I can't remember what they were. Either the state or the federal government, right.

Q And so that was the closing you were
referring to about Buckhorn?
A Yes.
Q And were you provided with information
about that closing?
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Obviously not.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Even after sending this email?
A No.
Q When you are asking for information about Bronco Billy's a few sentences up -- you say, "I want to know what the two of you say is happening with Bronco Billy's too" --

A Yes.
Q -- what did -- sorry.
A I'm sorry. I didn't know what the question was.

Q At this time did you understand that there was going to be a pending sale of the company?

A I've got to find the Bronco Billy's portion. I'm still on this -- is that on page 2?

Q Page 2, yes.
A What is your question, now?
Q Did you understand there was a pending sale of Bronco Billy's?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: I don't know. Let's see what the date is here.

Oh, there wasn't a sale at that time.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Okay. What did you -- why were you asking about Bronco Billy's, then?

A Just seeing what had happened -- what's going on with the company, asking general questions; would they please tell me what's happening with the company.

Q At the bottom of WJ010614 there's a sentence from Todd Jaksick on February 5, 2014, where he says, "Tahoe. I can't let you put the company operation at risk. You are refusing to leave, and I will have no choice but to have you removed. That is really, really silly, so let's try to figure it out today. Please call me."

Were you staying in the Tahoe house in February 2014?

A They asked me to -- or not they, I'm sorry -- Todd mainly -- Stan knew \(I\) was going to -they asked me to move into the Tahoe house because my dad's wife was there, and she was not acting properly.

It was -- you know, with some shady characters and so forth. And they wanted me to go and -- move into the house, try and get things -- help her get things packed up so that she could move out. So that's what I did.

As soon as I got that done, got her moved out, then my purpose for Todd was over and so he wanted me to be moved out.

Q And in February of 2014 Janene had been moved out?

A Yes.
Q And so he was telling you to -- he was essentially trying to evict you from that house then?

A It was my time, yeah.
Q And he says, "I can't let you put the company operations at risk." What did you understand the company operations to be at that time?

A I didn't even know what he was talking about.

Q Did he say -- did he tell you at that time that he was trying to rent out the Tahoe property?

A We were going to do some construction on the Tahoe property before it was ever rented, and that hadn't happened yet.

Q And was that construction about to happen
in February 2014, if you can recall?
A I would say within a couple of months. It was probably too cold up there, I mean, still, snow-wise, but --

Q That's not really the typical construction season?

A Yeah, no. Not in Incline.
Q Going back to paragraph -- sorry. Just on 87. Did you understand that the Lake Tahoe house was owned by a company in February 2014?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: A company? I thought that we all owned it.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q So when he says "company operations at risk," do you have any specific understanding what he meant in that email?

A No.
Q The ownership of any company that might have the Tahoe house?

A No. I thought we all owned it together.
Q Turning to back to 86, this is where you had wanted another email reflecting your request to have your 13 percent interest bought out by Todd?

> A Correct.

Q And halfway in the page you say -- on WJO11190 you say, "Please ask Todd what cash value he would give me for my 13 percent of Bright Holland." Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And then, "Don't ask Stan. I don't want him to even consider it. Stan is a good" -- and did you mean "Stan is good" or "Stan is a god"? I accept either answer.

A He definitely wasn't -- I didn't think of him as a god, so it must have been "good."

Q "Stan is good, and this does him no good." And why did you believe that Stan buying 13 percent of Bright Holland would do Stan no good?

A Because Todd would have controlled it and never give him a distribution.

Q So basically it was a hundred percent minority discount?

A Yes.
Q And you thought Todd would want the 13 percent in order to help you out or because it would provide some benefit to Todd?

A Well, that's why \(I\) think he didn't do it -he wouldn't provide -- wouldn't -- he didn't want to help me out, I don't think. I think he wanted to -- I
just thought maybe he'd want the whole thing; he'd want my portion so he could, you know, keep increasing his percentages of ownership.

But he kept my -- whenever there was the distribution, he kept my portion anyway. So it really didn't matter if he bought me out or not.

Q How do you know he kept your portion of the distribution?

A Well, I mean, granted, he -- I don't know what the entitlement was to the operating agreement or whatever for Bright Holland, but I'm talking about Burning Man sale.

And I know that that 13 percent -- Stan and I thought we would each get our 13 percent of the Burning Man Fly Geyser sale. And \(I\) know that Todd was told by counsel, from what Stan told me -- LeGoy counsel -- that that was a good time to give Wendy some money.

Q From the Bright Holland --
A From the Bright Holland sale of Fly Geyser, Burning Man.

Q So there's a piece of property called Fly Geyser, and that sold. That's owned by the Bright Holland company?
A It was.

Q And then it was sold to the Burning Man folks?

A Yes. For 6.5 million.
Q And that 6.5 million, your understanding, went to Bright Holland LLC, the Bright Holland company?

A Yes.
Q Do you understand there to be an LLC that was owned by the family trust called Fly Geyser LLC?

A I didn't know -- yes, I do.
Q Do you understand what the function or purpose of that LLC was?

A That's a good question. No.
Q Was there any discussions with your dad about having tours or commercializing the Fly Geyser in any way?

A At one point, yes, I do remember.
Q And was that connected with this Fly Geyser LLC in any way?

A Well, I would assume so, if that's -- I don't have specific knowledge of that, but \(I\) would assume that would be true.

Q But no personal knowledge of what Sam wanted to do with Fly Geyser LLC?
\[
\text { A } \quad \text { No. }
\]

Q So the Burning Man sale transferred the money to the Bright Holland entity, 6.5 million?

A I'm not sure if they put it there or if they gave it to Fly Geyser LLC. I don't know where it went.

Q And here you're requesting Todd buy
13 percent of your interest in Bright Holland?
A Yes.
Q And you were doing that on the belief that that 13 percent was worth approximately -- at least 13 percent of the 6.5 million sale proceeds?

A Well, Kevin sent me -- Kevin sent me a financial statement, and on it it said it was worth 500,000 .

Q Your 13 percent interest?
A Yes.
Q And is that what you were requesting, or you were requesting some cash value from Todd at some --

A I just wanted him to tell me what he'd pay me for it -- mean try to see if he'd pay me anything for it.

Q Now, you said, "Don't ask stan. I don't want him to even consider it." But one of the agreements we previously looked at that was prepared
either by you or Whelan was a request to stan, was it not, for him to buy an interest in Bright Holland?

A Yes. But then after I had had a discussion with Kevin and he explained to me -- when I asked him -- when he told me that it was around \(\$ 500,000\) and I asked him what that entailed, he goes, "Oh, just some stock in some equipment."

And \(I\) said, "That's what the company owns? That's what the assets that you're telling me that I have are?"

And he said, "Yes," and he said, "and Todd has complete control over the company, and Todd can decide whether he wants to give you anything or not," and went into this big spiel.

And so I said, "Well" -- that's when I said, "Well, \(I\) don't want stan involved in trying to buy it because it would just screw Stan over." The only person that would benefit would be Todd.

Q In July 2017 you understand that that sale had already been consummated?

A Yes.
Q And so the company didn't just have assets of -- sorry -- didn't just have assets of some equipment and stock; it had \(\$ 6\) million?

A Well, that's what I thought.

Q So that was the value of the company at the time you were negotiating this with Stan too?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: It was actually worth a lot -- I thought -- a lot more than that because I know Bright Holland owned a ton of land. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q When -- did you have -- were you involved in the negotiation of sale?

A No.
Q Did you receive any documentation concerning that sale?

A \(\quad\) No.
Q Did you understand that the family trust provided any funds to Bright Holland in connection with that sale?

A Did I what?
Q Did you understand that the family trust provided any funds to Bright Holland in connection of that -- with that sale?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Why would -- that wouldn't make sense to me why the family trust gave Bright Holland money on a sale where they were receiving 6.5 million. I don't understand that, if that's what
you're asking me.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Well, did you hear the testimony of Stan that he believed that Todd took 434,000 to assist with the closing of the Bright Holland sale?

A I don't think \(I\) knew that.
Q And is that -- let's assume that that happened. Is that something that you would have consented to, to taking money out of the family trust to transfer to Bright Holland?

A I do know what you're talking -- I was -yes. You were saying that -- to pay off the note on Fly -- Fly Geyser during the sale. Is that what you're saying? Is that what we're talking --

Q Are you aware of that -- that transaction?
A No.
Q So what was the note that you were just referencing?

A I was referencing what -- when you were saying that they gave -- the trust gave Bright Holland money, I mean, that's ludicrous in the sense that -unless it was to -- they had -- in order -- unless it was to be done in order to make the sale go through, then \(I\) could see that happening, but --

Q And did you understand that the family
trust had to do that in order to make the sale go through?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Well, it wouldn't make sense.
Being a real estate person, I would think they would just deduct it from the 6.5 they were buying it for. BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:

Q Were you ever asked to consent to that use -- to any use of family trust funds in connection with any such sale or note --

A Never.
Q -- with respect to Bright Holland?
A \(\quad\) No.
Q And you say in this email, "I just can't understand why when Dad was alive, the company's debt were paid separately, Todd, all those notes for his debt" -- is that "portions"?

A Yes.
Q "After death, the trust pays them all for him."

Was it your understanding that when your dad was alive, that on the items that you are aware about on the indemnification agreement or any joint obligations, your dad would pay 51 percent if that was his ownership and Todd would pay 49 percent if that
was his ownership?
A That is correct. And I confirmed that with Kevin, and Kevin agreed.

Q Kevin agreed that while your dad was alive, the payment obligation with respect to a note for Bright Holland would be whatever proportion out of the family trust that your dad owned?

