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Q. Why don't you tell everyone here in the court what you do for a living?
A. Well, $I$ currently do a lot of depositions and trial testimony as a $30(b)(6)$ PMK for Alessi Koenig. I'm a California attorney.
Q. And can you explain to me why -- so you do a lot of depositions then, correct?
A. Hundreds and hundreds.
Q. Sounds like a lot of fun.
A. It's - -
Q. What were you doing in 2010 and 2011?
A. I was part of a firm called Alessi Koenig. We were an HOA assessment collection law firm. We also perform general counsel services.
Q. Okay. And you said you had a law degree; right?
A. Yes. I'm a California lawyer.
Q. California lawyer.

Where did you go to school at, sir?
A. I -- law school or undergraduate?
Q. Law school is fine.
A. The University of La Verne. And then $I$ finished up my last year at Pepperdine.
Q. Okay. So you were working at the law firm Alessi \& Koenig in 2010 and 2011; correct?

01:37:39 1
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01:38:11 15
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What is Alessi \& Koenig currently doing right now?
A. Alessi \& Koenig because of all the litigation with the banks and the investors finally had to throw up the white flag and file Chapter 7 in December of 2016 .
Q. Okay. Are you familiar today with the property known as 4254 Rolling Stone Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89103.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How are you familiar with that property, sir?
A. My understanding is that it is the subject property of this litigation.
Q. Okay. And are you familiar with that property outside of just being the subject of this litigation?
A. No.
Q. Did Alessi \& Koenig perform any collection services on behalf of --
A. My understanding is that we did. I don't have a specific recollection of this file. I did speak with, as $I$ often do prior to testifying or depositions, our paralegal Johnna Lepona, L-E-P-O-N-A, on my way to the hearing today. And she briefed me on the
$01: 38: 44$
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particulars of the foreclosure.
Q. Okay. Can you take a look at Exhibit 7 in your binder.
A. Okay.
Q. NOW, my Exhibit 7 runs as USBO026 through USBOO - - or USB0175. Does yours as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And it appears on the front page of Exhibit 7 that there's an affidavit of David Alessi as custodian of records for Alessi \& Koenig LLC. Do you see what I'm talking about, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. On USBOO28 there is, it looks like, a signature, and then your name David Alessi, Esquire?
A. Correct.
Q. Is that your signature there, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. So you testified as a custodian of records through this affidavit of custodian of records that these documents contained at USB02--0026 through 0175 were the true and correct collection file that Alessi \& Koenig had on the property that brings us here today?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And did you review these documents previously?

01:40:11
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A. I'm sure $I$ reviewed them back in November of 2015. I don't have a specific recollection of reviewing them.
Q. Okay. Let me take a look. But Alessi \& Koenig did conduct the foreclosure sale on this property?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. And you have no reason to believe that Alessi \& Koenig did not conduct a foreclosure sale on this property?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Let's go over to USB0034.

MR. BECKOM: Oh, and, I guess, as to the Court to the extent, $I$ believe we already stipulated to this, but $I$ would like to move -- we already entered.

THE COURT CLERK: Exhibit 7.
MR. BECKOM: All right. They're already in. MS. BAKER: Why not.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm at 0034 .
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Okay. Was this document contained in the Alessi \& Koenig's collection file for the property that brings us here today?
A. I believe so. There's a AK, Bates No. 000003 . Q. Okay.
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A. And this is a real property parcel record. And it would be standard practice for us to pull this document.
Q. Why would it be standard practice for you to pull that document?
A. We pull the real property parcel record to obtain information on the property.
Q. Okay. What kind of information would you be obtaining through USBOO34 and USBOO35?
A. We would be obtaining the owner's legal name, the property address as well as the off-site mailing address if there are any. We would also obtain the legal description.
Q. Understood. Anything else you would get from this document?
A. Um, that's about it.
Q. On USBOO35, the very top where it says total taxable value. Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. It's a little bit blurry, but $I$ know what you're talking about.
Q. Okay. Do you see up in the far -- and it's kind of cut off between two different pages back at USBOO34. The top of that says 2010 to 2011 . And then that column seems to go down on to the next page. But do you see at the bottom of that page where it says
$01: 42: 38 \quad 1$

01:42:51
$01: 43: 0810$
$01: 43: 2115$
total taxable value $\$ 62,943 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. Was Alessi \& Koenig, are you aware at the time this document was pulled which looks like to be around 2011 that this property which brings us here today was worth $\$ 62,943$ for tax purposes?
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know?
A. I don't know if we would have been aware of that.
Q. Okay. Any reason why you would not know?
A. I don't know if the legal assistant or the member of the firm who was handling this foreclosure looked at that date of sale on this document at that time.
Q. Do you know who the member of Alessi \& Koenig was that was handing this foreclosure at that time?
A. Not off the top of my head.
Q. Okay. And also in the first column where it says $\$ 84,557$ for taxable years 2009 through 2010, you might end up giving the exact same answer here. But was it Alessi Koenig's understanding that this property was $\$ 84,557$ for those taxable years according to the assessor?
A. When you say - and you've deposed me before,

| $01: 44: 00$ | 1 | so I know we've been through this particular area. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | When you say the property was worth a certain amount of |
|  | 3 | money, as I've testified many times before, my |
|  | 4 | understanding of the value of a property differs based |
| $01: 44: 13$ | 5 | upon whether or not that property is purchased with |
|  | 6 | good title through an escrow or whether or not that |
|  | 7 | property is purchased at a foreclosure sale where you |
|  | 8 | basically are purchasing a lawsuit. |
|  | 9 | So when you say what the property is worth |
| 01:44:28 | 10 | that could mean two different things to me. |
|  | 11 | MR. BECKOM: Your Honor, I'd like to move to |
|  | 12 | strike that testimony as impermissible expert |
|  | 13 | testimony. |
|  | 14 | THE COURT: Counsel. |
| $01: 44: 37$ | 15 | MR. VIIKIN: $\quad$ don't think it's expert |
|  | 16 | testimony. It's just -- it's personal knowledge. |
|  | 17 | THE COURT: $\quad$ don't know, what does the term |
|  | 18 | impermissible expert testimony mean? |
|  | 19 | MR. BECKOM: He's speculating as to the value |
| 01:44:46 | 20 | of the property. My understanding of Nevada law is |
|  | 21 | that the owner of the property can testify as to the |
|  | 22 | value of the property. Or the owner can testify - - |
|  | 23 | THE COURT: Didn't you ask him about value? |
|  | 24 | MR. BECKOM: All right. Fair enough. |
| 01:44:57 | 25 | withdraw. $\quad$ withdraw the -- |
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THE COURT: Right? I mean, okay.
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Let me go back and come at this a different way then. So go ahead and repeat -- go ahead and restate your testimony as far as the value of the property, at least your understanding of it.
A. Well, just that if an -- if a property is purchased through an escrow, the normal means of purchasing a property, the buyer obtains clear title. And the value of that property for that reason and others is worth more, in my opinion, than a property that is purchased, for instance, an HOA foreclosure sale, especially in Nevada between 2012 and 2015 , where you're not obtaining clear title.

You're inheriting what seems to be never ending lawsuits. And so, obviously, the analysis or the calculus in determining the value of that particular property at that particular purchase would be different than were one to purchase a property through an escrow where they would get clear title.
Q. Okay. So this was Alessi \& Koenig's -- was this Alessi \& Koenig's specific position in 2011 ?
A. We didn't have a position in 2011. Alessi \& Koenig still doesn't have a position. I'm just testifying to what $I$ feel is common sense. It's not a

01:46:33
$01: 46: 49$
$01: 47: 0210$

01:47:1315
position of Alessi \& Koenig necessarily. We made no representations to anybody as to values of property. We weren't overly interested in values of property.

Our main focus, as you know from deposing me prior, is to make sure that we do our job correctly on behalf of our client. We didn't engage in a lot of speculation.
Q. Understood. But you did mention, you know, $I$ guess, rather despondently never ending lawsuits; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Were you aware of these never ending lawsuits in 2011 when this document was pulled?
A. NO.
Q. Okay. Any reason why not?
A. They hadn't started yet.
Q. They hadn't started yet. Did you expect in 2011 that there would be never ending lawsuits as a result of your sales?
A. I don't think anybody expected all of this. I don't think anybody predicted it. Like $I$ said, we were focused on doing our job, and we didn't engage in a lot of speculating or speculation.
Q. So you did not expect - so you expected these properties to be sold free and clear?
$01: 47: 51$
$01: 48: 03$
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A. No. I did not say that. We didn't have a position on that. To expect for the property to be sold free and clear would have required speculation. And as $I$ testified moments ago, we did not engage in speculation.
Q. Understood. Can $I$ get you to go over to USBOO89.
A. Yes.
Q. Have you seen this document before,

Mr. Alessi?
A. I don't have a specific recollection of having seen this document before. $\quad$ have certainly seen documents like this before.
Q. Okay. I want to direct you down to bottom here where it says, signature of authorized agent for Glenview West Townhomes Association. Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it was signed by a Mr. Ryan Kerbow. Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Who is Mr. Kerbow?
A. Ryan Kerbow is a California and Nevada attorney. He no longer works for the firm. $\quad$ cannot remember the name of the firm that he currently works
$01: 49: 05$
$01: 49: 145$
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for. But $I$ do keep in touch with Ryan periodically.
Q. Okay.
A. He was a lawyer that worked for Alessi \& Koenig.
Q. Why would he be signing this document on behalf of the Glenview West Townhomes Association?
A. I would be speculating. You would have to ask him. Our policy, though, was that we signed the deeds of trust -- I mean the trustee's deed upon sale as agent for the association.
Q. But was Mr. Kerbow the attorney, the Nevada attorney, that was responsible for processing this foreclosure on behalf of Glenview west?
A. I wouldn't say that. We had, and I don't know which attorneys, Nevada attorneys worked for the firm at this time. Certainly Robert Koenig was a long time -- was a partner in the firm. $\quad$ know Ryan was an employee of the firm. I don't know if there were any other Nevada attorneys at the firm, who they were, or what role they had in this foreclosure.
Q. But if Mr. Kerbow's signature is on this trustee deed upon sale at USBOO89, he would have had, at least, some hand in the sale of this property, correct?
A. Well, yes. He signed the trustee's deed upon


| 01:51:31 |  | may have been. It's also possible that he may not have |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | been. |
|  | 3 | Q. Has Mr. Kerbow ever represented anyone while |
|  | 4 | an attorney at Alessi \& Koenig in quiet title |
| 01:51:43 | 5 | litigation relating to homeowners association |
|  | 6 | foreclosure services? |
|  | 7 | A. Representing? |
|  | 8 | Q. A purchaser post sale? |
|  | 9 | A. I don't know if Ryan kerbow has represented a |
| 01:51:54 |  | purchaser post sale. Our office has represented |
|  | 11 | purchasers post sale. $\quad$ don't know if Ryan has. |
|  | 12 | Q. Did they represent any purchasers in 2010? |
|  | 13 | A. I doubt, no. |
|  | 14 | Q. Did they represent any purchasers in 2011? |
| 01:52:07 | 15 | A. I doubt it. Really, the HOA sales didn't |
|  | 16 | start happening until 2012. |
|  | 17 | Q. Okay. Did Mr. Kerbow or Alessi \& Koenig ever |
|  | 18 | represent Mr. Haddad in any kind of quiet title - - and |
|  | 19 | Mr. Iyad Eddie Haddad in any kind of quiet title |
| 01:52:28 | 20 | litigation? |
|  | 21 | A. I'm not sure. $\quad$ I believe that there was some |
|  | 22 | relationship with Mr. Haddad for a brief period of |
|  | 23 | time. I'm not sure. You know, I'm a California |
|  | 24 | attorney. $\quad$ wasn't involved in the Nevada caseload |
| 01:52:44 | 25 | extensively. |
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I do seem to recall that there may have been some issue that Mr. Haddad had retained our firm for, but $I$ don't remember exactly what it was. It would not be unusual for an investor to look to Alessi \& Koenig for its expertise post sale, so wouldn't surprise me. But $I$ just can't give you many specifics on that.
Q. But generally, though, you would provide post sale services to investors; correct?
A. Not generally. It would be anomaly, but we have before.
Q. And had you done that in -- but you can't quite recall whether you did that in 2011 or 2012?
A. It would surprise me if in 2011 there was any of that - any need for that service. In 2012 Im not so sure.
Q. Okay. So did at any point in time did Alessi \& Koenig have an attorney-client relationship with Iyad Eddie Haddad?
A. Again, I'm not sure. $\quad$ I wasn't involved in any litigation wherein Alessi \& Koenig represented Mr. Haddad. But again, I'll just repeat, I believe, there may have been a matter that we represented Mr. Haddad on for short period of time. I'm just not exactly sure of the specifics.
Q. Do you remember generally what you represented
$01: 54: 11$

01:54:16
$01: 54: 5910$
$01: 55: 2215$
him on?
A. No.
Q. Do you remember if it was involving quiet title litigation?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Let's go ahead and go over to USB0047.
A. So 0047 looks to be an unrecorded notice of delinquent assessment lien. Unsigned.
Q. Okay. Why would this unrecorded notice of delinquent assessment lien be in your collection file?
A. So back in 2006, 2007, our entire office went paperless. So we have just an electronic filing system and filing program. And when a document -- you see these bold areas of the document, those bolded areas are date of sales from the program that get mail merged into the document. Those data sales are always in the program regardless of document.

When a notice of delinquent assessment lien is printed to be mailed and notarized and recorded, a copy of that notice of delinquent assessment lien is actually saved prior to it being signed or recorded into the letters and notices tab of our program.
Q. Okay. Let's go back one page to USB0046.
A. Okay. So that is a copy of the cover letter that would have accompanied the lien on 0047 or some

| 01:56:04 | 1 | other delinquent assessment lien. <br> Q. Okay. So this would be the letter. And this |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | letter, 0046 , would accompany 0047 during the |
|  | 4 | collection process. You would send that out to |
| 01:56:19 | 5 | individuals? |
|  | 6 | A. I don't know. Yes. Except that I would say, |
|  | 7 | you know, 1 can't testify as to whether or not 0047 was |
|  | 8 | the enclosure with the cover letter or if a signed and |
|  | 9 | notarized version of 0047 was the enclosure with the |
| 01:56:3510 | 10 | cover letter. |
|  | 11 | I can just testify that a notice of delinquent |
|  | 12 | assessment lien similar to the one or exactly like the |
|  | 13 | one on 0047 would have been enclosed with the cover |
|  | 14 | letter on 0046 . |
| 01:56:521 | 15 | Q. Okay. I'm looking at the bottom of 0046. The |
|  | 16 | documents that were provided by Alessi \& Koenig which |
|  | 17 | you testified to the authenticity to pursuant to the |
|  | 18 | earlier affidavit we discussed. There is a, looks like |
|  | 19 | a certified mail receipt at the bottom of the cover |
| 01:57:1120 | 20 | letter that you previously reference at 0046? |
|  | 21 | A. Yes. |
|  | 22 | Q. Okay. Looks like it go -- we can agree that |
|  | 23 | it goes out to the Edwards, George R Trust at 4254 |
|  | 24 | Rolling Stone Drive; correct? |
| 01:57:22 | 25 | A. Yes. |

$01: 57: 23$
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Q. Did you send this notice of lien to anyone else at all?
A. Did we send the notice of delinquent assessment lien to the delinquent owner? If you're asking if we sent it to the bank, no, we did not.

If the delinquent owner had a off-site address, we would have sent it to that address as well.
Q. Understood. But you would not send the notice of delinquent assessment lien to any form of deed of trust holder on the property pursuant to the policies and procedures of Alessi $\&$ Koenig at this time?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And so we can agree that then - you have no reason to believe that $U S$ Bank ever received this notice of lien?
A. I can't testify to that. They wouldn't have received it from us mailing it to them.
Q. Okay. Let's go on to USB0049.
A. There is the title report from First American Title?
Q. You've seen this document before, sir?
A. I do not have a specific recollection of seeing this document, but $I$ have certainly seen this form of document before.
Q. Okay. And why would this title report for

01:58:37
$01: 58: 52$

01:59:0510

First American Title be in the collection file?
A. We use this document to help us ascertain the parties in interest, the parties with a recorded interest on the property that we are foreclosing on.
Q. Okay. And this would assist you in mailing out the appropriate notices to all the lienholders and everyone the title denoted?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Let's go over to US -- and that would be the title report we're referring to, $I$ guess, we're both talking about, goes to USBOO49 to USBOO53; is that your understanding, Mr. Alessi?

MR. VILKIN: Objection, misstates the evidence.

THE COURT: I'll sustain. Rephrase. BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Can you identify for me where this title report begins and ends?
A. The title report begins on USBOO49 and ends on USBOO53.
Q. Okay. And, $I$ guess, you would rely on this document for the parties to - you would rely on this document to determine which parties to mail foreclosure notices to; correct?
A. This is -- this would be part of the body of


$02: 01: 20$

02:01:2910
A. Yes.
Q. And we can also both agree that the beneficiary on this title report is US Bank National Association, ND; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Would Alessi \& Koenig typically mail - as part of your procedures, would you typically mail documents to those two entities based on this title report?
A. It depends. It depends if there were any assignments. And that's why $I$ say this is part of what we rely on. If there was an assignment on the deed of trust, that would be relevant.
Q. Would you rely on this document to mail out the notice of default on the homeowners association lien?
A. Again, this would be part of what we rely on to mail out the notice of default.
Q. Okay. What would be the other part you would rely on?
A. We do in-house research. Clark County has always had great online information available vis-à-vis the assessor's page and the recorders' page, where we can find assignments or judgments that the title plant might have missed.

02:02:21
$02: 02: 31$
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02:03:0515
Q. Okay. But you would just use the Clark County Assessor's website to supplement this title report?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you would make sure that whoever was listed on the title report got the appropriate mailings as part of the policies and procedures?
A. Usually. I can imagine a situation where whoever is listed on the title report would be a former holder of a deed of trust, and the title report did not show an assignment. You know, the tens of thousands of foreclosures that we did, I'm sure that's happened.
Q. Okay.
A. But you're correct. In large part, the title report forms the foundation of what we rely upon to mail the notice of default.
Q. And would you think in your, $I$ guess, based on your policies and procedures it would not follow Alessi \& Koenig's policies and procedures to mail this to anyone other than these two entities, US Bank Trust or US Bank National Association unless there was some form of assignment; correct?
A. Well, every file is different. And $I$ would like -- you know, $I$ would feel more comfortable going through the file before $I$ answer that question.
Q. Not that --
$02: 03: 29$
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A. Because every file is different. $\quad$ know that the mailing department would engage in their own analysis. So, again, this is part of it, but I don't want to commit to this being everything.
Q. Okay. Go over to USBOO75.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know what this document is that we're looking at, sir?
A. There is -- it's a certified mail receipt showing that a document was mailed to Edward George Trust. It also lists some other entities on it.
Q. What - -
A. This looks to be a document that came from our program.
Q. Do you know what the purpose of this list of addresses up here would be?
A. The list of these addresses -- I don't know - I don't have a doc - the list of these entities at the top of the document would be the entities that the notice of default - looks to be the entities, just leafing through this, that the notice of default was mailed to.
Q. And how are you -- how are you drawing that conclusion, sir?
A. By the order that the paper is in the file.
$02: 05: 33$
1
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02:06:0210
Q. Which -- do you see the numbers in the bottom right-hand corner, the Bates No.?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you just identify for me, and also the Court, which Bates range you're relying on to, I guess, draw the conclusion that these were the mailing addresses for the notice of default which Alessi \& Koenig sent?
A. I am looking at Bates -- I'm going to use the AK Bates 44 through AK48.
Q. 48 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So is it your understanding that if an entity is not listed on USB0075 and as you just referred it to A\&K44, then Alessi \& Koenig did not mail notice to anyone that was not on this list?
A. I mean, there's a lot of papers in this file. I mean, $I$ would have to -- I wouldn't be able to tell you that off -- yet in the testimony.
Q. Well, I'll tell you what. We've previously talked about that title report where we discussed US Bank National Association, ND as being listed on that title report. Do you recall that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then $I$ think you also just


| 02:08:35 | 1 | Q. AKOOO1? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | A. And 0033 . |
|  | 3 | Q. What date did you refer to, sir? |
|  | 4 | A. I'm looking at the entry 4-5-2011, 4-12-2011. |
| 02:08:53 | 5 | Those appear to relate to the mailing shown on $A K$ |
|  | 6 | USB75. |
|  | 7 | Q. And does that indicate to you at all that |
|  | 8 | US -- that Alessi \& Koenig sent the notice of default |
|  | 9 | to US Bank National Association, sir? |
| 02:09:17 | 10 | A. It does not. |
|  | 11 | Q. Okay. |
|  | 12 | A. It indicates US Recordings as, but $I$ do not |
|  | 13 | see US Bank. |
|  | 14 | Q. Okay. And you have no - you don't have any |
| 02:09:34 | 15 | information -- because I believe you testified earlier |
|  | 16 |  |
|  | 17 | Koenig to mail it out -- mail out the notice of default |
|  | 18 | to the entities contained in the title report; correct? |
|  | 19 | A. Against who? |
| 02:09:47 | 20 | Q. We talked about that title report earlier from |
|  | 21 | First American Title; do you recall? |
|  | 22 | A. Yeah. Yeah. |
|  | 23 | Q. Okay. |
|  | 24 | A. That was one - that is one of the sources. |
| 02:09:55 | 25 | So it's possible that there's an assignment not shown |


| 02 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on the report. That's why I'm looking for the actual } \\ & \text { relevant operative deed of trust at that time so that } I \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | can help you better. |
|  | 4 | Q. No. Take -- no. Take your time. |
| 02:10:39 | 5 | A. Okay. So if you look on AK26, it looks as |
|  | 6 | though we mailed the notice of default to the entity on |
|  | 7 | the left corner of the document US Recordings, 2925 |
|  | 8 | Country Drive. |
|  | 9 | And then turning back to the mailings, I |
| 02:11:06 | 10 | believe, yes, that was one of the entities. So that's |
|  | 11 | where that address came from. The deed of trust shown |
|  | 12 | On USB57, my testimony is that the NOD was mailed to US |
|  | 13 | Recordings at 2925 Country Drive in St. Paul, |
|  | 14 | Minnesota, as reflected on the deed of trust on USB57. |
| 02:11:43 | 15 | Q. Okay. But that is not -- but we can agree - |
|  | 16 | let me go back and find it. That is not the entity |
|  | 17 | that we discussed earlier on that title report; |
|  | 18 | correct? |
|  | 19 | A. Correct. |
| 02:11:51 | 20 | Q. Okay. Is there any reason why you would have |
|  | 21 | an entity pop up on a title report and then you would |
|  | 22 | mail it to a different entity? |
|  | 23 | A. I can speculate as to the reason. I -- but I |
|  | 24 | don't have any direct knowledge of why. |
| 02:12:14 | 25 | Q. Does this procedure comply with the policies |
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and procedures of Alessi \& Koenig to process nonjudicial HOA foreclosure as they stood in 2011?
A. Without knowing more information about the file, $I$ cannot tell you.
Q. Okay. Do you know who would have made the determination to mail the notice of default to US Recordings versus US Bank?
A. I mean, your -- you're asking me to go back several years. I don't.
Q. Okay. Looking at USBOO77. Would it have been -- take a minute. $\quad$ know giving trial testimony isn't exactly the way $I$ like to spend my mondays, so take your time.
A. What was the question?
Q. USBOO77. Let me know when you get there.
A. Yes, that is a copy of -- a recorded copy of the notice of default recorded March 29, 2011.
Q. Okay. Who is Mary Indalecio?
A. She was a former employee of Alessi \& Koenig.
Q. Would it have be Ms. Indalecio who would have made the professional determination to mail it the US Recordings as opposed to US Bank?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Your system doesn't happen to automatically populate with mailing addresses that you
$02: 14: 10$
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get from title report; does it?
A. No.
Q. Okay. How do the mailing -- I believe you said that USBOO75 was a print-off from your computer system; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. How do those addresses get in there?
A. Those addresses are manually entered. So what may have happened is the -- whoever was working on this file would have taken the instrument number, the book number of this deed of trust and then pulled the deed of trust that you see in the file. And then they made a determination from that document to mail to the entity they mailed to.
Q. Okay. Let's go ahead and go over to USB0081.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, what is this that we're looking at, sir?
A. This is the same type of document that we previously looked at. However, as you can see, there were additional addresses entered into those data fields including the Ombudsman's Office. This would be the entities that we, Alessi \& Koenig, mailed the notice of trustee sale to.
Q. Okay.
A. And if you see the handwritten 24230 , that

| 02:15:51 |  | should match the trustee sale number on the recorded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | document. |
|  | 3 | Q. Understood. Now, question. There's a lot |
|  | 4 | more addresses on USB0081 than there are on USB - I |
| 02:16:06 | 5 | think it was 0075. Do you know why? |
|  | 6 | A. No. |
|  | 7 | Q. Okay. We can agree, though, that it's still |
|  | 8 | being sent to US Recordings; correct? |
|  | 9 | A. Yes. |
| 02:16:18 | 10 | Q. And then also on the notice of sale it looks |
|  | 11 | like Alessi \& Koenig now add in US Bank National |
|  | 12 | Association and US Bank Trust Company; correct? |
|  | 13 | A. US Bank National Association, correct. I |
|  | 14 | don't see -- oh, yes. And US Bank Trust Company. |
| 02:16:43 |  | Correct. |
|  | 16 | Q. Okay. Is there any reason why you guys would |
|  | 17 |  |
|  | 18 | Koenig. Why you would have included US Bank National |
|  | 19 | Association and US Bank Trust Company on the notice of |
| 02:16:56 | 20 | sale but not on the notice of default? |
|  | 21 | A. I don't know. Without looking at the file |
|  | 22 | further I don't know. |
|  | 23 | Q. Okay |
|  | 24 | A. I would note that the notice of default was - - |
| 02:17:15 | 25 | well, strike that. |

$02: 17: 23$

02:17:30

02:17:4310

02:18:4025
Q. What were you going to say about the notice of default, sir?
A. I was just looking at the dates, but it wasn't -- it wasn't anything.
Q. So is there any reason -- so, again. Is there any reason why you would send US Bank National Association the notice of trustee sale but not the notice of default?
A. Without looking at the file further, $I$ cannot give you an answer. I don't know why.
Q. Okay. But it is US -- it is Alessi \& Koenig, or it was Alessi \& Koenig's policies and procedures as of 2011 to send the deed of trust holder both the notice of default as well as the notice of sale?
A. Well, $I$ mean, when you say deed of trust holder, that could mean a lot of different things to me. It could mean any one of those three entities. They're all on the deed of trust as entities that possibly -- I mean, $I$ will leave that to the court -are authorized to accept mailing on behalf of the deed of trust. So there may be more than one entity beneficiary, servicer ...
Q. I guess I'll just rephrase that question then. Was it Alessi \& Koenig's policies and procedures in 2011 to mail the notice of default to the deed of trust
$02: 18: 44$
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holder?
A. The servicer of the deed of trust holder, the beneficiary, are you talking about the beneficiary?
Q. Any party listed on the deed of trust.
A. We -- our policy was to mail to at least one of those parties.
Q. One of them?
A. At least one of the parties, or the agent, or the beneficiary, the servicer of the deed of trust - of the deed of trust that the NOD.
Q. Okay. But we can -- we can -- can we agree that, $I$ guess, once again, US Bank National Association did not the receive the notice of default?
A. I would not testify to that.
Q. Any reason why?
A. Well, we mailed the notice of default to US Recordings. And if you -- if $I$ recall the deed -- they were on the deed of trust as an agent of the beneficiary. So in that way we did mail the deed - the NOD to the holder of the deed of trust.
Q. Okay. So it's your testimony then that mailings to US Recordings in your -- according to at least based on your review of this record Alessi \& Koenig would have been of the opinion that mailing to US Recordings would have been mailing to US Bank?
$02: 20: 06$
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A. I would leave that to the court.
Q. But would that be sufficient for Alessi \& Koenig's purposes?
A. Again, without looking further at the file and looking - you know, again, I'm -- I wouldn't speculate on that, that that's who that we mailed it to. Whether or not that constitutes adequate mailing, $I$ will leave to the Court.
Q. Okay. Let's go to USBOO84.
A. So 0084 is a copy of the notice of trustee sale, again, signed by Ryan Kerbow on behalf of Glenview West Townhomes.
Q. We can still agree that Mr. -- I guess, Mr. Kerbow was involved in the foreclosure process of this property; correct?
A. Yes. By this time in the process, when welre getting ready to set a property for sale, there's a three review process that happens. The legal assistant that handled the property up until this time, and then at one time it was a fella name Bronco who was replaced by a fella named George. Those individuals constituted our trustee sale department. And they would review the file. And then we would have a licensed Nevada attorney review the file.
Q. And in this case that would have been
$02: 21: 35$
$02: 21: 43$
$02: 21: 4910$
11

02:22:0215

Mr. Kerbow?
A. That's my assumption, yes.
Q. Would the foreclosure have gone - was it Mr. Kerbow who would green light these foreclosures to move forward?
A. Or whoever the Nevada attorney reviewing the file was, yes.
Q. And in this case --
A. That would be - -
Q. -- his signature on the notice of sale leads you to believe it was Mr. Kerbow?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Taking a look at notice of - and this is the notice of trustee sale that was sent out pursuant to mailing list earlier; correct, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you know is this a form or is this something that's drafted from scratch every time?
A. The notice of trustee sale?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Again, it's a mail merge document. The bold lettering in capitals are merged from data fields within the program. And that's what creates this document. So the template already exists.
Q. Okay. Do you know who initially drafted the
$02: 22: 34 \quad 1$ $02: 22: 51$
$02: 23: 0210$
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template?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I want you to go down to the very last paragraph of this document, sir.
A. Yes.
Q. On USBOO84. Do You see what I'm talking about, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. So there's a - looks like there's a what you consider to be just like your standard language in that paragraph for a foreclosure. This is not one of the merge fields; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you see in the second sentence where it says, said sale will be made without covenant or warranty, expressed or implied, or regarding title, possession, or encumbrances to paying the remaining balance of sum of the note, homeowners assessment, or other obligations served by this lien.

Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. Why is that language in there?
A. Well, it's boilerplate language as you know. And it speaks for itself. It's there to make that statement.
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Q. To make that statement?
A. Right.
Q. With regards to the portion notice of trustee sale it says that there's no covenant or warranty, express or implied, regarding title, possession, or encumbrances. Is your understanding that you were cautioning potential purchasers that there may be a title issue on this property?
A. That we are what?
Q. Is it your understanding that that language is to caution potential purchasers that there may be an issue with title when they purchase this property?
A. I'm not sure that that language is in there to caution potential purchasers. Rather than to - - like I said, it's - our job is not to caution anyone. So I wouldn't - $I$ would answer that question, no, that's not the reason that language is in there.
Q. Would you then, $I$ guess, clarify for me what the purpose of that language was regarding no warranty with title?
A. It's just to make that statement.
Q. Just to make that statement?
A. Boilerplate language in notices of trustee sales. And so it's in there to make that statement. But we -- the statement speaks for itself. I wouldn't

go so far as to say it's in there for any particular purpose to caution the investors. We just didn't think of it that way.
Q. Would you ever look at a purchaser and say, Hey, you're going to get title to this house at the conclusion of this HOA sale?
A. No.
Q. Any reason why?
A. Again, we didn't - our office was very careful not no speculate. And so we didn't engage in those types of conversations.
Q. So this language is basically just, you know, buyer beware --
(Court Reporter interrupts)
A. I'm sorry.
Q. Buyer beware you get what you get. You don't
A. No. Again, we would - - our job was to just ensure that we performed the nonjudicial foreclosure correctly. What type of title the investor got, we really didn't have a dog in that fight. That was not - - that was not a concern of ours.
Q. Okay. You also, I guess, cautioned them about possession. Would you ever have told a HOA purchaser at your HOA foreclosure sale that they would 100
$02: 26: 06$

02:26:12
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02:26:4215
percent have possession of this property?
A. Again, we did not engage in those types of conversations with investors.
Q. Okay. And encumbrances. What is your understanding of that term?
A. A deed of trust, a judgment lien, anything that would need to be paid out before the remaining equity of the property would be paid to the seller.
Q. Okay. So that was just -- so it's - can we agree then that that was just cautioning purchasers that, Hey, again, you get what you get. you don't throw a fit. There may be an encumbrance on this property?
A. Again, $I$ don't know that this language was necessarily geared toward purchasers or toward the homeowner that was being -- I mean, it's just boilerplate language. And $I$ just - $\quad$ would be going too far in my testimony if $I$ said that the language is there -- was there for a reason relating to purchasers to caution them or to -- it was just language that we had put in there.

I mean, this is 2011 , so 1 don't know the genesis of this. All $I$ can tell you that this is pretty standard boilerplate notice of trustee sale language.
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Q. So there's just - $\quad$ so, I guess, I'm confused. Is there no reason that language is in there at all?
A. Well, the language speaks for itself. I can just tell you that we didn't have it in our state of mind we're going to put this language in there to caution purchasers. That wasn't our job.
Q. What was the purpose of that language then; do you recall?
A. To have the notice of trustee sale comport with what our Nevada attorneys felt was industry standard or required. I don't know how much thought. I wasn't involved in that decision.
Q. Okay. Did you ever express to anyone about your sales that they would be, you know, $I$ guess, subject to a mortgage?
A. No. Again, we did not engage in that type of representation.
Q. Did you ever discuss with anyone that there might be litigation involved over these properties when you sold them?
A. I mean, there was litigation but there - - we didn't have those types of conversations. Well, strike that. You said have $I$ ever discussed with anyone?
Q. Yeah.
A. I'm sure that the attorneys in our office
$02: 28: 28$
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discussed it.
Q. Okay. So there was discussions amongst the attorneys in your office regarding the litigation over these properties?
A. Well, $I$ mean, this is September 2011. So this file happens to be one of the older files. And so if you're asking me in September of 2011 , don't recall if those types of discussions would have taken place then. Looking at the trustee deed upon sale, $I$ know that the property sold in early 2012 . So this is -this is a sort of at the beginning of when the litigation all started.
Q. Let's go to USBOO897. Again, thank you for coming here and testifying. I know this isn't, like, the funnest way to spend a Monday afternoon.
A. 0089 ?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Okay. Okay. That is the trustee's deed upon sale that $I$ just mentioned it's dated or recorded January 31, 2012 .
Q. Okay. Actually, you know what, I might have one more question. so look, what is this document that we're looking at, sir?
A. Well, it's exactly what it says. It's a trustee's deed upon sale. It's a deed that the trustee

| 02:30:08 | 1 | records on behalf of the HOA in this case, vesting title in the owner in the investor who was the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | successful bidder at the public auction. |
|  | 4 | Q. Okay. Looks like this trustee's deed -- are |
| 02:30:28 | 5 | you able to tell me how much this property sold for |
|  | 6 | January 25, 2012, based on this document? |
|  | 7 | A. The amount paid by grantee buyer at the |
|  | 8 | trustee sale was \$5,331 per this document. |
|  | 9 | Q. Okay. So going back to USB0080, I just want |
| 02:30:51 | 10 | to compare and contrast these documents for a second. |
|  | 11 | Looks like there was a sentence down here that says the |
|  | 12 | total amount of the unpaid balance and the obligation |
|  | 13 | secured by the property to be sold in a reasonable |
|  | 14 | estimated cost expenses and advances at the time of the |
| 02:31:07 | 15 | initial publication of the notice of sale is \$5,370. |
|  | 16 | Do you see what I'm talking about, sir? |
|  | 17 | A. Yes. |
|  | 18 | Q. Okay. Now, going back to the notice of |
|  | 19 | trustee's deed upon sale, it appears that this property |
| 02:31:22 | 20 | sold for less than the total amount due on the debt. |
|  | 21 | Can we agree on that, sir? |
|  | 22 | A. Yes. |
|  | 23 | Q. Is there any reason why? |
|  | 24 | A. I can't give an answer to that without looking |
| 02:31:412 | 25 | at the file at this time. |

02:31:4125
records on behalf of the HOA in this case, vesting title in the owner in the investor who was the successful bidder at the public auction.
Q. Okay. Looks like this trustee's deed -- are you able to tell me how much this property sold for January 25, 2012, based on this document?
A. The amount paid by grantee buyer at the trustee sale was $\$ 5,331$ per this document.
Q. Okay. So going back to USBOO80, I just want to compare and contrast these documents for a second. Looks like there was a sentence down here that says the total amount of the unpaid balance and the obligation secured by the property to be sold in a reasonable estimated cost expenses and advances at the time of the initial publication of the notice of sale is $\$ 5,370$. Do you see what I'm talking about, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, going back to the notice of trustee's deed upon sale, it appears that this property sold for less than the total amount due on the debt. Can we agree on that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there any reason why?
A. I can't give an answer to that without looking at the file at this time.
$02: 31: 42$
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$02: 33: 0625$
Q. Okay. Going back to 0075 looks like this sale went - was held at 4:00 p.m. at 930 South Fourth Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101. Do you see what I'm talking about, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that where Alessi \& Koenig was holding their HOA homeowner force sale at this time?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall going down to the specific sale, sir, at that address?
A. No. I didn't attend the sales. I didn't attend the sales. I would walk by them when we were having them in our conference room occasionally and peek my head in. But $I$ did not, in general, attend the sales.
Q. Okay. You just kind of step in every once in a while? say hi to everybody?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So let me ask you this plaintiff Resources -- or defendant as countermotion Resources Group is here today with, $I$ guess, their representative, Mr. Iyad Eddie Haddad. Are you - - have you met Mr. Haddad before?
A. I have met Mr. Haddad.
Q. When was the first time you met Mr. Haddad?
$02: 33: 08$
$02: 33: 18 \quad 5$
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A. I don't recall.
Q. Would you have known him in 2010 .
A. I don't recall. I've met him at our HOA trustee sales I believe.
Q. At your HOA trustee sales?
A. I believe, yes.
Q. I'm confused. Didn't you say you didn't attend those sales?
A. They were at - at some point they were at our office. And if $I$ was in the office, as you know Mr. Haddad was one of the more active investors in the industry. He attended, $I$ believe, if not all our sales, most of our sales. So $I$ saw -- had occasion to see him around the office at times on the days of the sales. Just as $I$ would any other investor.
Q. That's fair. Did you ever shoot the breeze with him? Have -- make small talk? Anybody like that?
A. I have no specific recollection. I mean, I would say, Hi, Eddie. How you doing? I don't recall any in-depth conversations with him about anything of substance.
Q. Okay. Did you have any in-depth -- short conversations with him of any substance?
A. Nothing of substance. Nothing, nothing that $I$ can recall. Mr. Haddad and his entities have no

| 02:34:18 | 1 | relationship to Alessi \& Koenig or myself. We have no |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | interest in his entities, and vice versa. |
|  | 3 | Q. Do you recall ever hearing Mr. Haddad discuss |
|  | 4 | that he was getting these properties free and clear of |
| 02:34:38 | 5 | a mortgage? |
|  | 6 | A. No. |
|  | 7 | Q. Okay. Do you recall having any conversation |
|  | 8 | with Mr. Haddad that he thought these - that this |
|  | 9 | litigation was going to be subject to a lawsuit? |
| 02:34:51 |  | A. I don't recall a conversation like that. |
|  | 11 | Q. Okay. Do you recall Mr. Haddad ever |
|  | 12 | demonstrating general awareness of the contested nature |
|  | 13 | of his title in any way, shape, or form? |
|  | 14 | A. No. I don't recall that. |
| $02: 35: 08$ | 15 | Q. Okay. Do you ever recall any purchaser |
|  | 16 | generally discussing the outcome of lawsuits involving |
|  | 17 | HOA foreclosure properties? |
|  | 18 | A. I recall sometime around the Supreme Court |
|  | 19 | decision in SFR the investors talking about that |
| 02:35:34 | 20 | obviously after the decision came down at one of our |
|  | 21 | subsequent sales. And I have a general recollection of |
|  | 22 | some scuttlebutt about lawsuits winding their way |
|  | 23 | through various districts courts. I don't have any |
|  | 24 | specific recollection of any specific conversations |
| 02:35:5525 |  | with Mr. Haddad to that effect. |

relationship to Alessi \& Koenig or myself. We have no interest in his entities, and vice versa.
Q. Do you recall ever hearing Mr. Haddad discuss that he was getting these properties free and clear of a mortgage?
A. NO.
Q. Okay. Do you recall having any conversation with Mr. Haddad that he thought these -- that this litigation was going to be subject to a lawsuit?
A. I don't recall a conversation like that.
Q. Okay. Do you recall Mr. Haddad ever demonstrating general awareness of the contested nature of his title in any way, shape, or form?
A. No. I don't recall that.
Q. Okay. Do you ever recall any purchaser
A. I recall sometime around the Supreme court decision in $S F R$ the investors talking about that obviously after the decision came down at one of our subsequent sales. And $I$ have a general recollection of some scuttlebutt about lawsuits winding their way through various districts courts. I don't have any specific recollection of any specific conversations with Mr. Haddad to that effect.
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Q. What do you mean by -- and just because, like, my vocabulary is about this big because I've got a six year old. What did you mean by scuttlebutt?
A. Well, you know, if a case would -- if a holding would emanate from one of the district courts, the investors would talk about it. I remember seemed like a natural thing for them to do at the sales. Hey, did you hear about this ruling that came out of this judge's chamber - I mean, of the courtroom. I don't recall Mr. Haddad specifically being involved in any of those conversations. I don't recall him not being involved in those conversations.

