ANIELA K. SZYMANSKI, ESQ. LAW OFFICE OF ANIELA K. SZYMANSKI, LTD. Nevada Bar No. 15822 3901 W. Charleston Boulevard Las Vegas, NV 89102 (725) 204-1699 Attorney for Appellant

Electronically Filed Jan 27 2022 08:34 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

YOAV EGOSI	
Appellant,	No.: 83454
vs.	
PATRICIA EGOSI, N/K/A	District Court Case No.: D-16-540174-
PATRICIA LEE WOODS,	D
Respondent.	

JOINT APPENDIX

VOLUME 3 OF 19

INDEX TO JOINT APPENDIX

Filing date	Document	Volume	Page
9/26/2016	Complaint for Divorce	1	1-8
10/19/2016	Answer and Counterclaim to Complaint for Divorce	1-2	9-28
10/19/2016	Prenuptial Agreement (exhibit to Answer and	2	15-28
	Counterclaim to Complaint for Divorce)		
10/28/2016	Reply to Counterclaim for Divorce	3	31
1/18/2017	Stipulation and Order for Referral Order for Outsourced Evaluation Services	3	35
7/14/2017	Transcript of June 13, 2017 Evidentiary Hearing re Prenuptial Agreement	3	38
7/14/2017	Transcript of June 14, 2017 Evidentiary Hearing re Prenuptial Agreement	4-5	217-428
9/20/2017	Order re Child Custody	6	429-430
11/3/2017	Clarifying Order re Prenuptial Agreement	6	431-432
11/22/2017	Motion to Clarify or Correct Order of 11/3/2017	6	433-439
12/18/2017	Opposition to Motion to Clarify of Correct Order of 11/3/2017	6	440-454
1/5/2018	Order re Motion to Clarify or Correct Order of 11/3/2017	6	455-456
9/4/2018	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Orders following June 13-14 Evidentiary Hearing re Prenuptial Agreement	6-7	457-467
9/10/2018	Notice of Appeal to Nevada Supreme Court	7	468-471
3/26/2018	Motion to Reconsider June 14, 2017 decision re Prenuptial Agreement	7-11	474-508
9/18/2018	Motion to Certify Order as Final and Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal	12	520-535
10/5/2018	Opposition to Motion to Certify Order as Final and Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal	13-14	536-545
10/15/2018	Order re Motion to Certify Order as Final and Stay Proceedings Pending Appeal	14	546-548
7/29/2020	Nevada Supreme Court Judgment and Order	14	549-554

5/14/2021	List of Witnesses	14	555-57
7/22/2021	Closing Brief of Patricia Egosi	14	558-562
7/23/2021	Closing Brief of Yoav Egosi	14	563-572
7/26/2021	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and		573-649
	Decree of Divorce		
8/24/2021	Notice of Appeal	15	650

INDEX TO JOINT APPENDIX REQUESTED SEALED

Filing date	Document	Volume	Page
5/9/2017	John Paglini Report	16	651-715
12/1/2021	Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing April 13,	17	716-875
	2021		
12/1/2021	Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing April 14,	17-18	876-
	2021		1013
12/1/2021	Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing May 20,	19	1014-
	2021		1251

1 **RPLY** Emily McFarling, Esq. CLERK OF THE COURT Nevada Bar Number 8567 MCFARLING LAW GROUP 3 6230 W. Desert Inn Rd. Las Vegas, NV 89146 4 (702) 565-4335 phone (702) 732-9385 fax eservice@mcfarlinglaw.com Attorney for Plaintiff 6 Patricia Egosi 7 IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 8 **FAMILY DIVISION CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 9 6230 W. Desert Inn Rd., Las Vegas, NV 89146 10 PATRICIA EGOSI, Case Number: D-16-540174-D Dept. No: Q 11 Plaintiff 12 VS. REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIM FOR DIVORCE 13 YOAV EGOSI, Phone: (702) 565-4335 14 Defendant 15 16 COMES NOW the Plaintiff, by and through her attorney of record, Emily 17 McFarling, Esq., of McFarling Law Group, and in answer to Defendant's Counterclaim for 18 Divorce, states as follows: 19 1. Plaintiff admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-4, 7-8 and 19 of 20 Defendant's Counterclaim for Divorce. 21 2. Plaintiff denies the allegations contained in paragraphs 5-6, and 9-18 of 22 Defendant's Counterclaim for Divorce. 23 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28

MCFARLING LAW GROUP

JT APPENDIX

1

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for an Order of this Court as follows:

- 1. Defendant's Counterclaim be dismissed and Defendant take nothing thereby;
- 2. Plaintiff's Complaint for Divorce be entered as prayed for therein; and
- 3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

DATED this 28th day of October, 2016.

MCFARLING LAW GROUP

By: /s/Emily McFarling
Emily McFarling, Esq.
6230 W. Desert Inn Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 565-4335
Attorney for Plaintiff
Patricia Egosi

DECLARATION OF PATRICIA EGOSI

- 1. I, Patricia Egosi, declare that I am competent to testify to the facts contained in the preceding filing.
- 2. I have read the preceding document, and I have personal knowledge of the facts contained therein, unless stated otherwise. Further, the factual averments contained therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, except those matters based on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.
- 3. The factual averments contained in the preceding filing are incorporated herein as if set forth in full.

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of Nevada and the United States (NRS 53.045 and 28 USC § 1746), that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTED this 2 day of October, 2016.

Patricia Egosi

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned, an employee of McFarling Law Group, hereby certifies that on the 28th day of October 2016, I served a true and correct copy of REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIM FOR DIVORCE, via mandatory electronic service by using the Eighth Judicial District Court's E-file and E-service System to the following:

Name	Email	Sele
Angela Romero	angela@standishnaimi.com	
Francesca M. Resch, Esq.	francesca@standishnaimi.com	
Haunani D. Magalianes	haunani@standishnaimi.com	D W
Jason Naimi, Esq.	iason@standishnaimi.com	

By: <u>/s/Maria Rios Landin</u>
Maria Rios Landin

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SAO **CLERK OF THE COURT** THE JIMMERSON LAW FIRM, P.C. JAMES J. JIMMERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 000264 ijj@jimmersonlawfirm.com MICHAEL C. FLAXMAN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 12963 mcf@jimmersonlawfirm.com 415 S. Sixth Street, Suite 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 388-7171 Attorneys for Defendant, YOAV EGOSI 8 9 DISTRICT COURT 10 FAMILY DIVISION 11 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 12 * * * * * 13 PATRICIA EGOSI, CASE NO. D-16-540174-D 14 Plaintiff, DEPT. NO. Q 15 VS. Courtroom No. 1 16 YOAV EGOSI,

STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR REFERRAL ORDER FOR OUTSOURCED EVALUATION SERVICES

Defendant.

COME NOW, Defendant, YOAV EGOSI (hereinafter "Joe"), by and through his attorneys, James J. Jimmerson, Esq. and Michael C. Flaxman, Esq. of THE JIMMERSON LAW FIRM, P.C., and Plaintiff, PATRICIA EGOSI (hereinafter "Patricia"), by and through her attorneys, Emily McFarling, Esq. and Samantha J. Mentzel, Esq. of MCFARLING LAW GROUP, and hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED that this Court shall issue a Referral Order for

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED that this Court shall issue a Referral Order for Outsourced Evaluation, along with

000 27 2016

PAMILY COURT

DEPARTMENT Q

÷	psychological and drug evaluations of both p	arties, to be performed by John Paglini,
1 2	Psy.D.; and	
3	IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED that De	efendant shall front the costs for the child
4	custody evaluation, subject to reapportionme	ent;.
5	DATED this <u>and</u> day of December, 2016	DATED this day of December, 2016
6	THE JIMMERSON LAW FIRM, P.C.	MCFARLING LAW GROUP / /
7	Michael C. Hayman	Jacobson 1944
	JAMES J. JIMMERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 00264	EMILY MCFARLING, ESQ.) Nevada Bar No. 08567
**	MICHAEL C. FLAXMAN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 12963	SAMANTHA J. MENTŽEL, ESQ.
11 12	415 S. Sixth Street, Suite 100	Nevada Bar No. 13001 6230 W. Desert Inn Rd.
11	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorney for Defendant,	Las Vegas, Nevada 89146 Attorney for Plaintiff,
13	YOAV EGOSI	PATRICIA EGOSI
14	ORDE	R
15		Stipulation of the parties, and good cause
16	appearing,	spandings, or the parties, and good eadse
17		Consult afficial Secretary of the Consult of the Co
18		Court shall issue a Referral Order for
	Outsourced Evaluation Services, specifically	
	psychological and drug evaluations of both p	parties, to be performed by John Paglini,
	Psy.D.; and	
22	<i>!!!</i>	
23 24	///	
25	///	
26	///	
27	///	
28	///	

28

1	
1	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant shall front the costs for the child
2	custody evaluation, subject to reapportionment.
3	DATED this day of <u>JAN 1 3 2017</u> , 201
4	
5	DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
6	Respectfully Submitted by:
7	THE JIMMERSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
8	Michael C. Hayman
9	JÁMES J. JIMMERSON, ESQ.
	Nevada Bar No. 000264 MICHAEL C. FLAXMAN, ESQ.
	415 South Sixth Street, Ste. 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
	(702) 388-7171 Attorneys for Defendant,
14	YOAV EGOSI
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2425	
26	
3	

ORIGINAL TRANS 1 2 3 4 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 5 FAMILY DIVISION 6 7 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 9 PATRICIA EGOSI, 10 Plaintiff, CASE NO. D-16-540174-D DEPT. Q 11 VS. YOAV EGOSI, 12 Defendant. 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRYCE C. DUCKWORTH 15 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 16 TRANSCRIPT RE: EVIDENTIARY HEARING TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 2017 17 18 19 20 21

22

23

24

FILED JUL 1 4 2017

D-16-540174-D EGOSI 6/13/2017 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