A That is correct.
Q And are you aware of any circumstances where the family trust or sam would pay a hundred percent of a debt obligation when Todd owned a portion of that equity or asset?

A Only in the form of a note that Todd would be responsible to pay back.

Q So that would be Todd, though, still
borrowing - -
A Correct.
Q -- in order to meet his obligation there?
A That's correct.
Q And here you say, "I think that every penny
we have paid him for indemnification debt should become a note payable to the trust with interest."

Did Kevin tell you that amounts had been paid under the indemnification agreement?
\[
\text { A } \quad I \quad-\quad I \text { can't recall, but } I \text { think he did. }
\]

Q So did he recall which specific indemnifications the family trust had distributed money or paid on --

A No. No. There have been some funds paid.
Q Do you have an understanding now of where those funds went?

A Not a good one. But I'm getting -- I'm definitely starting to see that -- where they went.

Q What's your understanding of where any funds went pursuant to Todd's indemnification agreement?

A To Todd.
Q Directly to Todd or to Todd's entities?
A Some were paid on his behalf, like a note payable, you know, that was due. The family trust would pay on Todd's behalf so Todd would not have to pay that portion of it. We paid it all.

Or Todd -- I know that Todd was -- had given or -- was or had given at that time a bill or an invoice to the trust asking to be repaid for certain things that he had paid for regarding that. So they would either go to -- if those were the ones that were being repaid -- I assume would go straight to Todd. The other ones, like I said, were paid on Todd's behalf.

Q And do you recall what entities those were related to?

A No. I know Jackrabbit was one of them. I don't know the others, \(I\) mean, off the top of my head.

Q What about Bright Holland?
A Oh, um -- yes, but -- I think that Todd moved all the property out of Bright Holland and put it in another entity, but \(I\) don't remember how that -or \(I\) still don't know how that happened.

Q But do you recall transactions related to an indemnification agreement with Bright Holland?

A You mean did he ask for money from Bright Holland? I don't remember. I never saw any.

Q What about with respect to Duck Lake?
A \(\quad\) No.
Oh, the \(\$ 85,000\) transfer of the plane.
That's the only one I saw.
Q And what about Buckhorn?
A \(\quad\) No.
Q And you had testified that you believe there were significant amounts of water rights that Todd took or converted or altered the ownership of?

A Significant.
Q And were those belonging to White Pine?
A Some were White Pine, some were Home Camp,
some were Lakeridge Golf Course, some were Jaksick Family LLC. Off the top of my head, that's -- White Pine Ranch, Bright Holland.

Q And do you know where these water rights belong to now?

A Either in Todd's trust or in Duck Lake Ranch, which Todd owns.

Q And what's your understanding of -- is it Duck Lake Flats or Duck Ranch Flats?

A Duck Lake -- Duck Flat Ranch. I don't know -- that -- I don't think that -- that might have been -- some might have been transferred there too. I don't really even know what that is.

Q Have you requested information about that?
A I think so.
Q Have you received any of that information?
A I don't know off the top of my head. I
don't -- I think that it was involved in Todd's 43 company things or whatever that we requested, but I don't know if we received any information on it.

I didn't know -- I didn't ever look at that as a big -- when \(I\) looked into it originally, \(I\) don't think that it had much in there except for maybe a little bit of land. But that could have definitely changed. It changes daily, it seems like.

Q So in this litigation the first -- this litigation was commenced by the filing of a petition by two of the co-trustees. You understand that?

A I do.
Q At that point in time were you committed to litigating against the trust yourself?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Were you absolutely going to file suit against the trust at the time the co-trustees filed their petition?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Well, I never wanted to file suit to sue them if they would have just given me what my portion would have been.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q But it wasn't your 100 percent intention at the time that this litigation was commenced to engage in litigation against your family?

A No. But it made the clock tick when I read it -- about it, that \(I\) had a certain amount of time to respond or it was like it was done.

Q And when you say "read it," you mean you read the petition filed by the co-trustees?

A Yes.
Q And at that point did you believe your hand was forced into making claims related to the trust?

A Forced, and forced to do quickly.
Q And in this litigation you've heard Stan testify about an investment account he shared with his father?

A Yes.
Q Do you recall that investment account?
A I don't recall it. I just recall what I've been told.

Q And there are items on the financial statements related to that investment account?

A Jakmar [sic], I think, is the name, or Mar- -- yes, I believe so.

Q And have you ever requested information related to that investment account?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: When \(I\) requested all the information to be detailed on financial statements, that would have been one of them.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Have you ever been denied information about that investment account?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.

THE WITNESS: Denied? No.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Stan's never told you "I'm not going to give you any information about that"?

A No one did. But no.
Q Do you have any claims related to that investment account in this litigation?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: Do I have any claims?
"Claims" meaning?
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Do you think Stan did anything wrong with respect to that investment account?

MR. JOHNSON: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. I mean, not at this -- I don't recall him doing it, but \(I\) would probably need to look into it further. But at this point \(I\) don't know. I don't know.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q And were you aware at a point in time -- at any point in time since your dad's death that one of the Lakeridge entities was providing loans to the family trust?

A Yes, I do.
Q And were you asked to sign an ACPA with
respect to those loans?
A I don't -- not that \(I\) recall, no.
Q Do you recall the interest rate or any documentation related to the loans of those Lakeridge loans to the family trust?

A No.
Q Did you know that Lakeridge was a -- you know, a cash-flow-positive entity during that time?

A Yes.
Q And is that your understanding as to why the loans came from Lakeridge to the family trust?

A Yes.
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Did you understand that there were any other entities really available, making money, that could keep the family trust afloat during this time?

A I was -- I really wasn't sure. It seemed like -- but \(I\) know that they were counting on stan to put money in from Lakeridge to keep it going until we figured out what to do with -- where money was or whatever.

Q And you were aware of that --
A Yes.
Q -- at the time it happened?

Did you have any objection to that happening?

A No.
Q Did you have any concern with Stan loaning money to the family trust from Lakeridge given what you know now?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: No. And back then I trusted them both so much, I just -- whatever they wanted to do.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q So both at the time and in hindsight, you think that was an appropriate loan?

A For Lakeridge to give money to the trust? Yes.

Q Correct.
You've heard testimony from Stan that he repaid Lakeridge with part of the proceeds of the Bronco Billy's sale?

A Yes.
Q Do you have any objection to that repayment?

A To the repayment? No.
Q Do you think that it was necessary for the family trust to borrow money from Lakeridge in order
to keep the entire enterprise afloat?
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: To my recollection, from what I've been told to this date, then \(I\) think so. I don't think it was going to personally pay for Stan's things.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q And you think it was appropriate for Lakeridge to be repaid from family trust assets?

A If -- if they borrowed money from them, then \(I\) would think that we would be good creditors and pay them back.

Q And you understood that the family trust had borrowed money from Lakeridge?

A Oh, yes, I definitely knew that because it was on the -- everything, yeah.

Q And so you have no objection to the repayment of those loans to Lakeridge from the family trust?

A \(\quad\) No.
Q And you've heard testimony and you were personally aware that \(S t a n\) set aside \(\$ 400,000\) from the Bronco Billy's account in what he believed was something for your benefit?

A Yes.
Q And did you have any problem with Stan retaining those funds in a subtrust?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Do you have an objection to Stan retaining those funds, even today, in that subtrust?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: I think that -- you mean do I
trust him?
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Well, let's start with that question.
A Okay.
Q Do you still trust Stan?
A Yes.
Q And do you know why he set aside those \(\$ 400,000\) ?

A Because he felt that if it went into the family trust, that it would be taken out for the indemnification, and therefore \(I\) would not receive any.

Q And do you agree with that feeling?
A Yes.
Q If you were in Stan's shoes, would you have
set aside that 400,000 for him if the roles were reversed?

A Yes.
MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Speculation.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q So you have no objection with the way Stan has managed those \(\$ 400,000\) in proceeds?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: From what \(I\) know -- from what
I know -- I don't know -- I mean, from what Stan's told me is all \(I\) can say. So \(I\) don't -- as long as it is done -- is consistent with what Stan told me, then I have no objection. It's just I don't have proof or anything, but --

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Based on what you understand today, after receiving every document in this case --

A Right.
Q -- you have no objection to that specific action that \(S\) tan took with respect to the \(\$ 400,000\) ? MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Misstates facts. THE WITNESS: On the -- based -- I mean, based on the knowledge that \(I\) have, I don't think that there's been any -- I don't have a problem with it based on what \(I\) know, what I've been told.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Are you aware of Todd setting aside any funds for you in the family trust?

A I'm not aware of them. I don't - no.
Q Has he told you that he has done anything like that?

A Well, when \(I\) trusted him back in the day, he was telling me he was always doing things for me, but they never -- they didn't happen.

Q Specifically with respect to the Bronco Billy's distribution --

A No.
Q -- Todd has not told you that he has set aside any funds for you?

A \(\quad\) No.
Q And there's been discussion about
equalization. Were you -- did you receive communications from Maupin, Cox concerning your ability or right to be equalized from the Bronco Billy's distributions?

A I don't know -- I think it was from Kevin. I'm not -- I don't think it was from Maupin, Cox.

Q And what do you recall from those communications from Kevin concerning your right to be equalized?

A That \(I\) was not going to be equalized because there was no reason to be because it was split -- it was taken out of the -- Bronco Billy's was taken out of the family trust and was now owned individually by Stan and Todd.

Q With respect to the 6 percent gifts. But the remaining interest was still a family trust asset?

A No. Not according to Kevin.
Q Kevin told you that the entirety of the Bronco Billy's sales proceeds were held individually by Stan and Todd?