My testimony, though, is that around the office, $I$ think we had our sales every other wednesdays when the dozen or so investors would come in, and there was a shake up in the courts on a ruling, they would talk about it.
Q. And that's just a general habitual thing that investors did?
A. I can recall it happening. I don't know habitual. $I$ can recall it happening, $I$ don't want to give you a number, a couple of times.
Q. You know, you talk about, $I$ guess, the ruling in SFR. I know everybody knows what we're talking about, but we have to be clear for the record here. I
$02: 37: 15$
$02: 37: 25$
$02: 37: 3610$
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mean, what do you mean the ruling in SFR? What are you talking about?
A. Well, where the Supreme court of Nevada ruled that the nonjudicial foreclosure sale by an HOA, to put it in a nutshell, wiped out the mortgage.
Q. Okay. Potentially, there's a lot of stuff going on.
A. Right.
Q. But all right. But, like, so you talk about that, you know, $I$ think you referred to it as a scuttlebutt. Like, you know, all these scuttlebutts, like, were they going on before that $S F R$ decision came down?
A. Like $I$ testified, if a decision came out of a district - a lower court, they were - - $\quad$ can recall on a couple of occasions those decisions being discussed, you know, before or after a trustee sale. You know, during this time was sort of beginning of the whole HOA trustee sale phenomenon. You know, but by 2013, 2014, we had a dozen, two dozen people in our conference rooms. And certainly there were discussions about what was happening in the industry among the investors. I can testify to that. $I$ don't - I didn't engage in that. $I$ purposefully stayed away from all of that for this very reason.
$02: 38: 34$
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$02: 39: 3525$
Q. Fair enough. But, I mean, like, when they're talking about the scuttlebutts you're talking about, like, you know, just general conversation?
A. Talking shop.
Q. Talking shop. Like, thank you for giving me a better word to use. When they're talking about shop prior to $S F R$, are they coming here saying, Hey, $I$ got this property free and clear of a mortgage. Court rule said so?
A. No. The investors $I$ don't - there would be no point in that kind of a conversation. You know, it really doesn't matter what we think or the investor thinks. It matters what the Court thinks. So, again, our job was to conduct a proper sale. And whatever title the investor got or didn't get, that was up for a Court to determine. We were fully aware of that.
Q. I know there may not have been a point to it. Was there at any point in time, did you hear these conversations go on where anybody thought, you know, you hear somebody say, Hey, I lost this property because some judge ruled against me. Or, Hey, I got this property free and clear. Would you hear those kinds of conversations?
A. I don't want to say never. But $I$ don't have a specific recollection of a conversation like that. If
$02: 39: 37 \quad 1$ $02: 39: 42$
$02: 39: 5510$

02:40:1215
$02: 40: 3425$
there was a conversation like that, $I$ might have heard it once or twice.
Q. Once or twice?
A. Yeah.
Q. So would it be fair to say that once or twice maybe you heard somebody talk about how they lost a lower court ruling and their property was, you know, up on appeal? Or they lost it? Or something like that?
A. I don't have -- I don't have a specific recollection, but if pressed $I$ would say that $I$ was probably heard a conversation like that or two.
Q. Okay. And that was just -- while, you know, we're talking, what, the beginning of 2012 . A long time ago. You don't remember specifically would have those conversations, but you remember them going on?
A. No. I don't remember them going on at the beginning of 2012. In fact, $I$ would be surprised if those types of conversation were happening at this time.
Q. Okay.
A. Because as $I$ testified moments ago, this was really the beginning of the whole $H O A$ foreclosure phenomenon.
Q. Do you know, say, with 100 percent certainty that you've never heard Mr. Haddad talk about losing a
$02: 40: 38$
$02: 40: 48$
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property in a lower court proceeding?
A. I cannot say with 100 percent certainty that.
Q. Why is that?
A. Because $I$ don't have a photographic memory of everything that's happened to me in my life over the last seven years.
Q. You and me both. Okay.
A. I can tell you $I$ have no recollection of that.
Q. You have no recollection. But you can't say with 100 percent certainty that it never happened?
A. I mean, correct.
Q. Okay. Here we do. Let's go back to USBO - - I apologize. I speak really fast at times. USBOO77.
A. Yes.
Q. What is this document that we're looking at, sir?
A. There is a recorded notice of default and election to sell on behalf of the homeowners association.
Q. Okay. And this is the one that Alessi \& Koenig would have filed the property records; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I want to take a look at - you see that. This is the same thing you said where they were merged code, and they can be bold and capitalized would

| 02:42:40 | 1 | be what would be merged in this document; correct? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | A. Yes. |
|  | 3 | Q. Okay. And this is the notice of default that |
|  | 4 | dealt with the subject the property that brings us here |
| 02:42:51 | 5 | today; correct? |
|  | 6 | A. Yes. |
|  | 7 | Q. I'm looking at this. And it says - it talks |
|  | 8 | about how not -- looking at midway through the second |
|  | 9 | paragraph it says notwithstanding the fact that your |
| 02:43:12 | 10 | property is in foreclosure, you may offer your property |
|  | 11 | for sale and provide that the sale is -- sorry. I'll |
|  | 12 | slow down. |
|  | 13 | All right. Actually, ${ }^{\text {Im }}$ going to start with |
|  | 14 | the big boldface letters. |
| $02: 43: 35$ | 15 | Remember that you may lose your legal rights |
|  | 16 | if you do not take prompt action. Notice is hereby |
|  | 17 | given that Alessi \& Koenig is appointed trustee agent |
|  | 18 | under the above lien dated January $4,2011 . \quad$ Executed |
|  | 19 | by Glenview West Townhomes Association to secure |
| 02:43:52 | 20 | assessment obligations in favor of said association |
|  | 21 | pursuant to the terms contained in the declaration of |
|  | 22 | Covenants conditions and restriction. It says CC\&Rs in |
|  | 23 | parentheses. Do you see what I'm talking about? |
|  | 24 | A. Yes. |
| 02:44:04 | 25 | Q. So it was your understanding that you were |



Now whether or not that provision is

| 02:45:24 | 1 | enforceable that wasn't -- we did not feel like it was our job to make a determination internally or |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | represent -- or in representing -- in representations |
|  | 4 | made to the investors. |
| 02:45:35 | 5 | Q. Did you ever -- these -- like these notice of |
|  | 6 | default and notice of sale, these are documents that |
|  | 7 | are advertised to the public; correct? |
|  | 8 | A. They are. The notice of default is recorded. |
|  | 9 | I don't know if I would say it's advertised to the |
| 02:45:50 | 10 | public. The notice of trustee sale is posted in three |
|  | 11 | conspicuous places within the county of the sale. |
|  | 12 | It's also published in a newspaper with |
|  | 13 | general circulation in the county of the sale. |
|  | 14 | We also would post the notice of trustee sale |
| 02:46:10 | 15 | on a trustee sale calendar on our website that the |
|  | 16 | public could access. |
|  | 17 | Q. Okay. Here we go. You said the notice of |
|  | 18 | trustee sale -- |
|  | 19 | A. Yes. |
| 02:46:29 | 20 | Q. -- would have made these representations. |
|  | 21 | And I am -- did you take any action with the |
|  | 22 | notice of trustee sale to clarify that that mortgage |
|  | 23 | protection clause, or the one that you were speaking to |
|  | 24 | because the mortgage protection clauses really weren't |
| 02:46:52 | 25 | validated by statute? |

$02: 47: 02$

02:47:1610
A. No.
Q. Why?
A. Because we purposefully and consciously stayed out that arena. We did not take a position one way or another on that issue.
Q. Did you take any -- when you were staying out of that arena, did you take any action to try to maximize the number of bidders that would attend these sales?
A. Well, $I$ mean, we certainly used all of the tools that the statute required such as posting the sale in three conspicuous places, like the public library. We certainly published the sale in the newspaper for three consecutive weeks. And we did take one additional action that was not statutorily required to let the public know about the sale. And that's the trustee sale calendar that was on our home page of our website. Other than that, we did not do anything.
Q. Okay. So you weren't trying to maximize the number of bidders at the sale?
A. We were hoping that there would be at least one bidder to pay our client in full.
Q. Okay.
A. Our job was to get our client paid.
Q. Let's go over to USBOO1 -- USB0164.

02:48:35
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02:49:2415
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Dying to talk about this, huh, sir?
A. You're right. For the 500 th time.
Q. So USBO164 Section 11 subordination lien to the mortgage. Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And it says the lien of the assessments provided for herein shall be subordinate to the lien of any first mortgage. What is your understanding of that provision?
A. What do you mean?
Q. What does that say?
A. Whether or not it's enforceable? My understanding of that provision is that -- could you be a little more specific?
Q. Sure. Do you think that this is telling everyone that the lien of the assessments is subordinate to the first mortgage?
A. I would leave that up to the court to determine.
Q. What is your -- what is your take on that? I mean, you are a California attorney; correct?
A. That's correct. And I'm also the founder of the largest assessment collection foreclosure firm in the state of Nevada. And $I$ know enough by now to not
$02: 49: 51$
$02: 50: 045$
$02: 50: 1710$
$02: 50: 4115$
speculate as to whether or not a court - what courts are going to do on this issue. so we just don't speculate. I see the provision. It's - I just cannot give you any testimony as to its import.
Q. Did you ever hear of any purchasers at any of your sales conducted by Alessi \& Koenig discussing these kinds of subordination clauses?
A. Not to my recollection.
Q. Okay. Did you ever see any purchaser at your HOA foreclosure sales act confused about what they were getting or buying?
A. You know, $I$ no -- I -- no. I can't answer that yes or no. I didn't know these investors well enough to know whether they were acting confused or not confused. Or...
Q. So did you ever see anyone at any of your sales say something to the effect of, Hey, why did that guy just purchase that HOA foreclosure property, he's crazy.

THE MARSHAL: Counsel, $I$ was having a hard time tracking on that one.

MR. BECKOM: I'm sorry.
THE MARSHAL: I'm sure Madam Clerk is suffering through.

MR. BECKOM: Is she winking at you over there?
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don't know.
Q. Okay.
A. I've never bid on any property at a bank foreclosure sale.
Q. So, but you did say you poked your head in to these HOA foreclosure sales periodically; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So let me just ask you this. You know, based on your perception of these HOA foreclosure sales that you poke into periodically that your company runs, in your opinion would these sales be described as depressed in terms of the bidding that you saw going on?
A. Depressed?
Q. Yes.
A. What do you mean by depressed?
Q. Do you think people were bidding up adequate amounts for a house?
A. As $I$ testified earlier, well, $\quad$ can think of no better example of a free market than a public auction. So the investors were bidding up to a point that that they felt made sense vis-à-vis the risk and the litigation. So $I$ would not say anything was depressed.
Q. And they were aware of the risk in this


02:54:5725
litigation at the time this building was going on?
A. You would have to ask them. My assumption
Q. Okay. I guess, one more time for the Judge's sake because $I$ don't think you actually answered the question. Based on your perceptions from, you know, being the custodian of records the company that runs these sales, in your opinion, was the bidding at these sales depressed in terms of value of a house?
A. No. Not in lieu of the type of title that the investors were getting and the fact that they were basically inheriting a lawsuit, the investors bid against each other. If any investor felt that the property was worth more, any investor in the public, they would have been there to bid that property up.

It really was a function of the, $I$ would say, uncertainty and risk. So $I$ would say that the price that was paid for these properties at public auction was the fair market value at that time.
Q. I understand. And then so based on your - they were actually based on your own perception in attending these sales in your opinion, these purchasers were aware of these issues in title defect which is why the price was so low?
A. That would be my assumption, yes.

| 02:54:58 | 1 | Q. Okay. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | A. I mean, yeah. Fair enough. |
|  | 3 | MR. BECKOM: The Court's indulgence. |
|  | 4 | BY MR. BECKOM : |
| 02:55:42 | 5 | Q. You know what, Mr. Alessi, again, probably |
|  | 6 | have to ask you some more questions after Mr. Vilkin |
|  | 7 | here does an excellent job here. But $I$ think I'm done |
|  | 8 | for right now. Again. Thank you very much for coming |
|  | 9 | here and testifying. |
| 02:55:5410 | 10 | A. My pleasure. |
|  | 11 | MR. VILKIN: Your Honor, we've been going an |
|  | 12 | hour and 25 minutes for this witness. I estimate I |
|  | 13 | have a half hour to 45 minutes with the witness. Would |
|  | 14 | now be a good time to take a short break? |
| 02:56:04 | 15 | THE COURT: Yeah, we can do that. Thank you, |
|  | 16 | sir. |
|  | 17 | MR. VILKIN: Thank you. |
|  | 18 | THE MARSHAL: Fifteen, your Honor. |
|  | 19 | THE COURT: Fifteen. |
| 02:56:09 | 20 | THE MARSHAL: Yes, sir. |
|  | 21 | $\begin{gathered} -000- \\ (\text { Recess }) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 22 | -000- |
|  | 23 | THE COURT: We can continue on. |
|  | 24 | MR. VILKIN: Thank you, your Honor. |
|  | 25 | $\backslash \backslash \backslash$ |
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pre-lien sent regular and certified mail. That's a pretty - - a very standard task that our office performs so that this would be a drop-down item.
Q. But is it correct that your employees would only enter information into this after they performed whatever task they're describing?
A. At or around the time they performed it, yes.
Q. Okay. And what happened on December $20 t h$, 2010? The second entry?
A. No contact from property owner.
Q. What about the second entry on December 20, 2010, on USB32?
A. Lien recordation was sent via regular and certified mail.
Q. What does that mean?
A. That --
Q. Who was IT sent to?
A. That document is sent to the delinquent homeowner.
Q. What exactly is sent to the homeowner? What is that referring to?
A. So earlier in my testimony we had reviewed a lien, what $I$ call a lien cover letter as well as the lien enclosure. USB46 and 47 .
Q. Okay. And what - - there's an entry for
$03: 27: 08$
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April 5, 2011. Can you describe what that means?
A. So within ten days of the notice of recording the notice of default our office mails a copy of the notice of default to the delinquent homeowner and any parties with a recorded interest in the property, i.e., the bank or its agent.
Q. And in this case can you look at USB75 in Exhibit 7 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that a mailing list that your firm created that you sent the notice of default to certified?
A. Yes.
Q. And then going back to 32, USB32 in Exhibit 7, what happened on October 26 , $2011 ?$
A. A notice of trustee sale was mailed to, again, all parties in interest. In addition to the parties in interest, the notice of trustee sale is mailed to the Ombudsman's Office.
Q. And is the mailing list that you used to mail that document contained on USB81?
A. Yes.
Q. And then on the USB82 and 83 are those the mailing receipts for the mailing of the notice of sale?
A. Yes.
$03: 29: 15$
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Q. And that notice of sale was sent to US Bank at its address in Fargo, North Dakota; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What date was that sent, the notice of sale?
A. It was sent - a little hard to read the stamp. It's -- it looks like October 2017 - - Im sorry, 2011.
Q. Well, does USB32 give you that information?
A. The entry is October 26 , as I said, on or around the time of the mailing. So it would have been -- we can also go to the - just bear with me. so October 26, 2011.
Q. That's when the notice of sale was mailed?
A. That would be my testimony.
Q. $\quad$ I'm sorry, sir.
A. Yes, that would be my testimony.
Q. And October 26 , 2011 , is approximately - it a little more than 90 days before the sale date in this case on January 25 th - -
A. Yes.
Q. -- 2012? Is there any reason you can think of why if you mailed the notice of sale to US Bank at its Fargo, North Dakota, address they wouldn't have gotten it within 90 days?
A. That would be beyond something $I$ would be
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comfortable testifying to. I would have - - $\quad$ would be speculating.
Q. Okay. What date did the notice of sale set the sale for?
A. The notice of sale set the sale for November 16, 2011.
Q. Okay. And, but the sale didn't occur that day; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. What happened on that date?
A. It was postponed.
Q. And how did you accomplish a postponement?
A. Our - -
Q. What was your policy and practice in that regard?
A. Our office would postpone a sale orally at the time and place of the sale.
Q. Is that what you believe happened on November 16, $2011 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. And so anybody attending the sale on October 16 , 2011 , would have been aware that the sale had been postponed to January 25, 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, if you would, staying within Exhibit 7,
$03: 32: 41$ $03: 32: 545$
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can you look at 41 to 43 , USB41 to 45 ?
A. Yes. This is an account ledger which is provided to our office by the management company on behalf of the HOA.
Q. Okay. When did this account for Mr. Edwards first become delinquent?
A. It looks like in February of 2010 . The owner stopped paying their assessments.
Q. Okay. And if you could look at in the same exhibit USB120 to 126 .
A. Yes.
Q. Were there any payments on this account between February 1st, 2010 , and the date of sale on January 25, 2012?
A. One payment of \$414.40.
Q. What date was that?
A. December 2011.
Q. December 28, $2011 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. And that's reflected on USB125?
A. Yes.
Q. Take a look if you would at USB85.
A. Yes.
Q. And that's a payment that Alessi \& Koenig received from Robert Hazel for \$700?
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A. Yes.
Q. And how did you handle distribution of that money?
A. As you can see on the status report, the association was paid $\$ 414.40$ of it. That is the entry on the 26 th of November with a remaining balance being retained by Alessi \& Koenig towards its fees and costs.
Q. You're referring to USB33 in Exhibit 7; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And could you explain to the Court why Alessi \& Koenig kept $\$ 264$ and $\$ 414$ was given to the HOA at that time?
A. That would just be based upon the relationship with the client. There were different ways of distributing partial payments depending on the homeowners association client and/or the management company. Oftentimes, the client would have us pay ourselves in a pro rata proportion to what was owed.

In other words if our office was owed $\$ 50$ and the HOA was owed $\$ 50$. And a check came in for $\$ 50$, we would split that equal to what each entity was owed. Other times it was always just a $50 / 50$ split. Some associations asked us to pay them everything upfront. And some associations allowed for us to take our fees
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upfront.
Q. Okay.
A. It was a case-by-case basis.
Q. Looking again at in Exhibit 7 at USB125. Does that reflect a payoff to the HOA of all past due assessments?
A. Yes, and late charges and late fees.
Q. Okay. And for what time period did that pay off occur? In other words what physical or calendar time period were the past due assessments unpaid, and then paid to the HOA based on this document?
A. Well, the owner, as you can see on USB124 made it - - it looks like their payment January of 2010 . So all of 2010 and 2011 through february of 2012 . 26 months.
Q. And the only payment on that account during that period credited to the HOA was the \$414.40?
A. Correct.
Q. And looking at USB125, there was a payment of $\$ 2,995.60$ to the HOA; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Where did that money come from?
A. That money came from the sale.
Q. The proceeds from the sale --
A. Yes.

03:38:02 $03: 38: 24$
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Q. -- from the buyer?
A. Yes.
Q. If you could look at in Exhibit 7 pages 49. Let's start with 49 .
A. Counsel, just very quickly, could you refresh my memory as to when the sale was? The date?
Q. January 25, 2012 .
A. Okay. And then what was your question?
Q. Can you look at USB49.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I believe you were asked earlier by counsel what pages constituted this property report; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And --
A. I believe I said 49 through 53.
Q. Well, my question is: Did this property report include attachments?
A. I don't know.
Q. Well, take a look at 54 through 73. Were documents 54 through 73 , did they accompany this title report?
A. They could have.
Q. And is -- I think you testified earlier that the deed of trust is included in that group; correct?
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IYAD EDDIE HADDAD,
having been first duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated. And if you will state and spell your name for the record, please.

THE WITNESS: It's Eddie Haddad. E-d-d-i-e. H-A-D-D-A-D. My birth given name is Iyad, I-Y-A-D.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Haddad. Thank you for being here today.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Seems kind of like a redundant question, but what brings you here today, sir?
A. Quiet title action.
Q. Okay.
A. On this one particular property on Rolling Stone.
Q. Are you familiar with the property at 4254 Rolling stone Drive?
A. Yes. Somewhat.
Q. Somewhat?
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A. Yes.
Q. How are you familiar with that property, sir?
A. It's a property acquired at an HOA sale back in 2012, I believe.
Q. Did you acquire that property in 2012 , sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you a couple of questions about your background, sir. What do you do for a living?
A. I'm a real estate broker.
Q. Okay.
A. My brokerage is Great Bridge Properties. And it's a sole proprietorship.
Q. Okay.
A. It's been around for over 20 years.
Q. Okay. So is there any other owner or brokerage affiliated with Great Bridge Properties other than you?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Do you employ people with Great Bridge Properties?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Is that the only live business you're involved in is just selling real estate and buying real estate, or brokering real estate transactions?

| $03: 43: 10$ | 1 |
| ---: | ---: |
|  | 2 |
|  | 3 |
|  | 4 | $03: 43: 14 \quad 5$
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A. Yes.
Q. Are you involved with the purchase and sale of foreclosure properties?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let me go over to Exhibit 12, USB466. And I apologize. The Bates number on these documents are very tiny on the left.
A. Okay.

MR. VILKIN: Did you say 486?
MR. BECKOM: 466 .
MR. VILKIN: Thank you.
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Let me know when you get there, sir.
A. Yes, I'm there.
Q. Have you seen this document before, sir?
A. Yes. It looks pretty familiar.
Q. Okay. What is it that we're looking at?
A. Trustee's deed upon sale.
Q. And this is the trustee's deed upon sale for 4254 Rolling Stone Drive Trust; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it looks like the purchaser is the 4254 Rolling Stone Drive Trust?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

| $03: 44: 24$ | 1 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 2 |  |
|  | 3 |
|  | 4 |
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MR. BECKOM: To the extent it wasn't admitted already, I would move to admit USB466. This is Exhibit 12466 through 467 .

MR. VILKIN: No objection.
THE COURT CLERK: Is 12 being admitted in its entirety?

MR. BECKOM: We can admit to its entirety.
THE COURT CLERK: Was that stipulated?
MR. VILKIN: Yes. I'll stipulate we can
admit. No objection to Exhibit 12.
THE COURT CLERK: Okay.
THE COURT: So stipulated.
(Exhibit 12 admitted).
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Okay.

THE COURT: And admitted.
MR. BECKOM: Fantastic.
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. All right. So what is your relationship, sir, to the 4254 Rolling Stone Drive Trust?
A. Trustee.
Q. You are the trustee of that trust?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what is your job as the trustee of that trust?
$03: 45: 20$
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A. Manage the affairs of the trust.
Q. Manage the affairs of the trust. Okay. Was the 4254 Rolling stone Drive Trust incorporated prior to -- well, actually, let me come at this a different way. It looks like that this deed says that there was a public auction on January 25, 2012; is that correct?
A. Yes. I don't dispute that.
Q. Okay. Do you -- were you at a sale, an HOA foreclosure property and specifically 4254 Rolling Stone Drive on January 25, 2012?
A. You know $I$ attend five sales a week, 52 weeks a year. This was five years ago, but $I$ would not refute that at all.
Q. Okay. So you have no specific recollection of the specific sale, but you believe in all likelihood you did attend?
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. Okay. This trust here, it's a very specific name for a trust. Was this trust incorporated prior to purchasing this property?
A. I would say right at the time of the sale.
Q. Right at the time of the sale?
A. Yes.
Q. Does this trust hold any other assets beside 4254 Rolling Stone Drive -- beside 4254 Rolling Stone

| 03:46:31 | 1 | Drive? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | A. No. |
|  | 3 | Q. Any reason why? |
|  | 4 | A. It's set up as a trust to hold one property. |
| 03:46:41 | 5 | Q. Why did you only put one property in this |
|  | 6 | trust? |
|  | 7 | A. I don't know. My attorney advised me to do |
|  | 8 | so. |
|  | 9 | Q. Okay. Who was the attorney at that time? |
| 03:46:59 |  | A. I don't recall. |
|  |  | Q. Okay. |
|  |  | A. Could have been Michael Bohn. |
|  |  | Q. Okay. Looks like this deed of trust or this |
|  |  | trustee's deed upon sale was signed by Mr. Ryan Kerbow. |
| 03:47:14 |  | Do you see that name at the bottom? |
|  |  | A. Yes. |
|  |  | Q. Okay. Do you know Mr. Kerbow outside of just |
|  |  | his capacity as an individual processing HOA |
|  |  | foreclosures? |
| 03:47:27 |  | A. No. |
|  |  | Q. Mr. Kerbow ever done legal work for you? |
|  |  | A. Yes. |
|  |  | Q. What kind of legal work has Mr. Kerbow done |
|  |  | for you? |
| 03:47:352 |  | A. So if I acquired a property that didn't have a |
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lender that would dispute their, you know, the title to the property, my title companies at that time would have required a quiet title action. Quiet title action would have to be brought on a free and clear property, let's say, where there was no deed of trust that would be extinguished before $I$ can get title insurance.

So Ryan Kerbow would have easily done a quiet title action just as easy as Michael Bohn, let's say, or any other attorney and would have done it because he would have already had the file. He would have to file with the Court. Get permission from the court to quiet title a proper at sale. And then $I$ wouldn't be able to get title insurance.
Q. So you would retain Mr. Kerbow as your personal attorney at different points in time?
A. Couple of times.
Q. Couple of times?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you remember the approximate time frame that this was done?
A. I would say right around this time, maybe.
Q. So during at the time of this sale, Mr. Kerbow was also one of your attorneys?
A. Let's put it this way. If I acquired a property from Alessi \& Koenig and it happened to be



03:51:2925
A. No. I wouldn't say that.
Q. What would you say?
A. I would say he would take a file and obtain
A. I should say property that at the time of sale did not have any first deeds of trust that would be, you know, disputing or that would have a claim against a property.
Q. Okay.
A. All property acquired in NRS 116 eventually becomes free and clear. But if there is to be any dispute, then $I$ don't think $I$ would have approached Ryan Kerbow. But if there was going to be no dispute, I would have approached him to take a fee to actually do the quiet title action because it would be done in 60 or 90 days rather than seven years of litigation.
Q. It has been quite some time.

Let me ask you this question. You said that, you know, you would retain him to litigate matters which were free and clear; correct? Was that your testimony? Or am I messing that up?
A. Couple of times. Couple of times only.
Q. Okay. But you would retain him for free and


03:51:53
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clear properties?
A. If I looked at the county recorder's office, and $I$ saw that there was no potential litigants, and that there was no deeds of trust recorded prior to the NRS 116 sale, then $I$ could potentially give the file to Ryan Kerbow.
Q. Interesting. Okay. So you would follow the property records looking for deeds of trust. And then if there was no deed of trust, you would retain Mr. Kerbow?
A. I think I've already testified and I've -- in any deposition with you, probably is yould ask me do $I$ do any work? What kind of work $I$ would do to prepare for a sale? And then $I$ would have, in the deposition, would have said that $I$ consult with a Nevada Legal News. And $I$ would consult with a county recorder's office. And anything of record would show up prior to bidding.

So, yes, $I$ would know if there was a deed of trust that is to be extinguished or not.
Q. But you do not, but it sounds like, and you don't dispute that you do a difference at least in your retention of Mr . Kerbow between properties that had no deed of trust on them and properties that had a deed of trust on them?
$03: 52: 58$
$03: 53: 10$
$03: 53: 2210$
$03: 53: 3515$
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A. Yes. Very few would have no deeds of trusts on them, but certainly some.
Q. I want to dig a little bit deeper in that then. Why? Why would it be different if there was no deed of trust on the property versus a deed of trust on the property?
A. Again, the time and expense of litigation.
Q. And you were - were you aware of the time and the expense of this litigation at the time that you were purchasing these properties?
A. I would say yes.
Q. And you were expecting there to be a contest over title to the property at the time you purchased it if there was a deed of trust attached to the property?
A. I would expect that there would be additional time and additional expense whenever there was a deed of trust recorded against a property prior to the NRS 116 sale.
Q. So at the time that you purchased this property on January 25, 2012 , right at the beginning of a brand-new year. You go and you purchase this property. And it sounds like you would look on the recorder's website, and you would see a deed of trust on there; is that correct?
A. That's always been my testimony. Yes; that is

| 03:54:09 | 1 | correct. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | Q. Okay. And if you saw one on there, you would |
|  | 3 | think, Well, this is going to involve litigation? |
|  | 4 | A. Not necessarily. Potentially. Not |
| 03:54:21 | 5 | necessarily. |
|  | 6 | Q. Potentially? |
|  | 7 | A. Potentially. |
|  | 8 | Q. And you were aware of that fact prior to |
|  | 9 | purchasing this property at the sale? |
| 03:54:31 |  | A. Yes. But, I mean, even if I showed up to the |
|  | 11 | auction and didn't know what I was doing, the law is |
|  | 12 | the law. And, you know, even if l showed up not |
|  | 13 | expecting to extinguish a deed of trust, guess what, |
|  | 14 | NRS 116 still says the deed of trust is extinguished. |
| 03:54:53 | 15 | Q. Okay. Let me ask you a real quick question |
|  | 16 | just because we got to get a complete record. Throwing |
|  | 17 | $a$ soft ball one because it's late in the day. I'm sure |
|  | 18 | you got to get home and get some -- USB - and IIll |
|  | 19 | need a magnifying glass. USB468, sir. |
| 03:55:27 | 20 | You seen this document before, sir? |
|  | 21 | A. Yes. |
|  | 22 | Q. And then I'm going to go over to USB469. And |
|  | 23 | it says by Resources - right there it says by |
|  | 24 | Resources Groups LLC, Nevada Limited Liability Company, |
| 03:55:44 | 25 | Iyad Haddad, manager. You see what I'm talking about? |
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A. Yes.
Q. Is that your signature there, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. So this is just basically -- it's not a transfer between two unrelated entities. Because you previously testified you're the trustee of Rolling Stone Drive Trust; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you transferred it over into a limited liability company; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that limited liability company appears to be, looks like the trustee of the Bourne Valley Court Trust; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Any reason why you did that, sir?
A. I don't recall, but that would be probably protected because $I$ would have gotten advice from my attorney at the time to do so.
Q. So you're basically saying is you don't remember, but you think it was probably told to you by a lawyer?
A. Yes. I would have consulted with my attorney before $I$ did that?
Q. Okay. And do you recall who your attorney was

| 03:56:32 | 1 | at the time? <br> A. Probably Michael Bohn at that time, again. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  |
|  | 3 | Q. Okay. And did you have any other attorneys at |
|  | 4 | all involving this property? |
| 03:56:40 | 5 | A. Yes. |
|  | 6 | Q. Who? |
|  | 7 | A. Ryan Alexander being one of them. |
|  | 8 | Q. Is this the first legal proceeding that -- by |
|  | 9 | legal proceeding I would define this broadly like |
| 03:56:49 | 10 | lawsuit, bankruptcy, anything like that. Is this the |
|  | 11 | first legal proceeding you've been involved in |
|  | 12 | involving this property? |
|  | 13 | A. I don't - I don't recall. Involving this |
|  | 14 | property? |
| 03:56:58 | 15 | Q. Yes. |
|  | 16 | A. Oh, I don't recall. |
|  | 17 | Q. Let's go ahead and flip over to Exhibit 11. |
|  | 18 | MR. BECKOM: If I recall correctly this is not |
|  | 19 | one of our stipulated exhibits; correct? This is the |
| 03:57:11 | 20 | bankruptcy record? |
|  | 21 | MS. BAKER: What number? |
|  | 22 | MR. BECKOM: Exhibit 11. |
|  | 23 | MS. BAKER: No. It's not admitted. |
|  | 24 | MR. BECKOM: Okay. |
| 03:57:192 |  | MR. VILKIN: $\quad$ will agree to Exhibit 11 can be |

03:57:22

03:57:29

03:57:5010

03:58:1515
admitted.
MR. BECKOM: Then $I$ would move to admit Exhibit 11 for all purposes.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.
(Exhibit 11 admitted)
MR. BECKOM: Okay.
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Go ahead and take a look at USB313. On the top left-hand corner it says in re The Bourne Valley Court Trust; do you see what I'm talking about, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then down below there it says 4254 Rolling Stone Drive. You see what I'm talking about, sir?
A. I don't. Is that on --
Q. It would be fourth from the bottom.
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And that's the same property you were just talking about as far as the trustee's deed upon sale and the quitclaim deed to Bourne Valley Court Trust and all that other good stuff; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And let me see. If you seen this document before, sir?
A. Yes.
$03: 58: 36 \quad 1$
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Q. Where have you seen this?
A. Through your deposition, $\quad$ believe.
Q. Through my deposition?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Take a look, and I would look - I would note at the top it says docket, Docket Entry No. 11 in this bankruptcy case. Do you see what I'm talking about, sir?
A. On the top of this page?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's go over a couple of pages here to USB32 9 .
A. Okay.
Q. Let me know when you get there, sir.
A. IIm there.
Q. Awesome. Do you see that portion where it says: I, the registered agent of the corporation named as debtor in this case declare under penalty of perjury that $I$ have read the forgoing summary and schedules consisting of 18 sheets and that they are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief?
A. I see that, yes. That's what it says.
Q. Okay. And then there's right below that you

| 03:59:50 | 1 | see where it says, /s/ Eddie Haddad? <br> A. Yes. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | Q. Okay. Did you review these bankruptcy |
|  | 4 | documents on behalf of the Bourne Valley Court Trust? |
| 04:00:05 | 5 | A. Well, first of all, that's -- my signature is |
|  | 6 | not on it even though it says signature. I can't |
|  | 7 | recall if I reviewed them before Ryan Alexander filed |
|  | 8 | them or not. |
|  | 9 | Q. Would you let Mr. Alexander file documents |
| 04:00:19 | 10 | without having you looked at them? |
|  | 11 | A. No. Generally speaking I would have directed |
|  | 12 | him to file, but would I have read every word, every |
|  | 13 | sentence, every letter, probably not. |
|  | 14 | Q. Okay. |
| 04:00:28 | 15 | A. It's just trust that my attorney is doing his |
|  | 16 | job. |
|  | 17 | Q. Okay. So would he just give you documents, |
|  | 18 | and you say, I trust what you're doing, you can sign |
|  | 19 | right there? |
| 04:00:36 | 20 | A. Generally speaking, yes. |
|  | 21 | Q. Okay. |
|  | 22 | A. But there's no signature here. This would |
|  | 23 | have been probably electronically filed I would say. |
|  | 24 | Q. Do you have any reason to believe that |
| 04:00:44 | 25 | Mr. Alexander would misrepresent your signature on a |
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petition?
A. Misrepresent? No.
Q. Okay.
A. Not misrepresent.
Q. Let's go back again.
A. But, you know, attorneys don't cross all their Ts, and dot their Is; do they?
Q. I should hope they do.
A. Sometimes maybe not.
Q. Let's go back then what we were just talking about. USB313, sir.
A. I'm sorry. One more time.
Q. 313 it's going to say schedule $A$, real property at the top.

Now, $I$ think we're talking about before where we noted that, you know, we have 4254 Rolling stone Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89103 was included on this schedule A; correct?
A. As a disputed lien, yes.
Q. Well, $I$ have another question though. Like over there, do you see the column where it says on the top current value of debtor's interest in property?
A. Yes.
Q. And it says $\$ 35,000$ ?
A. Yes.
$04: 02: 01$
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Q. And this is - and so, like, a couple of pages back here, you know, we have that testimony under penalty of perjury of USB329 which you don't dispute that you signed -- that you didn't sign that document, you just don't remember signing it; correct?
A. I think we already went over that. $I$ think $I$ made a pretty lengthy explanation of electronic signature, authorization. I probably would not have read every, you know, sentence or, you know.
Q. Okay. But you don't dispute that this bankruptcy petition for the Bourne Valley Court Trust says this property is worth $\$ 35,000 ?$
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Okay. Let's go over to USB318. Again, this is just for clarity sake. We both agree that you authorized the filing of the bankruptcy of the Bourne Valley Court Trust; correct?
A. Yes; that is correct.
Q. Okay. What happened with that bankruptcy?
A. It was dismissed.
Q. Do you remember why?
A. You'd have to ask my attorney. I'm not a technical expert, but $I$ know for a fact it was dismissed.
Q. Well, that's fair. If you asked me why some

| 04:03:25 | 1 | Of my cases got dismissed, 1 probably couldn't tell |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | you. |
|  | 3 | A. Right. |
|  | 4 | Q. Or potentially forgot. Who knows. Let's take |
| 04:03:32 | 5 | a look at USB318. |
|  | 6 | Do you see the very bottom where it says |
|  | 7 | Southwest Financial Services. |
|  | 8 | A. Yes. |
|  | 9 | Q. And then over in the -- there's a provision |
| 04:03:55 | 10 | that says date claim was - - and the second column over |
|  | 11 | at the top it says: Date claim was incurred. Nature |
|  | 12 | Of lien. And description in value of property subject |
|  | 13 | to lien. Do you see what I'm talking about, sir? |
|  | 14 | A. Are we talking about in each box? Or - |
| 04:04:20 | 15 | Q. There's a second -- |
|  | 16 | A. Or - |
|  | 17 | (Court Reporter interrupts) |
|  | 18 | Q. Sorry. |
|  | 19 | A. I do see the column. |
| 04:04:25 | 20 | Q. Okay. |
|  | 21 | A. Yes. |
|  | 22 | Q. Down here, it says, you know, very bottom, |
|  | 23 | right next to Southwest Financial services, it says |
|  | 24 | first mortgage, 4254 Rolling Stone Drive, Las Vegas, |
| 04:04:39 | 25 | Nevada, 89103. Do you see what I'm talking about, sir? |
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A. Yes.
Q. And at the top it looks like that the bankruptcy information at the top says it was entered on June the 13th, 2012; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So do you dispute at all that in -- well, $I$ guess, we can both agree that this is about the sale took place January 25, 2012; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then we can both agree that this took place maybe about like five months after that sale?
A. (No audible response.)
Q. Can we agree to that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Maybe not exactly. But five months after this sale we have a document a few pages back where it was testified under penalty of perjury, which you think you might, may or may not have authorized, but you're not sure, that says that there's a first mortgage on the property that brings us here today. Do you dispute this fact, sir?
A. Repeat the question one more time, please.
Q. Did you represent to the Federal Bankruptcy Court in June 13, 2012 , that this property was subject to a first mortgage?