	13		
1	APPEARANC	EES:	
2	13	Plaintiff: the Plaintiff:	PATRICIA EGOSI EMILY McFARLING, ESQ.
3			SAMANTHA MENTZEL, ESQ. 6230 W. Desert Inn Rd. Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
5			(702) 565-4335
6	13	Defendant: the Defendant:	YOAV EGOSI JIM JIMMERSON, ESQ.
7			KRISTINE BREWER, ESQ. 415 S. Sixth St., Suite 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
8			(702) 388-7171
9			
10			
11			
12 13			
14			
15			
16			
L7			
L8			
L9			
20			
21			
22			
23			
44			

1	INDEX	OF WI	TNES	S E S	
2	PLAINTIFF'S	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
3	WITNESSES:				
4	(None presented)				
5					
6	DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES:				
7	WIINESSES.				
8	PATRICIA EGOSI	22	80	93	
9	YOAV EGOSI	102	166		
10		* * * *	*		
11					
12	INDEX	OF EX	K H I B I	<u>T S</u>	
13	PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS:				ADMITTED
14					
15	7 - Mr. Guligan agreement				167
16	22 - Deposition of Mr. Ego	osi			174
17					
18	DEFENDANT'S <u>EXHIBITS</u> :				
19					
20	YY - LawDepot questions ar		i		176
21	ZZ - June 24 prenuptial ac	greement			148
22	AAA - Mr. Egosi Gmail				149
23	EEE - Deposition of Ms. Eq	josi			60
24	JJJ - LawDepot Receipt				138
1					

D-16-540174-D EGOSI 6/13/2017 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

1	LLL - Final prenuptial agreement	141
2	NNN - Tickets	117
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 2017

2

1

PROCEEDINGS

3

(THE PROCEEDINGS BEGAN AT 13:40:18)

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

THE COURT: We're on the record in the Egosi matter, case D-16-540174-D. Please confirm your appearances.

MS. McFARLING: Emily McFarling, bar number 8567, appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff, Patricia Egosi. Next to me.

MS. MENTZEL: Samantha Mentzel, bar number 13001. And we also have Patricia Egosi, Plaintiff, present.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. JIMMERSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jimmerson and Kristine Brewer of the Jimmerson Law Firm on behalf of Defendant, Joseph Egosi. My bar number is 264. Kristine?

MS. BREWER: And my bar number is 8387.

MR. JIMMERSON: And present in this court is Joseph Egosi, sir.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. JIMMERSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This is the time set for evidentiary proceedings on the prenuptial agreement. So we're set for this afternoon, tomorrow afternoon. Each side has three

> D-16-540174-D EGOSI 6/13/2017 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

hours. So as you -- as you know, I'll keep track of your time and let you know how much you've used.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I do note for the record that -- that the Defendant filed a motion in regards to the motion to validate the prenuptial agreement. And -- and so that hearing is scheduled for July 11th. I'm treating that as part of today's proceeding. So we're vacating the hearing on July 11th. There's no need for that hearing. And I -- and I understand and treat that as the genesis of the proceedings here today and the instruction from the Court that the Defendant will proceed first. So it -- it falls in line with his request to validate the prenuptial agreement.

So with that being said, again, you each -- even though we have a full day set for these proceedings, this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon, the time will evaporate very quickly. So I caution you in that regard and I'll give you periodic posts of time as we proceed. So focus on what's truly important. As part of that time, you'll each -- I have received pretrial memorandums from both sides.

Certainly if -- and -- and so I -- I can view those as opening statements, but if either party desires to make an opening statement as part of your allocation of time, you may do so at this time. And I'll start with the Defendant. Counsel, do you desire to make an opening statement?

> D-16-540174-D EGOSI 6/13/2017 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

MR. JIMMERSON: I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. JIMMERSON: May I approach the bench, Your Thank you. This case has taken a dramatic turnaround Honor? upon May 30th of 2017, when we had the opportunity to take the deposition of Plaintiff, Patricia Egosi. And I'm mindful of the Court's comments because I reviewed them again from our March hearing and -- and other comments more recently in May with regard to the fact that our client bears the burden of proof by the preponderance of the evidence that the Shear test, under the law of Georgia, the three elements have been satisfied under -- at -- at the conclusion of this case of the addition -- inducement of facts.

I'd like to run through you what I believe the evidence will prove, like an opening statement would do, with regard to the Egosi prenuptial agreement timeline and the documents that you'll have introduced -- or the testimony that you'll have introduced be -- before you.

The parties met on December 20 -- December of 2006 in Miami, Florida. At the time, Joseph was with a girlfriend, Sarah. You'll hear from the testimony of the Def --Plaintiff, Patricia, that they met in December of 2005. She's repeated through that in a number of different matters, including virtually every pleading that you have before you

that she swears to under oath. However, she's in error on that by one year. Were her to be -- were her version to be accurate, she had been living in Las Vegas -- I'm sorry, in Miami for two and a half years with the Defendant prior to their marriage on September 26th of 2008.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

She came with a round trip ticket. We will introduce that ticket before the Court. And she came on January 11th, 2007 and she remained in -- in Miami and then later Atlanta, where they moved in the summer of 2008 and then to Las Vegas in America through the -- from that date to the present with exception of short trips out of town. spend six months in Brazil over the 2007, 2008 time period.

In March of 2007 through August 13 of 2008 -- and these dates can go on, but I'm ending them on August 13th because that's the day that they sign the prenuptial agreement. It's the date that you're going to measure the elements of Shear, the conscionability, the fairness, the absence of fraud and the like.

And at that time, we have established that from March of 2007 until August 13, 2008 and thereafter, Patricia worked with Joe and his business Joy Phone (ph) according to her five days per week except when the parties were out of town. She was granted access to the back office, which contains all financial records, daily receipts, daily

expenses, business records, merchant accounts, which would be their credit card uses and their income everyday, daily reports, as well as the personal checking account and personal financial records of Joseph Egosi and herself.

Not here, but you'll see is that there was several bank accounts that Patricia had prior to marriage that -- that you have not been told about. And so much of what's in this time line you have not been told about until you read the Defendant's -- our motion -- our pretrial memorandum for the first time last -- either yesterday or last week.

In fall of 2007 to January of 2008, Joe and Patricia negotiated an investment by Mr. Guerillo (sic) (ph) where he was offering to pay \$2,000,000 for 40 percent of this business. Never did go through with it and didn't consummate it, but it was Joe's business but Patricia was deeply involved.

And in her deposition taken on May 30th, she testifies that she was involved and understood what the dollars were. She even did the math for us and said that if 40 percent is worth \$2,000,000, a hundred percent is worth \$5,000,000. And she will testify that she was aware of this man, she met this man and they negotiated over three months time during the time period indicated and was aware of the business and she of course was working the business since the

prior March.

March of 2007 to August of 2008, Patricia tasks are to answer the telephones speaking English, responding to telephone calls speaking English, placing phone calls speaking English, responding to about eight or 9,000 emails. And we'd like to offer them in bulk, but we presented them a couple months ago — a month ago we provided them to Plaintiffs, where she is either the recipient of the email and then she responds and she does so without a translator. She's not got a Google translator that hits a word in Brazilian and now it translates to English. No, she's doing this all in English herself and she — that is her duties and responsibilities.

She is an organizer. If you were to talk about qualities of Ms. Egosi, and one of those is that she has a desire to be involved in organizing aspects. And you'll hear Mr. Egosi testify as well as Ms. Egosi about her efforts to organize the business records and personal records, financial records of the parties. And I di — detailed the tasks that she had, reads, organizes, check account records, bank statements, merchant account records.

Daily reports were made as to how the business would do. It's -- it's a teleph -- telephone company that essentially -- it's what you used to see on television and infomercials. It sold an adaptor that you could plug in the

wall and it would take the streaming of the Internet and convert it to an analog telephone. And it could do it at seven or eight or \$9 a month as opposed to Vonage, which offers a similar product at about \$25 a month. And certainly less than Verizon or AT&T at, you know, \$65 a month. And she was involved in that business. Only four people had access to the back room which had all the financial records, Patricia, Joseph, and his parents, Violet (ph) and David (ph).

The next event is on March 24th, 2008 after she had been here a year and a couple months. They -- they start talking about marriage. This is signified by an email sent to a synagogue by Joe regarding Patricia converting to Judaism. And in fact, Judge, she did convert to Judaism.

In the time period of April 2008 to June of 2008, the parties discussed the prenuptial agreement. You will hear that surprisingly to me in terms of what she had been representing to you and to us, she understood what the word prenuptial meant. She knew what it was in Brazil.

And contrary to the representation by the Plaintiff that she had no education and that she was a poor downtrodden individual who had practiced, you know, a nightly trade that the Court is familiar with, the reality is she has graduated high school and went to three years of college at the University of Brazil, a school called the Duqe Caxais, D-u-q-e

K -- C-a-x-a-i-s, for three years of college.

1

2

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And the Court will find that they went online and that they looked at several different websites that had prenuptial agreements. They would review that and they selected the online agreement from LawDepot because of the guarantees that were advertised to exist, a \$10,000 payment in the event that the document was not enforced, and because of other recommendations made online there that suggested that it was a more reputable source for this type of an agreement than others that they had investigated.

Now here is where you're going to find new facts that you and I could fall off the chair, and maybe Ms. McFarling too to the extent she didn't know about it. On June 24th and 25th, and the reason I say two is because it went over the midnight hour, these parties around 10:30 or so on the 24th selected the LawDepot prenuptial agreement and downloaded it. But before you download it, you have to answer questions that tailor your interest and your family's needs to the document.

So for example, you answer questions that we will show you that says name, Joseph Egosi, name Patricia Acosta (ph), okay, that will identify -- there was a son, Nedson (ph), who they identify in the document. They identify what law is to apply there. They affirmatively choose Georgia even in June because they knew they intended to move to Georgia that summer.

And they go through a series about fif -- 15 to 25 questions that we'll show you and they fill it out. Then it's downloaded. Okay. And now there is a first draft of a prenuptial agreement that both parties have and have -- and read. Okay. In her deposition, she says I never read the agreement. Well, Joseph will testify that she did. But then of course when you were a trial lawyer, you would follow up this way and you would say well, why didn't you. I just didn't want to. No duress, no issues. So you have a clear understanding as of March 29th that she signed the document in August 13th voluntarily.

What happens beyond that? This is the shocker.

Unbeknownst to Joe, she delivered the prenuptial agreement, the first draft of June 25, to her lawyer, a woman named Batya Goodman, licenced in Florida and in New York. She went to Ms. Goodman's home and met with her up to an hour where Ms.