A Yes, he did, in an email.
Q And did he follow up with Stan or Todd about that?

A Yes.
Q And what did they tell you with respect to Kevin's representation?

A I can't remember what Stan told me, but he said that we needed to get a meeting together and talk about it, because he was under the impression that whatever they were doing was, you know, correct.

Q Stan suggested a meeting?
A Yes.
Q Did you receive any communication from Todd about the Bronco Billy's distribution?

A From Kevin I did, which is when -- when I asked Todd, lots of times I'd get them from Kevin -I'd get a response from Kevin instead.

Q And was that subsequent communication telling you that the family trust was owning none of the Bronco Billy's proceeds?

A There's an email that has been produced from Kevin to me that says there is -- there's -- the family trust does -- "I do not have to discuss this issue," or whatever, "because the family trust no longer has an interest in Bronco Billy's. It is now outside of the trust, and Stan and Todd own it individually," and that the -- something had been sent to change all of the ownership -- ownership
documentation had been sent to Bronco Billy's.
It's a long -- it's a long email that he responded about several things.

Q Could you see if that's Exhibit 57 in your binder?

A That's 56. Sorry. You got it? Thank you. Okay. No. I don't think this was it.

Q There's a reference to Bronco Billy's on TJ1318.

A I see that, but this is not the email I'm
talking about.
Q On this email it says "No gaming monies may be distributed without a license."

A Correct.
Q Did you have any reason to disagree with that?

A Not at this time, because it wasn't -- the sale had not -- was not -- was not going on.

Q And it also says "No obligations to beneficiaries can be completed yet until creditors have been satisfied or debt assumed."

A Yes. That's what it says.
Q And did you have any reason to disagree with these statements in between this time period on January -- on, excuse me, May 2014 and the sale of Bronco Billy's?

MR. JOHNSON: Legal conclusion.
Speculation.
THE WITNESS: This wasn't -- this -- this is not the sale of Bronco Billy's. That's not what we're discussing here.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q But between now and the sale --
A Oh, no, I believed -- yes, I believed -- I trusted all of them.

Q And no reason to disagree with these representations by Kevin?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Speculation. THE WITNESS: No.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q Did you ever receive any other information saying -- changing Kevin's advice here or his opinions?

A No. Up until the sale, when he told me that it wasn't owned by the family trust anymore.

Q And so that document -- which I don't think has been included as a deposition exhibit -- you're saying that that represented to you that the family trust had no interest in Bronco Billy's?

A That the -- that Bronco Billy's was no longer a part of the family trust; it was owned individually, 50/50, by Stan's trust and Todd's trust, and therefore the -- that the proceeds from the sale had nothing to do with the family trust.

Q But you understood that the information was subsequently -- that those assets were subsequently -or at least a portion of those -- were transferred to the family trust?

A Yes. I believe that was after my counsel at the time, Dana Dwiggins, demanded it or something.

I think that's what happened. She wanted the money to go there.

Q And your understanding is that as a result of her demand, the advisors to the trust changed their opinion and put the money back in the family trust?

A I believe after her -- she talked with the Maupin, Cox group, that that's what was determined. I believe that's what happened. I can't remember off the top of my head, but \(I\) believe that's right.

Q So your initial understanding was that there was no obligation for the family trust or the co-trustees to put any of the Bronco Billy's sale proceeds into the family trust?

A That's correct. From Kevin's email.
Q And do you recall the approximate date of that email?

A Two thousand -- let's see. It would have been 2016 or '17.

I think I have it in my car. No, maybe I don't.

I don't know. I don't know, off the top of my head, when it was. But it was probably within 60 days after the closing of Bronco Billy's, so whenever that was.

Q And this is just -- this is \(\$ 6\) million at
stake, so it's important that \(I\) understand what your position is here.

But there's \(\$ 6\) million in sales. Did Stan ever represent to you that you would be getting nothing as a result of the sale of Bronco Billy's?

A He said it was complicated and that I needed to discuss -- he said he didn't -- I needed to talk to Kevin and Todd about it because he didn't -he said that some things had changed and he was -didn't really -- I should talk to them, and he really didn't understand what had changed.

Q And other than that email, did Todd ever represent to you that the 6 million proceeds would not benefit you or the family trust in any way?

A No, Todd never did.
Q He never had a conversation with you about the sale of Bronco Billy's?

A Just an email saying, yes, it is great news, you know, hopefully that they will be able to follow through and buy it or something.

Q And what about Kevin Riley? Other than that one email you referenced, did he ever tell you that you would be getting nothing from the Bronco Billy's sale?

A In that email, yes. Other than that email,
no.
Q And so that email said it's not in the family trust, and there's no obligation to put it back in there, and you're going to get nothing from Bronco Billy's?

A In so many words. It said it's no longer part of the family trust; it's owned by the two boys individually.

Q And why didn't you file suit at that exact moment?

A Well, I think we were starting to. I mean, because he said that -- he said that -- I had an attorney at the time. For sure I did.

But he said that it had been removed from the family trust, that it was going into the boys' -and when I asked him why -- I said, "Why did that happen?" And in that email he said, "Because if we wanted to figure out" -- "give you" -- "give you a portion of it, we would have to have a costly appraisal done, and we didn't want to pay for a costly appraisal to see what your portion should be."

Q So it wasn't as a result of the gaming license issue, it was just a refusal to have an appraisal done?

A That was during -- for the sale, that's
what it was, yeah, that it was an appraisal --because I said, "I just found out that you don't have to be licensed, have a gaming license, if it sold or something."

Q How did you find that out?
A I called the Department of Gaming, Colorado Department of Gaming, and asked them.

Q And they provided that representation to you over the phone?

A Yes. It was a very simple question. Do you need to have -- if you -- if there's a sale of a casino, do you have to be an owner or licensed -- not owner -- do you have to be a licensed person in the state of Colorado -- not California, I'm sorry -- to receive proceeds.

Q But how can you receive proceeds from the sale of a casino if you weren't the owner of a casino?

A You could -- you could --
MR. JOHNSON: Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: Well, you could -- they could be gifted at a sale. Not proceeds when you're getting monies, like, monthly, but at the sale you could -you could -- it could go to anyone. You could give it to anyone is what -- I don't remember the words exactly. But you didn't have to be licensed to
receive it.
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q After everything was distributed?
A After they -- after -- I guess it was
after, you know, the money was received.
Q But just to be clear, they did not tell you that they could distribute the funds from the proceeds of a sale directly to a non-licensee?

A They told me that the -- that as -- that you did not have to be an owner -- not an owner, I'm sorry -- a licensed -- have a Colorado gaming license in order to see the proceeds of a sale, and they said this -- because there are different kinds of licenses.

There's a certain -- if you own less than 5 percent, you can have a certain kind of license, and, you know, if you own whatever else like that -but, yes, that you did not have to -- that you could -- it could be given to, I think they told me, the ACPS -- I mean the dog shelter -- if they wanted to gift it to that.

Q Gifted after the initial recipient got the funds?

A Well, yeah. I mean, obviously they're going to send the initial check to the -- to the company that -- you know, to Pioneer Group.

Q Right.
A Right.
Q And the owners of Pioneer Group are the only ones entitled to receive a portion of that initial check?

A Well, of course --
MR. JOHNSON: Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm assuming --
BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q So you thought that Stan and Todd should then gift the money back to you, or at least one-third of their share?

A Or that Pioneer Group could, because Pioneer Group was paid a large check and then -- of the 30 million --

Q Uh-huh.
A -- and then distributed it to, you know -it should have been to Dad's trust.

Q To the family trust?
A Yes.
Q Was it your understanding that the
25 percent interest was distributed out of the family trust to Todd and Stan individually?

A That's what Kevin told me.
Q Is it possible that they could have
distributed it to the subtrusts under the family trust for Todd and Stan?

MR. JOHNSON: Speculation.
THE WITNESS: He told me that -- I don't know what the difference is between the trust and the subtrust, but it went \(50 / 50\) to them.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q The subtrusts. Okay.
A And that it wasn't in the family trust. That's what he told me.

Q Do you believe that \(S\) tan arranged for that distribution from the Pioneer Group?

A I don't think Stan knew much more about it than I did.

Q So do you have any specific claims against Stan either as a co-trustee or individual with respect to how the Pioneer Group transaction was arranged, distributed, set up, et cetera?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure that I have -- I don't believe that \(S t a n\) did anything intentional, but I don't know what the -- I don't have enough information for me to decipher if something was done that shouldn't have been done.

BY MR. HOSMER-HENNER:
Q So it's just a lack of knowledge --
A Yes.
Q -- rather than any specific belief, even, that Stan did anything wrong with respect to Bronco Billy's?

MR. JOHNSON: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: That's correct. I don't know about -- I don't know that there's any -- everything could have been wrong. Everything could have been -my lack of knowledge is hindering me.

Q Wendy, that's -- given the flight of opposing counsel, that's all questions \(I\) have today. We reserve our right to hold you over at a subsequent deposition if we need to.

MR. HOSMER-HENNER: Do you have any questions that you want to try to get in?

MR. LATTIN: I don't think we have time.
But we do, on behalf of the trustees, reserve our right to go back and question on things that came up during your questions and Mr. Kreitlein's questions that we did not have a chance to go into.

MS. SHANKS: We join in that as his individual counsel.

> MR. JOHNSON: I'm going to object to that.

They've had more than, \(I\) think, three days of what they were allotted, and we gave them more time yesterday and, you know -- this has been going on forever.

So I'm going to take off now, and I guess we'll deal with that later.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Would you like to conclude for today?

MR. HOSMER-HENNER: Yes, please.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes today's Video Deposition of Wendy Jaksick, Volume V.