04:06:00 1
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A. No. No, that was not what $I$ represented.
Q. Can you explain to me then at the bottom why it includes a first mortgage listed on 4254 Rolling Stone Drive?
A. You have to be truthful with the Court. You have to disclose who is making a claim against a property. In this particular instance $I$ would imagine that my attorney at the time would have put the mortgage company as a disputed -- in the disputed column there, that's the third narrow column. says disputed.
Q. Okay.
A. So we can't lie to the Court. We have to tell the court the truth that there's a creditor that is claiming something, but we are disputing their claim.
Q. So you were aware of a claim by the first mortgage against 4254 Rolling Stone Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada, as of June 13th, 2012?
A. Again, as I reiterated earlier, I was familiar with this creditor prior to showing up to the auction and bidding on the property.
Q. Okay.
A. So the answer is yes. I was familiar with this creditor prior to the auction, at the auction, and I was familiar with their claim after the auction as

| $04: 07: 22$ | 1 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  | 04:07:27

04:08:0610

04:08:2320
well.
Q. Do you recall when you got served with process in this instant lawsuit?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. Looks like there's a -- let's go back to that Schedule A, USB313. You see what I'm talking about, sir?
A. Okay. yes.
Q. So the Bourne Valley Court Trust owned all these properties contained in this -- contained on this list?
A. At the time, yes.
Q. Are they all properties you purchased at an HOA foreclosure?
A. I believe they're all properties purchased at HOA sales, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Pursuant to NRS 116 .
Q. And at no -- and, like, it looks like all these properties as you go down the column, where it shows those values, it says value. At no point in time did you think that there was some kind of condition affecting value on those properties at least as stated in the schedule under penalty of perjury in June of 2012 ?
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A. No. I believe my attorney listed them as disputed claims. Again, we've been through this before. Each one of these here says disputed claim.
Q. Okay.
A. By law you have to disclose all creditors claims that was done here. But then you also, you know, disclose whether they're disputed or undisputed, so they're clearly marked as disputed claims.
Q. Okay. Let's go over to USB324, sir. Do you see where it lists, second from the top, says Law Offices Les Zieve. You see what I'm talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. And it says you have an unpaid lien on 4254 Rolling Stone Drive.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. Did you think you had a lien by a Law Offices of Les Zieve?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay.
A. I really cannot comment on that. I'm not prepared to comment on that, your Honor.
(Reporter clarification)
Q. Les Zieve, L-E-S Z-I-E-V-E.
A. All $\quad$ can think of is Law Offices of Les Zieve representing the first mortgage disputed creditor

04:11:41

04:11:46
$04: 12: 0510$

04:13:0615
$04: 13: 1320$
maybe
Q. Okay.
A. IIm not sure.
Q. Okay. Sounds like that you were, $I$ guess, aware of, you know, some kind of dispute with the first mortgage holder at least in June of 2012 ?
A. Well, again, $\quad$ was aware of a disputed first deed, you know, creditor the day of the auction, or even before the auction.
Q. Okay. Let's go over to USB327. And, I guess, just, you know, in passing it's -- you know, if you look, $I$ guess, it's one, two, three, four from the bottom. You see property management agreement with 4254 Rolling Stone Drive?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it says Great Bridge Properties over there on the left; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That is your company?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let me go over here and take a look starting at USB343. Have you seen this document before, sir?
A. Can't say that $I$ have. No.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the term motion
$04: 14: 05$
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04:15:5125
to value collateral?
A. It's been a while. I don't recall the explanation that my attorney gave me for it.
Q. Okay. Let's go over to page 2, USB344. So you would have no knowledge of - you would have no knowledge authorizing your attorney to file a motion stating that Southwest Financial Services had a lien of $\$ 50,000 ?$
A. Is that what $I$ said? Was that my testimony?
Q. Would you have knowledge or not?
A. Exactly would $I$ have knowledge of what?
Q. Would you be aware of - would you have authorized Mr. Alexander to file a property stating that there was a first mortgage encumbering this property? Because if you look back here, this motion had to do with, let me see, 4254 Bourne valley Court Trust. Actually let's go ahead and move over here a little bit further. Let's go to USB348.

You've seen this document before, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it that we're looking at?
A. Comparative market analysis.
Q. Comparative market analysis. What is a comparative market analysis?
A. Here is some comps to justify a value.
$04: 15: 58$
$04: 16: 06$

04:16:1710
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Q. Okay. It says if you look at in the left-hand corner it says Great Bridge Properties. Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. So your company Great Bridge Properties, did they perform of this comparative market analysis?
A. Cheryl Van Elsis is an independent contractor.
Q. Okay.
A. And she would have been done this comparative market analysis.
Q. Okay. Would you have asked her to do this comparative market analysis?
A. Probably Brian Alexander would have.
Q. Okay. Let's go ahead and flip on over to USB340--356. This is that same comparative market analysis that was done by your company or the independent contractor on behalf of your company. So can we agree it looks like at the top there's some notations up here. Looks like there's a case number. Says this was filed on 11-7-2012. Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it -- do you have any knowledge about whether or not this is the document that was filed in the bankruptcy of Bourne Valley Court Trust?

| 04:17:22 | 1 | A. I mean, you're asking me a question that's a rhetorical question. I mean, it says case |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | No. 12-16387. |
|  | 4 | Q. So you don't dispute that? |
| 04:17:41 | 5 | A. I don't know. You'd have to look. I don't |
|  | 6 | know how to even search these records, but |
|  | 7 | Q. Did you have your -- did you have Cheryl van |
|  | 8 | Ellis -- or Elsis on behalf of Great Bridge Properties |
|  | 9 | do an appraisal where she had a recommended listing |
| 04:17:56 | 10 | price of \$33,000? |
|  | 11 | A. No. That would have been Ryan Alexander and |
|  | 12 | Cheryl. |
|  | 13 | Q. Okay. And then going back here to USB344. |
|  | 14 | A. You skipped over all the sales that took place |
| 04:18:32 | 15 | that justifies that value. |
|  | 16 | Q. So you -- so you believe that value is |
|  | 17 | justified? |
|  | 18 | A. Absolutely, 100 percent. It would have to be |
|  | 19 | justified to be admitted. |
| 04:18:44 | 20 | Q. Well, here's -- all right. Well, that's fine. |
|  | 21 | A. Those are all factual numbers. |
|  | 22 | Q. That's fair. And then down here back on |
|  | 23 | that -- well, actually. I'm sorry. I'm being rude. |
|  | 24 | You haven't gotten back to the page yet. |
| 04:19:00 | 25 | A. That's okay. No problem. |

A. I mean, you're asking me a question that's a
A. I don't know. You'd have to look. I don't
Q. Did you have your -- did you have Cheryl van
A. No. That would have been Ryan Alexander and
Q. Okay. And then going back here to USB344.
A. You skipped over all the sales that took place that justifies that value.
Q. So you -- so you believe that value is justified?
A. Absolutely, 100 percent. It would have to be justified to be admitted.
Q. Well, here's - all right. Well, that's fine.
A. Those are all factual numbers.
Q. That's fair. And then down here back on
. That's okay. No problem.

04:19:01 04:19:16

04:19:2910

04:19:4215
Q. USB344. Says subject property. 4254 Rolling Stone Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89103. Do you see where I'm talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then below that it says first mortgage Southwest Financial Services. Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. And then below that it says assignee first mortgage US Bank?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you authorize -- well, actually one other thing before $I$ ask you this next question.

And then at the very last page USB347 of the motion, if you want to take a moment and cruise on over to that portion.
A. 347 , okay. Yes.
Q. So USB347 you see the very last paragraph where it says wherefore?
A. Yes.
Q. Says wherefore debtor prays this Court evaluate the property in accordance with the appraisal attached hereto. And then two, bifurcate the first mortgage claims of secured creditor and to secure unsecured claims. Do you see what I'm talking about,
$04: 20: 13$
$04: 20: 19$
$04: 20: 3410$
$04: 20: 5515$

04:21:2625
sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did You ask or - and this is - - this was filed. We can both agree this was filed November 7 of 2012; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you authorize Mr. Alexander to attempt to bifurcate the first mortgage lien of 4254 Rolling Stone Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada?
A. Yes. That's what it seems like. At the time, the law was unclear. $S F R$ had not come out. And there was lots of litigation to go forward to certify the extinguishment issue.
Q. But in November of 2012 you thought this property was subject to a mortgage?
A. No. That is not correct.
Q. Then can you explain why you authorized the filing of this motion?
A. If we go back to one of those documents that we -- first of all, NRS was adopted by Nevada legislature in $191 . \quad$ So the extinguishment to the tune of nine months directly proceeding the institution of an action has been law since 1991, not since 2012 .

However, there was some cases going up to the Nevada Supreme Court, and the Nevada Supreme Court was
$04: 21: 30$
$04: 21: 48$

04:22:1110
$04: 22: 2015$
$04: 22: 5225$
going to clarify the issue. So at the time the issue was not clarified.

Anyhow that's where we're at at the time. But if you take a look at USB325 I believe it was, you can see where I'm talking about where the loan was disputed. The lien was disputed.
Q. But it sounds like to me, Mr. Haddad - and you are the trustee of both the 4254 Rolling stone Drive Trust as well as the managing member of the Resources Group, the trustee for the Bourne valley Court Trust; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Sounds to me that you had a pretty firm knowledge that $U S$ Bank was going to be lurking around at the time you were filing these documents and, indeed, has a serious and legitimate concern about it?
A. I don't know if that's - - if that was going to be the case or not. Nobody can predict the future.
Q. But you at least seemed to be concerned enough to authorize the filing of this bankruptcy listing US Bank as a creditor; correct?
A. As a disputed creditor, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm sorry. That was page USB324 actually is where that shows up, 4254 Rolling stone Drive as a

| 04:22:56 | 1 | disputed claim. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | Q. Okay. Appreciate your honesty, sir. |
|  | 3 | A. Yes. |
|  | 4 | Q. Let's go back to USB466, Exhibit 12. |
| 04:23:22 | 5 | A. Exhibit 12? |
|  | 6 | Q. Yes, sir. |
|  | 7 | A. Okay. |
|  | 8 | Q. And this is the trustee's deed upon sale from |
|  | 9 | the sale that you attended; correct? |
| 04:23:49 | 10 | A. Yes. |
|  | 11 | Q. Okay. And that's the signature of your |
|  | 12 | attorney we went over before, Mr. Kerbow; correct? |
|  | 13 | A. No. That's not correct. He was not my |
|  | 14 | attorney at the time of this purchase. He was not my |
| 04:24:06 | 15 | attorney at the time of this purchase. He was the |
|  | 16 | attorney for the trustee. |
|  | 17 | Q. So let's go through. You don't quite recall, |
|  | 18 | but because you go -- 1 mean, how many sales you go to |
|  | 19 | a year, sir? |
| 04:24:22 | 20 | A. Five days a week, 52 weeks a year. |
|  | 21 | Q. That's a lot of sales. |
|  | 22 | A. Yes. |
|  | 23 | Q. Don't even take two weeks off. You're a hard |
|  | 24 | working man; right? |
| 04:24:32 | 25 | So do you recall where this sale took place |

04:24:35
$04: 24: 40$

04:25:0110

04:25:0915
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at?
A. I don't.
Q. If I - -
A. If you allow me some time to look through the document, it will probably talk about where the sale took place.
Q. That's fine.
A. Maybe not. However, if you allow me to take a look at the notice of trustee sale - -
Q. Well, let's walk through that a little bit first then.
A. Sure.
Q. So, like, you don't remember the specific sale. But do you have, like, a standard process you follow when you're getting ready to attend these sales?
A. Standard, sure.
Q. What is that? What do you do?
A. Show up 10, 15 minutes early. Make sure the traffic doesn't, you know, cause me to show up late.
Q. How do you know where to go?
A. On the notice of trustee sale.
Q. Where do you generally get the notice of trustee sale before you head down there?
A. Clark County recorder's website.
Q. You go to the actual Clark County Recorder's

04:26:4415
website?
A. And the Nevada Legal News.
Q. Okay. I'm going to see if $I$ can help you out and see if $I$ can help you find notice of sale, sir.
A. Would that be USB462?
Q. Fastest document locater in the west, sir. Thank you.
A. It's right there.
Q. So this - so you've identified -- so you've seen this document before, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Most likely it's been a while. But $\quad$ can't recall, but most likely.
Q. But this is the type of document you review?
A. Yes.
Q. okay. Why don't you take a minute and take a look at this and see if you can't remember where the sale took place?
A. $4: 00$ p.m. at 930 South Fourth street, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 .
Q. Where is that at?
A. Downtown.
Q. Downtown. Any specific business location? Middle of street?

04:27:05
A. Fourth Street would be right around Charleston. Probably 930 South Fourth is the Nevada Legal News.
Q. Okay. Do you attend sales at Nevada Legal News often?
A. Yes.
Q. It sounds like you attend sales frequently because you say you go to sales seven days a week, 52 weeks a year.
A. Five days a week, 52 weeks a year.
Q. So you do take two days off.
A. Yes.
Q. Good man. Saturday and Sunday sacred.

So you probably -- I mean, like, can we agree that you've been to a bunch of sales at the Nevada Legal News?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you only purchase at HOA foreclosure sales? Or do you purchase at other types of sales?
A. I purchase NRS 116 sales, NRS 107 sales, and Clark County Treasurer's Office sales.
Q. Okay. So you're pretty, like, you know, knowledgeable about the entire spectrum of foreclosure auctions?
A. I have experience, yes.

04:28:01 04:28:13

04:28:2410
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Q. Okay. I think do you drive down there? Take Uber? Do you walk down there? Take a bus? How do you get down to Nevada Legal News?
A. Typically drive.
Q. Drive. And then park your car?
A. Yes.
Q. Walk in there? At $4: 00$ p.m. in front of Nevada Legal News, like, on a typical day, what would you see?
A. I don't recall. This was a long time ago.
Q. Would there be a lot of people there?
A. I don't recall.
Q. How about the bidding at this sale. I'm assuming there's bidding; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you recall how much money you paid on this property?
A. According to the trustee's deed, the winning bid was \$5,000-- \$5,331.
Q. Okay. And you don't dispute that that's the amount of money?
A. I don't dispute that.
Q. Okay. How much money would you typically bring down with you to an HOA foreclosure sale?
A. For security purposes $I$ don't think that's a

| 04:29:14 | 1 | good question for me to answer. But plenty to pay for the property. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | Q. Would you bring more than \$10,000? |
|  | 4 | A. Is that -- I think that's a trade secret. You |
| 04:29:27 | 5 | know, I 'm not going to talk about. |
|  | 6 | MR. VILKIN: You can answer it. |
|  | 7 | THE WITNESS: Frequently, yes. |
|  | 8 | BY MR. BECKOM: |
|  | 9 | Q. More than $\$ 10,000$ ? Would you bring more than |
| 04:29:351 | 10 | \$20, 000? |
|  | 11 | MR. VILKIN: Your Honor, 1 let him ask the |
|  | 12 | questions, but I don't see the relevance to this. |
|  | 13 | THE COURT: I'll sustain. |
|  | 14 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 04:29:451 | 15 | BY MR. BECKOM: |
|  | 16 | Q. When you go to the bidding at an HOA |
|  | 17 | foreclosure sale, would you consider that -- to that to |
|  | 18 | be a, I guess, a lively process? Like, would there be |
|  | 19 | a lot of bidders there in January of 2012? |
| 04:30:062 | 20 | A. If you're talking about NRS 116 sales? |
|  | 21 | Q. Um-hum. |
|  | 22 | A. It would be a lot less bidding going on than, |
|  | 23 | let's say, October 20 of 2014 , the day after the SFR |
|  | 24 | decision came out. |
| 04:30:242 | 25 | Q. Okay. Would you describe the bidding as |
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depressed when --
A. No.
Q. -- compared to, let's say, a 107 sale?
A. No. I wouldn't call it depressed. I would call it, you know, uncertainty about how much time and how much money it would cost to litigate to get clear title.
Q. But it wasn't the same type of bidding that you would see at a 107 foreclosure sale?
A. Well, let's put it this way. NRS 107 sales, you still have risks commensurate with property condition, evictions, can't get into the property, you don't know what you're buying. Under NRS 116 you have the very same, what you call, risks. Add to it the heavy, heavy which $I$ call litigation. The heavy, heavy can be $\$ 4,000$ a month. And now welve been fighting over five years on this. So, you know, purchase at a NRS 116 sale is just a start of spending lots and lots of money to get clear title.
Q. And you were of this opinion in, let's say, January 24 , 2012 , the day before the sale?
A. I would have been anticipating some litigation, yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. BECKOM: The Court's indulgence one
$04: 32: 20$
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$04: 32: 5910$
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moment.
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Do you have any specific recollection about how many people actually bid on this property at the sale; do you?
A. According to this trustee's deed, the opening bid equals the bid by the winning bidder. so $I$ would say no other bidder.
Q. So you were the only bidder at this sale?
A. I would say I'm not sure if $I$ was the only person present. I'm not sure about that. I don't recall. But according to the numbers here, $I$ would have been the highest bid.
Q. So nobody else bid on the sale except for you based on your review of the trustee's deed?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. Okay. Is that a frequent occurrence?
A. Is it frequent?
Q. Yes.
A. Not anymore.
Q. Was it a frequent occurrence in 2012?
A. I think the Nevada Supreme Court really taught everybody what's at stake.
Q. Was this a frequent occurrence in 2005?
A. Yes, $I$ would say. Yes, I would say; right?
$04: 33: 32$
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Q. So the big sale with you being the only bidder there, the bidding was depressed?
A. No, not depressed. No. This was truly the market value because it cannot be disputed that a well publicized, well advertised, well recorded sale, and, you know, it's public, it's open to the public, anybody can come and bid, that truly is the definition of the highest value of a property.
Q. And so when that happened, nobody else showed up at least for this property?
A. Well, yes. That's correct.

MR. BECKOM: I have no further questions at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. Is it better? How much longer do you have, sir? Can we be done in 15 or ...?

MR. VILKIN: I'm hoping.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. VILKIN: Yeah, it's possible.
THE COURT: All right.

## CROSS - EXAMINATION

BY MR. VILKIN:
Q. Mr. Haddad, as $I$ recall your testimony on the issue of when you first hired Mr. Kerbow, you indicated some uncertainty as to when that occurred. And then
$04: 34: 40$ 04:34:51
$04: 35: 0610$
later in your testimony you seemed to indicate that he was not your attorney as of the date of the sale on January 25, 2012; is that correct?
A. That is correct.

MR. VILKIN: Your Honor, may $I$ show the
witness some documents to try to refresh his
recollection on when he first hired Mr. Kerbow.
THE COURT: Yes, You may, sir. You may approach.

BY MR. VILKIN:
Q. Mr. Haddad, if you would just review those to yourself and tell me when you've had a chance to review those.
A. I reviewed these with you.
Q. Well, $I$ - just review them and tell me when you're done --
A. Okay.
Q. -- reviewing them.
A. Yes. I am done.
Q. Okay. And were you involved in a lawsuit that was captioned Paradise Canyon Resort Owners Association versus Resources Group?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Okay. And was that lawsuit filed on January 18, 2012 ?

04:35:50 1 04:36:01
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And who was representing Resources Group as the defendant in that lawsuit?
A. Preston Rosay. (Phonetic)
Q. No. I'm asking about the Paradise Canyon Resort case.
A. Yes. Who was defending? I'm sorry who?
Q. The Paradise -- look at the captions.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. The Paradise Canyon Resort versus Resources Group case.
A. Correct.
Q. Who was representing Resources Group?
A. The plaintiff Resources Group.
Q. No. I think you're looking at -- take a look. Look at the caption at the top.
A. Um-hum.
Q. Paradise Canyon Resort Owners Association versus Resources Group.
A. True. Defendant Fidelity National Title defendant Paradise Owners Association.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm on page 1.
Q. You're on the wrong page.
A. Sorry.

04:36:58 1
$04: 37: 04 \quad 5$

04:37:1410

04:37:2315
Q. Look at the caption Paradise Canyon versus Resources Group.
A. Oh, yes. So that's page 3. Okay.
Q. Okay.
A. Sorry about that.
Q. Okay. And what date was that case filed?
A. January 18, 2012 .
Q. Okay. And was Resources Group the defendant in that case?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And who was representing Resources Group?
A. Michael Bohn.
Q. Okay. Who was the plaintiff in that case?
A. Paradise Canyon Resort Owners Association.
Q. And who was representing Paradise Canyon Resort Owners Association?
A. Robert Koenig AKA, Ryan Kerbow.
Q. Well, is Robert Koenig the Koenig of Alessi \& Koenig?
A. Yes; that is correct.
Q. And take a -- were you involved in a case captioned Houston Family Trust versus El Parque Homeowners Association?
A. What page? Yes, I was.
Q. Okay. And were you a defendant in that case?

04:38:03
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A. Yes.
Q. And what date was that case filed on?
A. April 9 of 2012 .
Q. And who represented you in that case?
A. Ryan Kerbow.
Q. Okay. Do you believe that April 9, 2012, is the first time Mr. Kerbow represented you in any quiet title action?
A. That is correct. We were against each other prior to that in Paradise.
Q. Okay. And what is your position with Resources Group?
A. I'm the manager of Resources Group.
Q. And Resources Group is an LLC; correct?
A. Yes; that is correct.
Q. And you testified earlier, I believe, that you were the trustee of 4254 Rolling Stone Drive Trust?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that true?
A. So I'm the manager of Resources Group LLC, and Resources Group LLC is the trustee for the trust.
Q. Okay. So you were incorrect when you said that you personally were the trustee. It was actually Resources Group was the trustee. You're the manager of Resources Group; correct?
$04: 39: 27$
$04: 39: 40$
$04: 39: 5710$
$04: 40: 1215$
A. I apologize for that. My attorney michael Bohn, who is not here, would have set that up a long time.
Q. We'll sanction him for that.

Now, when you went to the sale of this particular property on January 25, 2012 , what information did you have about the property prior to the sale?
A. I would have reviewed the Nevada Legal News. I would have reviewed the Clark County Recorder's website. All kind of title information $\quad$ would have had. Physically, you know, seeing the outside of the property.
Q. When you say all kind of title information, what are you talking about?
A. Anything of Clark County Recorder's website, the entire record would have come up for me.
Q. So all the recorded documents on the property?
A. All the recorded documents.
Q. Okay. Did you ever see any other documents concerning the property?
A. No. Nothing else. Only recorded documents.
Q. Okay. Did you get any information about this property from either the HOA or Alessi \& Koenig, the sales trustee prior to the sale?

04:40:35 04:40:46
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A. No.
Q. Did you have any information about any dispute between the holder of the first deed of trust and the HOA about the property?
A. No.
Q. Did you have any information about whether notices were sent or not sent to the first trust deed holder prior to the sale?
A. No.
Q. Did you talk to anyone at the sale prior to the sale about the property?
A. No.
Q. Now, when you -- before you purchased the sale, were you able to inspect the inside of the property?
A. Absolutely not. That's very, very rare.
Q. Okay. And so was that a risk that you considered yourself taking in terms of buying the property?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. And when the appraisal was done by the independent contractor from your office several months later, did she get a chance to inspect the inside of the property?
A. No.

04:41:34 04:41:45
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Q. She did not?
A. You'll have to ask her. I don't know if she did or not.
Q. Take a look at Exhibit 11.
A. She would have had her own instructions from the attorney.
Q. Well, take a look at Exhibit 11, USB359 and 360. And now -- I'm sorry. Let me withdraw that question.

So you don't know whether she went inside the property or not.
A. I don't know. That would have been Cheryl and the attorney.

MR. VILKIN: One second, your Honor. Nothing further. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?
MR. BECKOM: One brief follow up.
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. On this document this register of actions that Mr. Vilkin showed you.
A. Yes.
Q. You go there. I think he was referring to a Houston Family Trust. It's the third to the last page. Let me know when you get there, sir.
A. Third to the last from the packet. Yes, I'm
$04: 44: 02$ 04:44:11
$04: 44: 2610$
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there.
Q. Okay. So right there third from the bottom it says defendant Resources Group LLC, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then on the right-hand side it says Ryan M. Kerbow?
A. Yes. Correct.
Q. And so that's who you are here on behalf of today, Resources Group LLC, in regards to 4254 Rolling Stone Drive?
A. Yes.
Q. And so Mr. Kerbow was actually not even just, you know, your personal attorney for multiple purposes, but he was also actually the attorney for the Resources Group, the entity that purchased this property?
A. (No audible response.)
Q. Do you dispute that based on this document?
A. So I don't think that Ryan Kerbow was the attorney for 4254 Rolling Stone Drive Trust. I don't believe that's the case.
Q. That's not what $I$ asked, though. What I did ask was is -- was he the attorney for Resources Group LIC in this action that Mr. Vilkin just presented to you?
A. Not per se -- not for Resources Group, but
$04: 45: 15$
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the deed on behalf of Glenview West?
A. What document again?
Q. I apologize. USB466 at Exhibit 12 .
A. Ryan Kerbow is a professional attorney. And if he had any issue with conflicts of interest, he would have certainly, you know, let me know or he would have refused the work.
Q. But he was your attorney in that court case we just discussed, that A-12-659764-C. And he represented Resources Group, it looks like, beginning in April of 2012 sometime?
A. As a trustee for a different trust.
Q. I understand. And then also if we go back to USB462. This is the notice of sale that you testified as reviewing in order to figure out where to go and where to go buy this property. That document is also
$04: 46: 44$
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signed by Mr. Kerbow; is it not?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And so we can both agree that he was both the attorney for the Resources Group as well as the attorney that signed the notice of sale on behalf of Glenview West?

MR. VILKIN: Misstates the evidence.
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. I disagree. I think that actually that 100 percent is --

THE COURT: You can ask him the question. Go ahead.

MR. BECKOM: Do what?
THE COURT: Overruled. Rephrase it.
MR. BECKOM: Okay.
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. So we can agree that Mr. Kerbow represented the Resources Group LLC; correct, based on this document your attorney just presented to you to refresh your recollection?
A. As a trustee for a particular trust. Right.
Q. But is that a yes or a no?
A. According to this document, yes.
Q. And then USB462, can we both agree that Mr. Kerbow also signed this notice of sale?
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. BECKOM: I have no further questions at this time, your Honor.

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. VILKIN:
Q. Mr. Haddad, on what date did Mr. Kerbow represent you in the Houston Family Trust case?
A. According to this document, April 9, 2012 .

MR. VILKIN: Nothing further. Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay.
You're released, sir.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. Gentlemen, 10:30 a.m.?
MR. VILKIN: Yes.
MR. BECKOM: 10:30 tomorrow.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. VILKIN: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Enjoy your evening.
MR. HADDAD: Thank you, your Honor.
(Proceedings were concluded.)
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|  | 6/21 34/9 83/6 | 33/24 34/7 36/18 | \$2,995.60 [1] | 0089 [1] 122/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BY MR. BECKOM: | 203/20 | 44/25 46/10 46/22 | 149/20 | 0154 [1] 69/20 |
| $\text { [26] } 17 / 1218 / 17$ | MR. VILKIN: [84] | 49/7 49/12 50/15 | \$20,000 [1] | 0175 [1] 86/20 |
| 21/15 28/23 34/12 | 6/6 6/9 6/19 6/24 | 53/20 54/19 55/22 | 189/10 | 03 [1] 29/9 |
| 36/20 56/24 61/13 | 7/1 7/9 7/24 8/10 | 56/20 59/7 60/17 | \$201.09 [1] 10/16 | 0308 [2] 28/23 |
| 67/13 83/21 87/19 | 8/22 9/1 9/10 9/25 | 62/6 62/9 62/12 | \$264 [1] 148/12 | 29/3 |
| 91/1 101/15 138/5 | 12/25 21/10 28/21 | 62/16 62/22 63/5 | \$33,000 [1] | 0329 [1] 2/10 |
| 141/3 152/11 | 30/6 31/5 31/24 | 63/8 63/12 63/17 | 180/10 | 054 [1] 69/22 |
| 154/11 155/13 | 36/17 45/1 49/10 | 63/23 64/3 64/8 | \$35,000 [4] 11/5 | 1 |
| 155/17 166/6 189/7 | 49/13 50/11 56/18 | 64/11 64/13 64/20 |  |  |
| 189/14 191/1 | /8 60/14 60/18 | 65/5 65/13 65/15 | 170/12 |  |
| 199/17 202/7 | 61/8 62/4 62/8 | 65/22 66/3 66/10 | \$4,000 [2] 35/12 | rcent [1] |
| 202/15 | 62/20 62/23 63/11 | 66/13 66/17 66/21 | 190/16 | 14/17 |
| BY MR. VILKIN: | 63/21 63/25 64/7 | 66/25 67/25 68/7 | \$4,662 [1] 35/12 | 10-day [1] 10 |
| [15] 45/4 46/11 | 64/10 64/12 64/16 | 68/10 71/5 71/10 | \$414 [2] 16/14 | 100 [1] 119/25 |
| 47/2 49/17 50/17 | 65/14 65/17 65/19 | 73/7 78/17 79/23 | 148/12 |  |
| 53/22 55/1 55/23 | 66/7 66/16 68/3 | 80/1 80/11 80/13 | \$414.40 [3] | 130/24 131/2 |
| 59/11 60/23 77/23 | 68/8 71/4 71/8 | 80/16 80/20 80/23 | 147/15 148/5 | 131/10 180/18 |
| 142/2 192/21 193/9 | 78/16 80/9 80/19 | 81/2 81/5 81/7 | 149/17 | 202/10 |
| 203/6 | 80/25 81/4 81/6 | 81/10 81/15 81/17 | \$48,000 [1] 11/5 | 106 [1] 11/20 |
| BY MS. BAKER: | 81/8 81/13 81/16 | 82/2 82/4 82/8 | \$5,000 [1] 188/19 | 107 [4] 187/20 |
| [4] 68/13 71/12 | 81/24 82/3 82/10 | 82/13 82/16 82/23 | \$5,331 [4] 11/4 | 190/3 190/9 190/10 |
| 73/8 78/21 | 82/14 82/20 83/4 | 83/3 83/5 83/7 | 13/8 123/8 188/19 | 10:00 a.m [1] 9/1 |
| MR. BECKOM: | 90/14 101/12 | 83/17 90/13 90/16 | \$5,370 [1] 123/15 | 10:30 [1] 203/1 |
| [83] 6/15 7/4 8/13 | 141/10 141/16 | 90/22 90/25 101/14 | \$50 [3] 148/20 | 10:30 a.m [1] |
| 8/17 8/24 16/23 | 141/23 151/15 | 141/14 141/18 | 148/21 148/21 | 203/15 |
| 18/16 21/8 21/11 | 154/8 154/10 155/3 | 141/22 151/17 | \$50,000 [4] 10/13 | 11 [14] 71/25 72/3 |
| 28/22 30/4 30/12 | 155/8 165/24 189/5 | 151/21 151/24 | 22/5 22/6 178/8 | 72/18 74/1 74/4 |
| 30/20 31/3 31/7 | 189/10 192/15 | 155/11 155/15 | \$62,943 [2] 89/1 | 136/4 165/17 |
| 32/9 32/25 33/4 | 192/17 193/4 | 166/3 189/12 | 89/6 | 165/22 165/25 |
| 33/14 33/16 33/18 | 199/13 202/6 | 192/13 192/16 | \$700 [2] 11/11 | 166/3 166/5 |
| 33/25 34/3 34/10 | 203/10 203/15 | 192/18 193/7 | 147/25 | 199/4 199/7 |
| 36/15 44/23 46/6 | 203/18 | 199/15 202/10 | \$84,557 [2] 89/20 | 11 percent [1] |
| 46/20 50/13 53/19 | MS. BAKER: [21] | 202/13 203/11 | 89/23 | 11/6 |
| 54/18 55/20 56/21 | 9/13 9/16 10/2 10/5 | 203/14 203/17 | , |  |
| 59/5 60/11 61/9 |  | THE MAR | '91 [1] 182/21 | 116 [11] 14/25 |
| 62/3 62/10 62/13 | 77/20 78/18 79/19 | [18] 9/20 9/22 |  | 133/4 160/12 161/5 |
| 63/6 63/15 63/18 | $79 / 2580 / 1080 / 12$ | $10 / 162 / 1865 / 25$ |  | 162/18 163/14 |
| 64/1 64/4 64/17 | 80/15 80/18 87/17 | 66/5 66/12 67/22 | -000 [6] 64/19 | 174/18 187/20 |
| 64/22 65/11 66/8 | 165/20 165/22 | 68/1 68/4 80/22 | 64/20 82/12 82/13 | 189/20 190/13 |
|  | THE COURT | 83/8 137/19 137/22 | 141/21 141/22 | 190/18 |
| 82/25 83/18 87/12 | CLERK: [13] 17/5 | 137/25 141/17 | / | 12 [9] 154/5 155/3 |
| 87/16 90/10 90/18 | 18/15 33/20 33/23 | 141/19 151/19 |  | 155/5 155/10 |
| 90/23 137/21 | 34/2 34/5 67/6 | THE WITNESS: |  | 155/13 184/4 184/5 |
| 137/24 138/4 141/2 | 83/13 87/15 152/4 | [18] 17/8 46/23 | 0 | 201/5 201/12 |
| 151/16 151/22 | 155/4 155/7 155/10 | 49/14 53/21 54/20 |  | 126 [1] 147/10 |
| 154/9 154/25 155/6 | THE COURT: [130] | 60/13 60/19 62/17 |  | 1286 [1] 2/19 |
| 155/16 165/17 | 6/3 6/7 6/13 6/22 | 67/9 80/21 83/16 |  | 12C [1] 65/2 |
| 165/21 165/23 | 6/25 7/2 7/8 7/23 | 87/18 151/18 |  | 13 [1] 172/24 |
| 166/1 166/5 190/24 | 7/25 8/12 8/16 9/2 | 151/20 152/7 189/6 | 46 [4] 99/3 | 1300 [2] 67/24 |
| 192/11 199/16 | 9/11 9/14 9/17 9/21 | 189/13 203/13 | 14 99/1 | 68/6 |
| 202/12 202/14 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | \$ | 0047 [6] 98/7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13th [2] } 172 / 4 \\ & 173 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 203/2 203/16 | $30 / 2231 / 431 / 6$ | \$10,000 [2] 189/3 | 98/25 99/3 99/7 | $14 \text { [2] }$ |
| MR. GEISENDORF: | 31/23 31/25 32/23 | 189/9 | 99/9 99/13 | 15 [4] 64/10 66/17 |
| [4] 6/11 16/21 |  | \$1170 [1] 16/13 | 0075 [2] 112/5 | 185/18 192/15 |
| 64/5 65/18 MR. HADDAD: [4] | $33 / 1733 / 1933 / 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 130[2] \quad 11 / 2 \\ & 70 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124 / 1 \\ & \mathbf{0 0 8 4}[1] \quad 115 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \text { [8] 57/5 59/14 } \\ & 60 / 561 / 461 / 15 \end{aligned}$ |