Goodman reviewed the document in front of her, reviewed every page. Not necessarily every line, I couldn't get Ms. Egosi to commit to that, but over every page. And after 45 minutes to an hour, she was told by the lawyer no American woman would sign this document, I don't recommend you -- you sign it and you shouldn't marry him. And that's what she testified to in

her deposition of two weeks ago today, May 30th of 2017.

That is a far cry from the motion and the facts that you were presented by Ms. McFarling on behalf of her client on January 5 of 2017 when they filed the instant motion to invalidate. And needless to say, I'm confident that Ms. McFarling was surprised by the testimony as well because if she had known about it, that certainly would not have been honest with this Court or to myself because she's very explicit, and -- and if you've seen the pretrial memorandum, I'll give the exact quotes of the brief, without counsel, she signed on the very day she was given it. It wasn't a prior draft. All the things have now been disproven.

And there's something else I want to say as part of this opening statement I think is important. When you have those facts come to light, one of the things that you'll gather is that you realize you're not dealing with a woman who's downtrodden. You're not dealing with a woman who has no capability to protect herself. You're dealing with someone who surreptitiously took this document behind Joe's knowledge and, as she has every right to do, presented it to a lawyer who discussed it with her, who is not Joe's lawyer, and she was told not to sign it.

So the point being that you -- you get a lot in the papers when you review this. And I went back to review the

papers filed by Plaintiff's Counsel. And you'll get this thing that she's downtrodden, she was kicked out of the house, she didn't have any means. But then when you look deeper, you see she has an \$ 800,000 home, she earned \$50,000 a month as a prostitute, she had bank accounts undisclosed, she had bank accounts here that was not disclosed.

You -- you come away with maybe somebody -- something's just not right here. And that's one of the things we're going to ask you to take a look at that I think will rightly encourage you to maybe take a fresh look at this and that's certainly what we ask you to do.

Now, understand the timelines. First draft is June 25. That's nearly four weeks before she consults her lawyer. And then after that, another 26 days between July 18th of 2008 and signing the document on August 13 of 2008. And so that's why there's no serious effort on the part of -- of the Plaintiff to claim duress because there certainly cannot be that in the presence here. And I did go through their rudimentary questions and no gun to the head, nobody forced you to sign this. You had plenty of time to sign. So why did you sign it? Well, because I was in love with Joe, and I wanted to stay in America. So all right.

Now, going on. On August 13, okay, we have the parties reviewing the prenuptial agreement. They moved in the

summer of 2008. And so prior to moving, they downloaded this document and they had to answer the same questions, only they answered the questions in two significantly different ways, which I would say the only reasonable inference is that there's a knowingness -- there's a knowingness about what we're doing.

What do they do? They realize that Nedson's now 18. In fact, he was 18 on June 6th before they downloaded the first time, but recognizing that he's no longer a minor, they delete any reference to Nedson as a minor child which was present as you'll see on the document of June 25, the first draft. And in the second — the second draft they download, Joe specifically identifies each of the four or five assets that he had and his obligation on the HELOC, the credit line that he had specified.

When you look at the -- and when you look at the document and you look at the -- the entries, there is not a place to list a value. And so when I asked Ms. Egosi well, did the value of these assets bother you or did you want to know them, no. Why not? I -- I could care less, she said. Why -- what do you mean by that? I was marrying him for love and I -- I'm the one, you know, who understood that -- what a prenuptial was and I'm not -- I wasn't -- I didn't care specifically -- I didn't care what he owned or what it was

worth. And I went through some detail that you'll hear it today.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So they sign the document voluntarily, they sign it knowingly, they download it. There's about a two hour space and time between downloading it and going next door. say next door, you know -- in the same building I'm understanding but to a mortgage company that was there before a notary public and two witnesses and they signed.

In addition to that, there is, like in every finance -- prenuptial agreement, an effective date. And the effective date is of course on the date of marriage. Well, sometime between August 13 and September 26, the parties agreed to get married but they didn't agree to do that until after they had physically moved to Georgia.

Now what's also significant relative to absence of duress and absence of any type of a fraudulent thing is there was no wedding set before they signed the document, there were no invitations. There was plans for a wedding. They hadn't -- they talked about getting married, but they hadn't made any particular plans. A little different than sometimes you see when you have parties trying to attack a prenuptial agreement. None of that existed here. It's all fair. And then they moved to Atlanta, Georgia.

And -- and by the middle of September, then they

decided well why don't we get married and on the 26th of September, they went down to Fulton County Courthouse and got married with approximately another 150 couples in one large ceremony that apparently you call up and make arrangements for. And so the two of them -- of course they don't know the other 150 couples but they're all there and there's a blessing and they're all married and the -- the marriage certificate evidences that.

There are six weeks now, Judge, between August 13 when they sign the prenuptial agreement and September 26.

There is an effective date provision that makes it clear it doesn't go into effect until they get married. So when you hear the arguments by opposing Counsel that there was some sort of coercion or fraud, it's not brought out by the facts because there were six more weeks between the time they sign it and when they got married that she could have simply followed her lawyer's advice and chosen not to marry Mr. Egosi or demanded a modification.

Here's even more powerful testimony. At the deposition, she acknowledged she knew about every one of his assets because she had worked there for a year and a half. She had driven -- she took great joy -- if I were to show you the videotape, I don't know that I'll have the time to do that, about driving in his Mercedes AMG 55. Oh, I loved it, I

drove it everywhere. Went through every item, I knew the business, I worked in the back office with the financial records, enjoyed organization of the documents.

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13 l

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And then there's something else that's quite significant. You've heard the arguments by opposing Counsel and there is a tendency sometimes to be contradictory and that certainly is caught here, because you've heard the position by opposing Counsel just last month in our May hearing where, you know, she didn't have any understanding of their assets. Well, of course, she contradicts that in her deposition but even more importantly, in a hearing on March 29th before discovery commissioner Soonhee Bailey, the Counsel for the Plaintiff, Ms. McFarling, stated that she knows that the business is doing better now in 2017 than it was doing in 2008 because my client was aware of his earnings the entire marriage, end of quote. Page 27 of that transcript quoting Ms. McFarling's argument to Ms. Bailey.

And Ms. Egosi -- Mrs. Egosi also testifies that she knew generally if they were improving in terms of number of customers or the like. And in her deposition, at page 117, she testified quote, and has the business done better or worse since 2007 to the present day? Answer, better. Question, what's your basis for that opinion? Answer, I worked for the business and I know that.

It is a rare case that has such a turnaround in a time period between January when you have a motion, your own observations in March, and repeated again in May, and this. And that's why I ask the Court, with all due humility, please give Joe Egosi the opportunity of a new clean slate to look at this fresh because it's a different case. And as would be attested to by Mr. Edlin, our expert witness, if he's allowed to testify as to an issue of law, which I don't think he will be allowed by you, but he certainly can testify about ultimate facts.

And the facts you'll hear is that -- and he's an AML member. He's American College of Family Trial Lawyers. He has the finest credentials, one of the very best family law lawyers in Georgia, that the -- the agreement, that the printed document itself is an excellent document, that the facts that are adduced are those that you'd want to have known. Okay. And that while you would certainly want to have a stated value for every asset that's listed, the state of Georgia has been replete with cases, Sperland (ph), Lawrence (ph), Malon (ph), that indicates if there is disclosure, either by you and I having this conversation or having through work experience, which was the Malon case and the Lawrence case, that you acquire this information, then you're not going to be allowed to avoid your obligation.

And there's nothing here that's unconscionable within the mean in Shear, because what you have is a waiver of past interest in -- in an asset and a waiver of alimony. All after acquired community property assets are divided equally. And if -- if everyone could avoid an -- agree to agreement because of it barred prior to just ask it to be one parties and or -- not -- didn't barr, maintained that, and had a waiver of alimony, then you'd have most prenuptial agreements being set aside just on the basis of a claim.

But I really do think that you have to listen to the evidence. We'll hear it unfold again. I have had the opportunity to take the deposition of Ms. Egosi. I have a fair understanding of what Mr. Egosi's testimony is. And more importantly, I've seen what these documents demonstrate, and it's a far different story than we have all been led to believe was the Plaintiff's story prior to today. Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. Ms. McFarling, do you desire to make an opening statement as part of your --

MS. McFARLING: I would like to reserve my opening statement for the beginning of my case in chief.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Jimmerson, you may call your first witness.

MR. JIMMERSON: Thank you. Patricia Egosi, please.

1	THE COURT: Okay. All right. If you'd take the
2	stand.
3	(WITNESS SUMMONED)
4	THE MARSHAL: Stay standing.
5	THE COURT: And raise your right hand to be sworn.
6	THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear the testimony
7	you're about to give in this action shall be the truth, the
8	whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10	THE CLERK: Please state and spell your name for the
11	record and you can be seated.
12	THE WITNESS: Patricia Egosi, P-a-t-r-i-c-i-a.
13	Egosi, E-g-o-s-i.
14	THE COURT: Okay. You may be seated. Counsel, you
15	may proceed.
16	MR. JIMMERSON: Thank you.
17	(COUNSEL CONFER BRIEFLY)
18	MR. JIMMERSON: The Court's indulgence, Judge.
19	PATRICIA EGOSI
20	called as a witness on behalf of the Defendant, having been
21	first duly sworn, did testify upon her oath as follows on:
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. JIMMERSON:
24	Q Good afternoon, Ms. Egosi. If at any time I ask a

1	question that you don't understand, just let me know and	d I'll
2	be happy to rephrase it and try to work with you. Okay?	>
3	A Okay.	
4	Q Your present age please?	
5	A 45.	
6	Q And your date of birth?	
7	A October 9, '71.	
8	Q And in on August 13 of 2008 when you signed	l the
9	prenuptial agreement, you were 36 years of age; is that	right'
10	A Yeah, I guess so.	
11	Q And what is your current address?	
12	A 4200 Paradise Road, Apartment 2077, Las Vegas	Ne
13	Nevada. 89169 is the zip code.	
14	Q And how long have you lived there?	
15	A I guess three months now.	
16	Q Okay. So would that be March to June?	
17	A Yeah.	
18	Q Okay. Now, you went to see a criminal defense	!
19	lawyer with regard to charges brought against you by the	State
20	of Nevada; is that right?	
21	A Uh-huh (affirmative).	
22	Q You listed in those documents that we obtained	from
23	that firm a different address. You said that your home	
24	address is on South Jones. And and that was in April	of