One copy of the original video discs will be delivered to Robison, Sharp, Sullivan \& Brust, 71 Washington Street, Reno, Nevada. The total number of video discs used was two.

We are going off record, and the monitor time is approximately 12:33 p.m.

> (Deposition adjourned at 12:33 p.m.)
- ○○○-
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\end{array}
\] & 1258:23, 1259:16, \\
\hline 1118:2, 1138:6, & 1129:21, 1170:17, & 1224:8 bankrupt \({ }^{2]}\) - & 1099:13 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1259:20, 1260:14, } \\
& \text { 1260:15, 1261:12, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1192:17, 1253:23, } \\
& \text { 1254:17, 1255:1, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1194:4, 1194:8 attempting \({ }_{[1]}\) - & \[
\text { 1217:2, } 1217: 9
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { beneficiary }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\
& \text { 1106:18 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1260:15, 1261:12,
1261:23, 1262:5,
1261:23, 1262:5, \\
\hline \[
1256: 2,1256: 14
\] & 1125:7 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { base }[1]-1130: 21 \\
& \text { based }[25]-1110: 14,
\end{aligned}
\] & BENEFICIARY \({ }_{[1]}\) - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1262:17, 1262:24, } \\
& 1263: 5,1268: 6
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
ASPCA [1] - 1134:10 \\
asserted [1] - 1146:8
\end{tabular} & 1123:14, 1155:23, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1110:17, 1113:21, } \\
& \text { 1113:22, 1120:8, }
\end{aligned}
\] & benefit [15] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { binder }[3]-1173: 20, \\
& \text { 1202:24, 1258:19 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