| 1 | 144/15 145/7 | 29 [1] 110/17 | 44 [1] 106/10 | 186/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16... [3] 146/6 | 145/12 145/17 | 2925 [3] 39/14 | 45 [3] 69/22 | 89103 [6] 10/8 |
| 16... ${ }^{\text {che/19 }} 146 / 22$ | 146/6 146/19 | 109/7 109/13 | 141/13 147/1 | 23/6 85/10 169/17 |
| 16387 [1] 180/3 | 146/22 147/ | 2:00 [3] 7/20 | 466 [2] 154/10 | 1/25 181/2 |
| 17 [9] 28/17 28/19 | 147/18 149/14 | 80/25 81/3 | 155/3 | 89117 [1] 2/9 |
| 28/20 30/6 34/1 | 2012 [49] 11/4 | 2:00 p.m [1] 63/1 | 467 [1] 155/3 | 9 |
| 48/1 49/4 50/13 | 11/13 12/16 15/1 | 2:30 [1] 65 | 47 [1] 143/24 |  |
| 50/17 |  | 3 | $1$ | $145 / 24160 / 18$ |
| 17A [2] 34/3 34/7 | $96 / 1697 / 1297 / 14$ | 3.99 [3] 22/22 | $48 \text { [1] } 106 / 11$ | 90 percent [1] |
| 17th [3] 38/3 | 122/10 122/20 | $22 / 2322 / 24$ | $486 \text { [1] } 154 / 9$ | $74 / 8$ |
| 39/22 57/25 18 [4] 76/5 167/21 | $123 / 6130 / 13$ | 3.99 percent [1] | 49 [3] 150/3 150/4 | 930 [3] 124/2 |
| 18 [4] 76/5 167/21 $193 / 25195 / 7$ | 130/17 145/21 | 22/20 | 150/16 | 186/20 187/2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193/25 195/7 } \\ & 1991 \text { [1] } 182 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | 146/23 147/14 | 30 [3] 74/10 75/19 | 4:00 [1] 64/7 | 9510 [1] 2/7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1991 \text { [1] } 182 / 23 \\ & \mathbf{1 : 0 0 ~ [ 6 ] ~} 7 / 1764 / \end{aligned}$ | 149/14 150/7 153/4 | 84/4 | 4:00 p.m [3] 124/2 | 9:55 [1] 6/2 |
| $64 / 765 / 266 / 12$ | 153/5 156/6 156/10 | 30-year [1] 74/10 | 186/20 188/7 | : |
| 68/1 | 162/20 172/4 172/8 | 300 [1] 39/2 309 [1] 3/6 | 5 | :SS [1] 204/2 |
| 1:00 p.m [1] 63/2 | 174/25 177/6 | $31 \text { [1] } 122 / 20$ | 50 [3] 74/14 76/10 |  |
| 1:30 [1] 81/20 | $179 / 20 \text { 182/5 }$ | $313 \text { [2] } 169 / 13$ | $148 / 23$ | A |
| 1st [3] 67/20 78/16 | $182 / 14182 / 23$ | 175/19 | 50/50 [1] 148/23 | A-12-659764-C |
| 147/13 |  | 32 [2] 142/ | 500th [1] 136/3 | 201/18 |
| 2 | 191/21 193/3 | 144/14 | 52 [4] 156/11 | A-12-667690-C [1] |
| 20 [5] 66/17 | 193/25 195/7 196/3 | 3211 [1] | 184/20 187/8 | 1/1 |
| 102/11 143/11 | 196/6 197/6 201/20 | 3212 [1] 2/22 | 187/10 | A-L-E-S-S-I [ |
| 153/15 189/23 | 203/10 | 33 [2] 142/5 142/5 | 53 [1] 150/16 | 83/17 |
| 200 [1] 2/8 | 2013 [2] 16/9 | 347 [1] 181/17 | 537 [1] 39 | 3] $6 / 2$ 9/1 |
| 2001 [1] 10/18 | 128/19 | 356 [1] 179/15 | 54 [3] 69/23 |  |
| 2005 [1] 191/24 | 2014 [2] 128/19 | 360 [1] 199/8 | 150/20 150/21 | $y[3]$ |
| 2006 [1] 98/11 | 189/23 2015 [3] 8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3:00 [1] 64/7 } \\ & \text { 3rd [1] 37/7 } \end{aligned}$ | 541 [2] 1/24 204/17 | able [8] 27/1 35/7 |
| 2007 [1] 98/11 | 2015 [3] 87/2 |  | $55117 \text { [1] 39/15 }$ | 37/18 76/14 106/18 |
| 2009 [7] 10/13 | $2016 \text { [1] 85/7 }$ | 4 | 5691 [1] 2/11 | 123/5 158/12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21 / 1937 / 748 / 18 \\ & 58 / 1589 / 20102 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | $2017 \text { [5] } 1 / 216 / 1$ | 4-12-2011 [1] | 58103 [3] 38/4 | 198/14 |
| 201 [1] 39/15 | 67/20 78/16 145/6 |  | 39/23 58/1 | about [120] 8/1 |
| 201-dollar [1] | 207 [2] 78/3 78/5 | 4-5-2011 [2] | 5868 [1] 3/8 | 8/8 8/17 9/8 10/19 |
| 10/16 | 20th [1] 143/8 |  | 6 | $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 6 & 11 / 11 & 13 / 19 \\ 13 / 21 & 13 / 24 & 15 / 20\end{array}$ |
| 2010 [15] 10/24 | 212 [1] 78/6 23 [1] 65/21 | $\begin{gathered} 4.15 \mathbf{p} \\ 22 / 16 \end{gathered}$ | 60 [3] 35/12 75/14 | 16/13 24/6 25/11 |
| 70/23 77/13 84/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 3} \text { [1] } 65 / 21 \\ & \mathbf{2 4} \text { [2] } 8 / 21 \quad 190 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | 41 [1] 147/1 | 160/18 | 26/23 38/5 38/14 |
| 84/25 88/23 89/20 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 4} \text { [2] } 8 / 21190 / 21 \\ & \mathbf{2 4 / 7} \text { [1] } 142 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | 4254 [38] 10/7 | 685-0329 [1] 2/10 | 39/6 40/14 41/14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 96 / 12125 / 2143 / 9 \\ & 143 / 12147 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24/7 [1] } 142 / 11 \\ & \mathbf{2 4 2 3 0 [ 1 ] ~} 111 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | $13 / 1423 / 626 / 11$ |  | 50/7 50/20 51/8 |
| 143/12 147/7 <br> 147/13 149/13 | 2470 [1] 3/5 | 35/18 37/10 37/12 | 7 | 51/8 55/8 57/15 |
| $149 / 14$ | 25 [12] 102/8 | 42/8 69/9 77/10 | 702 [5] 2/10 2/11 | 59/14 60/5 61/7 |
|  | 123/6 141/12 | 78/8 85/9 99/23 | 2/21 2/22 3/8 | 61/19 64/25 68/3 |
|  | 146/23 147/14 | 152/22 154/20 | 73 [2] 150/20 | 68/6 77/18 81/19 |
| 28/8 | 150/7 156/6 156/10 | 154/22 155/20 | 150/21 | 81/23 86/11 88/16 |
| 35/4 42/19 43/18 | 162/20 172/8 193/3 | 156/3 156/9 156/25 | 75 [1] 74/11 | 88/18 88/20 90/23 |
| 45/8 46/4 70/23 | 197/6 | 156/25 166/12 | 75 percent [3] | 93/17 93/20 101/11 |
| 75/9 77/13 84/11 | 25th [4] 11/4 | 169/16 171/24 | 74/6 76/13 76/14 | 106/21 108/20 |
| 84/25 88/23 89/5 | 11/13 51/12 145/19 | 173/3 173/17 175/8 | 8 | $3 / 1114 /$ |
| 91/22 91/23 92/13 | 26 [6] 48/18 | $177 / 14178 / 16$ | 83 [1] 144/23 | 119/23 121/13 |
| 92/18 96/14 97/12 | $144 / 15145 / 9$ $145 / 12 ~ 145 / 17$ | $181 / 1 \text { 182/8 183/8 }$ | 866-339-5691 [1] | 123/16 124/4 |
| 97/13 107/22 108/4 | 145/12 145/17 | 183/25 196/17 | 2/11 | 125/20 126/19 |
| 108/4 110/2 110/17 | 26th [1] 148/6 | 200/9 200/19 | 873-5868 [1] 3/8 | 126/22 127/2 127/6 |
| 113/13 113/25 | $28 \text { [2] 58/15 }$ | $43 \text { [1] } 147 / 1$ | 89012 [1] $2 / 20$ | 127/8 127/17 |
| 120/22 122/5 122/7 | $\text { \| } 28 \text { [2] 58/15 }$ $147 / 18$ | $4325[3] 38 / 3$ | 89074 [1] 3/7 | 127/23 127/25 |
| 132/18 144/1 | 147/18 | $39 / 2257 / 25$ | 89101 [2] 124/3 | 128/2 128/9 128/21 |

(2) 16... - about

| A | acquired [4] 153/3 | 11/18 12/3 15/12 | 153 | 182/13 179/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| about... [53] 129/2 | 157/25 158/24 | 15/18 15/22 38/8 | affiliation [1] 52/2 | 182/4 187/14 202/3 |
| 129/2 129/6 130/6 | 160/12 | 40/1 44/18 51/6 | after [23] 8/19 | 202/17 202/ |
| 130/25 132/8 | act[2] 26/4 137/10 | 51/9 53/24 54/3 | 11/8 13/5 26/6 | agreed [2] 24/22 |
| 132/23 133/13 | acting [1] 137/14 | 54/4 54/18 55/20 | 32/17 51/4 52/25 | 65/12 |
| 135/16 136/2 136/5 | action [25] 14/7 | 56/1 56/10 60/10 | 53/8 53/16 63/3 | agreement [32] |
| 137/10 143/11 | 14/12 14/13 16/4 | 105/16 105/17 | 64/14 74/11 75/14 | 5/3 10/11 12/8 |
| 153/8 163/25 | 16/5 25/18 25/22 | 106/7 110/25 111/7 | 81/15 82/1 126/20 | 18/25 19/14 19/17 |
| 166/10 166/13 | 30/22 31/13 32/11 | 111/8 111/20 112/4 | 128/17 141/6 143/5 | 19/18 20/13 20/23 |
| 166/19 167/8 | 132/16 134/21 | addressing [1] | 172/11 172/15 | 21/18 23/18 24/25 |
| 169/11 169/15 | 135/7 135/15 | 62/24 | 173/25 189/23 | 25/7 25/11 25/14 |
| 171/13 171/14 | 152/18 158/3 158/3 | adequate [2] | afternoon [12] | 25/15 25/21 26/12 |
| 171/25 | 158/8 159/3 159/21 | 115/7 139/17 | 7/13 77/25 78/1 | 26/13 26/17 27/13 |
| 172/11 174/7 | 160/4 160/17 | admit [11] 21/9 | 80/25 82/14 82/15 | 27/14 27/23 28/1 |
| 176/11 179/3 | 182/23 196/8 | 30/6 36/17 50/12 | 82/16 82/25 83/3 | 35/5 36/12 37/10 |
| 179/21 179/23 | 200/23 | 71/2 71/3 79/22 | 122/15 152/13 | 40/21 59/17 59/18 |
| 181/3 181/7 181/25 | actions [2] 159/11 | 155/2 155/7 155/10 | 152/15 | 60/9 177/13 |
| 183/5 183/16 185/5 | 199/19 | 166/2 | again [37] 24/ | agreements [1] |
| 187/23 188/13 | active [3] | admitted [24] | 51/19 57/25 66/2 | 35/22 |
| 189/5 189/20 190/5 | 95/9 125/11 | 21/10 21/13 21/1 | 97/19 97/21 103/17 | agrees [2] 40/16 |
| 191/3 191/11 194/5 | actual [4] 42/21 | 21/15 33/22 33/23 | 105/3 113/5 114/12 | 41/10 |
| 195/5 197/7 197/15 | 51/15 109/1 185/25 | 34/7 36/19 36/20 | 115/4 115/5 115/11 | ahead [13] 6/8 |
| 197/23 198/2 198/4 | actually [28] 12/2 | 50/16 50/17 71/6 | 116/21 119/9 | 18/14 18/19 82/17 |
| 198/6 198/11 | 16/11 42/2 42/18 | 71/10 79/24 80/9 | 119/18 120/2 | 91/4 91/4 98/6 |
| above [1] | 44/15 52/15 58/4 | 155/1 155/5 155/13 | 120/11 120/14 | 111/15 165/17 |
| Absolutely [ | 58/11 65/1 71/1 | 155/16 165/23 | 121/16 122/13 | 166/8 178/17 |
| 180/18 198/16 | 71/15 98/21 122/21 | 166/1 166/4 166/5 | 129/13 133/15 | 179/14 202/12 |
| 198/20 | 132/13 138/14 | 180/19 | 133/21 138/11 | AK [3] 87/24 |
| accept [1] | 140/5 140/21 156/4 | adopted [1] | 141/5 141/8 144/16 | 106/10 108/5 |
|  | 160/16 178/17 | 182/20 | 149/4 162/7 165/2 | AK0001 [1] 108/1 |
|  | 180/23 181/12 | advance [1] | 169/5 170/14 | AK01 [1] 107/21 |
| 2] 1 | 183/24 191/4 | advances [2] | 173/19 176/2 177 | AK1 [1] 142/25 |
|  | 196/23 200/12 | 10/14 123/14 | 201/11 | AK26 [1] 109/5 |
|  | 200/14 202 | advancing [1] | against [22] 10/15 | AK48 [1] 106/10 |
| $7 / 23$ | add [4] 31/24 | 58/19 | 12/14 14/14 26/4 | AK70 [1] 107/5 |
|  | 63/15 112/11 | adversely [3] | 26/10 27/24 31/12 | AKA [1] 195/17 |
|  | 190/14 | 25/18 25/22 26/10 | 32/12 35/18 37/12 | Alessi [81] 63/16 |
|  | addition [3] 15 | advertised [4] | 40/25 41/9 41/12 | 63/17 63/21 64/25 |
| 99/3 150/21 | 26/16 144/17 | 13/9 134/7 134/9 | 56/18 108/19 | 66/8 68/3 68/4 82/2 |
|  | additional [8] 9/10 | 192/5 | 129/21 140/13 | 83/2 83/10 83/17 |
|  | 43/12 58/19 111/20 | advice [2] 159/23 | 160/9 162/17 173/6 | 83/23 84/4 84/12 |
| accordan | 135/15 159/2 | 164/18 | 173/17 196/9 | 84/25 85/2 85/4 |
|  | 162/15 162/16 | advised [3] 45/15 | agent [9] 93/15 | 85/19 86/9 86/10 |
|  | address [32] 11/24 | 157/7 159/19 | 94/10 95/7 114/8 | 86/14 86/21 87/4 |
| 27/12 34/16 89/23 | 15/14 15/15 29/18 | advising [5] 49/17 | 114/18 132/17 | 87/8 87/22 89/3 |
| 114/22 188/18 | 38/3 38/7 38/10 | 49/19 49/20 49/23 | 144/6 167/18 201/8 | 89/16 89/22 91/21 |
|  | 38/12 39/19 40/11 | 159/13 | ago [5] 93/4 | 91/22 91/23 92/1 |
| 202/23 203/10 | 44/3 44/4 44/7 | affairs [2] 156/1 | 130/14 130/21 | 93/10 94/3 95/3 |
| account [7] | 53/10 55/10 55/19 | 156/2 | 156/12 188/10 | 95/16 96/4 96/17 |
| $44 / 156$ | 57/12 57/13 57/20 | affected [1] 26/10 | agree [27] 22/3 | 97/4 97/16 97/20 |
| $147 / 5 \quad 147 / 12$ | 57/24 58/10 69/10 | affecting [2] 102/7 | 24/16 52/7 52/20 | 99/16 100/11 |
|  | 69/12 88/11 88/12 | 174/23 | 54/14 99/22 100/13 | 101/12 103/6 |
| accoun | 100/7 100/7 109/11 | affects [2] 25/18 | 102/23 103/2 107/3 | 104/17 106/7 |
| 77/9 77/12 | 124/10 145/2 |  | 109/15 112/7 | 106/15 107/13 |
|  | 145/23 151/4 | affidavit [3] 86/9 | 114/11 115/13 | 107/18 108/8 |
|  | addressed [1] | 86/19 99/18 | 120/10 123/21 | 108/16 110/1 |
|  | 11/22 | affiliated [5] 38/22 | 165/25 170/15 | 110/19 111/22 |
| acquire [1] 153/5 | addresses [26] | 39/11 52/19 67/18 | 172/7 172/10 | 112/11 112/17 |


| A | 199/16 204/5 | 77/2 77/5 90/2 | 96/12 96/14 96/18 | 197/16 199/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alessi... [24] | allegations [1] | 123/7 123/12 | 96/19 97/13 97/14 | anyway [4] 6/23 |
| 113/11 113/12 | 13/19 | 123/20 188/21 | 97/16 97/19 100/9 | 27/18 31/20 33/9 |
| 113/24 114/23 | alleged [4] 13/20 | amounts [3] 29/18 | 103/10 108/14 | nywhere [2] 11/5 |
| 115/2 124/6 126/1 | 13/25 14/14 14/17 | 41/6 139/18 | 109/20 109/24 | 1/21 |
| 131/20 132/17 | allow [2] 185/4 | analysis [9] 91/16 | 112/16 113/5 113/6 | apologize [5] |
| 133/8 133/16 137/6 | 185/8 | 105/3 178/22 | 113/17 114/4 | 23/24 131/13 154/6 |
| 141/5 142/4 142/9 | allowed [1] 148/25 | 178/23 178/24 | 114/15 119/1 119/8 | 197/1 201/12 |
| 142/18 147/24 | allowing [1] 55/19 | 179/6 179/10 | 123/23 125/15 | appeal [1] 130/8 |
| 148/7 148/11 | along [1] 43/21 | 179/12 179/16 | 125/20 125/22 | appear [2] 18/1 |
| 158/25 159/1 159/6 | already [9] 21/10 | analyst [2] 17/18 | 125/23 126/7 | 108/5 |
| 195/18 197/24 | 87/14 87/15 87/17 | 17/24 | 126/13 126/15 | appearance [1] |
| Alexander [8] | 116/24 155/2 | analyze [1] 45/24 | 126/23 126/24 | 6/15 |
| 165/7 168/7 168/9 | 158/10 161/11 | and/or [1] 148/17 | 127/10 129/18 | appearances [4] |
| 168/25 178/13 | 170/6 | annual [2] 22/19 | 134/21 135/6 135/7 | 2/1 3/1 6/9 82/18 |
| 179/13 180/11 | also [46] 6/17 6/20 | 22/20 | 136/9 137/4 137/5 | appeared [1] 13/7 |
| 182/7 | 7/18 10/19 10/22 | anomaly [1] 97/9 | 137/5 137/9 137/16 | appears [4] 37/6 |
| all [108] 6/6 6/14 | $12 / 112 / 512 / 11$ | another [4] 7/16 | 138/12 139/3 | 86/8 123/19 164/13 |
| 7/22 7/23 8/8 8/11 | 14/19 18/1 19/14 | 63/5 135/5 169/20 | 140/13 140/14 | appointed [1] |
| 9/2 13/11 29/5 | 22/19 26/6 26/17 | answer [12] 47/14 | 144/4 145/21 | 132/17 |
| 30/19 32/8 32/13 | 29/20 33/10 34/15 | 56/3 89/21 104/24 | 147/12 151/8 | appointment [1] |
| 32/22 33/6 33/11 | 40/5 58/7 60/5 | 113/10 118/16 | 153/16 156/24 | 63/2 |
| 34/11 36/17 37/21 | 60/21 81/9 84/13 | 123/24 137/12 | 157/3 158/9 159/18 | appraisal [3] |
| 40/16 41/2 41/6 | 88/12 89/19 96/1 | 173/23 175/14 | 159/19 160/8 | 180/9 181/22 |
| 42/8 42/9 42/17 | 102/12 102/14 | 189/1 189/6 | 160/13 161/12 | 198/21 |
| 44/13 44/15 44/19 | 103/2 105/11 106/4 | answered [1] | 161/13 164/16 | Appreciate [1] |
| 45/1 47/17 49/3 | 106/25 112/10 | 140/5 | 165/3 168/24 | 184/2 |
| 51/9 52/12 54/8 | 119/23 134/12 | anticipate [4] 7/4 | 175/10 179/23 | approach [1] |
| 55/17 58/8 60/22 | 134/14 136/23 | 49/8 63/14 81/21 | 186/24 191/3 196/7 | 193/9 |
| 61/1 61/3 61/8 | 145/11 158/23 | anticipated [1] | 197/20 197/23 | approached [ |
| 61/18 62/10 64/21 | 176/6 200/14 201/2 | 63/14 | 198/2 198/2 198/6 | 159/1 160/14 |
| 67/24 68/24 69/3 | 201/6 201/22 | anticipating [1] | 201/ | 160/16 |
| 69/8 70/1 71/10 | 201/25 202/25 | 190/22 | anybody [10] | appropriate [5] |
| 74/21 75/22 76/10 | always [4] 98/16 | any [147] 13/19 | 70/14 77/8 92/2 | 57/12 60/6 60/9 |
| 80/17 81/11 82/14 | 103/22 148/23 | 13/23 13/24 14/11 | 92/20 92/21 125/17 | 101/6 104/5 |
| 82/24 85/4 87/17 | 162/25 | 14/21 15/6 15/23 | 129/19 138/7 | approximate [1] |
| 90/24 92/20 95/20 | am [9] 17/18 39/10 | 17/25 23/13 23/16 | 146/21 192/6 | 158/19 |
| 100/2 101/6 108/7 | 69/10 78/4 80/15 | 24/17 25/7 25/8 | Anyhow [1] 183/3 | approximately [2] |
| 113/18 120/23 | 106/9 134/21 | 25/9 25/10 25/21 | anymore [1] | 14/17 145/17 |
| 121/2 122/12 | 160/23 193/19 | 35/4 38/22 38/25 | 191/20 | April [6] 16/9 |
| 125/12 128/9 | amend [11] 74/3 | 39/11 39/25 41/9 | anyone [12] 60/1 | 144/1 196/3 196/6 |
| 128/11 128/24 | 74/23 74/24 75/1 | 41/11 41/19 41/23 | 95/13 96/3 100/1 | 201/19 203/10 |
| 132/13 135/10 | 75/2 75/3 75/24 | 42/5 42/6 42/7 | 104/19 106/16 | April 5 [1] 144/1 |
| 144/17 149/5 | 76/3 76/4 76/9 | 43/17 43/25 44/18 | 118/15 121/13 | April 9 [2] 196/3 |
| 149/14 151/22 | 76/14 | 44/24 45/17 45/24 | 121/18 121/23 | 196/6 |
| 155/19 156/13 | amended [1] | 45/24 47/12 47/13 | 137/16 198/10 | are [90] 6/24 9/13 |
| 156/15 160/12 | 75/22 | 47/21 47/24 48/7 | anything [33] 9/9 | 21/22 27/21 27/22 |
| 165/4 166/3 166/21 | amendment [5] | 50/4 50/9 51/10 | 14/11 16/21 31/24 | 29/1 29/1 35/7 36/6 |
| 168/5 169/6 172/6 | 74/2 74/5 74/7 | 52/2 57/9 57/13 | 33/14 47/9 49/2 | 37/19 37/20 37/24 |
| 174/9 174/13 | 75/21 76/7 | 59/20 59/20 59/21 | 49/5 50/2 50/8 51/8 | 38/22 39/8 41/6 |
| 174/15 174/19 | American [3] | 59/23 59/23 59/25 | 56/21 59/6 59/8 | 42/10 44/19 48/22 |
| 175/2 175/4 175/17 | 100/19 101/1 | 62/7 72/8 73/18 | 62/14 65/21 68/3 | 51/3 53/17 54/1 |
| 175/23 176/5 | 108/21 | 73/19 73/20 75/24 | 78/18 80/17 88/14 | 55/15 61/25 62/8 |
| 176/24 180/14 | among [1] 128/22 | 76/21 77/20 81/9 | 113/4 120/6 125/20 | 63/10 65/23 65/25 |
| 180/20 180/21 | amongst [1] 122/2 | 82/5 85/19 88/12 | 135/18 138/4 | 66/21 67/18 68/22 |
| 182/20 192/19 | amount [14] 22/3 | 89/11 92/15 94/18 | 139/23 151/7 | 69/5 69/8 70/9 |
| 197/11 197/14 | 29/21 35/8 35/13 | 95/8 95/9 95/11 | 151/11 161/17 | 70/11 70/16 70/21 |
| 197/18 197/19 | 43/19 51/17 77/2 | 95/16 95/19 95/24 | 165/10 175/8 | 72/14 72/24 74/13 |

(4) Alessi... - are
are... [51] 78/3
80/7 80/8 82/24
85/8 85/12 85/16
88/12 89/3 90/8
98/15 98/16 101/4
105/23 105/23
107/24 111/8 112/4
113/20 114/3
116/22 118/9 123/4
124/22 128/1 129/7
133/3 134/6 134/7
134/8 136/22 137/2
142/7 142/8 144/23
152/22 153/2 154/2
154/7 155/22
159/13 167/21
171/14 173/15
174/13 175/5
177/25 180/21
183/8 197/15 200/8
area [2] 90/1
142/16
areas [2] 98/14
98/14
aren't [1] 45/23
arena [2] 135/4
135/7
argue [1] 31/22
argument [1] 14/1
argumentative [2]
53/20 54/19
around [13] 13/10
47/16 51/2 89/4
125/14 126/18
127/13 143/7
145/10 153/15
158/21 183/14
187/1
article [7] 71/15
71/16 71/17 71/19
71/22 72/1 74/1
as [173] 6/11 6/18 6/18 11/9 12/7 12/7 12/14 12/15 13/3
14/3 16/1 16/24
17/5 17/16 18/2
19/7 20/10 22/2
23/6 26/18 29/21
29/21 30/2 30/7
30/9 30/14 30/15
30/18 32/2 32/12
32/13 32/13 32/21
33/2 33/11 33/11
$35 / 835 / 835 / 10$
$35 / 1036 / 336 / 4$
41/11 42/20 44/4
44/21 45/19 45/22

| 46/3 48/10 48/10 | 153/7 160/20 | 66/24 67/19 69/6 | 178/3 178/6 184/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56/12 61/22 62/13 | 161/12 163/15 | 70/12 71/17 93/16 | 184/14 184/15 |
| 62/13 62/19 63/22 | 170/22 181/13 | 94/6 94/10 95/18 | 184/16 193/2 197/1 |
| 66/10 66/10 67/6 | 182/3 189/11 199/2 | 96/5 103/4 103/15 | 199/6 199/13 |
| 72/23 73/20 75/16 | 200/22 202/11 | 104/20 106/22 | 200/13 200/14 |
| 78/23 79/16 79/22 | asked [7] 55/4 | 107/18 108/9 | 200/19 200/22 |
| 79/24 80/6 81/25 | 55/12 148/24 | 112/12 112/13 | 201/13 201/17 |
| 82/1 83/13 84/4 | 150/11 170/25 | 112/19 113/7 | 202/4 202/5 202/19 |
| 85/9 85/23 86/5 | 179/11 200/21 | 114/12 131/19 | attorney's [1] |
| 86/6 86/9 86/18 | asking [17] 31/11 | 132/19 132/20 | 24/24 |
| 87/13 88/11 88/11 | 46/7 46/22 48/19 | 138/8 148/5 148/17 | attorney-client [1] |
| 90/3 90/12 90/19 | 48/22 51/8 51/9 | 159/24 193/21 | 97/17 |
| 90/21 91/5 91/5 | 54/3 56/15 60/16 | 194/18 194/21 | attorneys [9] |
| 92/2 92/4 92/18 | 72/19 72/20 100/5 | 195/14 195/16 | 94/15 94/15 94/19 |
| 93/4 94/9 95/9 | 110/8 122/7 180/1 | 195/23 201/9 | 121/10 121/25 |
| 95/10 99/7 100/7 | 194/5 | associations [4] | 122/3 158/23 165/3 |
| 103/6 104/6 106/14 | aspect [1] 15/4 | 10/25 95/5 148/24 | 169/6 |
| 106/22 107/3 | assessed [2] | 148/25 | auction [12] 13/9 |
| 108/12 109/5 | 159/17 159/17 | assumably [1] | 123/3 139/21 |
| 109/14 109/23 | assessment [14] | 56/4 | 140/18 156/6 |
| 110/2 110/22 | 16/7 84/13 98/8 | assume [2] 23/10 | 163/11 173/20 |
| 111/19 113/12 | 98/10 98/18 98/20 | 56/16 | 173/24 173/24 |
| 113/14 113/14 | 99/1 99/12 100/4 | assuming [2] | 173/25 177/8 177/9 |
| 113/18 114/18 | 100/9 102/16 | 53/13 188/14 | auctions [2] |
| 117/23 119/1 | 117/18 132/20 | assumption [4] | 175/18 187/24 |
| 124/20 125/10 | 136/24 | 23/9 116/2 140/2 | audible [3] 34/19 |
| 125/15 128/10 | assessments [15] | 140/25 | 172/12 200/16 |
| 130/21 133/6 | 10/23 11/2 16/3 | at [283] | August [2] 67/20 |
| 133/16 133/16 | 16/8 16/11 41/2 | attached [2] | 78/16 |
| 133/17 135/11 | 71/23 72/7 73/12 | 162/14 181/23 | authenticity [1] |
| 137/1 137/4 139/11 | 73/20 136/7 136/17 | attachments [1] | 99/17 |
| 139/19 142/24 | 147/8 149/6 149/10 | 150/18 | authoritative [1] |
| 143/23 143/23 | assessor [1] 89/24 | attempt [2] 75/24 | 20/13 |
| 145/9 148/4 149/12 | assessor's [2] | 182/7 | authorization [1] |
| 150/6 152/4 155/24 | 103/23 104/2 | attempted [1] | 170/8 |
| 157/4 157/18 158/8 | assets [1] 156/24 | 11/10 | authorize [3] |
| 158/8 158/14 | assign [1] 41/10 | attend [10] 124/11 | 181/12 182/7 |
| 159/18 166/19 | assignee [1] 181/9 | 124/12 124/14 | 183/20 |
| 166/19 167/19 | assignment [4] | 125/8 135/8 156/11 | authorized [7] |
| 169/19 173/9 | 103/12 104/10 | 156/16 185/15 | 93/15 113/20 |
| 173/18 173/19 | 104/21 108/25 | 187/4 187/7 | 170/16 172/18 |
| 173/25 174/20 | assignments [2] | attended [2] | 178/13 182/17 |
| 174/23 175/23 | 103/11 103/24 | 125/12 184/9 | 201/8 |
| 176/1 176/8 183/9 | assist [1] 101/5 | attending [2] | authorizing [1] |
| 183/9 183/21 | assistant [2] 89/12 | 140/22 146/21 | 178/6 |
| 183/22 183/25 | 115/18 | attention [1] 57/2 | automatically [1] |
| 189/25 192/23 | associated [2] | attest [2] 54/9 | 110/25 |
| 192/25 193/2 194/2 | 42/7 54/15 | 56/13 | availability [4] 8/4 |
| 201/1 201/21 | association [62] | attorney [43] | 8/10 65/9 74/25 |
| 201/24 202/4 202/4 | 1/9 15/2 16/11 | 54/22 55/1 84/5 | available [8] 8/23 |
| 202/21 | 17/19 17/21 17/24 | 93/24 94/11 94/12 | 43/6 43/12 43/15 |
| ascertain [1] | 18/7 18/12 36/9 | 95/7 96/4 96/24 | 43/16 43/20 81/23 |
| 101/2 | 37/25 42/7 42/15 | 97/17 115/24 116/6 | 103/22 |
| ask [25] $8 / 18$ 10/2 | 42/16 43/18 44/7 | 136/22 157/7 157/9 | AVENUE [5] $2 / 7$ |
| 16/18 42/10 48/3 | 46/5 46/20 47/6 | 158/9 158/15 | 2/19 38/3 39/22 |
| 50/20 55/3 77/3 | 47/23 48/9 48/15 | 164/19 164/23 | 57/25 |
| 90/23 94/7 124/19 | 48/20 48/24 49/7 | 164/25 168/15 | avoid [1] 142/25 |
| 139/8 140/2 141/6 | 52/24 54/22 57/24 | 170/22 173/8 176/1 | aware [17] 27/19 |


| A | 27/14 27/19 31/2 | 72/13 74/24 90/4 | 115/25 129/17 | 22/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ware... [16] | 31/19 35/5 35/8 | 103/8 104/16 | 138/14 138/20 | being [25] $11 / 3$ |
|  | 35/15 35/21 36/9 | 114/23 123/6 139/8 | 138/23 140/15 | 30/18 54/22 56/5 |
| 92/12 129/16 133/8 | 36/12 37/19 37/25 | 140/6 140/20 | 141/11 145/11 | 64/7 79/22 83/24 |
| 133/21 139/25 | 38/7 38/9 38/12 | 140/21 148/14 | 146/22 146/23 | 85/17 95/14 98/21 |
| 140/23 146/22 | 38/23 39/3 39/12 | 149/11 191/15 | 152/2 153/15 | 105/4 106/22 112/8 |
| 162/8 163/8 173/16 | 39/16 39/18 40/2 | 200/17 202/18 | 157/12 160/19 | 120/16 127/10 |
| 177/5 177/7 178/12 | 40/5 40/9 40/11 | basically [6] 69/1 | 162/25 165/11 | 127/11 128/16 |
| 17/5 177/7 178/12 | 40/21 40/21 41/23 | 90/8 119/12 140/12 | 168/23 176/2 178/2 | 140/7 148/6 152/14 |
| 126/12 | 42/1 42/14 42/17 | 164/4 164/20 | 179/9 180/11 | 155/5 165/7 175/23 |
| away [2] 10/1 | 42/22 44/3 44/6 | basing [1] 21/2 | 182/23 186/13 | 180/23 192/1 |
| 128/24 | 45/20 46/3 46/14 | basis [4] 30/5 | 187/15 190/16 | belief [1] 167/23 |
| Awesome [1] | 46/18 47/5 47/18 | 31/16 36/16 149/3 | 190/22 191/13 | believe [52] 14/9 |
| 167/17 | 47/22 48/8 48/20 | Bates [9] 28/20 | 199/ | 14/21 18/3 19/4 |
| B | 51/10 52/3 52/6 | 106/2 106/5 1 | 11/8 18/24 |  |
|  | 52/11 52/19 52/22 | 106/10 154/6 | 28/8 28/10 28/25 | 43/19 44/24 51/25 |
|  | 52/23 52/25 53/18 | be [213] | 29/10 64/24 73/17 | 52/2 54/4 56/14 |
| back [47] $12 / 6$ | 54/15 55/16 56/1 | bear [2] 107/4 | 89/25 90/3 93/9 | 61/5 61/16 62/14 |
| 16/9 16/11 37/15 | 57/24 58/5 58/11 | 145/11 | 93/12 93/13 97/10 | 71/9 71/12 77/2 |
| 57/23 58/21 61/15 | 58/18 58/20 58/23 | beast [1] 9/25 | 100/21 100/24 | 87/8 87/14 87/24 |
| 61/21 62/8 62/13 | 59/1 61/25 63/20 | beauties [1] $8 / 3$ | 104/24 120/7 | 95/5 96/21 97/21 |
| 62/16 64/21 73/4 | 82/20 83/1 100/5 | beauty [1] 82/9 | 124/23 128/12 | 100/14 108/15 |
| 75/21 76/17 78/11 | 100/14 102/24 | became [6] 10/9 | 128/17 145/18 | 109/10 111/3 |
| 87/1 88/22 91/3 | 103/3 104/19 | 10/17 10/23 41/17 | 154/15 158/6 | 116/11 125/4 125/6 |
| 98/11 98/23 109/9 | 104/20 106/22 | 67/20 73/21 | 163/20 164/24 | 125/12 133/13 |
| 109/16 110/8 123/9 | 107/18 108/9 | because [33] 8/21 | 166/24 168/7 | 146/18 150/11 |
| 123/18 124/1 | 108/13 110/7 | 9/13 12/12 14/13 | 169/15 176/3 177/9 | 150/16 151/6 153/4 |
| 131/12 142/15 | 110/22 112/11 | 14/16 28/10 32/6 | 177/23 178/19 | 156/15 167/2 |
| 144/14 153/3 169/5 | 112/12 112/13 | 32/20 56/16 81/4 | 181/13 184/12 | 168/24 174/15 |
| 169/10 170/2 | 112/14 112/18 | 81/19 85/4 105/1 | 185/23 186/10 | 176/1 180/16 183/4 |
| 172/16 174/5 | 112/19 113/6 | 108/15 127/1 127/2 | 190/21 198/13 | 196/6 196/16 |
| 175/16 175/18 | 114/12 114/25 | 129/21 130/21 | 204/6 | 200/20 |
| 175/19 178/15 | 139/3 144/6 145/ | 131/4 134/24 135/3 | BEFORE-ENTITLED | below [7] 22/22 |
| 180/13 180/22 | 145/22 151/9 | 140/5 158/9 160/17 | [1] 204/6 | 22/23 38/3 166/12 |
| 180/24 182/19 | 151/12 181/10 | 163/16 163/17 | beforehand [1] | 167/25 181/5 181/9 |
| 184/4 201/3 201/22 | 183/14 183/21 | 164/5 164/18 175/6 | 7/21 | bench [4] 1/16 8/3 |
| background [1] | bank's [21] 7/14 | 178/15 184/18 | began [2] 10/24 | 67/25 82/9 |
| 153/8 | 26/10 26/12 26/20 | 187/8 192/4 | 16/6 | beneficiary [7] |
| BAKER [3] 2/6 | 27/12 27/18 29/24 | BECKOM [3] 2/5 | beginning [7] | 12/24 103/3 113/22 |
| 6/17 82/19 | 30/14 34/17 37/9 | 6/16 82/19 | 122/11 128/18 | 14/3 114/3 114/9 |
| balance [4] 35/12 | 38/15 39/21 40/2 | become [3] 8/3 | 130/13 130/17 | 114/19 |
| 117/18 123/12 | 41/18 42/3 42/6 | 78/14 147/6 | 130/22 162/20 | enefit [1] 52/2 |
| 148/6 | 42/11 43/2 44/12 | becomes [1] | 201/19 | eside [2] 156/24 |
| ball [1] 163/17 | 50/22 61/25 | 160/13 | begins [2] 101/18 | 156/25 |
| bank[137] 1/9 2/2 | bankruptcy [12] | becoming [1] | 101/19 | best [5] 9/15 35/3 |
| 6/17 6/19 10/9 | 12/16 165/10 | 73/12 | behalf [27] 6/1 | 65/3 167/22 204/11 |
| 10/11 10/20 11/15 | 165/20 167/7 168/3 | been [58] $12 / 9$ | 6/18 13/2 17/20 | better [5] 55/16 |
| 11/21 11/25 12/20 | 170/11 170/16 | 17/3 30/8 31/14 | 18/11 18/13 37/25 | 109/3 129/6 139/20 |
| 12/22 13/25 15/1 | 170/19 172/3 | 43/20 47/1 47/10 | 52/6 52/11 82/20 | 192/14 |
| 15/6 15/19 15/20 | 172/23 179/25 | 48/17 49/9 50/4 | 85/20 92/6 94/6 | between [15] 11/5 |
| 15/21 16/24 17/1 | 183/20 | 55/16 55/17 67/4 | 94/13 113/20 | 26/13 27/14 31/18 |
| 17/18 17/21 17/24 | banks [1] 85/5 | 67/22 75/22 75/24 | 115/11 123/1 | 36/9 36/12 40/21 |
| 18/4 18/6 18/7 18/7 | bargain [1] 13/5 | 76/5 83/3 83/11 | 131/18 138/21 | 59/16 70/1 88/22 |
| 18/12 18/25 19/16 | bars [1] 23/12 | 89/9 90/1 95/25 | 138/22 147/4 168/4 | 91/13 147/13 |
| 19/17 19/22 21/17 | based [23] 12/20 | 96/1 96/2 97/1 | 179/17 180/8 200/8 | 161/23 164/5 198/3 |
| 21/17 22/3 23/4 | 20/25 21/5 21/6 | 97/22 99/13 110/11 | 201/10 202/5 | beware [2] 119/13 |
| 24/8 24/22 26/13 | 29/16 31/17 60/10 | 114/24 114/25 | behind [2] 18/16 | 119/16 |