1	2017. Sc	can you explain the discrepancy between your home in	
2	Paradise	Road and the home on South Jones you listed with that	
3	law firm?		
4	A	I was in process of moving and most of my mail went	
5	to this a	ddress. Actually, a lot of my mails go to different	
6	address b	ecause of the at the time, I don't have like my	
7	own place.		
8	Q	Who lives at the South Jones address now?	
9	А	It's my friend, Jacqueline Andrede.	
10	Q	Last name please?	
11	A	Andrede.	
12	Q	How do you spell it?	
13	A	A-n-d-r-e-d-e.	
14	Q	Thanks. Also, we discovered that you went to have	
15	some lase	r vision with Ken Wesfield (ph) in April, right?	
16	A	Laser vision?	
17	Q	Yes, and you spent how much did you spend? A	
18	couple th	ousand dollars I think.	
19	A	I don't think so, sir.	
20	Q	How much did you spend?	
21	А	Nothing.	
22	Q	Okay. There you listed your home to be on Sonoma	
23	Sunset Road. Who lives at that address?		
24	А	It's my friend Lilly Marcus (ph). My I.D when I	

1	took my I	.D. like few months ago, I stay with her and I use	
2	her address to make my I.D.		
3	Q	That was also in April 2017.	
4	А	No, my I.D. was not made in April.	
5	Q	You went to see Ken Wesfield, correct?	
6	A	Excuse me?	
7	Q	You went to see Dr. Wesfield in April of 2017?	
8	A	Yeah.	
9	Q	All right. And that's when you told that office	
10	that your	address on Sonoma Sunset?	
11	А	They use my my address I.D.	
12	Q	All right. Thank you, ma'am.	
13	А	My I.D. address, I mean.	
14	Q	Okay. I'm not going to go through the history	
15	your enti:	re history. I did want to say though that you came	
16	to America three or four times a year between the years of		
17	1998 and 2006, correct?		
18	А	I I don't know about like the years, but I	
19	yeah, three times a year almost.		
20	Q	And you came to Miami to work as a working girl; is	
21	that right?		
22	A	Yes.	
23	Q	Okay. And then you first met Joe Egosi in in	
24	December.	And you've heard my opening statement, so I've kind	

1	of tipped	\ensuremath{my} hand. You told me always that it was in December	
2	2005. Do	you recall that?	
3	А	Yeah, I recall that and I apologize for my mistake.	
4	Q	It's all right.	
5	А	In my head, I was with my husband since 2005. My	
6	day of my	deposition, I went to my passport and I figured out	
7	that it wa	as 2006.	
8	Q	Now you know that	
9	А	So look to me was like longer than that that I be	
10	with him.		
11	Q	Do you know how many times you said that you came to	
12	America in December 2005?		
13	А	Yes, in my head was 2005.	
14	Q	Fifteen, 20, 25 times.	
15	А	Yeah.	
16	Q	All right.	
17	A	I was I I'm I was sure that it was 2005.	
18	Q	But you would agree with Mr. Egosi that it was	
19	December of 2006?		
20	A	Yes, I agree.	
21	Q	All right. Now I had asked you for a copy, during	
22	your deposition of your passport. You didn't provide it to me		
23	and your client (sic) didn't provide it to me. You still have		
24	control of your passport, right?		

1	A No, it's with her and you know that.
2	Q So Ms. McFarling has the passport. All right.
3	Thank you. All right. I do renew my request to have that
4	document. Now, so when you came to you met Joe in December
5	of 2006, correct?
6	A Uh-huh (affirmative).
7	Q All right. And then you returned to America on
8	January 11th of 2007; isn't that right?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Okay. And you came thinking you were going to fly
11	back to Brazil in February of 2007?
12	A It was my plan.
13	Q All right. And but and when you came there,
14	you stayed at Joe's house where he was living with his
15	girlfriend, Sarah; is that right?
16	A Exactly.
17	Q And then a month or so passed and Sarah moved out,
18	right?
19	A Yes.
20	Q All right. Now, a lot of this I know is familiar to
21	you because these are exactly the questions that I asked you
22	in your deposition just two weeks ago today and the answers
23	you've given, but the Judge wasn't present to hear it and so
24	

1	A Un-nun (affirmative).
2	Q that's why we're repeating this.
3	A No problem.
4	Q If if I'm if I'm repeating questions, it's
5	because it's actually intentional. I just need the Judge to,
6	you know, hear this now for the first time. Okay. And so
7	from January 11th of 2006, except for a time I'm sorry,
8	it's 2007. Except for times when you would be out of out
9	of the state of Florida like vacation or travel, you remained
10	in the United States; is that right?
11	A Can you repeat the
12	Q Except for short trips a trip to Brazil I think
13	went for about five or six months, but except for times when
14	you were traveling, you came to to Miami and stayed in
15	Miami until 2008; is that right?
16	A I don't understand the question.
17	Q Fair enough. How long did you live in Miami after
18	you first arrived on January 11th, 2007?
19	A In Miami? I don't know the months, but we move to
20	Georgia in 2008 end of 2007 and begin of 2008. We are
21	not
22	Q Is
23	A I'm I'm not sure about the the month, but it
24	was 2008. So I say

1	Q I	If I suggested that you moved from Miami to Atlanta,
2	Georgia in	September of 2008, would that be refreshing your
3	recollection	on?
4	A A	No, it was before that, sir.
5	Q W	Where were you physically located when you signed
6	the prenupt	tial agreement that is the issue in this case?
7	A W	When I signed the prenup?
8	Q W	Where were you?
9	A W	We was in Florida.
LO	Q P	All right. And that date was August 13 of 2008.
L1	A T	That's what the prenup said, yeah.
2	Q P	All right. So you were still living in Florida as
.3	of August 1	l3 of 2008.
4	A N	No, we live already in in Georgia. I remember
.5	that we rer	nt a friend apartment
.6	Q P	All right.
.7	A -	and we stayed there in North Las Vegas at that
. 8	time.	
.9	Q N	Now you signed the document where did you sign?
20	Where wh	nere was the location of your signing the document?
21	A I	It was in Fort Lauderdale, if I'm not wrong.
22	<u>V</u>	MR. JIMMERSON: Okay. Madam, this is Triple L
23	proposed.	May I I this is my copy. Can I show it to
24	her or do y	you want to pull it

1		THE CLERK: I haven't copied it.
2		MR. JIMMERSON: Years of time, I'm moving along.
3	BY MR.	JIMMERSON:
4	Q	I'm showing you what's been marked as the final
5	signed	prenuptial agreement, Exhibit three LLL. Can you
6	identif	Ty that document?
7	А	Yes, the prenup agreement.
8	Q	Okay. And you signed that document, ma'am?
9	А	Excuse me?
10	Q	Did you sign that document?
11	А	Yeah, I was thinking on the last page. Yeah.
12	Q	And that is your signature?
13	A	Yes, it's my signature.
14	Q	And you signed in front of strangers that were
15	witness	ses, correct?
16	А	Exactly.
17	Q	And where did you sign it? In other words, what
18	office	did you sign it at?
19	А	I don't what kind of office it was, but it was an
20	office	one floor above of my husband's office.
21	Q	So do you recall that the document was downloaded by
22	you and	d your husband that very day, August 13?
23	А	It was not by was not downloaded by me.
24	Q	It wasn't downloaded but you were not present

1	when he was downloading?
2	A I was in the same room for sure, but it was not
3	downloaded by me.
4	Q Okay. But it was downloaded at his office, correct
5	A Yes, at his office.
6	Q And you went upstairs to the third floor where you
7	had the prenuptial agreement notarized signed and
8	notarized, correct?
9	A Yes.
10	Q All right. And that occurred on August 13, the date
11	of the agreement, right?
12	A Yes.
13	Q Okay.
14	(COUNSEL CONFER BRIEFLY)
15	Q Now, you heard in my opening statement and I made a
16	representation to Judge Duckworth that you began working for
17	Joy Phone in approximately March of 2007. Is that is that
18	the date when you began working for that company?
19	A I guess so.
20	Q And according to your testimony, you worked five
21	days a week except when you're out of town through through
22	the time you signed the prenuptial agreement, August of 2013.
23	A No, you're wrong. I work even when I was out of
4	town.

On and off? I don't understand what is on and off.

1

1 back room, were they? 2 Excuse me? 3 The other employees were not allowed to go to the 0 back room; is that right? 4 5 Α No. 6 0 And why was that? 7 Α I'm not sure. 8 Okay. Were the financial records of the business in the back room? 10 Financial record? Α 11 Yes, of the business. 12 A What do you mean financial record? Checking account records. You organize -- you filed 13 the check registers in two files. 14 On 2000 -- from 2007 to 2008, I was only responsible 15 A for portability department. And sometimes I did shipping 16 also. Actually, I did also customer return. 17 18 And do you recall that you felt that you were a good 19 organizer? 20 I am always a good organizer. 21 And do you recall that you would organize the checking reg -- registers -- not regi -- checking statement --22 bank statements on a monthly base -- and place them in the 23 24 right files?

1	A I I don't know about that.
2	Q Okay. You would look at the daily reports, correct
3	A Daily report of what?
4	Q The increased number of customers, the decreased
5	number of customers.
6	A Daily report of increase and decrease?
7	Q Yes.
8	A I don't know what you talk about.
9	Q So are you familiar with the fact that the company
10	every day produced a document, a single page, that would show
11	an increase in telephone customers or maybe if they lost
12	business lost customers, a decrease in customers?
13	A I only was aware about port customer's number, ship
14	customer's adaptor, and receive customer's adaptor. I'm not
15	sure how many I did per day because it's long time ago.
16	Q Okay. And you recall that those daily reports would
17	also show the amount of money that was being collected through
18	normally, credit cards? I guess a check or two could have
19	them, but normally credit cards.
20	A Say again please?
21	Q Do you recall that you would see on those daily
22	reports also the amount of money the company would earn on
23	that day because the customers the new customers would pay
24	up front their yearly charge? And it would show the, you know

-- the -- the credit card.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

A Yeah, you were -- you made -- you made me remem -remind something. Yeah, I did some yearly charge. Joe Egosi
gave me a list of customers every day to charge a yearly sign
up for the customer. So the only thing I did is follow the
list, and go to the customer account, find the customer
account, and then put the amount of money the customer
supposed to pay on the credit card information, click some
links, and then sometimes decline, sometime the -- the payment
went through, but I'm not sure how many customers it was.