CAPTIONS UNLIMITED OF NEVADA, INC. (775) 746-3534

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Certified [3] - & 1144:22 & co-trustee [43] - & 1186:2, 1218:1 & 1153:21, 1202:17, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1099:17, 1100:24, } \\
& \text { 1271:4 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
clarify [3] - 1121:9, \\
1142:11, 1142:17
\end{tabular} & 1103:5, 1104:13, 1104:23, 1106:14 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { coming [2] - 1165:2, } \\
& \text { 1224:3 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
1202:18 \\
complicated [1] -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline certify [3] - 1271:6, & clear [3] - 1128:4, & 1106:17, 1106:24, & commenced [2] - & 1262:6 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1272:22, } 1273: 6 \\
& \text { cetera }[1]-1267: 18
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1210:6, } 1265: 6 \\
& \text { clearly }[1]-1200: 18
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1107:3, 1108:2, } \\
& \text { 1108:19, 1110:25, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
1248: 2,1248: 19
\] commercializing [1] & comply [1] - 1190:1 compound [5] - \\
\hline chain [1]-1196:24 & client [1] - 1104:23 & 1111:5, 1111:24, & - 1238:15 & 1109:13, 1143:18, \\
\hline challenge [1] - & clock [1] - 1248:21 & 1112:18, 1113:6 & committed [1] - & 1149:6, 1160:5, \\
\hline 1214:9 & \begin{tabular}{l}
close [3]-1136:3, \\
1181:7, 1223:15
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1113:24, 1117:4, } \\
& \text { 1118:23, 1119:7, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1248:5 & 1207:12 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
1214:7 \\
chance \([3]\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { closed [5] - 1136:17, } \\
& \text { 1136:18, 1230:22, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1119:13, 1120:6, } \\
& \text { 1121:4, 1122:15, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1115:13, 1128:8 } \\
& \text { communicated [2] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
1159:18 \\
concern [5] -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1174:20, 1220:7,
\(1268: 22\) & \[
1230: 25,1231: 13
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1122:20, 1123:12, } \\
& \text { 1124:18, 1125:19. }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
1128: 15,1129: 10
\] & 1206:14, 1206:18, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1268:22 } \\
& \text { change }[2]-1110: 7,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { closely }[3]-1183: 24, \\
& \text { 1184:10, 1185:6 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1124:18, 1125:19,
1132:21, 1138:8, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { communication [8] - } \\
& \text { 1143:10, 1146:22, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1207:5, 1222:4, } \\
& \text { 1252:4 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1258:14 & closest [1] - 1142:14 & 1139:16, 1140:23, & 1156:22, 1156:23, & concerned [2] - \\
\hline Change/Add/Delete & closing [6]-1136:4, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1141:3, 1141:21, } \\
& \text { 1145:23, 1147:1, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1159:6, 1169:6,
1257:24, 1258:4 & 1138:2, 1161:2 \\
\hline [1] - 1272:8 changed [11] - & 1230:20, 1231:25,
1232:4, 1242:5, & 1149:1, 1149:20, & communications [4] & 1113:16, 1114:2, \\
\hline 1110:6, 1180:22, & 1261:23 & 1150:1, 1150:13, & - 1171:13, 1171:17, & 1124:12, 1139:14, \\
\hline 1181:2, 1206:23, & Co [4]-1113:13, & 1153:17, 1155:14, & 1256:18, 1256:24 & 1145:14, 1181:3, \\
\hline 1222:17, 1222:25,
1223:1, 1247:25, & 1116:22, 1139:11,
1141:13 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1155:16, 1200:16, } \\
& \text { 1267:16 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { companies [11] - } \\
\text { 1114:16, 1154:13, }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1206:2, 1207:16 } \\
& \text { 1241:12, 1256:18, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1261:4, 1262:9, & co [73] - 1103:5, & Co-Trustees [3] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1114:16, 1154:13, } \\
& \text { 1154:14, 1163:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1256:24 \\
\hline 1262:11 & 1103:8, 1104:13, & 1113:13, 1116:22, & 1168:16, 1196:22, & concerns [1] - \\
\hline CHANGES [1] -
1272:1 & \(1104: 23,1106: 14\),
\(1106: 15,1106: 17\), & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline \text { 1139:11 } \\
\text { co-trustees }[27]-
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1221:15, 1223:12, } \\
& \text { 1223:19, 1224:16, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 1206:22 } \\
\text { conclu }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline changes [5] - & 1106:21, 1106:24, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1103:8, 1106:15, } \\
& \text { 1106:21, 1107:9, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1231:15 & 1269:8 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1222:13, 1222:15, } \\
& \text { 1247:25, 1272:22, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1107:3, 1107:9, } \\
& \text { 1107:11, 1108:2, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1107:11, 1111:6, & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { company [25] - } \\
\text { 1118:21, 1126:16, }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { concludes }{ }_{[1]}^{-} \\
& 1269: 10
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1273:10 & 1108:19, 1110:25,
\[
\text { 1111:5, } 1111: 6,
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1115:6, 1116:11, } \\
& \text { 1117:11, 1132:9, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1136:1, 1136:7, } \\
& \text { 1136:8, 1208:21, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { conclusion [47] - } \\
\text { 1108:5, 1109:13, }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { chang } \\
\text { 1260:7 }
\end{gathered}
\] & 1111:24, 1112:18, & 1138:16, 1138:20, & 1210:10, 1232:19, & 1111:4, 1112:22, \\
\hline characters [1] - & 1113:6, 1113:24, & 1140:7, 1142:12, & 1233:10, 1233:12, & 1119:16, 1122:23, \\
\hline 1234:1 & 1115:6, 1116:11, & 1146:9, 1146:20, & 1233:15, 1234:16, & 1123:18, 1124:21, \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
charge \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1109:21 \\
check [4]-1222:10,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1117:4, 1117:11, } \\
& \text { 1118:7, 1118:23, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1146:24, 1149:3,
1149:22, 1153:21, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1234:17, 1235:10, } \\
& \text { 1235:12, 1235:15, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1125:23, 1138:11, } \\
& \text { 1139:5, 1139:20, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1265:24, 1266:5, & 1119:7, 1119:13, & 1155:25, 1170:18, & 1235:19, 1237:24, & 1140:8, 1141:6, \\
\hline 1266:14 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1120:6, 1121:4, } \\
& \text { 1122:15, 1122:20, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
1171:12, 1248:3, \\
1248:11, 1248:25,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1238:6, 1240:8, } \\
& \text { 1240:12, 1240:2 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1146:3, 1147:5 } \\
& \text { 1149:5, 1149:24 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Child [1] - 1223:16 \\
choice [1] - 1233:17
\end{tabular} & 1123:12, 1124:18, & 1261:12 & 1241:1, 1247:19, & 1151:23, 1152:9, \\
\hline circumstances \({ }^{[1]}\) - & 1125:19, 1132:9, & Co-Trustees' [1] - & 1265:25 & 1152:21, 1153:5, \\
\hline \(1244: 9\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
1132:21, 1138:8, \\
1138:16, 1138:20,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1141:13 } \\
& \text { co-trustees' [3] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Company [1] - } \\
& \text { 1125:13 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1155:17, 1163:17, } \\
& \text { 1170:19. 1177:22. }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CIVIL [1] - 1274:2 } \\
& \text { civil }_{[1]}-1148: 16
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1138:16, 1138:20, } \\
& \text { 1139:16, 1140:7, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1118:7, 1140:15, & company's [1] - & 1178:2, 1178:7, \\
\hline claim [3]-1109:17, & 1140:15, 1140:23,
1141:3, 1141:21. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1156:1 } \\
& \text { cold }^{11]}-1235: 3
\end{aligned}
\] & 1243:15 & 1179:3, 1183:7,
1187:12, 1190:4, \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
1140: 5,1155: 24
\] \\
claiming [3] -
\end{tabular} & 1142:12, 1145:23, & collateral [3] - & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { comp } \\
\text { 1136:9 }
\end{array}
\] & 1191:13, 1191:19, \\
\hline 1119:12, 1139:2, & 1146:9, 1146:20, & 1179:6, 1179:10,
1179.18 & comparison [1] - & 1192:7, 1192:13, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1145:23 } \\
& \text { claims [15] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1146:24, 1147:1, } \\
& \text { 1149:1, 1149:3, }
\end{aligned}
\] & Colorado [7] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1187: 5 \\
& \text { compel }_{[1]}-1146: 12
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1192:25, 1194:6, } \\
& \text { 1203:25, 1204:12, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1106:13, 1107:2, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1149:20, 1149:22, } \\
& \text { 1150:1, 1150:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1131:19, 1133:16, } \\
& \text { 1133:18, 1134:1, }
\end{aligned}
\] & complained \({ }_{[1]}\) - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1211:22, 1212:4, } \\
& \text { 1250:8, 1255:8, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1108:1, 1108:3,
1109:7, 1109:10 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1150:1, 1150:13, } \\
& \text { 1153:17, 1153:21, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1264:6, 1264:14, & 1131:14 complete [4] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1250:8, 1255:8, } \\
& \text { 1259:17, 1264:19, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1110:24, 1112:17, & 1155:14, 1155:16,
1155:25, 1156:1, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1265:11 } \\
& \text { column [11] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1121:23, 1139:9, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1266:7 } \\
& \text { conduct [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1113:4, 1120:11, } \\
& \text { 1249:3, 1250:6, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1170:18, 1171:12, & 1157:15, 1157:17, & 1140:12, 1240:12 completed [1] - & 1149:18 \\
\hline 1250:9, 1250:10, & 1200:16, 1248:3, & 1158:1, 1158:2,
1158:7, 1161:12, & 1259:10 & conducting [1] - \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1267:15 } \\
& \text { clarification [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1261:12, 1267:16 & 1182:24, 1183:5, & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { completely [5] - } \\
\text { 1138:5, 1147:16, }
\end{array}
\] & 1113:18 confident \({ }_{[1]}\) - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1195:17 & 1109:7, 1116:3, & copied [1] - 1218:24 & 1237:16, 1237:17, & 1143:16, 1156:23, \\
\hline confirm [1] - 1158:20 & 1132:3, 1157:25, & copies [5] - 1159:12, & 1260:24, 1268:13, & 1158:6, 1158:7, \\
\hline confirmed [1] - & 1158:2 & 1159:14, 1159:17 & 1268:24 & 1158:21, 1159:2, \\
\hline 1244:2 & contains [1] - 1108:1 & 1162:20 & COUNSEL [1] - & 1160:9, 1160:16, \\
\hline conflict [1] - 1153:14 & contemplated [1] - & copy [9] - 1112:14 & 1274:6 & 1164:18, 1165:12, \\
\hline confrontations [1] - & 1223:17 & 1162:14, 1162:16, & Count [7] - 1146:10, & 1165:20, 1167:15,