| B | 34/14 42/21 45/15 | 15 | 163/10 164/17 | 35/24 42/16 44/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| beyond [1] 145 | 58/18 | brokerage [2] | 164/21 168/12 | 45/17 46/11 48/3 |
| BFP [2] 31/2 33/3 | both [16] 14/13 | 153/12 153/17 | 168/22 169/6 | 54/8 56/15 57/2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{BF} \\ & \mathrm{hi} \end{aligned}$ | 32/12 66/10 101/11 | brokering [1] | 170/10 170/23 | 57/5 62/11 62/15 |
| $140 / 12140 / 15$ | 102/23 103/2 | 153/25 | 172/15 172/18 | 62/23 64/2 64/6 |
| 188/19 191/4 191/7 | 113/13 131/7 | Bronco [1] 115/20 | 173/15 175/4 175/8 | 64/14 64/21 65/8 |
| 191/7 191/13 | 170/15 172/7 | brought [1] 158/4 | 175/9 175/21 176/6 | 65/9 65/10 66/2 |
| 191/14 192/7 | 172/10 182/4 183/8 | Bryan [4] 6/18 | 180/6 182/14 183/3 | 66/14 66/18 67/1 |
| bidder [7] 13/1 | 202/3 202/4 202/24 | 16/25 17/2 17/9 | 183/7 183/19 | 67/15 69/19 71/2 |
| 123/3 135/22 191/7 | bottom [19] 19/4 | building [1] 140/1 | 184/18 185/14 | 71/16 75/15 75/16 |
| 191/8 191/9 192/1 | 20/18 20/19 24/12 | bunch [1] 187/15 | 186/13 186/14 | 75/17 75/17 75/18 |
| bidders [4] 12/6 | 34/20 37/22 69/19 | bus [1] 188/2 | 186/15 189/1 | 75/19 76/22 76/25 |
| 135/8 135/20 | 88/25 93/14 99/15 | business [4] 30/17 | 189/12 190/8 | 77/8 81/19 81/23 |
| 189/1 | 99/19 106/1 157/15 | 76/5 153/23 186/24 | 191/12 200/14 | 82/3 84/6 86/2 |
| bidding [ | 166/16 171/6 | busy [3] 64/4 64/5 | 200/25 201/17 | 90/21 90/22 93/6 |
| 138/13 139/12 | 171/22 173/2 | 64/8 | 202/22 | 99/11 99/22 100/13 |
| 139/17 139/21 | 177/13 200/2 | but [145] 7/2 9/4 | buy [1] 201/ | 101/17 102/17 |
| 140/8 161/18 | Bourne [15] 12/15 | 10/19 13/6 15/9 | buyer [5] 91/9 | 102/23 103/2 |
| 173/21 188/13 | 12/18 13/3 13/17 | 15/19 15/22 16/14 | 119/13 119/16 | 103/24 104/7 106/ |
| 188/14 | 32/13 164/13 166/9 | 17/4 25/24 27/9 | 123/7 150/1 | 107/3 107/17 |
| 189/22 189/25 | 166/20 168/4 | 27/18 28/16 30/23 | buyers [1] 70/14 | 107/21 109/3 |
| 190/8 192/2 | 170/11 170/16 | 31/9 32/1 33/6 33/9 | buying [6] 23/10 | 109/15 109/23 |
| bifurc | 174/9 178/16 | 51/14 51/25 53/9 | 137/11 138/9 | 111/19 112/7 |
| 181/23 182/8 | 179/25 183 | 53/11 62/13 63/4 | 153/24 190/13 | 114/11 114/11 |
| big [5] 9/25 18/21 | box [1] 171/14 | 65/4 65/8 65/22 | 198/18 | 114/11 115/13 |
| 127/2 132/14 192/1 | brand [1] 162/21 |  | C | 120/9 120/23 12 |
| bills [1] 22/9 |  |  |  |  |
| binder [5] 18/15 |  | 72/24 72/25 73/2 |  | $21$ |
| 18/20 18/21 18/22 |  |  |  |  |
| 86/3 | 27/13 28/1 31/17 | 77/15 77/16 79/13 | calendar [5] 66/3 | 133/16 139/19 |
| birth [1] 152/9 | 31/18 31/23 32/19 | 83/12 87/4 87/15 | 67/23 134/15 | 141/15 141/23 |
| bit [6] 29/5 88/19 | 33/6 33/10 33/20 | 88/19 88/24 89/21 | 135/17 149/9 | 142/25 144/1 144/7 |
|  | 34/8 | 92/8 94/1 94/11 | California [6] 84/5 | 145/11 145/21 |
|  | breaches [2] 34/9 | 94/21 95/19 97/3 | 84/17 84/18 93/23 | 147/1 148/4 149/12 |
|  | 34/1 | 97/6 97/7 97/9 | 96/23 136/22 | 150/9 155/7 155/9 |
| board [7] 7/19 $74 / 1374 / 1674 / 17$ | break [3] 63/11 | 97/11 97/21 100/8 | call [19] 16/24 | 158/6 159/3 165/25 |
| 74/19 76/25 142/1 | 81/20 141/14 | 100/23 102/18 | 34/3 62/8 64/2 | 168/18 172/7 |
| body [1] 101 | breeze [1] 125 | 104/1 104/13 105/3 | 66/20 66/23 70/7 | 172/10 172/13 |
| Bohn [5] | Brian [2] 68/3 | 107/6 108/12 | 81/12 81/14 81/23 | 173/2 176/24 |
|  | 179/13 | 109/15 109/15 | 82/1 82/3 83/2 | 179/18 182/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | Bridge [7] 153/ | 109/23 112/20 | 143/23 151/23 | 182/17 183/4 |
|  | 153/17 153/20 | 113/3 113/7 113/11 | 190/4 190/5 190/14 | 183/18 186/3 186/4 |
|  | 177/16 179/2 179/5 | 114/11 115/2 | 190/15 | 187/14 189/6 |
|  | 180/8 | 118/25 121/21 | called [5] 15/ | 190/16 192/7 |
| 120/17 120/24 | brief [3] 78/2 | 124/14 127/25 | 64/7 79/16 84/12 | 192/15 202/3 |
| bo | 96/22 199/17 | 128/9 128/9 128/19 | 142/15 | 202/11 202/17 |
| $55$ | briefed [1] 85/25 | 129/1 129/24 | calling [2] 7/4 | 202/24 |
| 131/25 | briefly [1] 64/24 | 130/10 130/15 |  | can't [16] |
|  | bring [6] 14/7 | 131/9 133/5 133/21 | calls [3] 47/ | 56/12 75/13 97/6 |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{D O} \\ 13 \end{gathered}$ | 64/14 66/14 188/24 | 138/20 139/5 141/7 | 55/21 60/12 | 97/11 99/7 100/16 |
| bona [4] 1 | 189/3 189/9 | 142/19 143/4 146/7 | came [9] 105/13 | 123/24 131/9 |
|  | brings [7] 86/22 | 152/3 152/16 | 109/11 126/20 | 137/12 168/6 |
| book [2] | 87/23 89/5 107/20 | 156/12 156/15 | 127/8 128/1 | 173/13 177/24 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \mathbf{D O} \\ 11 \end{array}$ | 132/4 152/17 | 159/10 159/23 | 128/14 148/21 | 186/13 186/18 |
| borrower [10] | 172/20 | 160/13 160/15 | 149/23 189/24 | 190/12 |
| $10 / 19 \text { 10/21 10/22 }$ | broadly [1] 165/9 | 160/25 161/21 | can [126] $7 / 22$ | [1] |
| 24/25 26/7 26/16 | broker [2] 52/15 | 161/21 162/2 | $\begin{aligned} & 7 / 229 / 79 / 109 / 19 \\ & 17 / 2320 / 333 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | canceled [1] 83/3 |

(7) beyond - canceled

| C | 74/23 74/24 75/2 | 173 | $178 / 1$ | 140/7 142/10 147/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cannot [9] 23/10 | 75/4 75/21 75/22 | 173/16 173/25 | colleague [1] | 148/18 151/8 |
| 32/22 93/24 110/4 | 75/25 76/4 76/7 | 176/3 184/1 | 61/16 | 163/24 164/10 |
| 113/9 131/2 137/3 | 76/9 76/14 132/22 | claimant [2] 6/11 | collect [1] 24/17 | 164/12 173/9 |
| 176/20 192/4 | 133/1 133/2 133/3 | 13/2 | collection [20] | 177/19 179/5 |
| Canyon [7] 193/21 | 133/4 133/7 133/10 | claiming [1] | 24/14 24/23 42/18 | 179/16 179/17 |
| 194/5 194/10 | CCR [2] 1/24 | 173/ | 45/9 45/22 46/14 | company's [1] |
| 194/18 195/1 | 204/17 | claims [8] 40/2 | 68/25 75/6 75/11 | 44/8 |
| 195/14 195/15 | cell [1] 62/15 | 41/9 41/11 176/2 | 75/12 76/17 84/1 | comparative [ |
| capacity [1] | certain [3] 45/1 | 176/6 176/8 181/2 | 85/19 86/21 87/2 | 178/22 178/23 |
| 157/ | 45/15 90/2 | 181/25 | 98/10 99/4 101/1 | 178/24 179/6 179 |
| capitalized [1] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { certainly [8] 93/12 } \\ 94 / 16 ~ 100 / 23 \end{array}$ | clarification [2] 61/10 176/22 | 107/13 136/24 collections [1] | 179/12 179/15 <br> compare [1] |
| $131 / 25$ <br> capitals [1] 1 | $128 / 21 \text { 135/10 }$ | clarified [1] 183 | 75/20 | $123 / 10$ |
| capitals [1] 1 caption [2] 1 | 135/13 162/2 | clarify [5] 33/2 | column [11] 23/21 | compared [1] |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{c a} \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 201/15 | 118/18 133/13 | 24/13 25/3 88/24 | 190/3 |
|  | certainty [4] 77/8 | 134/22 183/1 | 89/19 169/21 | competent [1] |
| 193/21 195/22 | 130/24 131/2 | clarity [1] 170/1 | 171/10 171/19 | 30/1 |
| captions [1] | 131/10 | CLARK [10] 1/7 | 173/10 173/10 | complete [5] |
| car [1] 188/5 | CERTIFICAT | 103/21 104/1 | 174/ | 50/22 54/4 107/81 |
| care [1] 69/3 | 204/1 | 185/24 185/25 | come [10] 25 | 159/2 163/16 |
| careful [1] 11 | certified [7] 79/21 | 187/21 197/10 | 27/2 82/2 91/3 | comply [1] 10 |
| case [39] 1/1 7/6 | 99/19 105/9 143/1 | 197/16 204/3 | 127/15 149/22 | comport [1] 12 |
| 8/5 10/6 13/20 14/5 | 143/14 144/12 | 204/14 | 156/4 182/11 192/7 | comps [1] 178/2 |
| 15/7 15/17 16/1 | 204/4 | class [2] 57/11 | 197/17 | computer [1] |
| 16/5 44/17 50/21 | certify [2] |  | comfortable [2] | 111/4 |
| 63/15 63/23 115/25 | 20 | cla | 10 | concern [2] 119/22 |
| 116/8 123/1 127/4 | challenge [1] | 133/5 133/22 | coming [5] 30/ |  |
| 144/7 145/19 149/3 | chamber [1] 1 | 133/22 134/23 | 42/3 122/14 129/7 | concerned [3] |
| 149/3 167/7 167/19 | chance [5] 8/8 9/9 | clauses [3] 133 | 141/8 | 8/4 183/19 |
| 179/19 180/2 | 69/14 193/12 | 134/24 137/7 | commensurate [1] | concerning [6] |
| 183/18 194/6 | 198/23 | clear [24] 32/7 | 190 | 13/20 47/18 54/6 |
| 194/11 195/6 195/9 | changes [2] 62/15 | 36/2 44/1 77/6 91/9 | comment [2] | 54/17 55/18 197 |
| 195/13 195/21 | 72/15 | 91/14 91/20 92/25 | 176/20 176/21 | concluded [1] |
| 195/25 196/2 19 | Chapter [1] 85/6 | 93/3 126/4 127/25 | commercial [2] | 203/23 |
| 200/20 201/17 | Chapter 7 [1] 85/6 | 129/8 129/22 158/4 | 31/3 33/3 | conclusio |
| 203/9 | charges [2] 41/4 | 159/1 159/11 | commercially [2] | 46/8 55/22 105/24 |
| case- | 149/7 | 159/21 160/4 160/5 | 14/16 14/18 | 106/6 119/6 |
| $149 / 3$ | CHARLES [3] 3/4 | 160/13 160/22 | commission [1] | conclusions [2] |
| caseload [1] | 6/12 82/21 | 161/1 190/6 190/19 | 26/2 | 46/10 46/22 |
| $\text { cases [5] } 21 / 3$ | Charleston [ | clearly [3] 30/1 | commit [1] 105 | condition [2] |
| $45 / 23171 / 1182 /$ | 187 | 133/16 176/8 | mmon [1] 91/25 | 4/22 190/12 |
| cash [1] 13/13 | check [4] 30/10 | Clerk [1] 137/2 | commonly [1] | conditions [2] |
| cause [2] 26/4 | 64/6 66/2 | client [12] 13/ | 23/5 | 70/4 132/22 |
| 185/19 | checked [1] 65/20 | 14/10 82/23 92/6 | communication | conduct [3] |
| caution [7] 58/8 | Cheryl [4] 179/7 | 95/11 97/17 135/22 | [1] 50 | 87/9 129/14 |
| 118/11 118/14 | 180/7 180/12 | 135/24 138/19 | community [3] | conducted [2] |
| 118/15 119/2 | 199/12 | 148/15 148/17 | 67/20 68/21 68/ | 63/20 137/6 |
| 120/20 121/6 | Cincinnati [1] 39/2 | 148/18 | companies [ | ucting [1] |
| cautioned [1] | circled [1] 36/25 | clients | / | 38/25 |
| 119/23 | circulation [1] | ] | 13 51/16 | 128/20 |
| cautioning [2] | 134/13 | close [3] 159/ | /13 51/16 52 | 124/13 128/20 |
| 118/7 120/10 | civil [5] 67/25 | 159/7 159/9 | /14 52/17 53/1 | conferences [1] |
| CC [32] 12/7 70/7 | 95/14 95/17 95/19 | closing [2] 52/15 | 14 54/25 55/ | 18/2 |
| 70/9 70/10 70/25 | 95/23 | 53/11 | 55/12 55/13 56/1 | conflict [2] |
| 71/3 72/13 72/14 | claim [11] 31/18 | code [1] 131/2 | 68/16 78/12 102/24 | 159/1 |
| 72/20 72/20 73/1 | 102/12 160/9 | collateral [4] | 112/12 112/14 | conflicting [1] |
| 73/25 74/3 74/5 | 171/10 171/11 | 24/18 25/23 25/23 | 112/19 139/10 | 133/4 |


| C | contractor [3] | 70/6 70/8 | 27/6 | 137/1 148/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 179/7 179/17 | 71/12 71/18 71/19 | 48/8 49/3 54/13 | 158/11 158/11 |
| $201$ | 198/22 | 71/23 72/2 72/4 | 56/3 56/14 65/7 | 164/14 166/10 |
|  | contrast [ | 72/5 72/8 72/22 | 65/14 65/18 65/2 | 166/20 168/4 |
| $13 / 11$ | 123/10 | 72/23 72/24 73/1 | 68/2 77/4 78/2 78/5 | 170/11 170/17 |
| confused [6] 121/1 | conversation [8] | 73/13 73/14 74/11 | 81/9 90/10 107/7 | 171/17 172/24 |
|  | 126/7 126/10 129/3 | 74/12 74/14 74/15 | 107/7 113/16 | 173/5 173/13 |
|  | 129/11 129/25 | 76/11 76/12 76/15 | 113/17 134/16 | 173/14 174/9 |
| 175/2 | 130/1 130/11 | 76/16 81/5 84/7 | 136/14 142/11 | 178/16 179/25 |
| 1/ | 130/18 | 84/25 86/15 86/21 | 147/9 148/11 150/3 | 181/21 182/25 |
|  | conversations [11] | 87/11 92/10 92/11 | 150/5 150/23 | 182/25 183/11 |
| consciou | 119/11 120/3 | 93/21 94/24 97/8 | 157/12 159/1 161/5 | 191/22 201/17 |
| 135/3 | 121/22 125/20 | 99/24 100/12 101/8 | couldn't [2] 68/5 | Court's [3] 81 |
| consecutive [1] | 125/23 126/24 | 101/24 102/1 | 171/1 | 141/3 190/25 |
| 135/14 | 127 | 102/20 102 | counsel [14] | courtroom [ |
| consider [5] 46/17 | 129/19 129/23 | 103/4 104/3 104/13 | 13/8 15/10 46/1 | 65/2 127/9 |
| 49/5 117/10 138/13 | 130/15 | 104/21 107/16 | 46/1 46/1 62/22 | courts [4] 126/2 |
| 189/17 | converted | 108/18 109/ | 84/14 90/14 95/4 | 127/5 127/16 137/ |
| considered [2] | 142/18 | 109/19 111/5 112/8 | 95/17 137/20 150/5 | covenant [3] 7 |
| 48/8 198/18 | copies [2] 41 | 112/12 112/13 | 150/12 | 117/15 118/4 |
| consisted [1] 16/8 |  |  | counter [2] | covenants [2] |
| consisting [1] | copy [16] | 17/ |  | 132/22 |
| 167/21 | 21/1 21/5 21/6 36/8 | 117/13 131/1 | counter-claim | cover [6] 98/ |
|  | 53/1 70/6 79/20 | 131/21 132/1 132/5 | [2] | 99/8 99/10 99/ |
| conspicuous [ | 79/21 98/19 98/24 | 133/14 134/7 | countermotion [1] | 99/19 143/23 |
| 134/11 135/12 | 110/16 110/16 | 136/22 136/2 | 124/20 | crazy [2] 137/19 |
|  | 115/10 142/8 14 | 139/6 139/7 | Country [3] 39/ | 138/9 |
| 115/21 150/12 | corner [15] 19/5 | 145/2 146/8 146/9 | 109/8 109/13 | create [1] 54/8 |
| constitutes [2] | 20/19 21/23 22/2 | 148/9 149/18 | county [15] 1/7 | created [2] 15/2 |
| 115 | 22/13 23/1 28/21 | 149/20 150/13 | 78/7 103/21 104 | 144/11 |
| constitutional | 34/20 38/16 52/2 | 150/25 154/20 | 134/11 134/13 | creates [1] 116/ |
| 15/5 | 53/9 106/2 109/7 | 156/6 156/17 | 161/2 161/16 | creating [1] 55/ |
| cons | 166/9 179/2 | 160/22 162/ | 185/24 185/25 | credit [12] 10/12 |
| $161 / 16$ | corporate [4] | 163/1 164/7 164/10 | 187/21 197/10 | 10/13 22/5 22/10 |
|  | 16/25 30/14 46/1 | 164/14 165/19 | 197/16 204/3 | 29/19 43/8 43/11 |
| $164 / 23$ | 63/16 | 166/21 167/22 | 204/1 | 43/12 43/16 43/16 |
| contact [6] 42/23 | corporation [3] | 169/18 170/5 | couple [14] | 43/20 43/24 |
| 54/23 54/25 74/18 | 69/3 69/4 167/18 | 170/13 170/17 | 37/16 59/9 127/22 | credited [1] |
| 143/10 | correct [179] 13/8 | 170/18 172/4 172/8 | 128/16 138/23 | 149/17 |
| contain [1] 5 | 18/4 19/1 19/18 | 175/6 177/17 182 | 15 | creditor |
|  | 19/21 19/22 20/1 | 182/16 183/11 | 158/17 160/24 | 173/20 173/24 |
|  | 20/2 26/21 27/11 | 183/21 184/9 | 160/24 167/12 | 176/25 177/8 |
| $108 / 18132 / 21$ | 27/15 27/16 29/6 | 184/12 184/13 | 170/1 175/17 | 181/24 183/21 |
| $144 / 21 \text { 174/10 }$ | 29/7 29/24 29/25 | 188/14 191/16 | course [2] 29/2 | 183/22 |
|  | 30/2 31/6 34/22 | 192/11 193/3 193/4 | 72/14 | creditors [1] 176/5 |
| contains [1] | 35/15 35/16 35/19 | 194/12 195/20 | court [58] 1/6 1/19 | CRIMSON [1] 2/19 |
| contend [1] 31/20 | 36/13 37/7 37/13 | 196/9 196/14 | 7/12 13/3 13/17 | cross [6] 45/1 45/ |
|  | 38/1 40/4 40/8 | 196/15 196/25 | 14/6 14/15 14/2 | 77/23 142/2 169/6 |
| contested [1] | 40/18 40/22 40/23 | 200/3 200/7 202/18 | 15/5 15/12 16/1 | 192/21 |
| 126/12 | 43/4 43/8 43/13 | correctly [3] 92/5 | 16/18 32/20 34/ | Cross-examinat |
| conting | 44/4 45/12 46/14 | 119/20 165/18 | 37/21 42/16 50/2 | [5] 45/1 45/4 |
| 32/24 | 47/19 49/24 50/1 | correspondence | 63/4 84/1 87/13 | 77/23 142/2 192/21 |
| continue [3] 33 | 50/23 51/17 51/23 | [2] 38/11 39/1 | 106/5 113/19 115/1 | cruise [1] 181/15 |
| 68/12 141/23 | 51/25 52/3 52/22 | cost [3] 24/13 | 115/8 119/14 | crying [2] 138/21 |
| CONTINUED | 53/2 53/5 53/1 | 123/14 190/6 | 126/18 128/3 | 138/22 |
| 3/1 | 55/13 57/20 58/15 | costs [3] 24/16 | 128/15 129/8 | [ |
| contract [4] 31/17 | $59 / 1460 / 260 / 6$ $61 / 162 / 268 / 18$ | $24 / 23148 / 7$ | 129/13 129/16 | current [5] 12/23 <br> 13/4 13/16 26/23 |

(9) conflicts - current

| C | dealt [1] 132/4 | 113/15 113/18 | defendant [14] | depositions [4] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| current... [1] | death [1] 26/7 | 113/20 113/25 | 1/13 6/10 13/2 13/4 | 17/25 84/3 84/7 |
| 169/22 | debt [3] 24/17 | 114/2 114/4 114/9 | 16/19 32/7 82/22 | 85/23 |
| currently [8] 35/8 | 40/17 123/20 | 114/10 114/17 | 124/20 194/3 | depressed [10] |
| 75/8 75/11 75/12 | debtor [2] 167/19 | 114/18 114/19 | 194/20 194/21 | 138/14 139/12 |
| 76/23 84/3 85/2 | 181/21 | 114/20 120/6 122/9 | 195/8 195/25 200/3 | 139/14 139/16 |
| 93/25 | debtor's [ | 122/18 122/25 | defendants [1] | 139/24 140/9 190/1 |
| custodian [5] | 169/22 | 122/25 123/4 | 11/1 | 90/4 192/2 192/3 |
| 86/10 86/18 86/19 | deceased [5] | 123/19 138/15 | defending [1] | DEPT [1] 1/3 |
| 107/12 140/7 | 26/25 27/1 34/ | 138/17 138/18 | 194/7 | depth [2] 125/ |
| customers [1] | 79/14 79/23 | 150/25 151/3 | defense [1] 16/ | 25/22 |
| 45/14 | December [8] | 154/18 154/19 | defenses [1] 41/11 | describe [2] 144/1 |
| cut [1] 88/22 | 34/23 35/1 35/4 | 156/5 157/13 | deficiency [1] 24/4 | 89/25 |
| D | 147/17 147/18 | 161/19 161/24 |  |  |
| Dak | December 20 [1] | 161/24 162/5 162/5 | 192/7 | describing [1] |
| 39/23 44/3 58/1 | 143/11 | 162/14 162/16 | degree [2] 69/16 | 143/6 |
| 58/6 58/12 59/3 | December 2011 | 162/23 163/13 | 84/15 | description [3] 5/2 |
| 145/2 145/23 | [1] 147/17 | 163/14 166/19 | delayed [1] 11/1 | 88/13 17 |
| data [4] 30/1 98/16 | December 20th [1] | 166/20 177/8 184/8 | delineate [1] | designate [1] 80/6 |
| 111/20 116/22 | 143/8 | 188/18 191/6 | 40/11 | designated [2] |
| date [24] 21/17 | December 28 [1] | 191/15 198/3 198/7 | delineated [2] | 57/14 80/5 |
| 21/25 29/21 34/18 | 14 | 201/4 201/10 | 44/4 57/24 | espondently |
| 34/22 34/23 51/11 | decision [8] 32/2 | deeded [1] 12/15 | delinquency [4] | 92/9 |
| 51/16 89/14 98/15 | 32/25 121/12 | deeds [7] 52/13 | 10/24 29/21 30/2 | destroy [2] 14 |
| 108/3 145/4 145/18 | 126/19 126/20 | 94/8 102/7 160/8 | 34/22 | 14/8 |
| 146/3 146/10 | 128/12 128/14 | 161/4 161/8 162/1 | delinquent [18] <br> 10/23 16/6 75/15 | destroyed [1] 21/4 |
| 147/13 147/16 | 189/24 <br> decisions [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { deemed [2] 61/1 } \\ & 61 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | 10/23 16/6 75/15 <br> 76/19 98/8 98/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { destructive [1] } \\ & 26 / 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 150/6 171/10 | decisions [1] $128 / 16$ | 61/18 <br> deeper [1] 162/3 | $\begin{aligned} & 76 / 19 \text { 98/8 98/10 } \\ & 98 / 1898 / 2099 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | 26/2 determination |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 171/11 193/2 195/6 } \\ & \text { 196/2 203/8 } \end{aligned}$ | declaration [2] | deeper [1] default [53] 10/17 | 99/11 100/3 100/4 | 27/2 32/2 80/6 |
| dated [4] $1 / 21$ | 70/3 132/21 | 11/14 11/16 11/23 | 100/6 100/9 102/15 | 110/6 110/21 |
| 102/8 122/19 | declare [1] 167/19 | 12/1 24/18 24/22 | 143/18 144/4 147/6 | 111/13 134/2 |
| 132/18 | decrease [2] 22/22 | 25/3 25/6 30/16 | delivering [2] | determine [4] |
| dates [2] 29/18 | 22/23 | 31/15 32/23 35/8 | 57/10 59/21 | 30/10 101/23 |
| 113/3 | deed [117] 5/5 | 42/25 43/3 44/7 | DELQ [2] 34/18 | 129/16 136/20 |
| dating [2] 16/9 | 10/14 10/18 11/18 | 44/13 44/18 45/21 | 34/23 | determining [1] |
| 58/21 | 12/4 12/9 12/12 | 46/4 46/19 47/12 | demonstrate [1] | 91/17 |
| David [9] 66/8 | 12/17 12/24 13/5 | 47/13 103/15 | 29/20 | did [125] $11 / 25$ |
| 68/4 68/5 68/5 83/2 | 14/2 14/6 15/11 | 103/18 104/15 | demonstrating [1] | 15/8 18/10 18/12 |
| 83/10 83/17 86/9 | 15/15 15/19 31/14 | 105/20 105/21 | 126/12 | 21/17 22/3 28/5 |
| 86/14 | 32/4 35/23 36/8 | 106/7 107/2 107/19 | denoted [1] 101/7 | 35/4 40/6 40/9 |
| day [11] 13/13 | 36/11 37/17 37/20 | 107/22 108/8 | department [8] | 41/23 42/2 42/5 |
| 28/10 30/24 33/6 | 38/15 39/19 40/1 | 108/17 109/6 110/6 | 42/19 45/9 45/17 | 44/11 47/21 48/20 |
| 107/22 146/8 | 40/7 41/18 43/21 | 110/17 112/20 | 46/15 65/21 66/10 | 50/2 50/8 51/10 |
| 163/17 177/8 188/8 | 44/2 48/17 49/16 | 112/24 113/2 113/8 | 105/2 115/22 | 51/13 55/3 78/14 |
| 189/23 190/21 | 49/22 49/25 50/1 | 113/14 113/25 | departments [1] | 79/1 79/2 84/19 |
| days [11] 75/14 | 50/7 50/10 51/23 | 114/13 114/16 | 45/14 | 85/19 85/21 85/22 |
| 75/19 125/14 144/2 | 52/21 53/24 54/2 | 131/17 132/3 134/6 | depending [3] | 86/24 87/5 87/9 |
| 145/18 145/24 | 54/6 54/17 55/18 | 134/8 144/3 144/4 | 31/13 43/19 148/16 | 92/8 92/17 92/24 |
| 160/18 184/20 | 57/19 57/21 58/4 | 144/11 151/5 | depends [2] | 93/1 93/4 95/8 95/8 |
| 187/8 187/10 | 58/12 58/14 58/17 | defaulted [2] 25/7 | 103/10 103/10 | 95/11 95/13 95/21 |
| 187/11 | 58/22 61/21 63/19 | 25/20 | deposed [1] 89/25 | 95/22 95/23 96/12 |
| de [1] 175 | 94/9 94/22 94/25 | defect [3] 14/11 | deposing [1] 92/4 | 96/14 96/17 97/12 |
| $\text { deal [2] } 64 / 15$ | 100/9 102/8 103/12 | 140/23 175/6 | deposition [9] | 97/16 97/16 100/1 |
| 64/15 | 104/9 109/2 109/11 | defects [3] 13/20 | 79/17 79/21 80/4 | 100/3 100/5 104/9 |
| dealing [2] 20/8 | $109 / 14111 / 11$ | 13/25 33/12 | 80/8 80/14 161/12 | 104/11 106/15 |
| $52 / 13$ | 111/11 113/13 | defend [1] 41/8 | 161/14 167/2 167/3 | 108/3 114/13 |

(10) current... - did

| D | direct [16] 17/12 | 148/2 | documents [35] | 112/21 112/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18/20 18/21 20/16 | district [4] $1 / 6$ | 5/7 13/23 13/24 | 113/10 119/16 |
| $120 / 2121 / 13$ | 23/20 29/13 35/24 | 1/19 127/5 128/15 | 20/10 44/19 44/22 | 120/11 120/14 |
|  | 57/2 57/18 58/5 | districts [1] | 47/18 49/4 51/7 | 120/22 121/11 |
| 124/14 125/16 | 67/13 83/21 93/14 | 126/23 | 54/6 54/17 70/11 | 122/7 125/1 125/3 |
| 125/22 127/3 127/8 | 107/7 109/24 | division [1] 18/8 | 86/20 86/24 93/13 | 125/19 126/10 |
| 127/19 129/18 | 152/1 | do [207] | 99/16 102/1 102/22 | 126/14 126/23 |
| 133/12 133/17 | directed | doc [1] 105/18 | 103/8 123/10 134/6 | 127/9 127/11 |
| 134/1 134/5 134/21 | 168/11 | docket [3] 1/2 | 142/14 142/14 | 127/20 127/21 |
| 135/4 135/6 135/7 | directing [1] 57/18 | 167/6 167/6 | 150/21 154/7 168/4 | 128/23 129/10 |
| 135/14 135/18 | direction [2] 53/4 | document [121] | 168/9 168/17 | 129/24 129/24 |
| 137/5 137/9 137/16 | 204/9 | 5/4 5/6 5/8 15/13 | 182/19 183/15 | 130/9 130/9 130/14 |
| 137/17 138/7 139/5 | directly [6] 30/15 | 15/14 15/20 18/24 | 193/6 197/18 | 130/16 131/4 133/4 |
| 146/3 146/12 147/5 | 48/23 49/2 49/16 | 19/6 19/7 19/9 | 197/19 197/20 | 134/9 137/2 138/12 |
| 148/2 149/8 149/22 | 49/21 182/22 | 19/12 20/6 20/16 | 197/22 | 138/16 139/1 140/5 |
| 150/17 150/21 | directors [1] | 23/9 23/12 28/25 | does [34] 17/24 | 150/19 156/7 157/7 |
| 153/5 1 | 142/11 | 29/10 29/15 30/15 | 18/6 29/15 29/20 | 157/10 159/9 |
| 157/5 159/10 | disagree [1] 202 | 35/7 35/11 35/14 | 29/22 32/5 33/21 | 160/14 161/22 |
| 159/2 | discharge [3] | 36/4 36/6 37/4 37/7 | 34/24 35/21 39/18 | 164/17 164/20 |
| 164/16 | 41/17 43/16 43/17 | 40/10 44/20 44/21 | 43/22 53/24 54/13 | 165/13 165/13 |
| 165/3 168/3 172/23 | disclose [3] 173/6 | 48/7 49/9 49/15 | 54/13 55/25 58/4 | 165/16 166/15 |
| 174/22 175/25 | 176/5 176/7 | 49/20 49/23 50/14 | 58/11 70/13 78/11 | 169/6 170/3 170/5 |
| 176/16 179/5 180/7 | discuss [2] 121/18 | 52/5 52/6 52/9 | 86/6 90/17 95/19 | 170/10 175/21 |
| 180/7 181/12 182/3 | 126/3 | 52/10 52/25 53/4 | 95/21 108/7 108/10 | 176/18 178/2 180/4 |
| 182/7 197/7 197/20 | discussed [10] | 53/15 54/5 54/8 | 109/25 111/1 | 180/5 180/5 183/17 |
| 197/23 198/2 198/6 | 37/12 44/2 99/18 | 54/9 54/16 55/10 | 136/12 141/7 | 184/17 184/23 |
| 198/10 198/23 | 106/21 107/14 | 55/17 55/25 56/13 | 142/21 143/15 | 185/2 185/13 |
| 199/1 199/3 200/21 | 109/17 121/23 | 60/11 60/15 60/20 | 145/8 149/4 156/24 | 186/17 188/10 |
| 203/8 | 122/1 128/16 | 61/22 62/1 69/21 | doesn't [8] 53/7 | 188/12 188/20 |
| didn't [28] | 201/18 | 69/25 70/13 87/21 | 54/5 55/11 56/9 | 188/22 188/25 |
| 50/5 54/8 90/23 | discusses [1] 26/6 | 88/3 88/5 88/15 | 91/24 110/24 | 189/12 190/13 |
| 91/23 92/6 92/22 | discussing [4] | 89/4 89/14 92/13 | 129/12 185/19 | 191/11 199/2 |
| 93/1 96 | 26/7 61/17 126/ | 93/9 93/12 94/5 | dog [1] 119/21 | 199/10 199/12 |
| 119/9 119/10 | 137/6 | 98/13 98/14 98/16 | doing [7] 84/11 | 200/18 200/19 |
| 119/21 | discussions [3] | 98/17 100/21 | 85/2 92/22 125/19 | done [28] 7/22 |
| 121/22 124/11 | 122/2 122/8 128/21 | 100/23 100/24 | 163/11 168/15 | 7/22 8/5 8/6 8/6 8/7 |
| 124/11 125/7 125/7 | dismissed [3] | 101/2 101/22 | 168/18 | 42/17 63/4 65/10 |
| 128/23 129/15 | 170/20 170/24 | 101/23 103/14 | dollar [1] 10/16 | 66/19 67/24 77/5 |
| 133/15 13 | 171/1 | 105/7 105/10 | don't [132] 8/5 9/4 | 83/7 97/11 141/7 |
| 146/7 157/25 | dispute [16] 156/7 | 105/13 105/19 | 9/12 14/21 17/16 | 157/21 157/23 |
| 163/11 170/4 175/9 | 158/1 160/14 | 107/9 107/17 109/7 | 18/19 30/8 32/7 | 158/7 158/9 158/20 |
| 163/11 170/4 175/9 | 160/15 161/22 | 111/13 111/18 | 33/6 44/24 47/14 | 160/17 176/6 179/9 |
| difference [1] | 170/3 170/10 172/6 | 112/2 116/21 | 47/15 48/2 49/1 | 179/16 192/15 |
|  | 172/20 175/9 177/5 | 116/24 117/4 | 50/3 52/2 52/18 | 193/16 193/19 |
|  | 180/4 188/20 | 122/22 123/6 123/8 | 59/6 62/9 62/14 | 198/21 |
| $11 / 1811 / 24$ | 188/22 198/2 | 131/15 132/1 | 65/8 70/24 75/13 | door [6] 65/1 |
| 55/20 88/22 | 200/17 | 142/18 142/22 | 75/19 77/2 84/1 | 65/19 65/22 65/23 |
| 91/3 91/19 1 | disputed [15] | 143/18 144/21 | 85/21 87/2 89/7 | 65/24 65/25 |
| 105/1 109/22 | 169/19 173/9 173/9 | 149/11 154/15 | 89/8 89/9 89/12 | dot [1] 169/7 |
| 113/16 142/14 | 173/11 176/2 176/3 | 163/20 166/24 | 90/15 90/17 92/20 | doubt [2] 96/13 |
| 148/15 156/4 | 176/7 176/8 176/25 | 170/4 172/16 | 92/21 93/11 94/14 | 96/15 |
| 158/15 162/4 | 177/7 183/6 183/6 | 177/22 178/19 | 94/18 95/16 95/24 | down [32] 8/22 |
| 201/21 | 183/22 184/1 192/4 | 179/24 185/5 186/6 | 96/9 96/11 97/3 | 22/18 23/8 23/8 |
|  | disputing [2] | 186/10 186/15 | 99/6 105/3 105/1 | 27/18 39/5 40/24 |
| difficult [1] 7 |  | 199/19 200/17 | 105/18 107/4 | /5 62/20 64/9 |
| dig [1] $162 / 3$ | distributing [1] | 201/11 201/25 | 107/11 108/14 | 88/24 93/14 117/3 |
|  | 148/16 | 202/19 202/23 | 109/24 110/9 | 123/11 124/9 |
| 175/11 | distribution [1] | 203/10 | 110/23 112/14 | 126/20 128/13 |