- Q Okay.
- A I didn't count at that time.
- Q All right. Now I asked you the question in your deposition two weeks ago, has the business done better or worse since 2007 to the present day. Do you recall that I asked you that question?
 - A Yes.
 - Q All right. Do you recall what your answer was?
- 19 A Yes.
- Q What was your answer?
- 21 A Doing better.
 - $\ensuremath{\mathbb{Q}}$ Okay. Can I ask you what's the basis for your opinion?
 - A I work for the company. On the time that my -- my

D-16-540174-D EGOSI 6/13/2017 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

1 | husband said he was losing money, I had to clean restroom, I 2 had to do the office, I had to move the office across the -the country, you know. And I thought he was losing money. That's why I did all that. And then time pass I saw how he like spend money on travels, on equipments, on everything for co -- for the company. 7 Okay. And prior to signing the prenuptial agreement, did you travel with your -- your husband, at that 8 9 time, your boyfriend, to Brazil? 10 Α Say again, sir? 11 Prior to signing the prenuptial agreement in August 12 2013 --13 Α Yeah. 14 -- had you and Joe traveled to Brazil for an 15 extended time? 16 Yeah, we -- I -- we -- I came in June -- January Α 2007 to stay with him. And I guess we went back to Brazil in 17 18 June if I'm not wrong. 19 Okay. And how long did you stay in Brazil? Several 0 20 months? 21 Α I don't remember, sir. 22 Five or six months? 0 23 Α I don't remember. 24 Okay. And you had enjoyed a -- a good lifestyle Q

yourself before you met Joe; isn't that right? 1 2 Α Excuse me? 3 You had enjoyed a comfortable lifestyle yourself 4 before you met Joe? 5 Α Yes. 6 And during -- by virtue of the work that you 7 performed before you met Joe -- you told Dr. Paglini for 8 example you made \$50,000 a month. 9 Α Yeah. 10 Okay. And in that time period before meeting Joe, you acquired a home in Brazil with another lady; is that 11 12 right? 13 Exactly. 14 And her name please? 15 Α Sandra Silva (ph). 16 Okay. And you acquired the home 50 percent and 50 0 17 percent; is that right? 18 Α Yes. 19 All right. And that was the home that you told the 20 Court, in our last court hearing in May, that it was worth about \$800,000 total? 400,000 for your side. 21 22 My husband said that, not me, because I still today Α 23 I don't know how much my house is evaluate in Brazil. 24 Do you recall that in your deposition two weeks ago, Q

1

that same 30 day trial period? 1 2 I don't know either. 3 And then in any event, you did learn from Joe and by the fact that Mr. Gulio (sic) no longer came to your home or 4 you no longer went to dinner that he would no longer have an 5 interest to buy any portion of Joe's business, right? 6 7 Can you please repeat? I -- I ask you --Did you learn that -- did you learn that Mr. Gulio 8 (sic) had chose not to buy the business? 9 10 I ask you to speak slow because I cannot follow you. You didn't have any trouble when I asked you the 11 identical question in your deposition. Did there come a time 12 13 when Mr. Gulio (sic) --14 But I cannot -- lis -- listen --15 Please. Did there come a time Mr. Gulio (sic) had no longer interest in buying the business? 16 17 Yeah, he was not longer, I guess. Α 18 And why was he not wrong (sic), you guess? You have to ask my husband, not me. 19 Α 20 No, why did you say that he was not wrong, I guess? 21 Excuse me? 22 Why did you say he's not wrong, I guess? You said 23 he's not wrong, I guess. 24 I don't say wrong, longer.

D-16-540174-D EGOSI 6/13/2017 TRANSCRIPT
VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

1	Q Longer?
2	A Yeah.
3	Q All right. Now, let's something else we learned
4	two weeks ago is that you graduated high school and you went
5	to college for three years, right?
6	A Yeah.
7	Q What high school did you graduate from?
8	A Which high school?
9	Q Yes, ma'am.
10	A In Brazil.
11	Q Okay. Do you know the name?
12	A Yeah, Albet Sunsu Demal (ph). Actually, sorry abou
13	that, Duqe Caxais.
14	Q And then you went to college. And what was the name
15	of the college for three years?
16	A Sorry, the the high school was Albet Sunsu Demal
17	and the college Duqe Caxais. It's a long time.
18	Q And do you recall at page 97 of your deposition
19	taken two weeks ago on March 30th, and I asked the question,
20	and what is the fair market value of that home today and you
21	answered I just figured that there is around \$800,000?
22	A Yeah.
23	Q Okay. Now and your girlfriend also told you that
24	the value of the home is \$800,000.

1	A No, I hever speak with customer over the phone.	
2	Q Never spoke to them on the phone.	
3	A Not over	
4	Q Ever.	
5	A the phone. On this period of time.	
6	Q Okay. And was there a time that you did start	
7	talking to customers?	
8	A Yeah, I start talk to the customers he push	me to
9	speak with customers around 2009. I was not hap becau	se my
10	English was not good as today. And I cry everyday that I	have
11	to talk with customer because they always like make fun or	f me
12	to the point that Joe even took phones like phone call	
13	middle of the phone call, he took the phone call and start	
14	yelling and screaming to the customer not	
15	MR. JIMMERSON: Your Honor	
16	A to curse me like that.	
17	MR. JIMMERSON: I'm going to move to strike. Al	.l of
18	this is voluntary.	
19	THE COURT: Su sustained.	
20	BY MR. JIMMERSON:	
21	Q Please, I just asked you when. The answer was 2	009
22	according to your testimony? Is when you first	
23	A Yeah, I think it was 2009, if I'm not wrong.	
24	Q So you deny that you talked on the phone to	
- 11		

1	customers	in 2008?
2	A	I don't think so, sir.
3	Q	And you deny talking to customers in 2007?
4	A	No, I never talk to the customer on phone in 2007.
5	Q	Did you respond to emails?
6	A	Yes, emails. Yes.
7	Q	Did you send emails?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	We produced about 9,000 of those emails in
10	production	1. You've seen those documents, haven't you?
11	А	Yeah, I see I saw some.
12	Q	And they are documents that you responded to or that
13	you initia	ted, that you started, right?
14	A	I don't understand the question.
15	Ω	You either sent a document to a customer or they
16	sent one t	o you and then you responded.
17	A	Yeah.
18		MR. JIMMERSON: Counsel, I'd like to ask as I do
19	have exhib	its 9,000 tickets and emails be introduced as one
20	exhibit.	
21	:	MS. MENTZEL: Are you looking at Exhibit D? Are you
22	looking at	Exhibit C?
23	1	MS. BREWER: Yes.
24	I	MR. JIMMERSON: Yes.

MS. BREWER: That's Exhibit C and D.

MR. JIMMERSON: C and D.

MS. MENTZEL: I'm going to object to authenticity of the documents. We're looking through the documents. They do not say response of Patricia. Most of the documents specifically say Joy Phone. We don't know whether they were sent or received by Patricia exactly. And I mean, I think when we're looking at 9,000 things of pages to -- to put in there -- 9,000 pages of documents when we don't even know -- it doesn't have Patri -- tricia's name as responses to those ex -- exhibits. I'm going to say authenticity. You have to prove that they're actually to and from her.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JIMMERSON: My response is twofold. Number one is they've had weeks to look at the documents, including the witness, to know, is she denying that she was part of it -- I mean, I'm just saying it's a little bit of game. Secondly, there are two types of documents in the 9,000. One's called tickets and one is called emails. The emails are to Joy Phone. The tickets are addressed specifically to Patricia. And we have an example for the Court you haven't seen. So that foundation argument by opposing Counsel, Ms. Mentzel, would not be accurate.

MS. MENTZEL: And we received these documents on

June 2nd of 2017, these 9,000 pages, which were produced by 1 2 Defendant. 3 MR. JIMMERSON: Right. MS. MENTZEL: On -- on June 2nd. We're looking at 4 what's June 13th now. 5 6 MR. JIMMERSON: It's true. 7 MS. MENTZEL: So we -- we received them 11 days ago? 8 MS. McFARLING: It's a Friday. 9 MS. MENTZEL: Oh, it was a Friday? 11 days ago. 10 MR. JIMMERSON: They've had plenty of time. And these are true and correct documents. Just --11 12 MS. MENTZEL: And --13 MR. JIMMERSON: Just a game and they're using my time to do it, Judge. My client can certainly lay the 14 foundation. They're business records kept in the ordinary course. I have a certificate of custodian of records, but I'd like -- if I could to get them admitted, if not, then --18 THE COURT: Well --19 MR. JIMMERSON: -- you'll make your ruling and 20 we'll --21 THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. 22 MR. JIMMERSON: -- go on. THE COURT: Through this witness, I sustain the 23 24 objection.

1	Q	And all of them were in English, correct?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	All the emails were in English?
4	А	Yes, it was United States.
5	Q	All the tickets were in English?
6	А	Yes. Actually sometimes I I also answer in
7	Spanish.	
8	Q	And and you responded in English, right?
9	A	Uh-huh (affirmative).
10	Q Q	Your response in English? Did you ever have to hire
11	a transla	ator to do your job, an interpreter?
12	A	What do you mean do my job translate? I don't
13	understar	nd the question.
14	Q	To receive emails, to send emails, to speak to
15	customers	s, to listen to customers. Did you ever have to
16	employ th	ne use of an interpreter or a translator?
17	А	I don't have employ but I have Google Translator.
18	Q	You didn't use it, did you?
19	А	If I use it? I still have Google Translate on my
20	cell phon	e now.
21	Q	But you didn't use it during your job, did you?
22	А	I use a lot.
3	Q	You did?
4	A	Yeah.