1169:21, 1169:25, \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
1224:4 \\
confused
\end{tabular} & \[
1223: 16,1227: 15
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1164:15, 1165:3, } \\
& \text { 1165:23, 1199:20, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1149:10, 1151:3, & 1171:15, 1172:20, \\
\hline 1199:12, 1216:2 & contends [1] - & 1218:17, 1269:12 & 1154:20 & 1197:5, 1256:18, \\
\hline 1216:3, 1218:6 & 1124:13 & corner [1] - 1164: & Counter [6] - & 1256:22, 1261:7 \\
\hline nnec & contests [1] & Corrao [2]-1102:19, & 1105:15, 1105:17 & Cox's [1] - \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1159:23 } \\
& \text { connected }[1] \text { - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
1124:14 \\
contingency [1] -
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1166:24 } \\
& \text { correct }[48]-1109: 5,
\end{aligned}
\]} & 1105:22, 1106:8, & crazy [1] - 1154:9 \\
\hline & & & 1146:16, 1149:13 & CRC [1] - 1099:24 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
1238:18 \\
connection [3] -
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\[
1202: 11
\] \\
contingent [8] -
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1116:11, 1116:19, } \\
& \text { 1122:9, 1129:17, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & Counter- & created [3] - \\
\hline & & & Respondents [4] - & 1145:11, 1153:14 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1241:15, 1241:19, } \\
& \text { 1243:9 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & 1185:18, 1186:16, & 1132:15, 1137:23, & 1105:15, 1105:17, & 1214:13 \\
\hline & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1186:19, 1186:23, } \\
& \text { 1187:3, 1228:21, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1152:18, 1152:20, } \\
& \text { 1152:23, 1156:10, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & 1146:16, 1149:13 & creation [2] - \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
1243:9 \\
conscience [2] -
\end{tabular} & & & Counter- & 1112:19, 1113:2 \\
\hline conscience [2] -
1155:3, 1155:9 & 1228:22, 1229:17 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1152:23, 1156:10, } \\
& \text { 1157:3, 1170:14, }
\end{aligned}
\] & Respondents' [2] - & creditors [2] - \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{consent [1] - 1243:8 consented [1] -} & continue [5] - & 1183:25, 1186:24, & 1105:22, 1106:8 & 1253:12, 1259:10 \\
\hline & 1102:22, 1131:2, & 1187:2, 1187:7, & counterpetition [19] & CRR [1] - 1099:24 \\
\hline 1242:9 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1229:12} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1187:11, 1187:13, } \\
& \text { 1200:15, 1201:6, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& -1104: 16,1104: 22, \\
& 1105: 3,1105: 6
\end{aligned}
\] & current [3] - \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{12:} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1201:15, 1201:22, } \\
& \text { 1202:11, 1202:12, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & 1106:10, 1107:25, & 1221:10 \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { continued [3] - } \\
& \text { 1135:22, 1140:15, }
\end{aligned}
\] & & 1109:8, 1109:25, & cut [2]-1195:5, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1188:5, 1204:9, } \\
& \text { 1236:7, 1239:24 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
1220:3 \\
CONTINUED [1] -
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1204:23, 1205:21,} & 1116:6, 1145:18, & 1196:8 \\
\hline & & & 1146:9, 1154:21, & \\
\hline 1236:7, 1239:24 considering [1] & \[
1173: 14
\] & \[
1205: 25,1208: 22
\] & 1156:2, 1156:4, & D \\
\hline 1122:24
consistent [6] - & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
1145: 14
\]} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1212: 3,1228: 22 \\
& 1235: 25,1244: 2
\end{aligned}
\] & 1172:19, 1191:8 & \\
\hline 1141:12, 1209:16, & & 1235:25, 1244:2, & Counterpetition [2] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { dad }[36]-1124: 25, \\
& 1133: 8,1135: 12,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1210:15, 1210:23, & \[
1122: 6,1124: 4
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1244:8, 1244:17, } \\
& \text { 1244:19, 1252:16 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1105:24, 1106:2 & 1177:17, 1178:10, \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
1211:10, 1255:12 \\
conspiracy
\end{tabular} & Control [1] - 1133:19 control [10] - & 1257:21, 1259:4, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { counting [1] - } \\
& \text { 1251:19 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1178:18, 1179:23, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1148:17 } \\
& \text { conspired [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1117:5, 1140:17,} & \(1261: 14,1268: 8\),
\(1271: 16,1272.23\) & counts [2]-1109:23, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1184:24, 1201:24, } \\
& \text { 1206:16, 1206:19, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline & & 1271:16, 1272:23
CORRECTIONS & 1109:24 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1206:16, 1206:19, } \\
& \text { 1206:24, 1207:1, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1148:22 \({ }^{\text {conspiring [1] - }}\)} & 1222:5, 1222:15 & CORRECTIONS [1] - & County [3] -
1102.13, 1271.5 & 1207:6, 1207:24, \\
\hline & 1224:24, 1229:21, & 1272:1 & 1102:13, 1271:5,
\(1273 \cdot 5\) & 1208:9, 1210:13, \\
\hline 1149:3
constitute [1] - & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 1229:22, 1240:12 } \\
\text { controlled }[1] \text { - }
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\] & 1172:24, 1248:10, & flip [1] - 1229:2 & four \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1120:17 \\
\hline \[
1103: 8,1104: 13
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1260:16, 1260:19, } \\
& \text { 1260:23, 1261:5, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
1248:14, 1263:9 \\
filed [11] - 1102:12,
\end{tabular} & Floor [1] - 1100:15 flow [1] - 1251:8 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { frame }{ }_{[1]}-1116: 4 \\
& \text { fraud }[1]-1151: 3
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline raudulent [1] - & 208:10 & 12 & 6:2 & g [1] \\
\hline 1149:17 & 1208:13, 1208:18, & great [2]-1127:24, & helped [1] - 1150:4 & 1268:11 \\
\hline freak [1] - 1229:22 & 1208:25, 1209:3 & 1262: & helping \([1]\) - 1189:16 & hindsight \({ }_{[1]}\) - \\
\hline free [1] - 1221:17 & 1209:11, 1209:18, & reedy [1] - 1221:21 & HENNER [92] - & 1252:12 \\
\hline frequently [1] - & 1209:21, 1209:22, & Group [8]-1208:6 & 1100:14, 1101:3 & ed [1] - 1200 \\
\hline 1229:4 & 1210:1, 1210:4 & 1213:8, 1265:25, & 1173:10, 1173:15 & hold [2] - 1205:17, \\
\hline Friday [3]-1099:16, & 1210:16, 1210:22 & 1266:3, 1266:13 & 1174:10, 1177:24 & 1268: \\
\hline 1102:7, 1271:7 & 1210:24, 1211:5, & 1266:14, 1267:12 & 7178:4, 1178:11 & holding \\
\hline FRIDAY [1] - 1102:1 & 1259:2, 1263:22, & 1267:17 & 1179:4, 1181:1, & 1138:22, 1190:7 \\
\hline friend [2]-1187:22, & 1264:3, 1265:11 & group [2]-1127:23, & 1183:11, 1184:8 & 1190:24, 1191:2 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{```
1223:20
    friends [1] - 1223:15
    front [1] - 1167:4
    fulfilling [1] -
```} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Gaming [5] - } \\
& \text { 1131:19, 1133:17, } \\
& \text { 1133:18, 1264:6, } \\
& \text { 1264:7 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
1261:7 \\
GROUP [1] - 1100:11
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1186:14, 1187:14, } \\
& \text { 1187:23, 1188:4, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1204:3, 1209:8 } \\
& \text { Holl [1] - 1220:11 }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { guess [13]-1108:19, } \\
& \text { 1117:16, 1117:17, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1189:3, 1189:9,
1189:14, 1190:11,} & Holland [37] - \\
\hline & & & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1125:13, 1126:16, } \\
& \text { 1194:5, 1220:11, }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{fulfilling [1] -
1150:19
full \([17]-1113: 11\),} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1264:7 general [3] 1105:10, 1154:2,} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1190:18, 1191:15, } \\
& \text { 1192:1, 1192:8, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline & & 1138:17, 1140:1, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1192:1, 1192:8, } \\
& \text { 1192:20, 1193:7, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1223:23, 1225:12, } \\
& \text { 1225:24, 1226:8, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1123:5, 1125:11, } \\
& \text { 1139:13, 1139:17, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{|l}
\text { 1233:10 } \\
\text { generally }[1] \text { - } \\
\text { 1144:6 }
\end{array}
\]} & 1144:18, 1167:20,
1176:22, 1222:2, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1194:11, 1194:20,} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1225: 24,1226: 8, \\
& \text { 1226:25, 1227:4, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1140:2, 1147:7, & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1176:22, 1222:2, } \\
& 1265: 4,1269: 5
\end{aligned}
\] & & 1226:25, 1227:4,
1228:7, 1231:13, \\
\hline 1148:18, 1153:9, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1144:6 } \\
& \text { Geyser [15] - 1126:7, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { guy }[1]-1199: 12 \\
& \text { guys }[1]-1231: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1197:15, 1197:22, } \\
& \text { 1198:20, 1199:7, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1228:7, 1231:13, } \\
& \text { 1236:3, 1236:14, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1156:3, 1156:9,
1170:16, 1170:18, & 1127:6, 1127:21, & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1198:20, 1199:7, } \\
& \text { 1202:5, 1204:5, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1237:11, 1237:19, } \\
& \text { 1237:20, 1237:24, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1170:23, 1227:6,
1227:9, 1271:15 & 1226:1, 1237:15, & H & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1204:18, 1207:8, } \\
& \text { 1207:14, 1209:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1238:5, 1239:2, } \\
& \text { 1239:7, 1240:2, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 1227:9, 1271:15 } \\
\text { fully [8]-1113:1 }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1237:20, 1237:23 } \\
& 1238: 9,1238: 15,
\end{aligned}
\] & half [3] - 1137:18, & 1210:20, 1211:6, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1239:7, 1240:2, } \\
& \text { 1241:6, 1241:15, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1147:3, 1147:16, & \[
1239: 4,1242: 13
\] & 1137:19, 1209:9 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1211:18, 1211:24, } \\
& \text { 1212:5, 1212:21, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1241:19, 1241:24,
1242:5, 1242:10, \\
\hline 1147:21, 1147:22, & gift [6] - 1207:16, 1207:20, 1210:9, & halfway [1] - 1236:1 hand \([7]\) - 1156:15, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1213:6, 1213:24, } \\
& \text { 1214:16, 1214:18, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1242:20, 1243:12, } \\
& \text { 1244:6, 1246:5, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1182:3 } \\
& \text { function }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1207:20, 1210:9, } \\
& \text { 1211:20, 1265:20, }
\end{aligned}
\] & hand \([7]\) - 1156:15, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1214:16, 1214:18, } \\
& \text { 1214:23, 1215:1, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1244:6, 1246:5, } \\