| D | E | 168 | 19/17 30/18 87/15 | $[1]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| down... [15] | E-d-d-i-e [1] 152/8 | Ellis [1] 180/8 | 111/20 |  |
| 132/12 138/20 | each [7] $14 / 14$ | else [15] 7/19 | /23 172/3 | estimated [2] |
| 138/23 142/24 | 58/10 140/13 | 14/11 16/21 33/1 | entire [4] 7/6 |  |
| 143/3 166/12 | 148/22 171/14 | 56/21 59/8 78/18 | 98/11 187/23 | te |
| 171/22 174/20 | 176/3 196/9 | 80/17 88/14 100/2 | 197/17 | 181/22 |
| 180/22 185/23 | earlier [20] 16/12 | 175/8 191/14 192/9 | entirety [3] 43 | [ [9] |
| 188/1 188/2 188/3 | 28/6 34/21 35/17 | 197/22 199/16 | 155/6 155/7 | 63/10 1 |
| 188/24 204/5 | 37/12 50/21 56/12 | Elsis [2] 179/7 | entities [16] 37/16 | 168/6 177/9 180 |
| Downtown [2] | 62/25 66/3 99/18 | 180/8 | 38/15 103/8 10 |  |
| 186/23 186/24 | 108/15 108/20 | EMAIL [1] 2/12 | 105/11 105/18 | evening |
| dozen [3] 127/15 | 109/17 116/15 | emanate [1] 12 | 105/19 105/20 | t [3] |
| 128/20 128/20 | 139/19 143/22 | employ [1] 153/20 | 108/18 109/10 | 24/18 24/22 |
| drafted [2] 116/18 | 150/11 150/24 | employed [1] 18/4 | 111/22 113/17 | entually |
| 116/25 | 173/19 196/16 | employee [2] | 113/18 125/25 | 160/12 |
| draw [1] | early [2] 122/10 | 94/18 110/19 | 164/5 | r [24] 44 |
| drawing [1] | 185/18 |  | titled [6] | 51/1 96 |
| 105/23 | easier [1] 34/5 | 142/22 143/4 | 12/23 14/25 15/3 | /17 100/14 11 |
| drive [44] 10/7 | easily [1] 158/7 | employer [1] | 57/5 204/6 | 19/24 121/13 |
| 13/14 23/6 26/11 | East [1] 39/1 | 36 | entity [13] | 121/18 121/23 |
| 35/19 37/11 37/12 | easy [5] 74/24 | enclosed [1] | 23/14 23/17 39/8 | 125/16 126/3 |
| 39/14 42/8 69/9 | 75/2 76/3 76/3 | enclosing [1] 50 | 106/14 109/6 | 126/11 126/15 |
| 77/10 78/8 85/9 | 158/8 | enclosure [3] | 109/16 109/21 | 133/12 134/5 |
| 99/24 109/8 109/13 | Eddie [11] 6/21 | 99/9 143/24 | 109/22 111/14 | 137/9 137/16 138/7 |
| 152/23 154/20 | 13/6 82/22 96/19 | encumbering | 113/21 148/22 | 138/14 157/21 |
| 154/23 155/20 | 97/18 124/22 | 17 | 00 | 197/20 |
| 156/3 156/10 | 125/19 151/24 | encumb | entries [1] 142/8 | every [12] |
| 156/25 157/1 164/7 | 152/1 152/8 168/1 | 120/12 | entry [8] 107/2 | 57/18 68/25 10 |
| 166/13 169/17 | Edward [1] 105/10 | encumbrances | 108/4 143/9 143/11 | 105/1 116/18 |
| 171/24 173/4 | EDWARDS [35] | 41/3 117/17 118/6 | 143/25 145/9 148/5 | 124/16 127/14 |
| 173/17 175/8 | 1/12 10/11 10/17 | 120/4 | 167/6 | 168/12 168/12 |
| 175/13 176/14 | 18/11 18/13 19/17 | end | equal [1] 148/ | 168/13 170/9 |
| 177/14 181/2 182/9 | 19/22 20/14 21/18 | 30/24 89/21 142/15 | equals [1] 191/7 | everybody [5] |
| 183/9 183/25 188/1 | 22/4 22/7 23/13 | ended [1] 11/3 | equiline [9] 5/3 | 6/14 12/13 124/17 |
| 188/4 188/5 196/17 | 24/21 25/13 26/14 | ending [4] 91/16 | 19/14 19/1 | 7/24 191/23 |
| 200/10 200/19 | 26/24 26/25 27/1 | 92/9 92/12 92/18 | 20/23 25/14 27/14 | everyone [6] |
| drop [2] 142/24 | 27/10 27/14 27/25 | ends [5] 19/6 36/3 | 28/1 35/5 | 57/19 59/1 70/13 |
| 143/3 | 28/3 28/5 28/11 | 25 101/18 | equity [5] | 101/7 136/17 |
| drop-down [2] | 31/19 32/14 36/10 | 101/19 | 25 24/5 43/7 | everything [3] |
| 142/24 143/3 | 36/13 40/21 41/17 | enforce [3] 12/23 | 120/8 | 05/4 131/5 148/ |
| due [13] $27 / 25$ | 41/23 43/10 61/23 | 16/4 21/4 | error [1] | ns [1] |
| 29/20 35/11 40/17 | 99/23 147/5 | enforceable [ | escrow [3] 90/6 | 190/12 |
| 41/4 41/6 70/19 | Edwards' [2] 34/25 | 133/19 134/1 | / 91/20 | evidence [16] |
| 73/13 73/21 123/20 | 37/4 | 136/13 | especially [1] | 11/15 12/5 12/ |
| 133/3 149/5 149/10 | effect [2] 12 | engage [10] 92/6 | 91/13 | 12/21 14/9 14/15 |
| dues [2] 68/25 | 137/17 | 92/22 93/4 95/8 | ESQ [4] 2/5 2/6 | 14/19 14/21 16/9 |
| 70/21 | efficient [1] 81/20 | 105/2 119/10 120/2 | 2/18 3/4 | 16/16 30/6 71/4 |
| duly [4] 17/3 67/4 | effort [1] 133/12 | 121/16 128/23 | Esquire [1] 8 | 79/22 79/24 101/ |
| 83/11 152/2 | efforts [1] 76/19 | 133/17 | establish [5] 31/15 | 202/7 |
| during [5] 10/18 | either [4] 23/17 | Enjoy [1] 203/20 enough [9] 14/3 | $\begin{aligned} & 31 / 16 ~ 33 / 6 ~ 33 / 1 \\ & 33 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | evidencing [1] $41 / 7$ |
| 99/3 128/18 149/16 | 32/6 51/13 197/24 | enough [9] 14/3 58/24 90/24 129/1 | 33/11 establishing [1] | exact [1] 89/21 |
| 158/22 | El [1] 195/22 | $136 / 25137 / 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { establishing [1] } \\ & 31 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | exactly [11] 8/6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { duties [3] 68/22 } \\ & 70 / 1595 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | election [1] 131/18 electronic [7] | 138/5 141/2 183/19 | estate [9] 11/9 | 9/4 97/3 97/24 |
| dwelling [1] 25/25 | 19/25 20/24 21/1 | ensure [1] 119/19 | 27/5 28/4 28/13 | 99/12 110/12 |
| Dying [1] 136/2 | 21/6 98/12 142/1 | enter [3] 21/17 | 32/15 153/10 | 122/24 142/19 |
| Dying [1] 136/2 |  | 142/16 143/5 | 153/24 153/25 | 143/20 172/15 |
|  | electronically [1] | entered [8] 10/11 | 153/25 | 178/11 |


| E | 10 | F | 115/21 | fine [7] 10/3 73/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ex | Exhibit 4 [8] 35/2 | face [2] 54/1 138/2 | felt [3] 121/10 | 81/13 81/25 84/21 |
| 17/12 45/1 45/4 | 36/2 36/17 51/19 | ] | 139/22 140/13 | $20185 / 7$ |
| 56/24 59/11 61/13 | 51/21 57/3 59/13 | 14/2 14/6 15/8 | fe | 63 |
| 67/13 77/23 78/21 |  | 16/15 16/17 46/8 |  |  |
| 83/21 142/2 152/11 | Exhibit 7 [13] 71/8 | 130/17 132/9 | fide [4] 12/12 14/4 | finished [2] 62 |
| 192/21 203/6 |  | 140/11 163/8 |  |  |
| examined [4] 17/4 |  | 170/23 172/21 | Fidelity [1] 194/20 <br> field [1] 47/11 |  |
| 67/5 83/12 152/3 | 146/25 148/8 149/4 | factors [2] 31/21 | fields [3] 111/2 | 93/24 93/25 94/15 |
| ex | 150/3 |  | 116/22 117/12 | 94/17 94/18 94/19 |
| example | Exhibit 8 [1] 78/3 |  | Fifteen [2] 141/18 | 95/6 97/2 136/24 |
| 139/20 | exhibits [2] | fa | 14 | 144/10 183/13 |
| excellent [1] |  | failed [1] 25/13 | Fifty [1] | t [64] 7/14 10 |
| except [2] 99/6 | exists [1] | failure [3] $25 / 2$ | fight [1] 119/ | 12/9 14/2 14/6 |
| 191/14 | expect [5] | $26 / 126 / 3$ | fighting [1] 190/16 | 14/24 16/24 17/3 |
| Excuse |  | fair [11] 11 | figure [3] 32/8 | 21/24 29/21 32/4 |
| executed [3] 37/6 | 162/15 | 58/24 90/24 125/16 | 65/3 201/24 | 34/18 34/22 37/15 |
| 53/1 132/18 | expected [2] 92/20 | 129/1 130/5 138/5 | file [36] 40/10 42/6 | 40/1 41/19 44/2 |
| execution [1] |  | 140/19 141/2 | 50/22 | 54/1 57/11 57/21 |
| 32/16 | expecting [2] |  | 86/21 87/22 98/10 | 59/22 67/4 67/10 |
| executor [3] 27/5 | 162/12 163/13 |  | 101/1 104/22 | 68/10 72/8 72/13 |
| 28/4 28/13 | expects [1] 63/ | familiar [16] 39 | 104/24 105/1 | 74/10 74/10 80/2 |
| exhibit [64] 5/2 | expense [3] 162/7 | 42/10 52/17 69/8 | 105/25 106/17 | 83/11 89/19 100/19 |
| 18/14 18/19 18/21 | 162/9 162/16 | 69/10 69/12 85/8 | 107/13 110/4 | 101/1 108/21 |
| 20/10 21/10 21/15 | expenses [1] | 85/12 85/16 152/22 | 111/10 111/12 | 124/25 136/9 |
| 22/12 23/1 24/1 | 123/14 | 153/2 154/16 | 112/21 113/9 115/4 | 136/18 147/6 152/2 |
| 24/10 28/17 28/20 | experien | 173/19 173/23 | 115/23 115/24 | 60/8 165/8 165/11 |
| 30/6 33/22 33/25 |  | 173/25 177/25 | 116/7 122/6 123/25 | 68/5 171/24 |
| 34/1 34/7 35/24 | ex | Family [3] 195 | 151/7 151/11 | 172/19 172/25 |
| 36/2 36/17 36/20 | 90/15 90/18 170/23 | 199/23 203/9 | 158/10 158/10 | 73/3 173/16 |
| 48/1 49/4 50/13 | expertise [1] 97 | Fantastic [1] | 161/5 168 | 25 |
| 50/17 51/19 51/21 | ex | 155/17 | 168/12 178/6 | 177/5 177/7 178/ |
| 57/3 59/13 60/10 | 8 | far [8] 35/8 35/10 | 178/13 | 81/5 181/9 181/23 |
| 69/17 69/18 71/6 | explain [5] 42 | 62/13 88/21 91/5 | filed [14] | 182/8 182/20 |
| 71/8 71/10 78/3 | 84/6 148/11 173/2 | 119/1 120/18 | 26/9 27/24 58/14 | 185/11 192/24 |
| 86/2 86/5 86/9 | 182/ | 166/19 | 131/21 168/7 | 193/7 196/7 198/3 |
| 87/16 142/4 144/8 | ex | Fargo [9] | 168/23 179/20 | 198/7 |
| 144/14 146/25 | express [2] | 39/23 44/3 57/25 | 179/24 182/4 182/4 | fit [2] 119/17 |
| 147/10 148/8 149/4 | express [2] 118/5 | 58/5 58/12 59/2 | 193/24 195/6 196/2 | 120/12 |
| 150/3 154/5 155/3 |  | 145/2 145/23 | files [1] 122 | 0] |
| 155/10 155/13 | ex | fast [1] 131/13 |  | 5 |
| 165/17 165/22 | extensive [1] | Fastest [1] 186/6 |  | 72/15 184/20 |
| 165/25 166/3 166/5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { extensive [1] } \\ & 63 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { favor [1] } 132 / 20$ | 182/18 183/1 $183 / 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 172 / 15184 / 20 \\ & 187 / 10190 / 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 184/4 184/5 199/4 | 63/21 <br> extensively [1] | Fax[2] 2/11 2/22 | $\text { fill [1] } 45 / 13$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 187 / 10190 / 17 \\ \text { flag [1] } 85 / 6 \end{array}$ |
| 199/7 201/5 201/12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { extens } \\ & 96 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | February [4] 10/24 | finally [2] 15/ | flip [3] 29/5 16 |
| Exhibit 11 [6] | extent [5] 21/10 | $147 / 13$ | 85/5 | $179 / 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 165 / 17 \text { 165/22 } \\ & 165 / 25 \text { 166/3 199/4 } \end{aligned}$ | 87/14 133/2 155/1 |  | financial [10] | floor [1] 83/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16 \text { / } \\ & 199 / \end{aligned}$ | 159/10 |  | 38/17 38/19 39/1 | focus [3] 13/25 |
| Exhibit 12 [6] | extinguish [2] | Federal | 52/8 53/12 68/24 | 30/25 92/4 |
| 154/5 155/3 155/10 | 73/20 163/13 | $\text { fee [2] } 1$ | 171/7 171/23 178/7 | focused [1] 92/22 |
| 184/4 201/5 201/12 | extinguished [3] |  | 181/6 | llow [5] 104/17 |
| Exhibit 17 [6] | 20 | feel [3] | [10] | 38/2 161/7 185/1 |
| 28/17 28/20 30/6 |  | 104/23 134/1 | 51/16 65/21 66/ | 199/17 |
| 34/1 48/1 50/13 |  | fees [4] 24/24 | 66/11 68/8 103/2 | llowed [1] 46/25 |
| Exhibit 3 [7] 18/21 | [3] 32/4 182/13 |  | 107/17 109/16 | following [4] 25/7 |
| 20/10 21/10 22/12 | 182/21 | fella [2] 115/20 | 186/4 | 25/21 47/10 102/6 |

(13) examination - following

| F | four [10] 7/7 54/ | 126/16 168/11 | 78/14 78/24 79/13 | 106/9 113/1119/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 54/18 55/19 56/1 | 168/20 185/22 | 93/16 94/6 94/13 | 120/17 121/5 123/9 |
| $67 / 683 / 13152 / 4$ | 56/10 60/10 61/1 | genesis [1] 120/23 | 95/18 102/16 | 123/18 124/1 124/9 |
| force [2] 20/25 | 75/16 177/12 | gentlemen [2] | 115/12 132/19 | 126/9 128/7 128/12 |
| 124/7 | fourth [5] 124/2 | 9/24 203/15 | 201/8 201/10 202/6 | 130/15 130/16 |
| foreclose [3] 31/17 | 166/16 186/20 | GEORGE [9] 1/12 | Glenwest [1] | 132/13 133/16 |
| foreclose [3] 31/17 | 187/1 187/2 | 10/10 18/11 36/9 | 78/12 | 137/2 139/12 140/1 |
| foreclosed | frame [1] 158/ | 61/23 78/25 99/23 | go [88] 6/8 8/20 | 141/11 144/14 |
| $16 / 17$ | fraud [1] 14/19 | 105/10 115/21 | 18/14 18/19 22/11 | 160/15 163/3 |
|  | free [16] 32/7 | get [63] 7/7 7/22 | 22/25 27/18 35/9 | 163/22 169/13 |
|  | 92/25 93/3 126/4 | 7/22 8/5 8/5 8/6 8/6 | 36/22 37/15 38/14 | 175/16 180/13 |
| foreclos | 129/8 129/22 | 8/8 9/19 11/21 15/6 | 39/5 40/24 55/18 | 182/24 183/1 |
| 12/21 12/22 27/19 | 139/20 158/4 159/1 | 15/8 15/10 15/13 | 57/5 61/21 64/21 | 183/14 183/17 |
| 28/15 30/21 31/11 | 159/11 159/21 | 25/4 28/16 28/18 | 68/10 69/20 71/22 | 186/3 189/5 189/22 |
| 32/11 32/12 32/18 | 160/4 160/5 160/13 | 32/11 39/19 62/15 | 73/10 73/24 81/16 | gone [1] 116/3 |
| 42/6 42/16 45/16 | 160/22 160/25 | 63/4 65/7 65/9 | 82/17 83/5 84/19 | good [29] 6/6 6/7 |
|  | frequent [4] | 65/12 66/18 66/2 | 87/12 88/24 91/3 | 6/22 6/23 10/4 10/5 |
| 87/9 89/13 89/17 | 191/17 191/18 | 67/1 75/17 76/7 | 91/4 91/4 93/6 98/6 | 13/1 17/14 17/15 |
|  | 191/21 191/24 | 76/8 88/14 91/20 | 98/6 98/23 99/22 | 45/6 45/7 64/18 |
|  | frequently [2] | 93/6 98/15 110/15 | 100/18 101/9 102/2 | 67/15 77/25 77/25 |
| 107/19 110/2 | 187/7 189/7 | 111/1 111/7 119/5 | 105/5 109/16 110/8 | 78/1 80/24 82/14 |
|  | front [4] 69/17 | 119/16 119/16 | 111/15 111/15 | 83/23 83/25 90/6 |
|  | 76/25 86/8 188/7 | 120/11 120/11 | 115/9 117/3 119 | 138/3 138/16 |
|  | full [5] 44/9 75/17 | 129/15 135/24 | 122/13 129/19 | 141/14 152/13 |
|  | 76/20 135/22 | 142/21 154/13 | 131/12 134/17 | 152/15 166/21 |
|  | 204/10 | 158/6 158/11 | 135/25 145/11 | 187/13 189/1 |
| 136/24 137/10 | fully [1] 12 |  | 15 | t [21] 7/1 |
| 137/18 | fun [1] 84/9 | 163/16 163/18 | 163/22 165/17 | 33/20 34/14 34/14 |
|  | function [1] | 163/18 167/15 | 166/8 167/12 169/5 | 34/15 60/16 62/25 |
|  | 140/16 | 175/2 185/22 188/3 | 169/10 170/14 | 64/2 76/14 81/16 |
| 138/25 139/4 139/6 | funds [2] 56/6 | 190/6 190/12 | 174/5 174/20 | 104/5 119/20 127/ |
|  | 58/19 | 190/19 197/23 | 175/19 176/9 | 129/7 129/15 |
| $17$ | funnest [1] 122/ | 198/23 199/24 | 177/10 177/21 | 129/21 151/3 |
|  | further [23] 31/25 | gets [1] 80/5 | 178/4 178/17 | 163/16 163/18 |
|  | 44/25 56/19 59/7 | getting [7] 29/1 | 178/18 179/14 | 171/1 174/2 |
|  | 61/9 61/10 61/13 | 65/3 115/17 126/4 | 182/12 182/19 | gotten [3] 145/23 |
| foreclosures | 62/4 62/5 73/10 | 137/11 140/11 | 184/4 184/17 | 164/18 180/24 |
|  | 77/21 78/17 80/19 | 185/15 | 184/18 184/18 | governing [1] |
| 157/19 159/25 | 112/22 113/9 115/4 | give [11] 47/5 | 185/25 | 70/11 |
| FOREGOING [1] | 151/16 151/17 | 48/20 56/4 97/6 | 187/8 189/16 | grab [1] 18/19 |
|  | 178/18 192/12 | 113/10 123/24 | 199/22 201/2 | grant [1] 13/5 |
| 2 | 199/15 203/3 | 127/22 137/4 145/8 | 201/22 201/24 | granted [1] 24/3 |
| forgoing [1] | 203 | 161/5 168/17 | 201/25 202/11 | grantee [1] 123/7 |
| 167/20 | future [3] 10 | given [11] 45/ | goes [5] 58/7 | grantor [10] 40 |
|  | 37/17 183/18 | 46/4 46/18 54/1 | 60/21 69/21 99/ | 41/2 41/5 41/8 |
| form [7] 19/25 | G | 57/10 59/20 59/21 | 10 | 0/ |
| 20/4 100/9 100/24 |  |  |  |  |
| 104/20 116/17 | $151 / 12 \text { 178/3 }$ | gives [3] $8 / 19$ | 14/22 16/10 | rantors [1] 61/ |
|  | geared [1] 120/15 | 74/25 102/7 | 16/16 16/18 23/20 | great [9] 9/11 |
| former [2] 104/ | GEISENDORF [4] | giving [5] 29/17 | 30/7 32/2 36/22 | 103/22 153/12 |
| $110 / 19$ | 3/3 3/4 6/12 82/22 | 48/13 89/21 110/11 | 48/3 53/1 57/23 | 153/17 153/20 |
|  | general [10] 74/1 | 129/5 | 61/15 63/7 63/10 | 177/16 179/2 179/5 |
| forward [2] 116/ | 84/14 95/4 95/17 | glass [1] 163/1 | 63/23 66/11 66/15 | 180/8 |
| $182 / 12$ | 124/14 126/12 | Glenview [22] | 67/2 68/17 69/18 | green [1] 116/4 |
|  | 126/21 127/18 | 10/25 47/22 47/22 | 70/7 70/25 71/3 | ground [1] $41 / 3$ |
| $30 / 8 \quad 30 / 12$ | 129/3 134/13 | 48/9 48/14 49/6 | 75/21 76/17 80/7 | group [36] 2/15 |
| founder [1] 136/23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { generally [8] 77/5 } \\ & 97 / 797 / 997 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | 66/24 67/19 68/19 | 80/8 82/24 104/23 | 6/11 6/13 6/21 |

(14) follows - group

| G | 94/22 97/2 97/11 | happening [5] | 83/5 90/19 137/18 | 178/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| group... [32] 12/12 | 100/6 103/22 | 96/16 127/20 | head [5] 89/18 | 179/19 180/13 |
| group... [32] 12/12 $13 / 313 / 1531 / 12$ | 120/21 125/13 | 127/21 128/22 | 124/14 138/11 | 180/22 191/12 |
|  | 127/14 128/20 | 130/18 | 139/5 185/23 | 197/2 200/8 |
| 183/10 193/22 | 133/5 142/9 143/22 | happens [2] | hear [7] 13/19 | here's [1] 180/20 |
| 194/2 194/11 | 146/23 151/8 | 115/18 122/6 | 14/15 127/8 129/18 | hereby [2] 132/16 |
| 194/13 194/14 | 151/13 158/10 | hard [3] 137/20 | 129/20 129/22 | 204/5 |
| 194/19 195/2 195/8 | 159/5 161/23 | 145/5 184/23 | 137/5 | herein [4] 11/1 |
| 195/11 196/12 | 161/24 176/16 | has [28] 6/14 7/19 | heard [6] 8/17 | 24/3 72/7 136/8 |
| 196/13 196/14 | 178/7 178/16 180/9 | 15/5 15/10 19/22 | 14/1 130/1 130/6 | hereto [1] 181/23 |
| 196/20 196/21 | 182/11 183/13 | $30 / 8$ 30/13 30/17 | 130/11 130/25 | HEREUNTO [1] |
| 196/24 196/25 | 193/12 197/12 | 31/14 32/23 35/3 | hearing [7] 66/3 | 204/13 |
| 200/3 200/9 200/15 | 199/5 201/14 204/6 | 44/4 47/18 52/2 | 75/18 76/22 76/25 | Hey [8] 119/5 |
| 200/22 200/25 | 204/12 | 63/1 63/2 75/22 | 77/3 85/25 126/3 | 120/11 127/7 129/7 |
| 201/1 201/19 202/4 | Haddad [39] 6/21 | 75/24 83/3 96/3 | heavy [4] 190/15 | 129/20 129/21 |
| 202/18 | 13/6 13/12 13/18 | 96/9 96/10 96/11 | 190/15 190/15 | 137/17 138/9 |
| Groups [2] 32 | 81/7 81/12 81/23 | 103/21 157/23 | 190/15 | hi [2] 124/17 |
| 163/24 | 82/1 82/22 82/23 | 160/19 182/23 | Heifner [16] 6/18 | 125/19 |
| guess [31] 20/18 | 96/18 96/19 96/22 | 183/16 | 8/15 16/25 17/2 | high [1] 13/12 |
| 23/8 27/17 31/8 | 97/2 97/18 97/21 | have [266] | 17/9 17/14 18/24 | highest [2] 191/ |
| 31/21 32/24 64/24 | 97/23 124/22 | haven't [1] 180/24 | 19/10 29/1 30/13 | 192/8 |
| 66/14 87/13 92/9 | 124/23 124/24 | having [10] 15/22 | 34/16 36/7 45/6 | him [45] 8/20 9/5 |
| 101/10 101/21 | 124/25 125/11 | 17/3 67/4 83/11 | 50/19 57/2 59/13 | 9/9 14/12 18/16 |
| 102/17 104/16 | 125/25 126/3 126/8 | 93/11 124/13 126/7 | heirs [1] 10/20 | 27/6 62/11 62/13 |
| 106/5 113/23 | 126/11 126/25 | 137/20 152/2 | held [2] 31/14 | 62/16 63/3 63/5 |
| 114/12 115/13 | 127/10 130/25 | 168/10 | 124/2 | 63/10 63/25 64/14 |
| 118/18 119/23 | 151/24 152/1 152/8 | Hazel [3] 11/9 | help [4] 101/2 | 64/15 64/16 65/3 |
| 121/1 121/14 | 152/13 163/25 | 28/10 147/25 | 109/3 186/3 186/4 | 65/7 65/9 65/13 |
| 124/21 127/23 | 168/1 183/7 192/23 | he [62] 8/19 8/23 | helpful [1] 107/9 | 65/15 65/17 66/20 |
| 140/4 163/13 172/7 | 193/11 203/8 | 9/7 10/11 10/12 | helps [1] 46/2 | 68/6 79/1 79/2 |
| 177/4 177/10 | hadn't [2] 92/16 | 13/20 13/21 27/7 | HENDERSON [2] | 81/14 82/3 90/23 |
| 177/12 189/18 | 92/1 | 30/17 35/3 35/4 | 2/20 3/7 | 94/8 98/1 125/2 |
| guy [2] 137/18 | half [1] 141/13 | 37/6 68/9 79/3 79/5 | her [8] 9/19 66/25 | 125/3 125/14 |
| 138/9 | hallway [1] 9/25 | 79/8 79/16 79/23 | 67/1 138/1 138/4 | 125/17 125/20 |
| guys [2] 11 | hand [18] 19/4 | 81/22 93/24 93/25 | 179/11 199/2 199/5 | 125/23 127/11 |
| $112 / 17$ | 20/19 21/23 22/2 | 94/3 94/5 94/22 | here [63] 6/17 | 160/16 160/21 |
|  | 22/13 23/1 24/12 | 94/25 95/4 95/6 | 8/15 17/20 28/16 | 160/25 168/12 |
| H | 25/3 28/21 34/20 | 95/8 95/9 95/13 | 32/20 36/7 37/16 | 189/11 197/4 |
| H-A-D-D-A-D [1] | 38/16 52/2 53/9 | 95/19 95/21 95/21 | 37/19 37/24 38/15 | 202/11 |
| 152/9 | 94/23 106/2 166/9 | 95/22 95/24 95/25 | 42/3 42/17 61/16 | hire [1] 159/11 |
| H-E-I- | 179/1 200/5 | 96/1 125/12 126/4 | 62/16 62/22 72/21 | hired [3] 68/19 |
| 17/ | handle [5] 9/7 | 126/8 138/10 158/9 | 83/4 83/5 83/24 | 192/24 193/7 |
| habitual [2] | 47/11 65/3 68/24 | 158/10 159/20 | 84/1 86/22 87/23 | his [16] 8/19 14/3 |
| 127/18 127/21 | 148/2 | 160/3 168/17 | 89/5 89/21 93/15 | 27/3 28/4 30/19 |
| had [71] 8/20 | handled [1] 115/19 | 184/13 184/14 | 102/5 102/18 | 32/14 62/15 83/3 |
| 11/23 12/7 13/13 | handling [3] 53/12 | 184/15 193/1 193/7 | 105/16 107/1 | 95/11 116/10 |
| 13/18 15/12 15/14 | 89/13 89/17 | 199/22 200/14 | 107/20 122/14 | 125/25 126/2 |
| 22/16 22/19 24/9 | handwritten [1] | 200/22 201/2 201/5 | 123/11 124/21 | 126/13 157/18 |
| 24/21 28/7 28/8 | 111/25 | 201/14 201/14 | 127/25 129/7 | 168/15 193/6 |
| 28/9 28/14 29/5 | happen [3] 9/4 | 201/15 201/17 | 131/12 132/4 | hitch [1] 10/22 |
| 42/14 43/3 44/6 | 32/6 110/24 | 201/18 202/3 | 134/17 141/7 141/7 | HOA [64] 7/18 |
| 46/5 46/19 47/8 | happened [14] | he's [24] 7/16 8/20 | 141/9 142/25 | 10/23 11/2 11/11 |
| 48/21 49/8 49/23 | 8/22 15/9 15/11 | 8/24 8/25 30/13 | 152/14 152/17 | 11/12 11/14 16/15 |
| 50/22 51/4 51/10 | 104/11 111/9 131/5 | 30/14 41/19 46/7 | 156/18 167/12 | 27/19 27/24 32/3 |
| 51/14 53/13 55/17 | 131/10 143/8 | 46/9 46/9 46/21 | 168/22 170/2 | 45/16 47/12 47/13 |
| 59/1 66/2 67/23 | 144/15 146/10 | 49/12 63/22 64/2 | 171/22 172/20 | 49/21 49/23 50/6 |
| 69/14 84/15 85/5 | 146/18 158/25 | 64/4 64/7 64/8 66/9 | 175/22 176/3 176/6 | 50/9 67/17 70/4 |
| 86/22 94/14 94/20 | 170/19 192/9 | 79/10 81/22 83/4 | 177/21 178/15 | 70/15 79/8 84/13 |

(15) group... - HOA

| H | 8/12 9/11 9/17 9/21 | 15/8 73/18 111/19 | 163/25 166/10 | 96/11 97/13 98/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [42] | 9/23 10/4 13/1 | 182/24 185/8 | 166/13 167/7 | 99/8 100/4 100/5 |
| $96 / 15110 / 2119 / 6$ | 14/23 15/12 30/6 | huh [4] 64/4 136/1 | 167/16 169/12 | 100/6 102/17 |
| 119/24 119/25 | 31/25 34/12 45/2 | 136/2 194/9 | 170/22 171/13 | 103/10 103/12 |
| 123/1 124/7 125/3 | 49/11 50/12 56/19 | hum [3] 74/15 | 171/25 174/6 175/7 | 106/13 107/4 107/7 |
| 125/5 126/17 128/4 | 59/7 59/9 60/15 | 189/21 194/17 | 175/7 175/12 | 107/7 107/7 107/17 |
| 128/18 130/22 | 61/11 62/6 62/9 | hundreds [2] 84/8 | 176/11 176/20 | 109/5 111/25 |
| 133/24 137/10 | 62/18 62/21 62/24 | 84/8 | 177/3 179/3 179/20 | 114/17 114/17 |
| 137/18 139/6 139/9 | 63/22 64/18 66/1 | hurt [1] 138/4 | 180/23 180/23 | 120/18 122/6 122/8 |
| 142/10 142/11 | 71/9 78/17 79/20 | hypothetically [1] | 181/3 181/7 181/25 | 125/10 125/12 |
| 147/4 148/12 | 80/20 81/1 81/25 | 9/3 | 183/5 183/24 186/3 | 127/4 127/4 128/14 |
| 148/21 149/5 | 82/11 83/9 90/11 | I | 188/13 189/5 | 129/25 130/10 |
| 149/11 149/17 | 141/11 141/18 |  | 191/10 191/11 | 130/17 132/16 |
| 149/20 151/8 | 141/24 176/21 | I'd [7] 7/11 61/11 | 192/16 194/5 194/7 | 133/4 134/9 140/13 |
| 151/12 153/3 156/8 | 189/11 193/5 | 66/23 73/2 79/22 | 194/23 196/13 | 145/22 146/25 |
| 157/18 159/14 | 199/14 199/15 | 90/11 151/23 | 196/20 199/8 | 147/9 147/22 |
| 174/14 174/16 | 203/4 203/19 | I'Il [18] 8/2 8/8 | 199/25 201/7 | 148/20 150/3 152/5 |
| 175/18 187/18 | 203/21 | 33/16 46/11 55/2 | I've [10] 44/14 | 157/25 158/24 |
| 188/24 189 | HONORA | 60/18 64/9 78/2 | 44/20 76/5 90/3 | 159/10 159/17 |
| 197/24 198/4 | 1/18 | 80/16 97/21 101/15 | 125/3 127/2 138/23 | 159/19 160/4 |
| HOA's [4] 72/10 | hope [1] | 106/20 107/11 | 139/3 161/11 | 160/13 160/15 |
| 72/12 72/25 75/6 | hopefully | 113/23 132/11 | 161/11 | 161/2 161/9 161/19 |
| HOAs [2] 138/21 | 66/17 | 155/9 163/18 | I-Y-A-D [1] 152/9 | 162/4 162/14 163/2 |
| 138/22 | hoping [4] 7/5 7/6 | 189/13 | i.e [1] 144/5 | 163/10 163/12 |
| hold [3] | 135/21 192 | I'm [136] 8/1 8/7 | identified [2] | 165/18 166/23 |
| 156/24 157/4 | hour [3] 81/24 | 23/20 24/5 25/5 | 30/15 186/9 | 168/7 170/25 |
|  | 141/12 141/13 | 25/11 26/7 28/22 | identify [3] 37 | 177/11 178/15 |
| 100/10 104/9 | hours [1] 8/21 | 29/6 30/7 32/8 36/1 | 101/17 106/4 | 179/1 181/15 |
| 113/13 113/16 | house [5] 23/10 | 36/22 38/5 39/6 | if [175] $8 / 58 / 19$ | 182/19 183/4 |
| 114/1 114/2 11 | 103/21 119/5 | 40/14 41/14 47/22 | 8/23 9/6 9/9 9/19 | 183/17 183/17 |
| 177/6 198/3 198/8 | 139/18 140/9 | 48/3 48/19 51/8 | 9/20 11/21 17/6 | 185/3 185/4 185/8 |
| holding [2] 124/6 | housekeeping [1] | 51/9 51/20 51/25 | 25/7 25/9 25/9 | 186/3 186/4 186/18 |
|  | 64/23 | 52/17 53/13 54/3 | 25/13 25/21 26/9 | 189/20 191/10 |
|  | Houston [3] | 54/22 54/25 55/5 | 26/16 27/24 29/6 | 193/11 199/2 201/2 |
| HOLTHUS [2] 2 | 195/22 199/23 | 57/15 60/16 61/19 | 31/13 32/22 33/6 | 201/14 201/22 |
| $6 / 18$ | 203/9 | 65/8 67/2 68/16 | 38/11 38/25 39/14 | imagine [2] 104/7 |
|  | how [52] 7/3 27/ | 69/18 69/21 70/25 | 39/25 42/14 42/20 | 173/7 |
|  | 35/21 47/11 50/3 | 71/3 71/16 72/16 | 42/24 43/2 44/6 | immediately [2] |
|  | 53/24 54/3 55/9 | 72/19 72/19 78/14 | 45/15 46/4 46/19 | 16/3 133/6 |
|  | 55/12 60/4 60/8 | 81/18 84/5 84/17 | 48/1 48/6 48/7 49/8 | impair [1] 41/9 |
|  | 60/17 66/14 67/18 | 86/11 87/1 87/19 | 50/3 50/3 50/19 | impermissible [2] |
|  | 69/5 70/21 72/10 | 88/18 91/24 93/17 | 51/4 51/14 51/19 | 90/12 90/18 |
|  | 74/2 74/2 74/13 | 93/20 96/21 96/23 | 51/25 54/21 54/23 | implied [2] 117/16 |
|  | 74/16 76/3 77/12 | 96/23 97/14 97/19 | 55/4 55/4 55/10 | 118/5 |
|  | 81/3 81/18 82/24 | 97/23 99/15 102/17 | 55/16 56/15 60/1 | import [1] 137/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { no } \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ | 85/12 105/23 | 104/11 106/9 107/4 | 60/3 60/25 62/14 | important [1] |
| homeow | 105/23 111/3 111/7 | 107/21 108/4 109/1 | 62/21 63/3 63/4 | 14/24 |
| $42 / 742$ | 121/11 123/5 | 112/17 115/5 117/6 | 64/2 64/6 65/7 65/8 | improve [1] 41/13 |
| 43/1 | 125/19 130/6 132/8 | 117/20 118/13 | 65/9 65/21 66/5 | in [439] |
| 46/19 47/5 54/21 | 133/13 142/21 | 119/15 121/1 | 66/11 66/18 67/7 | in-depth [2] |
| 70/18 96/5 103/15 | 146/12 148/2 153/2 | 121/25 123/16 | 68/7 74/4 74/24 | 125/20 125/22 |
| 117/18 131/18 | 180/6 184/18 | 124/3 125/7 132/7 | 75/18 76/13 77/1 | in-house [1] |
| 138/8 148/17 | 185/20 188/2 | 132/13 132/23 | 78/5 79/16 | 103/21 |
| 195/23 | 188/13 188/16 | 133/16 136/5 | 80/3 81/21 81/22 | inaction [3] 25/18 |
| homes [1] 69/5 | 188/23 190/5 190/6 | 136/23 137/22 | 81/22 83/14 88/12 | 25/22 27/25 |
| honesty [1] 18 | 191/4 192/14 | 137/23 138/3 141/7 | 89/9 89/12 91/7 | incidents [1] 8/21 |
| Honor [53] 6/7 | however [9] 10/21 | 142/5 145/6 145/15 | 91/7 94/18 94/21 | include [1] 150/18 |
| 6/20 6/22 6/25 7/10 | 11/15 14/4 14/18 | $\begin{array}{ll} 153 / 10 & 154 / 14 \\ 163 / 17 & 163 / 22 \end{array}$ | 95/16 95/24 96/9 | included [5] 15/19 |


| I | inheriting [2] | 80/9 98/16 98/22 | 69/11 69/19 72/1 | 193/25 195/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| included... [4] | 91/15 140/12 | 111/20 139/10 | 72/23 72/24 73/25 | January 24 [1] |
| (12/17 112/18 | initial [3] 22/13 | 142/18 142/22 | 73/25 74/11 74/23 | 190/21 |
| 150/25 169/17 | 22/16 123/15 | 143/5 164/9 190/12 | 74/24 74/24 75/14 | January 31 [1] |
| includes [1] 173/3 | initially [2] 27/3 | 204/8 | 76/2 76/2 76/3 76/8 | 122/20 |
| including [3] | 116/25 | investor [9] 97/ | 77/5 77/8 80/9 | January 4 [1] |
| 24/24 25/23 111/21 | input [1] 30/9 | 119/20 123/2 | 84/10 88/19 88/21 | 132/18 |
| incomplete [1] | inputted [1] 30/2 | 125/15 129/12 | 90/15 90/16 90/16 | job [12] 46/13 92/5 |
| 107/6 | inroads [1] 65/11 | 129/15 138/19 | 91/25 95/25 96/1 | 92/22 118/15 |
| incorporated [3] | inside [3] 198/14 | 140/13 140/14 | 105/9 108/25 112/7 | 119/18 121/6 |
| 32/19 156/3 156/19 | 198/23 199/10 | investors [16] | 114/21 116/21 | 129/14 134/2 |
| incorrect [1] | inspect [2] 198/14 | 85/5 97/8 119/2 | 117/23 117/24 | 135/24 141/7 |
| $196 / 22$ | 198/23 | 120/3 125/11 | 118/15 118/21 | 155/24 168/16 |
| incur [1] | instance [3] 91/12 | 126/19 127/6 | 118/24 119/1 120/9 | Johnna [1] 85/24 |
| incurred [1] | 133/18 173/7 | 127/15 127/19 | 120/16 122/19 | judge [4] 1/18 |
| 171/11 | instant [1] 174/3 | 128/22 129/10 | 122/24 122/24 | 1/19 65/2 129/2 |
| Indalecio [2] | instead [1] 55/19 | 134/4 137/13 | 122/25 134/9 | judge's [2] 127/9 |
| 110/18 110/20 | institution [3] | 139/21 140/11 | 134/12 136/13 | 140/4 |
| indeed [1] 183/16 | /3 16/5 182/22 | 140/12 | 137/3 145/6 145/17 | dgment [4] |
| independent [3] | instructions [1] | involuntary [1] | 152/8 153/3 153/13 | 31/12 32/12 32/20 |
| 179/7 179/17 | 199/5 | 23/17 | 153/15 156/18 | 120/6 |
| 198/22 | strument [2] | involve [1] 163/3 | 157/4 163/17 164/4 | judgments [1] |
| INDEX [1] 4/1 | 57/13 111/10 | involved [15] 10/9 | 165/23 168/15 | 103/24 |
| indicate [5] 35/1 | insurance [4] | 59/23 59/25 96/24 | 169/13 175/2 | judicial [7] 12/21 |
| 40/6 44/22 108/7 | 25/25 158/6 158/13 | 97/19 115/14 | 177/11 177/12 | 12/22 30/21 31/11 |
| 193/1 | 159/3 | 121/12 121/19 | 178/2 186/8 186/13 | 32/10 32/11 32/18 |
| indicated [4] | intend [1] 62/9 | 127/10 127/12 | 192/6 192/6 192/18 | jumps [1] 133/6 |
| 48/17 59/1 192/24 | intent [1] 72/25 | 153/24 154/2 | 199/23 | June [5] 172/4 |
| 204/7 | interest [32] 15/3 | 165/11 193/20 | item [2] 61/4 | 172/24 173/18 |
| indicates [4] | 23/5 23/13 23/16 | 195/21 | 143/3 | 174/24 177/6 |
| 107/17 108/12 | 24/3 24/9 33/7 | involving [5] | [1] | urisdiction [1] |
| 151/7 151/11 | 41/10 42/25 43/23 | 126/16 165/4 | its [17] 15/2 16/16 | 95/14 |
| indication [4] | 46/6 46/20 47/6 | 165/12 165/1 | 18/20 46/5 46/20 | jurisdictional [1] |
| 40/20 42/5 51/10 | 47/7 47/23 48/10 | is [411] | 47/6 47/23 48/9 | 95/6 |
| 59/23 | 48/15 48/16 48/21 | isn't [3] 12/22 | 48/15 97/5 137/4 | jury [1] 8/4 |
| individual [2] | 49/7 49/24 101/3 | 110/12 122/14 | 144/6 145/2 145/22 | just [94] 7/18 8/20 |
| 157/18 201/9 | 101/4 126/2 144/5 | ISOM [4] 1/24 | 148/7 155/5 155/7 | 8/21 14/1 28/8 |
| individuals [2] | 144/17 144/18 | 204/4 204/17 | itself [3] 117/24 | 30/11 34/1 34/21 |
| 99/5 115/21 | 151/13 159/18 | 204/1 | 118/25 121/3 | 35/25 36/2 40/20 |
| indulgence [2] | 159/20 169/22 | issue [17] 9/12 | Iyad [7] 96/19 | 43/10 44/1 49/3 |
| 141/3 190/25 | 201/14 | 14/23 33/3 33/3 | 97/17 124/22 | 50/6 54/3 54/23 |
| industry [3] | interested [1] 92/3 | 62/24 63/8 97/2 | 151/24 152/1 152/9 | 55/5 55/12 56/14 |
| 121/10 125/12 | Interesting [1] | 118/8 118/12 135/5 | 163/25 | 57/18 62/22 66/11 |
| 128/22 | 161/7 | 137/2 175/10 |  | 67/22 68/16 78/5 |
| information [34] | interests [1] 46/14 | 182/13 183/1 183/1 |  | 81/18 85/17 90/16 |
| 13/19 15/23 27/6 | internal [2] 42/2 | 192/24 201/14 | January [24] 11/2 | 91/7 91/24 97/6 |
| 29/17 30/8 30/9 | 42/3 | issues [5] 7/11 | 11/3 11/13 15/1 | 97/21 97/23 98/12 |
| 30/11 32/9 34/24 | internally [1] | 16/1 30/25 32/20 | 16/6 51/12 122/20 | 99/11 104/1 105/20 |
| 42/23 42/24 52/15 | 134/2 | 140/23 | 123/6 132/18 | 106/4 106/14 |
| 52/16 52/16 54/9 | interpretation [1] | it [355] | 145/19 146/23 | 106/25 113/3 |
| 88/7 88/8 103/22 | 72/21 | it's [94] 18/16 | 147/14 149/13 | 113/23 117/10 |
| 108/15 110/3 | interrupts [2] | 25/18 27/9 29/8 | 150/7 156/6 156/10 | 118/21 118/22 |
| 142/17 142/17 | 119/14 171/17 | 31/9 33/9 33/23 | 162/20 172/8 | 119/2 119/12 |
| 142/21 142/23 | into [24] 10/11 | 36/25 37/22 50/14 | 189/19 190/21 | 119/18 120/9 |
| 143/5 145/8 167/22 | 19/17 21/18 30/6 | 51/14 52/23 55/4 | 193/3 193/25 195/7 | 120/10 120/16 |
| 172/3 197/7 197/11 | 30/18 32/19 32/22 | 55/5 59/14 59/20 | 197/6 | 120/17 120/20 |
| 197/14 197/23 | 44/19 65/11 71/3 | 60/15 63/7 65/6 | January 14 [1] | 121/1 121/4 122/19 |
| 198/2 198/6 | 73/10 75/17 80/4 | 67/24 68/7 69/3 | 11/2 <br> January 18 [2] | 123/9 124/16 |