-1	. ~	when did you start using it, maram?
2	2 A	I used Google Translate before I met Joe Egosi.
3	Q	Did you use it during your job as part of your
4	responsil	oilities in front of these folks?
5	A	What folks?
6	Q	Folks your mother-in-law, your father-in-law, and
7	your hush	pand.
8	A	No, I don't understand the question. So please
9	Q	Would any one of the three of them have seen you use
10	this alle	eged translator that you got?
11	А	I'm not sure I don't know.
12	Q	What was your level of fluency in English in June
13	in August	of 2013?
14	A	I speak some English, yes, and read and write only
15	few words	
16	Q	Do you recall in
17	A	here and there.
18	Q	Sorry. Do you recall in your motion on January 5 of
19	2017 that	you swore to under oath, that you didn't speak a
20	word of Er	nglish?
21	А	It's the way that I can say that I don't speak word
22	in English	. Speak word
23	Q	But in fact, you spoke quite a bit of English; isn't
24	that true?	or migrish; Isn't
- 1		

Τ.	Α	rean, I speak some English for Suite.
2	Q	I think we would agree that you are not fluent in
3	English.	Agree?
4	А	Yeah.
5	Q	But your knowledge of English was quite extensive
6	because of	f your many trips to United States from 2008 to the
7	to the	time you signed the prenuptial agreement, right?
8	A	I don't think I need to speak English when I was a
9	stripper.	I work with my body, not with my mouth.
10	Q	And you made a trip to United States about 20 times
11	between 20	008 and 2006 I mean, between 1998 and 2006; isn't
L2	that right	z?
13	А	Excuse me? Say again?
L4	Q	You came to the United States about 20 times over
L5	the eight	years of 2000 of 1998 to 2006?
16	А	I I don't know how many times with what you
.7	saying.	
.8	Q	All right. Now, let me just you knew how to
.9	write, for	example, words like I love you?
0.2	А	Yeah.
1	Q	How are you doing?
2	A	Uh-huh (affirmative).
:3	Q	Everything okay?
4	А	Simple

1	Q You speak that in English?
2	A Simple simple things like that.
3	Q And you could write in English as well, right?
4	A Simple things like that.
5	Q Now, you first started discuss
6	(COUNSEL CONFER BRIEFLY)
7	Q You first started discussing a prenup in March of
8	2007; is that right?
9	A Excuse me, sir? Like I I
10	(COUNSEL CONFER BRIEFLY)
11	MS. MENTZEL: Quick question for the Court. I'm
12	just wanting wondering if the witnesses if these are
13	witnesses back here
14	MR. JIMMERSON: They are.
15	MS. MENTZEL: preparing to testify
16	MR. JIMMERSON: They are.
17	MS. MENTZEL: we'd like to invoke the
18	Exclusionary Rule with the witnesses.
19	MR. JIMMERSON: As long as it's applied mutually, I
20	have no objection.
21	MS. MENTZEL: Absolutely.
22	THE COURT: Okay. So anyone who is you plan to
23	call as a witness needs to be excused.
24	(COUNSEL CONFER BRIEFLY)

Τ	BI MR. JIMMERSON:
2	Q So the question that I was asking you was
3	MS. McFARLING: May I ask who this is behind us?
4	MR. JIMMERSON: That's the father. Isn't that
5	isn't that David?
6	MR. EGOSI: Yes, is he going to be a witness?
7	MR. JIMMERSON: He is definitely going to be a
8	witness.
9	MR. EGOSI: Okay. David, please
10	THE MARSHAL: It is policy, sir.
11	MR. D. EGOSI: You want me to do?
12	MR. EGOSI: You're going to be a witness.
13	MR. JIMMERSON: You have to leave, David, because
14	you're going to be a witness.
15	MR. D. EGOSI: Where do I go, outside?
16	MR. JIMMERSON: Yes, sir. Thank you so much.
17	BY MR. JIMMERSON:
18	Q Okay. The question I asked you before the
19	interruption there was, did you and Joe start talking about a
20	prenuptial agreement in the spring of 2007?
21	A You say spring 2007?
22	Q Yeah, March and April 2007.
23	A I I don't remember.
24	Q You remember me asking in your deposition?

1	A I don't remember which month we start talk about
2	prenup.
3	Q But it was months before you downloaded the
4	prenuptial agreement.
5	A I still don't remember when.
6	Q Okay. Very good. And do you recall that you looked
7	at different websites where were were you looking at
8	prenuptial agreements?
9	A Excuse me?
10	Q Do you recall looking at different websites online
11	to look at different prenuptial agreements?
12	A Me look website for the prenup?
13	Q With with Joe, yes. The two of you.
14	A No, not me.
15	Q You don't recall that you looked at three or four
16	different websites?
17	A No.
18	Q Do you recall that you and Joe on June 25 downloaded
19	a first draft of your prenuptial agreement?
20	A The whole pro prenup process was made by my
21	husband.
22	MR. JIMMERSON: I move to strike the answer as being
23	non-responsive.
24	THE COURT: Sustained.

4	DI MR. JIMMERSON:	
2	Q Do you recall that you and Joe downloaded the first	
3	draft of your prenuptial agreement on June 24 and June 25?	
4	A My husband did that.	
5	Q All right. And you were not present?	
6	A Maybe I was around him, but I did not sit with him	
7	and look to the computer and download anything.	
8	Q Okay. So you met with your lawyer on July 18th of	
9	2007; isn't that right? I'm sorry, 2008. I misspoke. You	
10	met with your lawyer on July 18th of 2008; isn't that right?	
11	A Lawyer? Which lawyer you talk about?	
12	Q Ms. Goodman, the one you identified in your	
13	deposition.	
14	A She was never my lawyer.	
15	Q You met with a woman named Batya Goodman on July	
16	18th of 2008; isn't that right?	
17	A Batya?	
18	Q Yes or no?	
19	A I know her name right now, but I know her from as	
20	Bea was Joe's close friends.	
21	MR. JIMMERSON: Move to strike the answer as being	
22	non-responsive.	
23	THE COURT: Sustained.	
24	BY MR. JIMMERSON:	

1	BY MR. J	IMMERSON:
2	Q	When you met with her, you met with her in her
3	bedroom,	correct?
4	А	Yes.
5	Q	And you met with her alone, only the two of you
6	being pr	esent, correct?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	And you met with her for approximately one hour;
9	isn't th	at right?
10	A	No.
11	Q	How long did you meet with her?
12	А	I think like a few minutes.
13	Q	Oh, just a few minutes.
14	A	Yeah.
15	Q	So when you testified it was 45 minutes to an hour,
16	that was	not truthful two weeks ago?
17	A	Maybe.
18	Q	And she told you after she read every page to
19	you, corr	rect?
20	А	She read for herself, yeah.
21	Q	And then she discussed what was in the agreement,
22	correct?	
23	А	No, she didn't discuss me anything.
24	Q	She discussed with you that that there be a

	30 I d like to just there's not a requirement for
2	publishing deposition. That's a vestige of a thousand years
3	ago. I would move to publish or have printed out the
4	deposition of Patricia Egosi taken on March 30th, 2017.
5	THE COURT: And that's marked as one of the
6	exhibits?
7	MR. JIMMERSON: It is May 30th I say that's
8	it's and exhibit number is what?
9	MS. BREWER: Triple E.
10	MR. JIMMERSON: EEE.
11	THE COURT: Any objection to the admission of of
12	Exhibit Triple E?
13	MS. MENTZEL: No Objection.
14	THE COURT: Exhibit Triple E is admitted into the
15	record.
16	(DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT EEE ADMITTED)
17	MR. JIMMERSON: And in that regard, I would
18	stipulate to and by and introduce Joe's deposition.
19	THE COURT: Which is Exhibit
20	(COUNSEL CONFER BRIEFLY)
21	MS. BREWER: Double N.
22	MR. JIMMERSON: Double N. NN. Okay. All right.
23	BY MR. JIMMERSON:
24	Q I'd like to call your attention to page 88 of your
- 11	

D-16-540174-D EGOSI 6/13/2017 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

deposition and ask you to recall that I asked you this 1 question reading from lines 11 through 22. Just read them 2 3 quietly to yourself please. 4 11420? Α 5 No, no, no. Read it to yourself. 6 Α 1141? 7 0 Line 11. You see the 11 there? 8 Α Yeah. 9 Just read there down to 22. Q 10 Α 22? 11 Yeah, please. Just read it to yourself. Q 12 MS. MENTZEL: I'm sorry, Jim. What page are you on? 13 MR. JIMMERSON: 88. 14 MS. MENTZEL: 88. Thank you. 15 (COUNSEL AND CLIENT CONFER BRIEFLY) 16 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm done. BY MR. JIMMERSON: 17 18 Question. When you -- when you met with -- with Bea -- referring to -- she went over this document with you. 19 You've already -- you told us that right. Like she read for 20 herself and then she tried to explain to me what is the 21 22 document for, but she never like read to me every single page, every single sentence. Question. What did she read to you 23 then if she didn't read everything? Answer. She read for 24

1	you?	
2	A	He went there with me to read the prenup. He knows
3	then.	
4	Q	Well, you didn't say that in your deposition. So
5	you're sa	ying he was present when it was read to you?
6	A	We went to her house for this for to
7	read the	prenup.
8	Q	Really?
9	A	He knows that. He
10	Q	Who was present for that meeting to read the prenup?
11	A	In the house?
12	Q	Yes, ma'am.
13	A	Me, him, his her boyfriend, her.
14	Q	Okay. And why did you meet with her alone in her
15	bedroom?	
16	А	It was her thing to do. I don't know. We have to
17	ask	
18	Q	You asked to meet with her.
19	A	We
20	Q	You asked to go over the agreement with her, didn't
21	you?	
22	А	Huh?
23	Q	You asked her to review the document, didn't you?
24	А	I ask her.