& \text { 1246:7, 1246:11, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1238:11 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1266:11 } \\
& \text { gifted }[2]-1264: 21,
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1158:2, 1158:14, } \\
& \text { 1182:21, 1249:2 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
1215:3, 1215:7, \\
1215:11, 1215:15, \\
1215:19, 1215:20,
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Home [1] - 1246:25} \\
\hline fundamental \({ }_{[1]}\) & & & & \\
\hline 1155:8 & \begin{tabular}{l}
1265:21 \\
gifts [4]-1206:15,
\end{tabular} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
1214:17 \\
handling [1] - 1223:9
\end{tabular}} & 1222:23, 1224:20, & honest [1] - 1188:5 hope [1] - 1220:5 \\
\hline funded [4] - 1181:20, 1181:25, 1182:3, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1206:19, 1207:11, } \\
& \text { 1257:6 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1225:14, 1228:4, } \\
& \text { 1228:19, 1229:7, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & hopefully \({ }_{[1]}\) - \\
\hline 1186:25 & & \[
\text { hang }[1]-1177: 6
\] & & hopefully [1] - \\
\hline funds [20]-1121:1, & given [18]-1114:6, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { hard }_{[1]}-1224: 24 \\
& \text { hated }[2]-1224: 4 \text {, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1232:7, 1233:6, & 1262:19 horribly [1] - \\
\hline 1135:17, 1189:19, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1122:25, 1125:25, } \\
& \text { 1134:7, 1139:22, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1224:6 } \\
& \text { head }[9] \text { - 1162:10, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & 1242:2, 1243:7, & \begin{tabular}{l}
1189:24 \\
HOSMER \({ }^{921}\) -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1190:19, 1191:11, } \\
& \text { 1201:14, 1201:21, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1146:19, 1146:22, & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1248:9, 1248:17, } \\
& \text { 1249:22, 1250:2, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1100:14, 1101:3, } \\
& \text { 1173:10, 1173:15, }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline 1202:1, 1241:15, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1147:7, 1168:1, } \\
& \text { 1180:19, 1210:16, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1163:11, 1212:10, } \\
& \text { 1223:25, 1246:4, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & & \\
\hline 1241:19, 1243:9, & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1249:22, 1250:2, } \\
& \text { 1250:11, 1250:19, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1174:10, 1177:24, \\
\hline 1245:4, 1245:6, & \(1219: 18,1245: 19\),
\(1248: 15,1252.5\) & 1247:2, 1247:17 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1251:14, 1252:11, } \\
& \text { 1253:8, 1254:6, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1179:4, 1181:1,} \\
\hline 1245:10, 1254:3, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1265:18, 1268:12} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 1261:9, 1261:22 } \\
\text { hear }[1]-1242: 3
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1253:8, 1254:6, } \\
& \text { 1254:12, 1255:5, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1254: 8,1256: 3 \\
& 1256: 14,1265: 7
\end{aligned}
\] & & heard [8] - 1125:1 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1254: 12,1255: 5, \\
& 1255: 15,1256: 1
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
1179:4, 1181:1, \\
1183:11, 1184:8,
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1265:22 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { glad [1] - 1230:22 } \\
& \text { god [2] - 1236:8, }
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1259:22, 1260:5, } \\
& \text { 1265:2, 1266:9, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1187:23, 1188:4, } \\
& \text { 1189:3, 1189:9, }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline future [3] - 1220:5, & 1236:11 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1211:17, 1249:5, } \\
& \text { 1252:17, 1253:22 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1265:2, 1266:9, } \\
& \text { 1267:7, 1268:1, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline 1221:7, 1222:5 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Golf [1] - 1247:1 \\
gonna [1] - 1136:3
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { heart }[1]-1213: 15 \\
& \text { held }[9]-1102: 14 \text {, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1268:16, 1269:9 & 1190:18, 1191:15, \\
\hline G & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { goodwill [2] - } \\
& \text { 1198:23 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1131:7, 1135:11, & 1271:6, 1272:22, & 1192:20, 1193:7, \\
\hline [1] - 115 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { government }[2] \text { - } \\
& \text { 1231:21, 1231:23 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1184:10, 1185:6, & \begin{tabular}{l}
1273:6 \\
herein [5] - 1105:14,
\end{tabular} & 1194:11, 1194:20,
1195:16, 1195:23, \\
\hline game \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1154:3 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{grand [1] - 1199:20 grandchildren's [1] -} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1191:22, 1257:10 } \\
& \text { help [10]-1138:23, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & 1153:12, 1271:13, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1195:16, 1195:23, } \\
& \text { 1197:15, 1197:22, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline gaming [29] - & & & 1271:14, 1273:9 & 1198:20, 1199:7, \\
\hline 1131:18, 1133:12, & 1182:3 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1195:2, 1195:5, } \\
& \text { 1196:19, 1197:14, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
hide [1] - 1114:11 \\
higher \([1]\) - 1230:21
\end{tabular}} & 1202:5, 1204:5, \\
\hline 1134:2, 1205:13,
1206:4, 1206:12, & grandmother's [1] - & & & 1204:18, 1207:8 \\
\hline 1207:4, 1208:3, & \begin{tabular}{l}
1199:20 \\
granted [2] - 1107:4,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1201:24, 1213:13, } \\
& \text { 1234:3, 1236:21, }
\end{aligned}
\] & himself \([1]\) - 1147:8 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1207:14, 1209:13, } \\
& \text { 1210:20, 1211:6, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1211:18, 1211:24, & 1248:9, 1248:17, & including [3] - & information [72] - & intended [2] - \\
\hline 1212:5, 1212:21, & 1249:22, 1250:2, & 1156:1, 1171:12, & 1105:16, 1107:4, & 1152:13, 1169:2 \\
\hline 1213:6, 1213:24, & 1250:11, 1250:19, & 1186:22 & 1108:23, 1110:17, & intending [1] - \\
\hline 1214:16, 1214:18, & 1251:14, 1252:11, & income [4] - 1134:4, & 1110:23, 1113:15, & 1215:7 \\
\hline 1214:23, 1215:1, & 1253:8, 1254:6, & 1134:11, 1135:13 & 1114:1, 1114:7, & intent [2] - 1110:15, \\
\hline 1215:3, 1215:7, & 1254:12, 1255:5, & increasing [1] - & 1114:13, 1115:8, & 1145:14 \\
\hline 1215:11, 1215:15, & 1255:15, 1256:1, & 1237:2 & 1115:9, 1115:12, & intention [2] - \\
\hline 1215:19, 1215:20, & 1259:22, 1260:5, & incurs [1] - 1123:9 & 1115:17, 1115:18, & 1209:17, 1248:18 \\
\hline 1222:23, 1224:20, & 1265:2, 1266:9, & indemnification [34] & 1115:20, 1116:10, & intentional [4] - \\
\hline 1225:14, 1228:4, & 1267:7, 1268:1, & - 1122:6, 1122:9, & 1116:15, 1116:16, & 1138:15, 1151:4, \\
\hline 1228:19, 1229:7, & 1268:16, 1269:9 & 1122:17, 1122:22, & 1118:14, 1121:11, & 1151:7, 1267:22 \\
\hline 1232:7, 1233:6, & hour [2]-1214:22, & 1123:8, 1123:14, & 1123:1, 1124:12, & intentionally [1] - \\
\hline 1235:14, 1241:7, & 1214:23 & 1123:23, 1124:4, & 1125:25, 1126:2, & 1138:13 \\
\hline 1242:2, 1243:7, & house [7] - 1229:25, & 1124:7, 1124:20, & 1126:5, 1126:19, & interest [44] - \\
\hline 1248:9, 1248:17, & 1233:20, 1233:24, & 1124:23, 1125:7, & 1126:21, 1127:14, & 1106:22, 1117:1, \\
\hline 1249:22, 1250:2, & 1234:3, 1234:13, & 1174:2, 1175:3, & 1128:24, 1129:11, & 1120:4, 1120:8, \\
\hline 1250:11, 1250:19, & 1235:9, 1235:20 & 1180:16, 1181:4, & 1129:12, 1129:23, & 1120:12, 1126:15, \\
\hline 1251:14, 1252:11, & hundred [5] - & 1184:19, 1184:20, & 1130:22, 1132:7, & 1130:23, 1131:1, \\
\hline 1253:8, 1254:6, & 1121:12, 1121:16, & 1186:7, 1186:17, & 1134:12, 1136:14, & 1131:6, 1131:7, \\
\hline 1254:12, 1255:5, & 1130:9, 1236:17, & 1187:8, 1192:11, & 1136:19, 1139:23, & 1131:9, 1131:12, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1255:15, 1256:1, } \\
& \text { 1259:22, 1260:5, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1244:10 & 1193:2, 1193:3,
1216:5, 1217:14, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1144:15, 1146:21, } \\
& \text { 1147:8, 1147:14, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1131:16, 1131:22, \\
\hline 1265:2, 1266:9, & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1216:5, 1217:14, } \\
& \text { 1218:2, 1218:7, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1147:17, 1147:20, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1132:18, 1132:21, } \\
& \text { 1133:8. 1141:15. }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1267:7, 1268:1, & & 1243:23, 1244:21, & 1148:2, 1150:4, & 1188:14, 1188:17, \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
1268:16, 1269:9 \\
HOSMER-HENNER
\end{tabular} & idea [6]-1111:1 & 1244:24, 1245:10, & 1150:8, 1150:21,
1150:24, 1152:5, & 1194:9, 1196:21, \\
\hline [92] - 1100:14, 1101:3, & 1121:17, 1133:7, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1246:11, 1254:21 } \\
& \text { indemnifications [1] }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1150:24, 1152:5, } \\
& \text { 1154:16, 1155:23, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1208:6, 1212:8, } \\
& \text { 1212:13, 1219:25, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1173:10, 1173:15, & 1163:9, 1168:23,
1177:23 & \[
-1245: 2
\] & 1155:25, 1158:1, & 1220:2, 1221:14, \\
\hline \(1174: 10,1177: 24\),
\(1178: 4,1178: 11\) & identified [8] & indemnified [1] - & 1162:12, 1163:4, & 1226:6, 1226:8, \\
\hline 1178:4, 1178:11,
\[
1179: 4,1181: 1
\] & 1121:6, 1157:14, & 1177:21 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1180:11, 1180:15, } \\
& \text { 1217:21, 1229:3. }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1226:11, 1226:18, \\
\hline 1179:4, 1181:1,
1183:11, 1184:8, & 1157:16, 1158:19, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { indemnify [1] - } \\
& \text { 1179:23 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1232:3, 1232:10, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1227:1, 1227:4, } \\
& \text { 1235:24, 1239:7, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1186:14, 1187:14, & 1161:24, 1162:2, & indemnity [2] - & \[
1247: 14,1247: 16
\] & 1239:15, 1240:2, \\
\hline 1187:23, 1188:4, & \begin{tabular}{l}
1162:8, 1169:4 \\
identifies [1] -
\end{tabular} & 1124:11, 1124:13 & 1247:20, 1249:16 & 1244:22, 1251:3, \\
\hline 1189:3, 1189:9, & 1157:17 & independent [3] - & 1249:20, 1249:23, & 1257:7, 1258:11, \\
\hline 1189:14, 1190:11,
1190:18. 1191:15. & ignored [1] - 1128: & 1153:22, 1195:24, & 1250:4, 1260:6, & 1260:14, 1266:22 \\
\hline 1190:18, 1191:15, & II [2] - 1146:10, & 1202:17 & 1260:20, 1267:24 informed [4] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { interests [1] - } \\
& 1195 \cdot 18
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1192:20, 1193:7, & 1146:11 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { independents [1] - } \\
& \text { 1154:3 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1113:14, 1113:25, & interference [1] - \\
\hline 1194:11, 1194:20, & \begin{tabular}{l}
III [1] - 1148:16 \\
immediately [2] -
\end{tabular} & indicate [2] - & 1124:3, 1130:2 & 1102:25 \\
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\hline 1107:21, 1110:6, & 1232:21, 1235:3 & subtrusts [2] - & 1234:21, 1234:23, & 1169:11, 1170:6, \\