(17) included... - just

| J | 88/8 88/22 96/18 | 139/1 139/8 140/6 | 195/17 195/18 | 90/20 95/6 133/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| just... [35] 125/15 | 96/19 124/16 | 141/5 150/19 151/2 | 195/18 195/19 | 163/11 163/12 |
| 127/1 127/18 129/3 | 129/11 152/16 | 154/13 156/11 | 197/24 | 176/5 176/10 |
| 130/12 137/2 137/3 | 157/23 161/13 | 157/7 157/17 158/1 | Koenig's [8] 87/22 | 176/16 176/24 |
| 137/18 138/1 138/3 | 174/22 175/5 | 159/9 160/9 160/21 | 89/22 91/21 91/22 | 182/11 182/23 |
| 138/11 139/8 | 175/10 177/5 | 161/19 163/11 | 104/18 113/12 | lawsuit [8] 90/8 |
| 145/11 148/14 | 197/11 197/14 | 163/12 167/15 | 113/24 115/3 | 126/9 140/12 |
| 148/23 150/5 |  |  | L | 174/3 |
| 153/24 157/17 | knew [2] 13/21 | 171/22 175/14 | L-E-P-O-N-A [1] | 194/3 |
| 158/8 163/16 164/4 | knew [2] 13/21 13/21 | 176/7 176/18 177/5 | 85/24 | lawsuits [6] 91/16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | knock [1] 7/7 | 177/8 177/11 | L-E-S [1] 176/23 | 92/9 92/13 92/18 |
| $170 / 5170 / 15$ | know [164] 9/4 | 177/11 180/5 180/6 | La [1] 84/22 | 126/16 126/22 |
| 177/11 190/18 | 25/3 28/18 30/8 | 183/17 185/19 | labor [1] 41/12 | lawyer [5] 84/17 |
| 193/11 193/15 | 31/12 33/14 38/19 | 185/20 187/22 | lack [1] 30/7 | 84/18 94/3 159/18 |
| 200/12 200/23 | 46/3 46/17 47/14 | 189/5 190/5 190/13 | lacking [1] 30/12 | 164/22 |
| 201/18 202/19 | 47/15 49/1 50/2 | 190/17 192/6 | Ladies [1] 9/24 | LDRS [3] 20/6 20/9 |
| justified [2] | 50/3 55/10 55/12 | 197/12 199/2 | land [1] 102/7 | 20/12 |
| 180/17 180/19 | 55/25 56/9 59/16 | 199/10 199/12 | language [18] | leading [1] 14/20 |
| justifies [1] 180/15 | 60/9 60/17 65/8 | 199/24 200/13 | 117/10 117/22 | leads [1] 116/10 |
| justify [1] 178/25 | 65/24 70/24 75/10 | 201/15 201/15 | 117/23 118/10 | leafing [1] 105/21 |
| K |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 119/12 120/14 |  |
| K-A-L-L-F-E-L-Z | 79/3 79/10 81/4 | 47/25 48/18 49/1 | 120/17 120/18 | 114/8 114/23 |
|  | 81/21 88/19 89/7 | 50/11 52/4 52/18 | 120/20 120/25 | 135/21 161/22 |
|  | 89/8 89/9 89/11 | 75/23 90/16 109/24 | 121/2 121/3 121/5 | 174/23 177/6 |
| KALLFELZ [3] 67/3 | 89/12 89/16 90/1 | 167/22 178/5 178/6 | 121/7 | 183/19 192/10 |
| 67/10 67/11 | 90/17 92/4 92/8 | 178/10 178/11 | large [1] 104/13 | leave [5] 9/5 |
| keep [5] 10/20 | 94/14 94/17 94/18 | 179/23 183/14 | largest [1] 136/24 | 113/19 115/1 115/7 |
| 10/21 20/24 50/7 | 95/16 95/24 96/9 | knowledgeable [2] | LAS [12] 2/9 6/1 | 136/19 |
| 94/1 | 96/11 96/23 99/6 | 55/14 187/23 | 10/7 23/6 85/9 | leaving [2] 8/24 |
| kept [5] 19/25 20/4 | 99/7 104/10 104/23 | known [4] 13/14 | 124/3 169/17 | 8/25 |
| 29/23 29/24 148/12 | 105/1 105/7 105/15 | 23/5 85/9 125/2 | 171/24 173/17 | lectern [3] 9/18 |
| Kerbow [40] 93/19 | 105/17 110/5 | knows [3] 16/1 | 181/2 182/9 186/21 | 9/22 9/23 |
| 93/22 93/23 94/11 | 110/11 110/15 | 127/24 171/4 | Las Vegas [10] | ledger [3] 77/5 |
| 95/13 96/3 96/9 | 110/23 112/5 | Koenig [60] 63/17 | 10/7 23/6 85/9 | 78/7 147/2 |
| 96/17 115/11 | 112/21 112/22 | 84/4 84/12 84/25 | 124/3 169/17 | left [16] 20/19 |
| 115/14 116/1 116/4 | 113/10 115/5 | 85/2 85/4 85/19 | 171/24 173/17 | 21/23 22/2 22/13 |
| 116/11 157/14 | 116/17 116/25 | 86/10 86/22 87/5 | 181/2 182/9 186/21 | 23/1 23/21 23/23 |
| 157/17 157/21 | 117/23 119/12 | 87/9 89/3 89/16 | last [13] 8/16 8/21 | 34/20 38/16 52/2 |
| 157/23 158/7 | 120/14 120/22 | 91/24 92/1 94/4 | 20/17 61/6 67/11 | 53/9 109/7 154/7 |
| 158/14 158/22 | 121/11 121/14 | 94/16 95/3 95/16 | 73/10 84/23 117/3 | 166/9 177/17 179/1 |
| 159/17 159/24 | 122/9 122/14 | 96/4 96/17 97/4 | 131/6 181/14 | left-hand [11] |
| 160/15 161/6 | 122/21 125/10 | 97/17 97/20 99/16 | 181/18 199/23 | 20/19 21/23 22/2 |
| 161/10 161/23 | 127/4 127/20 | 100/11 103/6 106/8 | 199/25 | 22/13 23/1 34/20 |
| 184/12 192/24 | 127/23 127/24 | 106/15 107/13 | late [4] 149/7 | 38/16 52/2 53/9 |
| 193/7 195/17 196/5 | 128/10 128/11 | 107/18 108/8 | 149/7 163/17 | 166/9 179/1 |
| 196/7 200/6 200/12 | 128/17 128/17 | 108/17 110/1 | 185/19 | legal [28] 13/10 |
| 200/18 201/13 | 128/19 129/3 | 110/19 111/22 | later [3] 13/15 | 44/17 44/18 46/1 |
| 202/1 202/17 | 129/11 129/17 | 112/11 112/18 | 193/1 198/23 | 46/8 47/1 59/19 |
| 202/25 203/8 | 129/19 130/7 | 113/11 114/24 | latest [2] 58/22 | 88/10 88/13 89/12 |
| Kerbow's [2] | 130/12 130/24 | 124/6 126/1 131/21 | 58/24 | 115/18 132/15 |
| 94/21 95/2 | 133/4 134/9 135/16 | 132/17 133/8 | law [28] 2/17 3/3 | 138/21 157/21 |
| KIM [4] 67/3 67/10 | 136/25 137/12 | 133/17 137/6 142/9 | 14/4 15/4 45/19 | 157/23 159/13 |
| 67/10 67/15 | 137/13 137/14 | 142/19 147/24 | 45/24 45/25 46/2 | 159/23 161/15 |
| kind [19] 38/25 | 138/7 138/10 | 148/7 148/12 | 46/10 46/22 47/16 | 165/8 165/9 165/11 |
| 42/7 43/17 50/9 | 138/11 138/17 | 158/25 159/1 159/6 | $\begin{aligned} & 57 / 984 / 1384 / 15 \\ & 84 / 2084 / 2184 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | 186/2 187/3 187/4 |


| L | 189/23 190/3 | 78/7 78/11 79/22 | listing [4] 46/9 | 48/6 49/3 51/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| legal... [4] 187/16 | 190/10 190/20 | 83/1 84/9 86/13 | 46/9 180/9 183/20 | 61/6 71/1 71/14 |
| 188/3 188/8 197/9 | letter [12] 38/25 | 87/15 89/4 90/11 | lists [2] 105/11 | 78/2 78/5 78/11 |
| legislature [1] | 75/15 76/18 98/24 | 92/21 93/13 99/12 | 176/10 | 86/2 87/4 97/4 |
| $182 / 21$ | 99/2 99/3 99/8 | 99/18 99/22 104/23 | litigants [1] 161/3 | 109/5 116/13 119/4 |
| legitimate [1] | 99/10 99/14 99/20 | 107/16 110/12 | litigate [2] 160/21 | 122/22 131/23 |
| 183/16 | 143/23 168/13 | 112/11 117/9 | 190/6 | 142/4 144/7 147/1 |
| lend [1] 22/4 | letterhead [1] | 117/10 118/14 | litigation [29] | 147/9 147/22 150/3 |
| lender [13] 20/6 | 142/19 | 122/14 123/4 | 17/18 17/23 85/4 | 150/9 150/20 |
| 37/23 41/5 41/5 | lettering [1] | 123/11 124/1 | 85/15 85/17 95/8 | 162/22 166/8 167/5 |
| 41/10 41/11 52/23 | 116/22 | 125/17 126/10 | 95/9 95/14 95/17 | 167/5 171/5 177/12 |
| 54/24 55/7 56/4 | letters [3] 20/6 | 127/1 127/7 128/9 | 95/19 95/24 96/5 | 177/21 178/15 |
| 56/5 56/17 158/1 | 98/22 132/14 | 128/11 128/12 | 96/20 97/20 98/4 | 179/1 180/5 183/4 |
| lending [2] 56/6 | liability [4] 73/12 | 128/14 129/1 129/3 | 121/19 121/21 | 185/4 185/9 186/18 |
| $56 / 17$ | 163/24 164/10 | 129/5 129/25 130/1 | 122/3 122/12 126/9 | 194/8 194/15 |
| lengthy [2] 7/16 | 164/12 | 130/8 130/11 | 139/23 140/1 | 194/16 195/1 199/4 |
| 170/7 | library [1] 135/13 | 133/18 134/1 134/5 | 160/18 162/7 162/9 | 199/7 201/3 |
| Lepona [1] 85/24 | licensed [1] | 135/12 138/7 | 163/3 182/12 | looked [9] 34/21 |
| Les [4] 176/11 | 115/23 | 138/10 145/6 147/7 | 190/15 190/23 | 44/20 77/9 89/14 |
| 176/17 176/23 | lie [1] 173/13 | 149/13 151/23 | litigations [1] 18/1 | 111/19 142/13 |
| 176/24 | lien [63] 11/1 11/8 | 152/16 154/22 | little [10] 8/20 | 151/2 161/2 168/10 |
| less [3] 74/8 | 12/8 12/13 15/25 | 156/5 157/13 | 29/5 88/19 136/15 | looking [34] 19/1 |
| 123/20 189/22 | 16/2 16/4 16/7 16/8 | 161/21 162/22 | 142/13 145/5 | 19/13 29/12 36/6 |
| let [29] $8 / 20$ 25/3 | 16/15 16/16 26/4 | 164/13 165/9 | 145/18 162/3 | 54/15 66/6 70/25 |
| 25/19 28/18 42/10 | 26/5 26/9 27/24 | 165/10 169/20 | 178/18 185/10 | 72/16 99/15 105/8 |
| 72/11 87/4 91/3 | 41/9 42/21 42/24 | 170/1 172/2 172/11 | live [2] 9/9 153/23 | 106/9 107/21 |
| 109/16 110/15 | 43/4 43/18 44/9 | 174/5 174/19 | lively [1] 189/18 | 107/24 108/4 109/1 |
| 124/19 135/16 | 45/16 72/4 72/6 | 174/19 177/4 | living [3] 17/17 | 110/10 111/17 |
| 139/8 153/7 154/5 | 72/8 72/13 72/21 | 179/18 179/19 | 84/2 153/9 | 112/21 113/3 113/9 |
| 154/13 156/4 | 73/1 73/20 98/8 | 182/10 183/7 | LLC [12] 2/15 6/11 | 115/4 115/5 122/9 |
| 160/20 163/15 | 98/10 98/18 98/20 | 185/13 185/14 | 13/3 86/10 163/24 | 122/23 123/24 |
| 166/23 167/15 | 98/25 99/1 99/12 | 187/7 187/14 | 196/14 196/20 | 131/15 132/7 132/8 |
| 168/9 175/19 | 100/1 100/4 100/9 | 187/22 188/8 | 196/21 200/3 200/9 | 149/4 149/19 |
| 177/21 178/16 | 100/15 102/12 | 189/18 201/19 | 200/23 202/18 | 154/17 161/8 |
| 189/11 199/8 | 102/16 103/16 | likelihood [1] | LLP [1] 2/4 | 178/21 194/15 |
| 199/24 201/15 | 117/19 120/6 | 156/15 | Ioan [13] 22/7 | looks [32] 70/5 |
| let's [58] 6/8 9/19 | 132/18 136/4 136/7 | likely [2] 186/13 | 22/15 23/18 24/2 | 70/6 78/7 86/13 |
| 18/14 22/11 22/25 | 136/8 136/17 143/1 | 186/14 | 24/10 24/23 29/17 | 89/4 98/7 99/18 |
| 25/2 28/17 37/15 | 143/13 143/23 | limited [5] 25/24 | 34/25 35/21 38/9 | 99/22 105/13 |
| 38/14 39/5 40/24 | 143/23 143/24 | 69/16 163/24 | 47/18 52/15 183/5 | 105/20 107/6 109/5 |
| 41/1 58/25 61/21 | 169/19 171/12 | 164/10 164/12 | loans [1] 47/12 | 112/10 117/9 123/4 |
| 66/18 71/1 71/14 | 171/13 176/13 | line [10] 10/12 | locate [1] 107/5 | 123/11 124/1 145/6 |
| 71/15 71/22 73/10 | 176/16 178/7 182/8 | 18/25 22/5 22/10 | located [1] 10/7 | 147/7 149/13 |
| 73/24 74/9 82/17 | 183/6 | 29/18 43/7 43/11 | locater [1] 186/6 | 154/16 154/22 |
| 87/12 98/6 98/23 | lienholders [2] | 43/12 43/16 43/24 | location [1] 186/24 | 156/5 157/13 |
| 100/18 101/9 | 32/14 101/6 | list [14] 102/8 | locked [3] 65/19 | 164/13 172/2 174/5 |
| 111/15 115/9 | liens [9] 11/11 | 105/15 105/17 | 65/22 65/23 | 174/19 175/2 |
| 122/13 131/12 | 41/2 41/17 41/20 | 105/18 106/16 | logistical [1] 7/11 | 179/18 179/19 |
| 135/25 150/4 158/5 | 41/20 41/21 41/24 | 107/1 107/2 116/15 | long [8] 33/6 66/14 | 201/19 |
| 158/8 158/24 | 42/12 43/25 | 144/10 144/20 | 66/16 81/25 94/16 | lose [1] 132/15 |
| 159/16 165/17 | lieu [2] 73/19 | 151/5 174/11 | 130/13 188/10 | losing [1] 130/25 |
| 167/12 169/5 | 140/10 | 175/22 175/25 | 197/2 | lost [3] 129/20 |
| 169/10 170/14 | life [1] 131/5 | listed [14] 11/19 | longer [7] 27/10 | 130/6 130/8 |
| 171/4 174/5 176/9 | light [1] 116/4 | 12/16 37/17 37/20 | 58/21 63/13 79/10 | lot [23] 33/7 52/14 |
| 177/10 178/4 | like [89] 7/11 | 57/20 61/22 102/24 | 79/11 93/24 192/15 | 73/12 73/18 74/6 |
| 178/17 178/18 | 21/23 33/5 34/4 | 104/5 104/8 106/14 | longest [1] 63/23 | 74/8 74/13 74/14 |
| 179/14 184/4 | 57/18 61/11 66/23 | 106/22 114/4 173/3 | look [51] 37/16 | 84/3 84/7 84/9 92/6 |
| 184/17 185/10 | 70/5 70/6 77/12 | 176/1 | 41/1 48/1 48/2 48/3 | 92/22 95/23 106/17 |


| L | 106/6 108/5 110/25 | 102/11 | 29/17 30/24 34/4 | medical [1] 22/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| lot... [8] 112/3 | 111/3 113/20 | March 25 [1] | 37/19 42/10 48/7 | meet [2] 25/9 |
| 113/16 128/6 | 114/24 114/25 | 102/8 | 51/25 52/20 53/17 | 80/24 |
| 138/24 184/21 | 115/7 116/15 | March 26 [1] | 54/14 54/23 67/15 | meeting [1] 7/19 |
| 188/11 189/19 | 144/10 144/20 | 48/18 | 72/11 75/13 84/6 | member [3] 89/13 |
| 189/22 | 144/24 144/24 | March 28 [1] | 85/25 87/4 89/25 | 89/16 183/9 |
| lots [3] 182/12 | 145/10 151/5 | 58/15 | 90/10 91/3 92/4 | members [5] |
| 190/18 190/18 | mailings [4] 10 | March 29 [1] | 97/5 97/13 101/17 | 71/17 74/13 74/16 |
| low [1] 140/24 | 107/23 109/9 | 110/17 | 102/17 106/4 107/4 | 74/17 74/19 |
| lower [5] 14/20 | 114/22 | March 3 [2] 10/1 | 107/7 107/10 | memory [2] 131/4 |
| 28/21 128/15 130/7 | mails [1] 14 | 21/19 | 109/16 110/8 | 150/6 |
| 131/1 | [1] 92/4 | marked [2] 5/2 | 110/15 113/17 | mention [2] 28/6 |
| lowest [1] 22/21 | maintain [3] 25/24 | 176/8 | 118/18 122/7 123/5 | 92/8 |
| Ltd [2] 38/17 38/20 | 26/1 41/13 | market [11] 11/6 | 124/19 129/5 | mentioned [ |
| luck [1] 138/3 | maintenance [1] | 139/20 140/19 | 129/21 131/5 131/7 | 122/19 |
| lunch [4] 81/15 | 71/23 | 178/22 178/23 | 139/8 145/11 153/7 | menu [1] 14 |
| 81/16 82/10 82/12 | make [20] 11/ | 178/24 179/6 | 154/5 154/13 156/4 | merge [2] 116/21 |
| lurking [1] 183/14 | 25/13 27/7 32/2 | 179/10 179/12 | 157/7 160/20 | 117/12 |
| M | 61/11 65/10 80/6 | Marshal [2] 9/20 | 166/23 167/15 | 116/22 131 |
| ma'am [7] 9/18 | 92/5 104/4 117/24 | 66/25 | 170/25 173/2 | 132/1 |
| 12/25 68/12 71/7 | 118/1 118/21 | Mary [1] 11 | 175/19 177/21 | messing [1] |
| 77/25 80/21 80/23 | 118/22 118/24 | match [1] 112/1 | 178/3 178/16 180/1 | 160/23 |
| Madam [1] 137/23 | 125/17 134/2 | materials [1] | 183/7 183/13 185/4 | met [5] 9/9 124/23 |
| made [13] 11/10 | 185/18 | 41/13 | 185/8 185/19 189/1 | 124/24 124/25 |
| 35/2 35/4 92/1 | makes [1] 34/5 | matter [9] 7/16 | 193/12 193/15 | 125/3 |
| 110/5 110/21 | making [2] 59/1 | 17/16 32/5 50/23 | 197/17 199/8 | method [1] 59/24 |
| 111/12 117/15 | 173/6 | 64/24 79/17 97/22 | 199/24 201/15 | Michael [5] 157/12 |
| 134/4 134/20 | man [3] 61/23 | 129/12 204/6 | mean [55] 9/3 9/4 | 158/8 165/2 195/12 |
| 139/22 149/12 | 184/24 187/13 | matters [2] 129/13 | 9/8 29/8 30/24 32/1 | 197/1 |
| 170/7 | manage [3] 68/15 | 160/21 | 33/5 33/22 51/3 | middle [3] 20/19 |
| magnifying [1] | 156/1 156/2 | maximize [2] | 52/12 54/22 54/24 | 22/18 186/25 |
| 163/19 | management [5] | 135/8 135/19 | 54/25 56/12 65/6 | midway [1] 132/8 |
| mail [29] 15/14 | 67/17 142/10 147/3 | may [33] 12/16 | 65/16 77/4 80/8 | might [12] 28/16 |
| 39/14 57/11 59/22 | 148/17 177/13 | 14/7 22/9 25/9 41/5 | 90/10 90/18 91/1 | 31/9 31/20 54/16 |
| 98/15 99/19 101/23 | manager [15] 6/21 | 41/12 41/21 56/13 | 94/9 106/17 106/18 | 65/14 66/4 89/21 |
| 102/19 103/6 103/7 | 67/21 68/15 68/21 | 56/13 62/21 68/9 | 110/8 112/17 | 103/25 121/19 |
| 103/14 103/18 | 68/23 78/12 78/15 | 95/25 96/1 96/1 | 113/15 113/16 | 122/21 130/1 |
| 104/15 104/18 | 78/23 79/5 79/8 | 97/1 97/22 111/9 | 113/17 113/19 | 172/18 |
| 105/9 106/15 | 79/10 163/25 | 113/21 118/7 | 120/16 120/22 | Mike [1] 65/25 |
| 108/17 108/17 | 196/13 196/20 | 118/11 120/12 | 121/21 122/5 | Miley [1] 65/2 |
| 109/22 110/6 | 196/24 | 129/17 132/10 | 125/18 127/1 127/3 | mind [3] 107/4 |
| 110/21 111/13 | manages [1] 79/11 | 132/15 133/7 133/7 | 127/9 128/1 128/1 | 121/5 133/6 |
| 113/25 114/5 | managing [1] | 133/15 138/24 | 129/1 131/11 | minimis [1] 175/6 |
| 114/19 116/21 | 183/9 | 172/18 172/18 | 135/10 136/11 | Minnesota [3] |
| 143/1 143/14 | manner [1] 26/2 | 193/5 193/8 193/8 | 136/22 139/16 | 39/15 109/14 151/4 |
| 144/20 | manually [1] | May 2012 [1] | 141/2 143/15 159/9 | minor [1] 64/23 |
| mailed [14] 54/7 | 111/8 | 12/16 | 159/10 163/10 | minute [3] 28/16 |
| 98/19 105/10 | many [11] 7/4 | maybe [10] 34/8 | 180/1 180/2 184/18 | 110/11 186/17 |
| 105/22 109/6 | 21/3 53/24 54/3 | 64/6 81/23 130/6 | 187/14 | minutes [4] 66/17 |
| 109/12 111/14 | 69/5 74/13 74/16 | 158/21 169/9 | means [2] 91/8 | 141/12 141/13 |
| 111/22 114/16 | 90/3 97/6 184/18 | 172/11 172/15 | 144/1 | 185/18 |
| 115/6 144/16 | 191/4 | 177/1 185/8 | meant [1] 71/21 | misrepresent [3] |
| 144/18 145/13 | March [9] 10/13 <br> 11/14 21/19 37/7 | MCCARTHY [2] 2/4 $6 / 18$ | measure [1] $138 / 3$ mechanical [1] | 168/25 169/2 169/4 $\text { missed [1] } 103 / 25$ |
| $145 / 22$ | 48/18 58/15 102/8 | me [80] 6/17 7/18 | mechanical [1] $33 / 12$ | missing [1] 80/15 |
| 57/11 59/22 88/11 <br> 100/17 101/5 105/2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102/11 110/17 } \\ & \text { March } 20 \text { [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 / 2417 / 2320 / 3 \\ & 25 / 3 \quad 25 / 1928 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mediations [1] } \\ & 18 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { misspellings [1] } \\ & 142 / 25 \end{aligned}$ |

(20) lot... - misspellings

| M |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| misstates [2] |  | 178/13 182/7 1 |  |  |
| 101/13 202/7 | 72 | 184/12 192/23 | 161/10 161/23 |  |
| oment [6] 37/ | most [9] 14/24 | 192/24 193/7 | 184/12 192/2 | 126/1 138/20 |
| /22 107/12 | 21/3 45/23 56/16 | 193/11 196/7 | 193/7 196/7 200/ | N |
| 107/16 181/15 | 142/23 186/13 | 200/23 202/1 | 202/25 203/ | 14 |
| 191/1 | $186 / 14$ | 202/17 202/25 | Mr. Kerbow's [2] | 20/3 |
| moments [2] 93/4 | motion [5] 177/25 | 203/8 203/8 | 94/21 95/2 | /17 53/10 67/8 |
| 130/21 | 178/6 178/15 | Mr. Alessi [9] | Mr. Marshal [1] | 67/10 67/11 78/25 |
| 1] $122 / 15$ | 181/15 182/18 | 63/16 63/21 64/25 | 9/20 | 83/15 86/14 88/10 |
| ${ }_{\text {Mondays [1] }}$ | move [12] 21/9 | 82/2 83/23 93/10 | Mr. Ryan [2] 93/19 | 93/25 115/20 152/6 |
| 110/12 |  |  |  |  |
| money [13] 22/3 | 25/2 28/17 30/5 $36 / 1650 / 1287 / 15$ | 101/12 $141 / 5$ 142/4 Mr. Alexander [4] | Mr. Vilkin [4] | $157 / 15204 / 14$ |
| 43/10 43/12 56/18 | 90/11 116/5 155/2 | 168/9 168/25 | 64/25 141/6 199/20 | named [2] 115/21 |
| $14$ | 166/2 178/17 | 178/13 182/7 | 200/23 | 167/18 |
| 188/21 188/23 | Moving [1] 23/8 | Mr. Edwards [29] | Ms. [1] 110/20 | narrow [1] 173/10 |
| 190/6 190/19 | Mr [2] 17/14 | 10/17 18/13 19/17 | Ms. Indalecio [1] | NATIONAL [21] |
| month [3] 11/3 | 115/13 | 19/22 20/14 21/18 | 110/20 | 1/9 17/18 17/21 |
| 68/25 190/16 | Mr. [123] 8/15 | 22/4 22/7 23/13 | much [11] 48/10 | 18/7 18/12 |
| monthly [3] 10/15 | 9/20 10/17 13/12 | 24/21 25/13 26/14 | 70/21 75/14 121/11 | 36/9 37/25 52/23 |
| 70/18 70/21 | 13/18 18/13 18/24 | 26/24 26/25 27/1 | 123/5 141/8 188/16 | 石/3 104/20 |
| months [10] 16/2 | 19/10 19/17 19/22 | 27/10 27/14 27/25 | 188/23 190/5 190/6 | 106/22 107/18 |
| 16/8 16/12 16/12 | 20/14 21/18 22/4 | 28/3 28/5 28/11 | 192/14 | 108/9 112/11 |
| 50/6 149/15 172/11 | 22/7 23/13 24/21 | 31/19 32/14 36/13 | multiple [2] 95/6 | 112/13 112/18 |
| 172/15 182/22 | 25/13 26/14 26/24 | 40/21 41/17 41/23 | 200/13 | 113/6 114/12 |
| 198/22 | 26/25 27/1 27/10 | 43/10 147/5 | my [86] | 194/20 |
| more [18] 40/20 | 27/14 27/25 28/3 | Mr. Edwards' | 19/24 31/9 | natural [ |
| 91/11 104/23 110/3 | 28/5 28/10 28/11 | 34/25 37/4 | 32/10 32/25 36/2 | nature [2] 126/12 |
| 112/4 113/21 | 29/1 30/13 31/19 | Mr. George [1] | 38/24 39/13 46/8 | 171/11 |
| 122/22 125/11 | 32/14 34/16 34/25 | 36/9 | 46/24 47/8 47/10 | ND [5] 36/9 37/25 |
| 136/15 140/4 | 36/7 36/9 36/13 | Mr. Haddad [28] | 47/25 48/3 48/6 | 57/24 103/4 106/22 |
| 140/14 141/6 | 37/4 40/21 41/17 | 13/12 13/18 81/7 | 48/18 49/1 50/11 | ar [1] 37/22 |
| 145/18 169/12 | 41/23 43/10 45/6 | 81/12 81/23 82/1 | 52/4 52/12 52/18 | necessarily [4] |
| 172/22 189/3 189/9 | 50/19 57/2 59/13 | 82/23 96/18 96/22 | 56/9 60/20 61/16 | 92/1 120/15 163/4 |
| 189/9 | 63/16 63/21 64/25 | 97/2 97/21 97/23 | 75/23 77/16 78/6 | 163/5 |
| morning | 64/25 81/7 81/12 | 124/23 124/24 | 83/2 84/23 85/14 | necessary [1] 32/9 |
| 6/7 6/22 6/23 8/19 | 81/23 82/1 82/2 | 124/25 125/11 | 85/21 85/24 86/5 | cessity [1] 9/5 |
| 10/4 10/5 13/1 | 82/23 83/23 93/10 | 125/25 126/3 126/8 | 87/7 89/18 90/3 | need [20] 9/10 |
| 17/14 17/15 45/6 | 93/19 93/22 94/11 | 126/11 126/25 | 90/20 91/11 102/2 | 9/18 31/15 32/16 |
| 45/7 67/15 67/23 | 94/21 95/2 95/13 | 127/10 130/25 | 109/12 110/12 | 32/19 33/14 33/21 |
| 77/25 83/23 83/25 | 96/3 96/17 96/18 | 152/13 183/7 | 116/2 120/18 |  |
| mortgage [33] | 96/19 96/22 97/2 | 192/23 193/11 | 124/14 127/2 | 48/11 57/19 62/7 |
| 18/10 18/13 23/11 | 97/21 97/23 101/12 | 203/8 | 127/13 131/5 |  |
| 52/14 72/8 73/19 | 115/14 116/1 116/4 | ${ }_{\text {Mr. Hazel }}$ [1] | 136/13 137/8 | 163/19 |
| 121/15 126/5 128/5 | $116 / 11124 / 22$ | 28/10 <br> Mr. Heifner [11] | 138/11 140/2 $140 / 25141 / 10$ | 163/19 |
| 129/8 133/9 133/22 | $\begin{aligned} & 124 / 23124 / 24 \\ & 124 / 25125 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | Mr. Heifner [11] $8 / 15$ 18/24 19/10 | $\begin{aligned} & 140 / 25141 / 10 \\ & 143 / 22145 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | needed [1] 8/24 |
| 133/23 134/22 | $125 / 25 \text { 126/3 126/8 }$ | 29/1 30/13 34/16 | 145/16 150/6 | 14/19 |
| $134 / 24136 / 5136 / 9$ $136 / 18171 / 24$ | 126/11 126/25 | 36/7 45/6 50/19 | 150/17 151/6 152/9 | NEVADA [51] $1 / 7$ |
| $136 / 18171 / 24$ $172 / 19$ $172 / 25$ | 127/10 130/25 | 57/2 59/13 | 153/12 157/7 158/2 | 6/1 10/7 13/10 14/5 |
| 172/19 172/25 | 141/5 141/6 142 | Mr. Iyad [3] 96/ | 159/3 162/25 | 15/4 15/5 23/6 |
| 173/3 173/9 173/17 $175 / 23176 / 25$ | 147/5 151/24 | 124/22 151/24 | 164/18 164/23 | 35/22 42/20 45/20 |
| $175 / 23176 / 25$ $177 / 6178 / 14181 / 6$ | 152/13 157/14 | Mr. Kerbow [26] | 167/3 167/22 168/ | 85/10 90/20 91/13 |
| $177 / 6178 / 14181 / 6$ $181 / 10181 / 24$ | 157/17 157/21 | 93/22 94/11 95/13 | 168/15 170/22 | 93/23 94/11 94/15 |
| 181/10 181/24 | 157/23 158/14 | 96/3 96/17 115/14 | 171/1 173/8 176/1 | 94/19 95/7 95/7 |
|  | 158/22 159/24 | 116/1 116/4 116/1 | 178/3 178/9 184/13 | 95/15 96/24 115/23 |
| $\underset{133 / 5}{\operatorname{mortgagee}} \text { [1] }$ | 161/10 161/23 | 157/17 157/21 | 184/14 197/1 204 | $\begin{aligned} & 116 / 6121 / 10124 / 3 \\ & 128 / 3133 / 14 \end{aligned}$ |