2

1	Q Okay. You knew that she was a lawyer?
2	A Yeah, because it was his friend. He told me.
3	That's why we went there.
4	Q And you asked her what her opinion was about the
5	agreement and what it said?
6	A She said not to sign.
7	Q I know. Appreciate that. Thank you. Now, she got
8	the agreement because you emailed it to her; isn't that right
9	A No, sir.
10	MR. JIMMERSON: All right. Now
11	(COUNSEL CONFER BRIEFLY)
12	MR. JIMMERSON: What Exhibit number is it?
13	MS. BREWER: Triple it's Double Z.
14	MR. JIMMERSON: May I have Double Z, please? ZZ.
15	BY MR. JIMMERSON:
16	Q You had a child from a prior relationship, ma'am?
17	A Prior relationship, yes.
18	Q Who is that child?
19	A Nedson Acosta (ph).
20	Q And what is his date of birth?
21	A June 6, '99.
22	Q And when you and David excuse me, when you and
23	Joe had this first agreement downloaded that you discussed and
24	you had Ms. Goodman review for you, it referenced Nedson as

1	your son,	didn't it?
2	A	Who who fill out the document was my husband, so
3	MONE MANUE	
4	Q	You
5	A	whatever is there; I don't know why he did it.
6	Q	So you deny being present with him when it was
7	downloade	d?
8	A	Exactly.
9	Q	I okay. And but you got a hold of the
10	document,	right?
11	A	When I talk to Bea and when I sign.
12	Q	So how did you get physical control
13		MR. JIMMERSON: And we're going to mark this
14	exhibit, 3	Judge, Exhibit ZZ, the July the Ja June 24
15	agreement.	
16	BY MR. JIN	MERSON:
17	Q	You recognize that document, don't you, ma'am?
18	А	Yes, the prenup again.
19	Q	Good. Did you ever tell your lawyer that you had
20	negoti	that shown that document to a lawyer?
21	A	Of course no. Once again, she was not my lawyer.
22	She was my	husband friend.
23		Did you ever tell your lawyer that you signed
24	that th	at you had that document in a meeting with Ms.

	Goodinair:	
2	A	I don't have a lawyer.
3	Q	Would you now answer my question for the third time?
4	Did you t	ell your lawyer that you had taken that document
5	А	I told
6	Q	and discussed it with Ms. Goodman?
7		MS. McFARLING: Objection. Calls for
8	attorney-	client privilege.
9		THE COURT: Sustained.
10	BY MR. JII	MMERSON:
11	Q	Do you recognize this document?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	What is it?
14	А	This is a prenup agreement.
15	Q	And that was the document that you discussed with
16	Attorney E	Batya Goodman, correct?
17	А	It's the document that she read.
18		MR. JIMMERSON: Move to admit Exhibit ZZ, Your
19	Honor.	
20		MS. MENTZEL: I'll object as to authenticity. I
21	want the c	lient to actually look at the document. I don't
22	know if sh	e's aware that it's not the same document that she
23	signed.	
24		THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.

1	MS. MENTZEL: If she would actually look through to
2	see what document it is
3	THE WITNESS: Okay. Yeah. Yeah, it's not the same
4	What is this?
5	BY MR. JIMMERSON:
6	Q Well, if you picked up your lawyer's objection,
7	well, my question to you is have you said you have seen
8	that document before?
9	A Oh, okay. You did not stop; look the other pages,
10	right?
11	Q You're right, but it's something you had now for
12	four or five days to look at. It says it was discovered by
13	Mr. Egosi.
14	A If I saw this document before?
15	Q Yes.
16	A I don't think so, sir.
17	Q What document did you show Ms. Goodman, the lawyer?
18	A It's funny you ask me that, because I still don't
19	know if it's the document that I gave to Bea was the do the
20	the same document that I sign. You know, so
21	Q I can assure you that it wasn't.
22	MR. JIMMERSON: Judge, I'll give this to my client.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	BY MR. JIMMERSON:

1	∥	Now listen to my question.
2	A	Okay.
3	Q	Have you read this document in the last two weeks?
4	А	Yeah.
5	Q	Okay. And you had not read it, according to your
6	testimony	, before that.
7	A	Before? Before two weeks before?
8	Q	Had you read
9		MS. McFARLING: Objection. Misstates her her
10	depositio	on testimony.
11		THE WITNESS: I I don't understand the questions.
12		THE COURT: Overruled.
13	BY MR. JI	MMERSON:
14	Q	Did you
15	А	I I don't understand what you try to ask me.
16	Q	Have you ever read that document?
17	A	I read this document, yeah.
18	Q	When was the first time you read it?
19	A	After he drove in the streets.
20	Q	So what date was that?
21	А	I don't remember.
22	Q	Is the date you're referring to the day that the
23	police gav	ve you a choice of going to jail or going back to
24	Atlanta or	June on August 19?

1	you moved	to Atlanta?
2	A	I don't remember which month.
3		MS. McFARLING: Objection. Asked and answered.
4		MR. JIMMERSON: I agree, I I wanted to I
5	wanted to	confirm their answers I don't have.
6	BY MR. JII	MMERSON:
7	Q	Okay. Now, you and Joe decided to get married in
8	September	of two thou of 2008, correct?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And you got married at Fulton County Courthouse,
11	correct?	
12	А	Uh-huh (affirmative).
13	Q	On September 26th of 2007, correct?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	Remember you told me September 28?
L6	А	2007 or 2008?
L7	Q	2008, June September 28, 2008.
.8	А	Yeah.
.9	Q	Okay. Do you remember in your deposition you told
20	me you got	married on September 28th of 2008?
21	A	Yeah, I I still haven't forgotten it was that.
22	Q	All right. Now were there other couples present
3	getting ma	rried at the same time?
4	А	There was a lot.

1	Q Your son, Ben, was born on January 14th of 2014?
2	A Exactly.
3	Q Okay. And you've lived separate and apart from your
4	husband since mid August of 2016; is that
5	A Excuse me?
6	Q And you've lived separate and apart away from Joe
7	since the middle of August 2016; is that right?
8	A Yeah.
9	MR. JIMMERSON: At this time I have no further
10	questions.
11	THE COURT: All right. Let's let's take a break,
12	an an afternoon break. Ten minutes and then we'll resume.
13	You may you may step down to take a
14	THE WITNESS: Is it all right?
15	THE COURT: Yeah, you may step down.
16	THE WITNESS: Okay.
17	(COURT RECESSED AT 14:54 AND RESUMED AT 15:04)
18	THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record in
L9	the Egosi matter. Ms. McFarling, did you desire to question
20	your client at this time?
21	MR. JIMMERSON: Judge, I'd like to ask for seven or
22	eight more minutes to examine about 10 questions.
3	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's have the
24	Plaintiff if you'd take the stand again, ma'am.
- 11	

1	THE WITNESS: Okay.
2	THE COURT: I remind you you're still under oath.
3	You're still under oath. Okay. Mr. Jimmerson.
4	BY MR. JIMMERSON:
5	Q Mrs. Egosi, I I just forgot to ask a few
6	questions. You knew what a prenuptial agreement was before
7	you signed this document, did you?
8	A My husband explain to me.
9	Q And you knew what it was in Brazilian; isn't that
10	true?
11	A Yeah, I hear about the prenup agreements for rich
12	people.
13	Q And you remember telling me what you understood what
14	a prenuptial agreement is.
15	A Yeah, I remember.
16	Q And you knew it before you signed the agreement. Do
17	you remember telling me that?
18	A Before I sign the agreements?
19	Q Before you signed
20	A Yeah, before I signed the agreement.
21	Q So tell the Court what your understanding of a
22	prenuptial is.
23	A As my husband said, the prenup agreement was a
24	document that's supposed to protect our assets, things that we
- 1	

had before we married.

1 was? 2 I remember they have like in kind of those things 3 for me to analyze. I don't think I saw anything to be analyzed over there at the time. 4 5 You testified earlier that prior to meeting Joe, there were times you made \$50,000 a month, correct? 6 7 Excuse me? Say again? Α 8 0 Prior to meeting Joe, there were times that you made --10 Α Yes. 11 -- from your income 50,000 a month? 12 Α Yeah. Did you give up that income for Joe? Can you please 13 14 answer verbally? 15 Α Yes. 16 You testified earlier about a contract that you are now aware of between -- or potential contract between a Marco 17 Guligan and Joe. When was the first time you ever physically 18 19 saw that contract? 20 Was in 2017. I don't remember which month. And how did you obtain a copy of that contract in 21 22 2017? 23 Somebody faxed to your office. Α 24 Did you request that somebody --Q

1	A Yes.
2	Q send it to me? And did you request that Marco
3	Guligan send it to me?
4	A Yes.
5	Q And when was the first time that you were aware of
6	any dollar amounts or numbers contained in that contract that
7	you first saw in 2017 after Marco Guligan sent it to my
8	office?
9	A After you guys I I call you guys office and
10	you guys sent to me via email a copy. And I read and it was
11	actually, it was a version in English, another version in
12	Portuguese. I read the one in Portuguese and I saw they had
13	like an amount of money and some percentage. Since I'm not
14	good at mathematic, I call a friend and ask how much should b
15	the total of his business. And the person told me how much
16	was.
17	Q And when that person did some math after looking at
18	the contract that you received in 2017, had you been aware of
19	the numbers or finances prior to that?
20	A Sorry, can you please repeat?
21	Q Were you ever aware of the the numbers or dollar
22	amounts associated with that contract prior to receiving it in
23	2017?
24	A No.

No.

And at the time that Joe was negot -- negotiating

1

be like his investor. You know, since the man like stepped out of the business, he lost the deposit. 3 So in -- in 2007, when I got the contract when I figured out that was not that way. Joe run away from Brazil because he's supposed to pay this man one year later and he 6 never pay. Actually, every time we went to Brazil, I cannot -- I was not able to tell my family what time I -- I arrive --7 8 MR. JIMMERSON: Objection, Your Honor. 9 Α -- what time I leave. 10 MR. JIMMERSON: This is far beyond the question that 11 was asked. 12 THE COURT: Sustained. MR. JIMMERSON: She's volunteering testimony. 13 14 THE COURT: It be -- it's becoming a narrative. 15 BY MS. McFARLING: 16 Did Joe inform you of situations concerning Marco Guligan dur -- at times during your marriage after the 17 situation when he was negotiating this contract? 18 19 I don't understand the question. Can you please Α 20 repeat? 21 Were there -- when -- when you went to Brazil with Joe after you were married, did you ever have any contact with 22 23 Marco Guligan?

1

24

Α

No.