\hline 1110:18, 1137:18, & 1244:15, 1246:9, & 1267:1, 1267:8 & \[
1235: 9,1235: 20
\] & 1170:21, 1171:6, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1150:9, 1200:11, } \\
& \text { 1201:8, 1201:14, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
1254: 15,1257: 7
\] & successors [2] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { tape [2] - 1214:20, } \\
& \text { 1214:21 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1173:9, 1173:12, } \\
& \text { 1174:8, 1177:23, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1201:8, 1201:14, } \\
& \text { 1222:12, 1250:3, }
\end{aligned}
\] & stock [2] - 1240:7, & 1122:1, 1122:5 & \[
\operatorname{tax}[3]-1121: 15,
\] & 1174:8, 1177:23, \\
\hline 1253:6, 1254:25, & 12 & sue [5] - 1190:15, & \[
1168: 4,1168: 11
\] & 1180:25, 1183:8, \\
\hline 1255:10, 1260:17 & 1132: & 1216:23, 1217:2, & taxes [1] - 1206:7 & 1184:7, 1187:13, \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
stand [1] - 1150:15 \\
STANLEY \({ }_{[3]}\) -
\end{tabular} & stood [1] - 1224:9 & sued [1] - 1200:14 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { TBJ }[2]-1122: 3, \\
& 1179: 1
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1187:22, 1188:3, } \\
& \text { 1189:2. 1189:8. }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
STANLEY[3]- \\
1100:10, 1100:22
\end{tabular} & stop [3] - 1150:15, & suggested [1] - & TBJSC [1] - 1122.3 & \begin{tabular}{l}
1189:2, 1189:8, \\
1189:13, 1190:5
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1100: 10,1100: 22, \\
& 1103: 16
\end{aligned}
\] & 1151:12, 1170:5 & 1257:22 & team [3] - 1200:2, & 1190:14, 1191:21 \\
\hline Stanley [5] - 1103:4, & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1142:19} & 1200:4, 1200:6 & \[
1192: 15,1193: 1
\] \\
\hline 1124:6, 1131:10, & 1227:23 & & telephone [2] - & 1194:7, 1195:14, \\
\hline 1131:21, 1132:17 Stanley's [1] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { story [1] - 1129:15 } \\
& \text { straight [2] - 1169:5, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1197:17 } \\
& \text { suing }[3]-1223: 17,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1159:7, 1198:12 } \\
& \text { terms }[3]-1190: 5,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1195:22, 1197:12, } \\
& \text { 1197:19, 1198:19, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1124:6 } \\
& \text { start [6] - 1170:22, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
1245: 23
\] & 1229:4 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1190:10, 1204:20 } \\
& \text { testified }[5]-1104: 2 \text {, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1199:6, 1202:4, } \\
& \text { 1204:1, 1204:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1171:7, 1209:1, & 1100:4, 1100:15 & \[
1248: 15,1263: 9
\] & 1114:19, 1167:13, & 1206:22, 1207:13, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1216:13, 1254:13 } \\
& \text { started }[5]-1115: 6,
\end{aligned}
\] & 1100:19, 1102:15,
1166:23, 1269:14, & Suite [2] - 1100:12, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1195:9, 1246:20 } \\
& \text { testify [1] - 1249:6 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1209:6, 1210:19, } \\
& \text { 1211:2, 1211:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1130:13, 1159:9, & 1271:9 &  & testimony [22] - & 1211:23, 1212:18, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1221:13, 1227:24 } \\
& \text { starting }[4]-1168: 3
\end{aligned}
\] & stressed [2] - & 1099:15, 1102:15 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1109:5, 1113:23, } \\
& \text { 1121:18, 1122:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1213:5, 1213:22, } \\
& \text { 1214:11, 1214:22, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1203:1, 1245:8, & 1224:13, 1224:14 & 1103:11, 1166:23, & 1124:16, 1125:16, & \[
1215: 6,1222: 22
\] \\
\hline 1263:11 & stressi & 1269:13, 1271:8 & 1128:9, 1128:12, & 1228:15, 1229:6, \\
\hline State [6]-1102:13, & strong [4] - & 1100:3 & 1132:1, 1146:19, & 1232:6, 1233:3, \\
\hline 1231:5, 1231:22, & \[
1136: 7,1153: 13
\] & summarize [1] - & 1147:25, 1148:7, & 1235:12, 1241:4, \\
\hline 1231:23, 1271:5, & structure [1] - & 1109:4 & 1150:9, 1167:18, & 1241:22, 1243:4, \\
\hline 1273:6 & 1196:7 & supplied [7] - & 1201:4, 1201:5, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1248:8, 1248:14, } \\
& \text { 1249:19, 1250:1, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline STATE[3]-1099:4, & stubborn [1] & 1115:11, 1116:10, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1201:9, 1242:3, } \\
& \text { 1252:17. 1253:22. }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1250:9, 1250:15, \\
\hline state [3] - 1134:1, & 1229:20 &  & 1272:4, 1272:5 & 1252:8, 1253:4, \\
\hline 1225:1, 1264:14 & 1134:19, 1168:3, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1158:15 } \\
& \text { supply [2] - 1146:21, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & Texas [2]-1100:19, & 1254:5, 1254:10, \\
\hline statement [6] - & 1168:16, 1220:15 & & 1159:6 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1255:9, 1255:22, } \\
& \text { 1259:19, 1260:4, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1099:11 & 1141:14, 1145:8, & 1147:6, 1147:19, & 1264:24, 1272:4, \\
\hline Volume [4] - & 1145:14, 1146:17, & 1148:11, 1149:7, & 1272:5 \\
\hline 1102:10, 1166:14, & 1148:20, 1153:10, & 1149:25, 1150:24, & works [2]-1107:10, \\
\hline 1166:20, 1269:11 & 1153:13, 1156:18, & 1151:24, 1152:10, & 1138:19 \\
\hline volume [2] - & 1166:13, 1166:20, & 1152:22, 1154:6, & worry [1] - 1205:19 \\
\hline 1167:17, 1167:21 & 1167:2, 1173:8, & 1155:18, 1159:4, & worth [13]-1218:4, \\
\hline voluminous [1] - & 1173:17, 1198:22, & 1161:5, 1161:20, & 1220:4, 1220:6, \\
\hline 1159:1 & 1215:3, 1215:21, & 1163:18, 1165:8, & 1220:20, 1221:4, \\
\hline voluntarily [2] - & 1216:6, 1237:17, & 1166:3, 1167:20, & 1221:8, 1226:7, \\
\hline 1189:22, 1189:25 & 1268:12, 1269:11 & 1169:11, 1170:6, & 1226:9, 1226:21, \\
\hline vote [2]-1138:18, & Wendy's [9] - & 1170:21, 1171:6, & 1239:10, 1239:13, \\
\hline 1138:19 & 1106:1, 1110:14, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1173:9, 1173:12, } \\
& \text { 1174:8, 1177:23, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1241:4 \\
\hline W & 1131:21, 1132:18, & 1178:3, 1178:8, & 1200:4 \\
\hline & 1139:11, 1200:2, & 1180:25, 1183:8, & writing [2] - 1133:21, \\
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { wag }[1]-1221: 23^{\text {wait }[4]-1130: 6,} \\
& 1157: 2,1177: 6, \\
& 1193: 13
\end{aligned}
\]} & 1200:4 & 1184:7, 1187:13, & 1202:6 \\
\hline & West [1] - 1100:15 whatsoever [2] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1187:22, 1188:3, } \\
& \text { 1189:2, 1189:8, }
\end{aligned}
\] & written [1] - 1201:25 \\
\hline & 1119:4, 1123:22 & 1189:13, 1190:5, & wrongdoing [1] - \\
\hline & Whelan [10] - & 1190:14, 1191:21, & wrongful [1] - \\
\hline & 1187:18, 1187:20, & 1192:15, 1193:1, & 1149:18 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1227:7, 1227:12, } \\
& \text { 1227:13, 1240:13 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1189:2, 1189:15, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1194:7, 1195:14, } \\
& \text { 1195:22, 1197:12, }
\end{aligned}
\] & wrote [1] - 1128:5 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
1227: 13,1240: 13 \\
\text { WAS }[1]-1274: 7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1197:8, 1197:24, } \\
& \text { 1198:7, 1199:9, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1195:22, 1197:12, & \\
\hline Washington [6] - & 1199:25, 1240:1 & 1199:6, 1202:4, & \\
\hline 1099:15, 1100:4, & & 1204:1, 1204:13, & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1102:15, 1166:23, } \\
& 1269: 14,1271: 9
\end{aligned}
\]} & 1197:19 & 1206:22, 1207:13, & year [3]-1121:14, \\
\hline & whispers [1] - & 1209:6, 1210:19, & 1124:25, 1128:21 \\
\hline Washoe [2] - & 1102:24 & 1211:2, 1211:13, & years [7] - 1145:15, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1102:13, 1271:5
WASHOE [2] -} & White [3]-1246:24, & 1211:23, 1212:18, & 1146:17, 1201:15, \\
\hline & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1246:25, 1247:2 } \\
& \text { whole [6] - 1127:21, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & 1213:5, 1213:22, & 1226:2, 1226:3, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 1099:5, 1271:2 } \\
\text { watched [2] - }
\end{gathered}
\]} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1222:22, 1228:15,} & 1227:21, 1227:22 \\
\hline & 1172:15, 1194:2, & & yesterday [2] - \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1221:20, 1221:24 } \\
& \text { water [4]-1184:22, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
1237: 1
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1229: 6,1232: 6 \\
& \text { 1233:3, 1235:12, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
1114:19, 1269:3 \\
yourself [4]-
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1184:23, 1246:21, & wholly [1] - 1118:21 & 1241:4, 1241:22, & 1133:19, 1146:23, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
1247:4 \\
weeks [1] - 1130:6 welcome [2] -
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
wife [1] - 1233:25 \\
willing [1] - 1154:8 \\
Winnemucca [1] -
\end{tabular}} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1243:4, 1248:8, } \\
& \text { 1248:14, 1249:19, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
1159: 13,1248: 6
\] \\
\hline & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1248:14, 1249:19, } \\
& \text { 1250:1, 1250:9. }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
yourselves [1] - \\
\(1103 \cdot 1\)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline & & 1250:1, 1250:9, & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
1173:16 \\
WEND
\end{tabular}} & 1186:3 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 1250: 15,1252: 8, \\
& 1253: 4,1254: 5,
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline & wipe [1] - 1192:11 & & Z \\
\hline 1099:11, 1100:17,
1104:1, 1270:12, & wished [1] - 1223:3 & 1255:22, 1259:19, & \\
\hline 1271:11, 1272:2, & wishes [3]-1210:16, & 1260:4, 1264:20, & ZACHARY \(_{[1]}\) - \\
\hline 1273:8 & 1210:24, 1211:11 & 1267:21, 1268:8, & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Zachary [1] - } \\
& \text { 1103:13 } \\
& \text { zero [1] - 1145:21 }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline Wendy [49]-1101:7, & withheld [1] - 1150:7 & 1267:21, 1268:8,
1274:9 & \\
\hline 1101:8, 1101:9,
1101:10, 1101:11 & withholding [2] - & witness [4] - & \\
\hline 1102:9, 1103:14, & 1139:3, 1204:25 & 1129:10, 1273:11. & \\
\hline 1104:7, 1105:15, & WITNESS [115] - & \[
1273: 12,1273: 13
\] & \\
\hline 1105:20, 1105:23, & \[
1111: 5,1112: 23
\] & WJ000445 [1] - & \\
\hline 1106:2, 1106:6, & 1115:25, 1116:13, & 1157:14 & \\
\hline 1113:14, 1116:25, & 1119:17, 1122:24, & WJ010614 [1] - & \\
\hline \(1123: 6,1124: 2\),
\(1124: 3,1124: 7\), & 1123:19, 1124:22, & \begin{tabular}{l}
1233:13 \\
WJ011190 [1] -
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline 1124:3, 1124:7,
1124:9, 1124:13, & 1125:24, 1128:13, & 1236:2 & \\
\hline 1127:24, 1131:4, & 1129:18, 1133:6, & wording [1] - 1114:4 & \\
\hline 1131:8, 1131:14, & 1137:11, 1138:12, & words [8] - 1115:1, & \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1139:6, 1139:21, } \\
& \text { 1140:9, 1141:7, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1143:2, 1222:3, & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1137:10, 1138:5, } \\
& \text { 1139:12, 1140:20, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 1143:19, 1146:4 & 1224:12, 1263:6, & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}```