1	MS. McFARLING: Yeah.
2	MS. MENTZEL: right here.
3	MR. JIMMERSON: I got it.
4	MS. McFARLING: Would you prefer I use the one in
5	your exhibit book or do you care?
6	MR. JIMMERSON: I don't care.
7	MS. McFARLING: Oh, look at that. Okay. Perfect.
8	MR. JIMMERSON: I should have waited 15 minutes,
9	Judge, to hand that to her.
10	BY MS. McFARLING:
11	Q Can you please turn to page 89 of your deposition
12	transcript?
13	A Yeah.
14	Q Early earlier Mr. Jimmerson said that you had
15	said at your deposition that you had met with Ms. Goodwin for
16	45 minutes to an hour. Do you recall him asking you that? Do
17	you recall? Do you recall him asking about your testimony
18	from the deposition?
19	A I don't remember.
20	Q Okay. If you could look at page 89 of this
21	deposition, line 4, he asks, so what did how long did the
22	meeting last with her at her home. And what was your answer
23	to that?
24	A A few minutes.

question that Joe -- Joe says why don't you talk to Bea, she 1 knows about these types of things? 3 MR. JIMMERSON: Object to the form of the question, Judge. I impeached her through her testimony where this lawyer did try to explain to her about the prenup. Now, trying to rehabilitate those fashions are inappropriate 7 because the words say what they say. 8 THE COURT: Well the transcript does say what it --9 what it says. So I --10 MS. McFARLING: Correct. 11 THE COURT: -- certainly can read that, but the 12 objection's overruled. Counsel may inquire. 13 MS. McFARLING: There was an -- there was an implication that she had not -- that she -- how -- how it came 14 15 to be that -- that Patricia went to her home. 16 MR. JIMMERSON: I'm just -- object -- that's 17 argument. That's for --18 THE COURT: Yeah. 19 MR. JIMMERSON: -- conclusion of the case. 20 THE COURT: Yeah, I mean the doc -- the transcript 21 speaks for itself. 22 BY MS. McFARLING: 23 Right. So do you -- do you agree with that question that was asked by Jimmerson? Joe says why don't you talk to 24

Bea, she knows about these types of things 1 2 Yeah, he bring up her name because was his friend. How -- had you ever met Bea before that day? 3 Q Α Yes. 4 5 And how did you know Bea? Q 6 When I met Joe, there was over at -- Joe's friend 7 and Joe introduce me to them. And then we party here and 8 there together. All the crazy parties from Joe Egosi. 9 And whose -- whose idea was it that you meet with 10 Bea about --11 Α His -- his idea. 12 His who? Q 13 Α Joe's idea. 14 Did -- when you -- when you talked with Bea in her 15 bedroom about this premarital agreement, did you believe her to be a lawyer representing you in negotiating this prenup 16 17 with Joe? 18 For sure not. First of all, she was not lawyer this 19 time. She was kind of assistant. And --20 MR. JIMMERSON: Excuse me, Your Honor. She 21 testified on direct that she was a lawyer. Okay. And I can 22 take judicial notice of NRS 47 matters of fact that this woman is barred in Florida and in New York. And she's now going to 23 start prevaricating and say she wasn't a lawyer. And -- and

1	this is what is going on here. I just want to call to the
2	Court's attention.
3	(COUNSEL CONFER BRIEFLY)
4	THE WITNESS: Excuse me? Excuse me?
5	MS. McFARLING: There's no question pending. I
6	don't think there's been any evidence presented that this
7	woman was a lawyer at that time.
8	MR. JIMMERSON: Court can take judicial notice the
9	same. If you're going to have her deny that she's a lawyer,
10	then I will produce her bar information from the from this
11	online
12	THE COURT: Is that the
13	MS. McFARLING: From the state of Georgia?
14	THE COURT: Is that the Plaintiff's offer? The
15	MS. MENTZEL: From the state of Georgia.
16	MS. McFARLING: My offer of proof is that there are
17	zero records that this woman is a lawyer in the state of
18	Georgia.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	MR. JIMMERSON: I didn't say Georgia. She's a
21	lawyer Florida and New York. I never said Georgia.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MR. JIMMERSON: The meeting though took place in
24	Florida.

D-16-540174-D EGOSI 6/13/2017 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

1	where she read the premarital agreement, did you know her full
2	name?
3	A No.
4	Q And at that time, did you believe her to be a
5	lawyer?
6	A On page 74, I say like some assistant, something
7	like that.
8	Q And and do you believe your deposition answer to
9	be consistent as to your knowledge of this woman's
10	professional status at the time you met with her?
11	MR. JIMMERSON: Objection, Judge.
12	THE WITNESS: Yes.
13	MR. JIMMERSON: That's
14	THE COURT: What what is the evidentiary
15	objection?
16	MR. JIMMERSON: It's an improper question as to what
17	she believes her testimony is. That's like self serving, I
18	could say anything I want to say about my earlier testimony.
19	THE COURT: Well well
20	MR. JIMMERSON: And her testimony today that says
21	she was a lawyer.
22	THE COURT: Yeah, the record speaks for itself. The
23	the objection's overruled. There's not a basis for the
24	Court to that becomes an issue of credibility.

1	BI MS. MC	FARLING:
2	Q	At the time that you signed the premarital
3	agreement	, did you know the value of Joe's business?
4	А	No.
5	Q	Do you know that value today?
6	A	I still don't know.
7		MS. McFARLING: That's all my questions at at
8	this poin	t in time, but I do plan to recall her.
9		THE COURT: Any redirect?
10		MR. JIMMERSON: Yes, three questions.
11		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. JI	MMERSON:
13	Q	The prenuptial agreement is 13 pages long, correct?
14	A	I don't know. I'm not sure.
15	Q	Okay. How long would it did it take Ms. Goodman
16	to read t	hat 13 page document in her bedroom?
17	А	I don't remember how long
18	Q	Thank you.
19	A	but it was few minutes.
20	Q	And do you recall that you testified that you never
21	asked Joe	the value of the business?
22	А	Excuse me?
23	Q	You never asked Joe the value of the business he
24	listed, d	id you?
11		

1	A No, I never ask.
2	Q Okay. You never asked the value of anything, did
3	you?
4	A No.
5	Q But you had lived with him, you had worked for him,
6	you have driven in his car, you had lived in his condo.
7	A Uh-huh (affirmative).
8	Q Okay. And you had worked at his business?
9	A Excuse me?
10	Q And you had worked at his business?
11	A Yes.
12	MR. JIMMERSON: Thank you. Nothing further.
13	THE COURT: All right. You may step down.
14	(COUNSEL AND CLIENT CONFER BRIEFLY)
15	MR. JIMMERSON: I do call Sarah Woelz to the witness
16	stand please. I'll go get her when she's ready.
17	MS. MENTZEL: Patricia, come here.
18	(WITNESS SUMMONED)
19	MR. JIMMERSON: Ms. Brewer's going to conduct the
20	direct, Your Honor. If I could ask for minutes. May I leave
21	for just one minute please? May I leave the
22	THE COURT: Yeah, that's fine.
23	MR. JIMMERSON: I'll be back in one minute. Go
24	right ahead and take the wi sit right here, ma'am.

understand English. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 4 MS. BREWER: And that was included in the 5 disclosure. And we were not sure or aware of the existence of 6 these parties because it's been so long ago since there was 7 contact. So it wasn't exactly easy to get a hold of people 8 after 10 years of --9 THE COURT: Okay. But will you acknowledge the -the disclosure didn't happen until just recently. 10 11 MS. BREWER: We acknowledge. 12 THE COURT: Okay. So from a timeliness --13 timeliness standpoint, it creates an issue --14 MS. BREWER: And we --15 THE COURT: -- for you. 16 MS. BREWER: -- were disclosing pursuant to 16.2 as quickly as possible when items became available. As you know, 17 this case has been extremely fluid. And with the discovery of 18 19 information, more information is flowing when we -- as the 20 story is shifting and changing. 21 THE COURT: Well, here's what I'm inclined to do. 22 I'm inclined at least at this point not to allow the witness to testify. To the extent I feel like that testimony may be 23

testify regarding Patricia's ability to comprehend and

1

24

warranted or necessary at the conclusion, I can remedy the

No.

Egosi in the 18 month time period of March of '07 through

23

24

August of '08?

	and only. The the reports that you be referring to r
2	believe is what she knows as as sign up report. It's
3	signup.pl on on our internal systems. The reason that
4	Patricia will have to look at the sign up report is because
5	she did all the shipping. So in before we ship, she had to
6	look at the daily report to see all new customers that join
7	and how much they paid and make sure that they have 911
8	authorization. Basically they have to acknowledge that E911
9	is different from traditional 911, that's emergency services.
10	So once she confirm that, she will print their bills and she
11	will send them the adapter. Without the adapter, our clients
12	will not be able to use our service.
13	Now, the thing about the sign up report and we
14	can pro we can show the judge so he can visualize what I'm
15	trying to say.
16	MS. McFARLING: Objection. Non-responsive to the
17	question asked.
18	THE COURT: Sustained.
19	THE WITNESS: Yeah, sorry.
20	BY MR. JIMMERSON:
21	Q How can have you produced documents that evidence
22	her duties and responsibilities?
23	A Yes. I helieve we have

What did -- what did you produce? Have you

delivered to opposing Counsel?

A We -- we produce tickets, emails, different reports.

Q And what do the tickets speak to?

A Tickets is communication -- communication between clients and employees. And it could also be used internally. And the way tickets -- new tickets get generated is any time an email is -- gets sent into the company, they are -- they automatically signed a ticket number. So that way the company could track every request from beginning to end. Also sometimes tickets will fall into the wrong department. For example, if you email support@joyphone.com, it will go into the support department but maybe that customer wants to do upgrade or billing. So that ticket will then be assigned to the billing department, which will fall into Patricia's queue.

 $\ensuremath{\mathbb{Q}}$ And tickets are directed specifically to Patricia. Is that right?

A The tickets that go to billing and tickets that go to portability and upgrades go directly to Patricia. Other tickets that go to the general mailbox of support will be assigned by the support staff to billing or basically to Patricia.

Q Okay. Showing what's been marked as proposed MMM. What are these group of documents please?

A These are samples of tickets that work by Patricia.