| N | 106/2 108/14 109/4 | 59/2 145/2 145/23 | 105/21 106/7 | November 7 [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NEVADA... [23] | 109/4 111/2 112/6 | not [210] | 106/16 107/2 | 182/4 |
| NEVADA... [23] 136/25 138/21 | 117/2 118/4 118/16 | notarized [2] | 107/19 107/22 | now [38] 12/20 |
| 161/15 | 118/19 119/7 | 98/19 99/9 | 108/8 108/17 109/6 | 19/24 20/16 22/3 |
| 169/17 171/25 | 119/10 119/18 | notations [1] | 110/6 110/17 | 27/21 27/22 33/20 |
| 173/18 181/2 182/9 | 121/2 121/16 | 179/19 | 111/23 112/10 | 34/22 35/24 36/2 |
| 182/20 182/25 | 124/11 125/18 | note [20] 6/8 | 112/19 112/20 | 38/14 47/17 48/2 |
| 182/25 186/2 | 125/25 126/1 126/6 | 10/12 10/17 12/23 | 112/24 113/1 113/7 | 53/24 61/15 63/10 |
| 186/21 187/2 187/4 | 126/14 129/10 | 19/15 19/16 19/22 | 113/8 113/14 | 65/4 70/22 76/22 |
| 187/15 188/3 188/8 | 129/11 130/16 | 19/24 19/25 20/4 | 113/14 113/25 | 81/15 81/20 85/3 |
| 191/22 197/9 204/2 | 131/8 131/9 133/15 | 20/20 24/23 34/25 | 114/13 114/16 | 86/5 111/17 112/3 |
| 204/15 | 135/1 137/12 | 35/18 37/11 54/23 | 115/10 116/10 | 112/11 123/18 |
| never [13] 22/21 | 137/12 137/13 | 82/17 112/24 | 116/13 116/14 | 133/25 136/25 |
| 75/2 76/2 91/15 | 138/5 139/20 | 117/18 167/6 | 116/19 118/3 | 141/8 141/14 |
| 92/9 92/12 92/18 | 140/10 143/10 | noted [3] 6/14 | 120/24 121/9 | 146/25 151/18 |
| 129/24 130/25 | 151/10 151/15 | 24/10 169/16 | 123/15 123/18 | 169/15 190/16 |
| 131/10 138/17 | 151/17 151/23 | notes [3] 43/21 | 131/17 132/3 | 197/5 198/13 199/8 |
| 138/17 139/3 | 153/19 153/22 | 44/15 204/8 | 132/16 134/5 134/6 | NRS [16] 11/20 |
| new [2] 11/23 | 155/4 155/10 | nothing [23] 13/21 | 134/8 134/10 | 14/25 72/15 133/4 |
| 162/21 | 156/14 157/2 | 13/23 15/20 17/4 | 134/14 134/17 | 160/12 161/5 |
| News [10] 13/10 | 157/20 158/5 160/1 | 31/25 56/19 61/9 | 134/22 144/2 144/3 | 162/18 163/14 |
| 138/21 161/16 | 160/15 161/3 161/4 | 62/4 62/5 67/5 | 144/4 144/11 | 174/18 182/20 |
| 186/2 187/3 187/5 | 161/9 161/23 162/1 | 77/21 78/17 80/19 | 144/16 144/18 | 187/20 187/20 |
| 187/16 188/3 188/8 | 162/4 165/23 | 80/20 83/12 125/24 | 144/24 145/1 145/4 | 189/20 190/10 |
| 197/9 | 168/11 168/22 | 125/24 125/24 | 145/13 145/22 | 190/13 190/18 |
| newspaper [2] | 169/2 172/12 173/1 | 151/16 152/3 | 146/3 146/5 151/5 | NRS 106 [1] 11/20 |
| 134/12 135/14 | 173/1 174/19 | 197/22 199/14 | 151/12 185/9 | NRS 107 [2] |
| next [10] 8/7 39/5 | 174/21 175/24 | 203/11 | 185/21 185/22 | 187/20 190/10 |
| 65/1 65/24 65/25 | 176/1 177/24 178/5 | notice [154] 11/14 | 186/4 201/23 202/5 | NRS 116 [11] |
| 66/5 66/15 88/24 | 178/5 180/11 | 11/16 11/16 11/17 | 202/25 | 14/25 133/4 160/12 |
| 171/23 181/13 | 180/25 182/16 | 11/21 11/22 11/24 | noticed [2] 44/16 | 161/5 162/18 |
| nice [1] 65/7 | 184/13 190/2 190/4 | 12/1 12/2 12/3 12/8 | 59/24 | 163/14 174/18 |
| nicely [1] 83/7 | 191/8 192/3 192/3 | 12/13 14/11 14/23 | notices [18] 15/7 | 187/20 189/20 |
| night [1] 8/16 | 192/12 194/5 | 14/25 15/3 15/10 | 15/8 15/16 15/21 | 190/13 190/18 |
| nine [4] 16/2 16/8 | 194/15 197/22 | 16/6 31/1 33/2 | 15/23 40/6 41/6 | NRS statutes [1] |
| 16/12 182/22 | 198/1 198/5 198/9 | 39/19 39/22 40/3 | 42/6 55/18 56/2 | 72/15 |
| no [156] 1/1 2/12 | 198/12 198/25 | 42/14 42/22 42/25 | 56/10 98/22 101/6 | NRS was [1] |
| 9/6 10/1 12/5 13/18 | 200/16 202/22 | 43/3 44/6 44/13 | 101/24 102/19 | 182/20 |
| 15/6 18/25 19/20 | 203/3 | 44/18 45/21 46/4 | 118/23 151/14 | number [14] 31/2 |
| 21/11 27/10 28/20 | No. [3] 87/24 167/7 | 46/18 47/5 47/21 | 198/7 | 33/25 62/15 72/18 |
| 30/8 30/23 31/5 | 180/3 | 48/8 48/13 48/20 | notified [6] 27/3 | 80/3 111/10 111/11 |
| 33/13 34/2 34/19 | No. 000003 [1] | 48/22 49/6 49/9 | 42/20 42/22 46/5 | 112/1 127/22 135/8 |
| 35/6 36/18 39/4 | 87/24 | 49/21 50/4 50/20 | 46/19 47/12 | 135/20 154/6 |
| 39/17 41/25 44/12 | No. 11 [1] 167/7 | 51/1 51/11 51/15 | notify [7] 15/2 | 165/21 179/19 |
| 44/17 44/21 45/22 | No. 12-16387 [1] | 57/6 57/9 58/5 58/7 | 41/21 41/23 45/14 | numbered [1] |
| 47/16 49/23 50/14 | 180/3 | 58/8 58/10 58/11 | 45/17 47/13 55/7 | 69/20 |
| 50/25 51/3 51/5 | nobody [4] 68/2 | 59/14 59/16 59/17 | notifying [1] 49/7 | numbers [4] 19/5 |
| 51/5 51/13 52/4 | 183/18 191/14 | 59/20 59/21 60/3 | notwithstanding | 106/1 180/21 |
| 56/12 61/2 63/5 | 192/9 | 60/4 60/16 60/21 | [1] 132/9 | 191/12 |
| 64/3 65/12 65/16 | NOD [3] 109/12 | 60/22 60/25 61/1 | November [8] | nutshell [1] 128/5 |
| 66/1 71/5 73/11 | 114/10 114/20 | 61/2 61/3 61/8 61/8 | 10/18 11/12 87/1 | NV [4] 1/24 2/9 |
| 78/10 78/13 79/10 | none [1] 175/4 | 61/16 61/17 61/18 | 146/6 146/19 148/6 | 2/20 3/7 |
| 79/11 79/18 80/16 | nonissue [1] 8/13 nonjudicial [3] | 70/13 98/7 98/9 98/18 98/20 99/11 | 182/4 182/14 <br> November 16 | 0 |
| 80/19 81/16 81/16 | $110 / 2 \text { 119/19 128/4 }$ | $100 / 1100 / 3100 / 8$ | 146/6 146/19 | o'clock [6] 7/17 |
| 82/7 85/18 87/8 | normal [1] 91/8 | $100 / 15102 / 15$ | November 2 [1] | $7 / 2066 / 1268 / 1$ |
| 92/1 92/14 93/1 | North [7] 38/4 | 103/15 103/18 | $10 / 18$ | 80/25 81/3 |
| $93 / 24 ~ 96 / 13 ~ 98 / 2$ $98 / 5 \quad 100 / 5 \quad 100 / 14$ | 39/23 44/3 57/25 | 104/15 105/20 | November 2011 <br> [1] $11 / 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{0 0 o} \text { [6] 64/19 } \\ & 64 / 2082 / 1282 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |


| 0 | October 26 [4] | 114/8 115/20 | 45/16 45/23 45/24 | orally [1] 146/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OOO... [2] 141/21 | 144/15 145/9 | 117/11 122/6 | 46/18 47/12 47/12 | order [13] 14/18 |
| 000... [2] 141/21 141/22 | 145/12 145/17 | 122/22 125/11 | 49/1 49/4 50/3 51/2 | 14/25 30/10 31/16 |
| object [1] 30/7 | off [19] 16/14 | 126/20 127/5 | 52/16 53/11 54/10 | 31/23 32/17 39/19 |
| objection [16] | 16/15 21/23 22/10 | 131/20 134/23 | 54/13 54/22 57/10 | 42/25 62/16 76/7 |
| 21/11 36/18 46/7 | 42/24 43/4 44/9 | 135/4 135/15 | 57/13 58/6 59/17 | 81/13 105/25 |
| 46/21 50/15 53/20 | 51/17 51/18 88/11 | 135/22 137/21 | 64/7 64/7 65/8 66/3 | 201/24 |
| 54/19 55/21 60/12 | 88/22 89/18 100/6 | 138/8 140/4 147/15 | 69/22 70/14 71/1 | ordinary [1] 29/23 |
| 64/3 71/5 82/5 82/8 | 106/19 107/8 111/4 | 152/20 157/4 157/5 | 73/11 73/13 73/18 | original [2] 21/4 |
| 101/13 155/4 | 149/9 184/23 | 158/23 163/2 | 73/18 73/19 73/21 | 23/11 |
| 155/10 | 187/11 | 163/17 165/7 | 74/8 74/13 75/16 | originate [2] 18/10 |
| obligation [2] | off-site [2] 88/11 | 165/19 169/12 | 75/18 76/20 77/25 | 18/12 |
| 25/10 123/12 | 100/6 | 172/22 176/3 | 78/25 80/1 81/15 | originates [1] 18/8 |
| obligations [3] | offer [1] 132/10 | 177/12 181/12 | 81/24 84/20 85/23 | other [45] 7/12 |
| 7/13 117/19 132/20 | office [22] 3/3 | 182/19 190/25 | 86/6 89/12 90/5 | 11/21 14/14 15/18 |
| obtain [3] 88/7 | 96/10 98/11 111/21 | 199/14 199/17 | 90/6 90/6 90/22 | 23/13 23/17 24/24 |
| 88/12 160/3 | 119/9 121/25 122/3 | online [3] 103/22 | 91/16 92/23 94/19 | 32/14 38/15 39/25 |
| obtained [3] | 125/10 125/10 | 142/9 142/11 | 95/7 95/11 95/17 | 41/4 49/16 49/21 |
| 47/7 201/4 | 125/14 127/14 | only [20] 8/3 11/11 | 95/21 96/17 97/12 | 50/1 57/13 63/2 |
| obtaining [4] 88/9 | 143/2 144/3 144/19 | 13/21 19/25 20/12 | 98/21 98/25 99/7 | 63/2 76/21 80/5 |
| 88/10 91/14 159/21 | 146/16 147/3 | 24/4 56/3 76/10 | 99/8 99/12 103/24 | 81/22 94/19 95/2 |
| obtains [1] 91/9 | 148/20 161/2 | 76/13 143/5 149/16 | 104/19 107/5 | 99/1 103/19 104/19 |
| obvious [2] 55/4 | 161/17 187/21 | 153/23 157/5 | 113/12 114/8 114/8 | 105/11 117/19 |
| 55/5 | 198/22 204/14 | 160/24 175/12 | 115/7 116/6 116/17 | 125/15 127/14 |
| obviously [4] 33/5 | OFFICES [4] 2/17 | 187/18 191/9 | 117/15 117/16 | 135/18 140/13 |
| 52/25 91/16 126/20 | 176/11 176/17 | 191/10 192/1 | 117/16 117/17 | 148/20 148/23 |
| occasion [1] | 176/24 | 197/22 | 117/18 118/4 118/5 | 149/9 153/16 |
| 125/1 | often [2] | open [4] 7/25 | 118/5 120/15 | 153/17 156/24 |
| occasionall | 187/5 | 45/14 69/18 192/6 | 120/20 121/11 | 158/9 165/3 166/21 |
| 124/13 | Oftentimes [1] | opening [2] 9/16 | 122/19 124/20 | 181/12 187/19 |
| occasions [1] | 148/18 | 191/6 | 126/1 126/13 | 191/8 196/9 197/20 |
| 128/16 | oh [6] 29/1 3 | operativ | 127/15 128/17 | others [1] 91/11 |
| occupation [1] | 87/13 112/14 | 109/2 | 129/12 129/15 | otherwise [4] 15/3 |
| 67/16 | 165/16 195/3 | opinion [6] 91/11 | 129/21 130/2 130/3 | 25/10 26/3 57/9 |
| occur [5] 25/8 | Ohio [1] 39/2 | 114/24 139/11 | 130/5 130/8 130/8 | our [77] 6/8 7/13 |
| 25/21 50/6 146/7 | okay [417] | 140/8 140/22 | 130/11 133/3 133/7 | 14/10 25/23 26/5 |
| 149/9 | old [1] 127/3 | 190/20 | 133/17 133/25 | 29/7 29/13 33/9 |
| occurred [3] 16/ | older [1] 122/6 | opportunity [1] | 134/2 134/3 134/23 | 42/18 42/25 43/23 |
| 32/23 192/25 | Ombudsman's [2] | 80/5 | 135/4 136/13 137/1 | 43/23 44/14 44/17 |
| occurrence [3] | 111/21 144/19 | opposed [1] | 137/11 137/13 | 44/17 44/19 44/19 |
| 191/17 191/21 | on [315] | 110/22 | 137/14 137/15 | 45/14 46/2 46/25 |
| 191/24 | once [6] 47/7 | oppression [1] | 138/4 138/19 | 47/1 48/16 50/14 |
| occurrin | 114/12 124/16 | 14/20 | 138/21 143/7 144/6 | 51/6 51/18 53/16 |
| $41 / 2050 / 5$ | 130/2 130/3 130/5 | opt [1] 15/4 | 145/9 148/17 149/9 | 82/17 85/24 92/4 |
| occurs [1] 30/2 | one [72] 8/2 8/14 | opt-in [1] 15/4 | 151/8 151/12 | 92/5 92/6 92/22 |
| OCTOBER [10] | 20/13 21/21 30/25 | options [2] 75/17 | 151/13 153/16 | 94/8 95/7 96/10 |
| 1/21 6/1 138/23 | 32/6 32/17 38/8 | 76/21 | 153/25 157/13 | 97/2 98/11 98/22 |
| 144/15 145/6 145/9 | 39/5 40/20 41/1 | or [186] 8/7 9/24 | 158/9 160/9 160/18 | 105/13 107/9 114/5 |
| 145/12 145/17 | 56/22 58/8 58/21 | 10/20 12/3 14/11 | 160/23 161/20 | 115/22 118/15 |
| 146/22 189/23 | 60/21 60/25 61/2 | 14/20 15/23 18/11 | 168/8 170/9 171/4 | 119/9 119/18 121/4 |
| October 16 [1] | 61/8 61/10 61/17 | 19/14 19/16 21/3 | 171/14 171/16 | 121/6 121/10 |
| 146/22 | 62/25 64/12 64/23 | 22/23 23/17 25/10 | 172/18 176/7 177/8 | 121/25 124/13 |
| October 20 [1] | 65/6 73/8 91/19 | 25/18 25/22 25/23 | 178/10 179/16 | 125/3 125/9 125/12 |
| 189/23 | 98/23 99/12 99/13 | 26/1 28/13 32/3 | 179/24 180/8 182/3 | 125/13 126/20 |
| October | 102/11 107/5 | 32/7 37/11 38/25 | 183/18 187/19 | 127/14 128/20 |
| $138 / 23$ | 108/24 108/24 | 41/11 41/13 41/20 | 192/15 197/24 | 129/14 133/21 |
| October 2017 [1] | 109/10 113/17 | 42/22 42/24 43/22 | 198/7 199/3 199/11 | 134/2 134/15 |
| 145/6 | 113/21 114/5 114/7 | 44/11 44/17 45/14 | 201/15 202/22 | 135/17 135/17 |


| 0 | own [7] 53/16 | 98/ | past [4] 29/5 29/20 | perform [5] 25/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| our... [14] 135/22 | 67/17 68/15 68/16 | papers [1] 106/17 | 149/5 149/10 | 84/14 85/19 95/1 |
| 135/24 135/24 | 105/2 140/21 199/5 | Paradise [10] | Paul [3] 39/15 | 179/6 |
| 142/8 142/10 | owned [1] 174/9 | 193/21 194/5 194/8 | 109/13 151/4 | performed [4] |
| 142/16 143/2 144/3 | owner [11] 10/ | 194/10 194/18 | y [16] 16/14 | 19 143 |
| 146/13 146/16 | 49/16 90/21 90/22 | 194/21 195/1 | 24/16 26/3 41/2 | 143/7 |
| 147/3 148/20 | 100/4 100/6 123/2 | 195/14 195/15 | 42/24 44/8 51/1 | performing [1] |
| 148/25 165/19 | 143/10 147/7 | 196/1 | 70/18 75/ |  |
| ours [1] 119/22 |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { pa } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}\right.$ | 35/22 | $2$ |
| ourselves [2] | owners [11] 74/6 | 132/9 181/18 | 149/8 189/1 | 97/23 149/8 149/10 |
| 48/24 148/19 out [35] $7 / 7$ | 74/8 74/14 74/14 | paragraph 16 [1] | paying [4] 28/4 | 149/17 |
| out | 76/9 76/10 193/21 | 59/14 | 28/5 117/17 147/8 | periodically [3] |
| 23/4 32/8 51/16 | 194/18 194/21 | paralega | payment [13] | 94/1 139/6 139/10 |
| 65/3 65/21 66/5 | 195/14 195/16 | 85/24 | 11/11 16/13 34/2 | perjury [5] 12/19 |
| 66/11 68/8 76/18 | owns [1] 18/9 | parcel [2] 88/1 | 35/2 41/7 68/25 | 167/19 170/3 |
| 76/19 81/13 99/4 | P | 38/6 | 75/18 76/20 147/15 | 172/17 174/24 |
| 99/23 101/6 102/19 | P.C [1] 2/17 | 132/23 | $149$ |  |
| 103/14 103/18 | p.m [5] 63/1 63/2 | 132/ | $149$ |  |
| 108/17 108/17 | 124/2 186/20 188/7 |  |  |  |
| 116/14 120/7 127/8 | packet [1] 199/25 | parking [1] 138/24 | 10/15 25/13 27/7 | 66/6 68/7 |
| $128 / 5128 / 14135 / 4$ $135 / 6182 / 11186 / 3$ | $\text { page [39] } 4 / 2$ | Parque [1] 195/22 | $35 / 1035 / 1140 / 14$ | personal [3] 90/ |
| 135/6 182/11 186/3 189/24 201/24 | 20/17 20/19 21/24 | part [19] 11/9 | 40/17 41/3 68/25 | 158/15 200/13 |
| outcome [2] 31/13 | 22/12 22/18 29/6 | 11/10 14/24 59/17 | 73/21 147/12 | personal |
| 126/16 | 37/15 37/22 44/2 | 69/11 84/12 95/9 | 148/16 | knowledge [1] |
| outside [3] 85/17 | 54/1 57/12 57/21 | 95/10 101/25 | payoff [3] 42/23 | 90/16 |
| 157/17 197/12 | 60/10 61/21 69/19 | 102/21 103/7 | 51/17 149/5 | personally [1] |
| over [49] 8/20 | 71/14 73/24 73/25 | 103/11 103/17 | peek [2] 124/1 | 196/23 |
| 20/17 22/11 23/20 | 78/3 86/8 88/24 | 103/19 104/6 | 138 | rspective |
| 25/2 28/16 28/17 | 88/25 98/23 102/4 | 104/13 105/3 107/9 | PEGGY [4] 1/24 | 7/3 |
| 34/11 36/22 40/13 | 102/6 103/23 | 142/23 | 204/4 204/17 | Pete [1] 39/2 |
| 54/16 78/23 87/12 | 103/23 135/1 | partial [3] 11/ | 204/1 | [2] |
| 93/6 98/6 101/9 | 167/9 178/4 180/24 $181 / 14183 / 24$ | $1$ | penalty [5] |  |
| 102/2 105/5 111/15 | 194/23 194/24 | $91 / 1891 / 1895 / 11$ | 172/17 174/24 |  |
| 121/19 122/3 131/5 | 195/3 195/24 | $119 / 1 \quad 152 / 20 \quad 173 / 7$ | people [8] $12 / 8$ | phone [2] 62/15 |
| 135/25 137/25 | 199/23 | 197/6 202/21 | $56 / 16 \text { 107/2 128/20 }$ | $62 / 16$ |
| $153 / 15154 / 5$ $162 / 13163 / 22$ | page 1 [4] 57/12 | particulars [1] | 139/17 153/20 | Phonetic [1] 1 |
| 162/13 163/22 | 60/10 61/21 194/23 | 86/1 | 188/11 191/4 | photographic [1] |
| $167 / 12169 / 21$ | page 14 [1] 73/25 | parties [19] 14/13 | Pepperdine [1] | 131/4 |
| 170/6 170/14 171/9 | page 2 [1] 178/4 | 32/22 37/21 41/12 | 84/23 | physical [1] 149/ |
| $171 / 10175 / 16$ | page 207 [1] 78/3 | 42/17 58/5 59/17 | per [4] 72/19 73/1 | Physically [1] |
| 175/22 176/9 | page 3 [1] 195/3 | 59/17 59/20 60/4 | 123/8 200/25 | 197/12 |
| 177/10 177/16 | pages [13] 19/6 | 101/3 101/3 101/22 | per se [1] 200/2 | Pinnacle [5] 77/17 |
| 177/21 178/4 | 36/22 70/1 78/5 | 101/23 114/6 114/8 | percent [14] 11/6 | 77/19 77/20 79/3 |
| 178/17 179/14 | 88/22 142/4 142/7 | 144/5 144/17 | 14/17 22/16 22/20 | 79/11 |
| 180/14 181/15 | 150/3 150/12 | 144/17 | 74/6 74/8 76/13 | place [14] 34/1 |
| 184/12 190/17 | 167/12 170/1 | partner [1] 94/17 | 76/14 120/1 130/24 | 39/18 47/1 47/4 |
| overly [1] 92/3 | 172/16 175/18 | parts [1] 69/4 | 131/2 131/10 | 51/4 122/8 146/17 |
| overrule [4] 33/16 | paid [16] 13/13 | party [7] 59/2 | 180/18 202/10 | 172/8 172/11 |
| 33/17 46/23 60/18 | 16/11 16/15 22/10 | 59/23 59/25 60/6 | percentage [3] | 180/14 184/25 |
| Overruled [3] | 24/25 40/17 40/22 | 60/8 60/9 114/4 | 22/19 22/20 76/8 | 185/6 186/19 204/7 |
| 53/21 54/20 202/14 | 43/4 120/7 120/8 | party's [1] 5 | eption [2 | aced [1] 11/1 |
| owed [8] 35/14 | 123/7 135/24 | passed [1] 10/19 | 139/9 140/21 | places [2] 134/ |
| 77/2 77/2 77/5 |  | passing [1] 177/11 | perceptions [1] | 135/12 |
| 148/19 148/20 | 88/1 | password [1] |  | plaintiff [7] 1/10 |
| 148/21 148/22 | paper [1] 105/25 paperless [1] | 142/12 | perfectly [1] 83/6 | 2/2 10/9 13/16 |


| P | post [7] 96/8 96/10 | 14 |  | 88/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| plai | 96/11 97/5 97/7 |  | proceeds [1] | /59/52 |
| $124 / 19194 / 14$ | 134/14 138/22 | primarily [1] 30/25 | 149/24 | 90/2 90/4 90/5 90/7 |
| $195 / 13$ | posted [2] 13/10 | primary [1] 24/2 | process [9] 59/ | 90/9 90/20 90/21 |
| plan [6] 7/13 8/6 | 134/10 | print [1] 111/4 | 99/4 110/1 115/14 | 90/22 91/6 91/7 |
| 10/22 34/4 75/18 | posting [1] 135/11 | print-off [1] 111/4 | 115/16 115/18 | 91/9 91/10 91/11 |
| 76/20 | postpone [1] | printed [3] 35/11 | 174/2 185/14 | 91/18 91/19 92/2 |
| planning [1] | 146/16 | 35/14 98/19 | 189/18 | 92/3 93/2 94/23 |
| plant [1] 103/24 | postponed | printout [1] 34/17 | processing [2] | 100/10 101/4 |
| please [12] 17/6 | 146/11 146/23 | prior [38] 12/14 | 94/12 157/18 | 107/19 115/15 |
| 17/8 62/19 67/7 | postponement [1] | 16/8 22/10 28/7 | produced [1] | 115/17 115/19 |
| 67/9 67/15 80/23 | 146/12 | 28/7 28/9 28/14 | 49/10 | 8/8 118/12 120/1 |
| 83/14 83/16 152/5 | potential [5] 70/14 | 42/3 50/3 50/5 50/6 | production [1] | 120/8 120/13 |
| 152/7 172/22 | 118/7 118/11 | 51/2 51/11 51/15 | 107/9 | 122/10 123/5 |
| pleasure [1] | 118/14 161/3 | 58/16 58/17 58/25 | professional [ | 123/13 123/19 |
| 141/10 | potentially [6] | 73/21 77/18 77/20 | 110/21 201/13 | 129/8 129/20 |
| plenty [1] 189/1 | 128/6 161/5 163/4 | 78/23 85/23 92/5 | program [7] 98/13 | 129/22 130/7 131/1 |
| PMK [1] 84/4 | 163/6 163/7 171/4 | 98/21 129/7 156/3 | 98/15 98/17 98/22 | 131/21 132/4 |
| point [7] 97/16 | practice [5] 72/24 | 156/19 161/4 | 105/14 116/23 | 132/10 132/10 |
| 125/9 129/11 | 88/2 88/4 95/10 | 161/17 162/17 | 142/16 | 133/1 133/24 |
| 129/17 129/18 | 146/ | 163/8 173 | prompt [1] 132 | 137/18 138/20 |
| 139/21 174/21 | pragmatic [1] 8/ | 173/24 196/10 | proper [2] 129/ | 139/3 140/14 |
| points [1] 158/15 | prays [1] 181/21 | 197/7 197/25 198/8 | 158/12 | 140/15 143/10 |
| poke [1] 139/10 |  | 19 | properties | 44/5 150/12 |
| poked [1] 139/5 | pre-lien [1] 143/1 | priority [1] 23/22 | 92/25 121/19 122/4 | 150/17 151/13 |
| policies [14] 42/ | predicate [1] | PRISCILLA [3] 2/6 | 126/4 126/17 | 152/20 152/22 |
| 43/2 44/8 46/2 | 17/1 | 6/17 82/19 | 140/18 153/12 | 53/2 153/3 153 |
| 46/25 47/9 | predict [1] 183/18 | pro [1] 148/19 | 153/17 153/21 | 156/9 156/20 157/4 |
| 104/6 104/1 | predicted [1] | pro rata [1] 148/19 | 154/3 159/12 161/1 | 157/5 157/25 158/2 |
| 104/18 108/16 | 92/ | probably [18] 9/5 | 161/23 161/24 | 158/4 158/25 |
| 109/25 113/12 | preferen | 9/15 63/4 63/7 | 162/10 174/10 | 159/22 160/4 160 |
| 113/24 | 81/1 | 130/11 141/5 | 174/13 174/15 | 160/7 160/10 |
| policy [1 | prepare [2] 17/25 | 161/12 164/17 | 174/20 174/23 | 60/12 161/8 162/5 |
| 51/16 51/18 72/12 | 161/13 | 164/21 165/2 | 175/4 175/10 | 162/6 162/13 |
| 75/7 75/11 75/12 | prepared [9] 52/6 | 168/13 168/23 | 175/17 177/16 | 162/14 162/17 |
| 76/18 94/8 | 52/8 52/9 52/10 | 170/8 171/1 179/13 | 179/2 179/5 180/8 | 162/20 162/22 |
| 146/14 | 52/12 78/9 175/7 | 185/5 187/2 187/14 | property [193] | 163/9 165/4 165/12 |
| $\text { pop [1] } 1$ | 175/12 176/21 | problem [3] 9/6 | 10/6 10/10 10/10 | 165/14 166/18 |
| populate | present [3] 7/11 | 63/5 180/25 | 10/15 10/21 11/1 | 69/14 169/22 |
| 110/25 | 37/21 191/11 | procedure [1] | 11/3 11/4 12/14 | 70/12 171/12 |
| porti | presented [3] | 109/25 | 12/15 12/16 12/18 | 172/20 172/24 |
| por | 14/22 200/23 | procedures [15] | 13/4 13/7 13/16 | 173/7 173/21 |
| 181/16 | 202/19 | 42/11 43/2 44/8 | 13/23 14/3 23/5 | 177/13 178/13 |
|  | pressed [1] 130/10 | 46/25 47/10 55/15 | 23/13 24/9 25/24 | 78/15 181/1 |
| $80$ | Preston [1] 194/4 | 100/11 103/7 104/6 | 26/1 26/1 26/3 26/5 | 181/22 182/15 |
| position [9] 33/9 | prettier [1] 142/18 | 104/17 104/18 | 26/10 26/11 26/21 | 188/17 189/2 |
| $\text { 46/24 91/22 } 91$ | pretty [12] 62/16 | 108/16 110/1 | 27/20 27/25 31/13 | 190/11 190/12 |
| 91/24 | 64/5 74/24 75/14 | 113/12 113/24 | 32/21 34/15 35/18 | 191/4 192/8 192/10 |
| 135/4 196/11 | 77/6 120/24 143/2 | proceed [2] 6/24 | 40/10 41/4 41/8 | 97/6 197/7 197/13 |
| possession [4] | 154/16 159/5 170/7 | 82/25 | 41/13 41/24 44/13 | 97/18 197/21 |
| 117/17 118/5 | 183/13 187/22 | proceeded [1] | 46/6 47/6 47/24 | 97/24 198/4 |
| 119/24 120/1 | prevent [2] 14/12 | 27/ | 48/10 48/15 48/16 | 98/11 198/15 |
| possibility [1] | 41/ | proceeding [8] | 48/21 49/24 56/8 | 98/19 198/24 |
| 43/22 | previously [6] | 16/3 45/16 73/19 | 56/18 58/15 58/18 | 99/11 200/15 |
| possible [4] 95 | 86/25 99/20 102/18 | 131/1 165/8 165/9 | 58/25 59/1 69/15 | 01/5 201/2 |
| 96/1 108/25 192/18 | 106/20 111/ | 165/11 182/22 | 77/10 85/9 85/13 | O |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { possibly [2] } 31 / 12 \\ & 113 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | price [5] 14/16 | Proceedings [3] 203/23 204/6 | $\begin{aligned} & 85 / 1585 / 1686 / 22 \\ & 87 / 687 / 1087 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 148/19 } \\ \text { proprietorship [1] } \end{array}$ |


| P | 11 | 203/3 | 17 | 130/10 131/8 131/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 俍... | 126/15 137/ | quick [3] 63/11 | 119/8 120/19 121/2 | 8/ |
| $\text { [1] } 153 / 13$ | 1 | 66/5 163/15 | 123/23 128/25 | 156/14 191/3 193/ |
| protect [3] 42/25 |  | quickly [1] 150/5 | 145/21 157/3 | 202/20 |
| 43/23 46/13 |  | quiet [19] 14/ | /16 168/24 | recommended |
| protected [1] | 118/7 118/11 | 14/13 14/14 16/1 | reasonable [2] | 180/9 |
| 164/18 | , | 96/4 96/18 96/ | 4/ |  |
| protection [5] | 120/15 120/19 | 98/3 152/18 158/3 | reasonableness [2] | 11/23 11/23 17/7 |
| 133/5 133/9 133/22 | 121/6 137/5 140/2 | 158/3 158/7 158/11 | 31/3 33/3 | 20/20 20/25 30/17 |
| 134/23 134/24 | purchasing [6] | 159/2 159/11 | reasoning [1] 22/8 | 32/22 44/12 44/17 |
| prove [1] $31 / 10$ | 90/8 91/9 138/20 | 159/21 160/4 | recall [43] 97/1 | 50/25 51/5 51/9 |
| provide [3] 41/5 | 156/20 162/10 | 160/17 196/7 | 97/12 106/23 | 60/23 64/22 67/8 |
| 97/7 132/11 | 163 | quieting [1] 14 | 108/21 114/17 | 3/6 80/4 80/7 80/9 |
| provided [7] 2/12 | purpose [5] 22/6 | quitclaim [1] | 121/8 122/7 124/9 | 82/18 83/15 88/1 |
| 30/9 72/7 95/4 | 105/15 118/19 | 166/20 | 125/1 125/3 125/19 | 88/6 114/23 127/25 |
| 99/16 136/8 147 | 119/2 121/7 | quite [3] 97/12 | 125/25 126/3 126/7 | 152/6 161/17 |
| provision [14] | purposefully [2] | 160/19 184/17 | 126/10 126/11 | 163/16 165/20 |
| 20/22 24/19 25/17 | 128/24 135/3 | $\mathbf{R}$ | 126/14 126/15 | 197/17 204/11 |
| 57/17 61/16 74/25 | purposes [8] 36/1 |  | 126/18 127/10 | recordation [1] |
| 75/3 133/6 133/18 | 9/6 115/3 138/18 |  | 127/11 127/20 | 143/13 |
| 133/25 136/10 | 138/19 166/3 | ramifications [1] | 127/21 128/15 | recorded [36] |
| 136/14 137/3 1 | 188/25 200/ | 159/ | 138/16 157/10 | /14 11/9 11/14 |
| provis | pursuant [12] | range [1] | 164/17 164/25 | 13/22 13/24 14/2 |
| 24/2 | 11/20 24/9 24/25 | rare [1] 198/ | 165/13 165/16 | 15/11 15/15 16/7 |
| public [14] 13/9 | 32/4 99/17 100/10 | rata [1] 148/19 | 165/18 168/7 174/2 | 48/18 49/17 49/22 |
| 60/22 123/3 134/7 | 116/15 132/21 | rate [4] 22/13 | 175/21 178/2 | 53/1 53/6 53/8 |
|  | 133/1 133/2 133/14 | 22/16 22/19 22/20 | 184/17 184/25 | 53/13 54/15 58/22 |
| 135/12 135/16 | 174/ | rather [3] 92/9 | 186/14 188/10 | 6/20 98/19 98/21 |
| 139/2 | put [12] 12/13 | 118/14 160/18 | 188/12 188/16 | 101/3 102/16 |
| 140/18 | 12/18 47/1 70/13 | re [1] 166/9 | 191/12 192/23 | 110/16 110/17 |
| 192/6 | 120/21 121/5 128/4 | reach [2] 39/3 | recalled [1] 9/7 | 12/1 122/19 |
| publicat | 157/5 158/24 | 39/15 | Recapping [1] | 31/17 134/8 144/5 |
| 123/15 | 159/16 173/8 | reaction [1] 138/8 | 68/19 | 161/4 162/17 192/5 |
| publicized [1] | 19 | read [9] 32/22 | receipt | 97/18 197/19 |
| 192/5 | putting [2] | 44/15 80/4 80/8 | 99/19 105/9 | 97 |
| published [4] | 55/19 | 145/5 167/2 | receipts [1] 144/2 | recorder [1] 36/8 |
| 79/25 80/1 134/12 | puzzlemen | 2170 | receive [6] 39/22 | corder's [7] |
| 135/13 | 138 | g [1] 43/21 | 40/6 44/11 51/6 | 161/2 161/ |
| pull [4] 43/24 88/2 | Q | reads [1] 57/19 | 114/13 159/23 | 162/23 185/24 |
| 88/5 88/6 |  |  | received [18] 5/2 | 185/25 197/10 |
| pulled [3] 89/4 |  |  | $40 / 342 / 642 / 14$ | 97 |
| 92/13 111/11 |  |  |  | corder |
| purchase [13] | 56/5 56/9 72/11 | $88 / 188 / 6153 / 10$ | 51/11 51/15 53/8 | recording [7] 53/7 |
| $1 / 1$ | 76/2 78/6 104/24 | 153/24 153/24 | 53/15 100/14 | 53/14 53/14 54/25 |
|  | 110/14 112/3 | 153/25 163/15 | 100/17 107/2 | 58/16 58/24 144/2 |
| $4 / 141$ | 113/23 118/16 | 169/13 | 147/25 | recordings [18] |
|  | 122/22 138/16 | realize [1] 24/17 | receiving [4] 44/12 | 11/22 39/9 39/11 |
|  | 140/6 150/8 150/17 | really [12] 8/1 | 44/18 51/1 51/6 | 52/1 53/5 53/6 53/7 |
| purchased [12] | 152/16 160/20 | 32/9 56/12 96/15 | recently [1] 67/22 | 53/17 108/12 109/7 |
|  | 163/15 169/20 | 119/21 129/12 | recess [4] 64/19 | 109/13 110/7 |
| $91 / 12162 / 13$ | 172/22 175/1 | 130/22 131/13 | 82/10 82/12 141/21 | 110/22 112/8 |
| $162 / 19 \quad 174 / 13$ | 175/14 180/1 180/2 | 134/24 140/16 | recessed [1] 64/24 | 114/17 114/22 |
| 174/15 175/17 | 181/13 189/1 199/9 | 176/20 191/22 | recollection [18] | 114/25 151/4 |
| 198/13 200/15 | 202 | reason [23] 9/7 | 52/13 85/22 87/2 | records [24] 26/20 |
| purchaser [11] | questions [8] | 19/20 87/8 89/11 | 93/11 100/22 | 40/10 44/14 44/16 |
|  | 44/25 50/20 141/6 | 91/10 92/15 100/14 | 125/18 126/21 | 51/3 55/9 58/15 |
| 14/10 96/8 96/10 | $\begin{aligned} & 151 / 17153 / 7 \\ & 189 / 12192 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 109 / 20109 / 23 \\ & 112 / 16113 / 5113 \end{aligned}$ | 126/24 129/25 | 58/25 59/1 69/14 |

(26) proprietorship... - records

| R | 28/10 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ed [1] | 103/3 103/9 104/2 | 11/20 |  |
| 77/15 77/16 77/17 | 173/19 | 104/5 104/8 104/9 | requirements | [ |
| 77/18 77/20 86/10 | relate [2] 46/2 | 104/14 106/21 | 13/11 |  |
| 86/18 86/19 107/12 | 108/5 | 106/23 107/5 107/6 | research | urn [3] |
| 123/1 131/21 140/7 | related [2] $47 / 12$ $48 / 12$ | 107/8 108/18 | 103/21 | $3 / 10$ |
| 161/8 180/6 | relates [1] 33/2 | $108 / 201099$ $109 / 17$ $109 / 21$ | 24/5 | 42/1 42/2 69/14 |
|  | relating [3] 41/4 | 111/1 142/9 142/9 | resident [2] 95/7 | 86/24 114/23 |
| RECROSS-EXAMI | 96/5 120/19 | 142/13 142/15 | 95/7 | 5/18 115/22 |
| ATION [2] 59/11 | relationship [8] | 142/17 148/4 | resolution [1] | 5/24 168/3 |
| 203/6 | 96/22 97/17 126/1 | 150/12 150/18 | 76/19 | 86/15 191/15 |
| redemption [1] | 148/14 155/19 | 150/22 | Resort [6] 193/21 | 93/11 193/12 |
| 32/18 | 159/5 159/7 159/10 | REPORTED [1] | 194/6 194/10 | 3/15 |
| redirect [4] 56/24 | relatively [2] 7/14 | 1/24 | 4/18 195/ | viewed [12] |
| 61/13 78/21 82/3 | 63/1 | Reporter [4] | 195/16 | /20 47/17 50/2 |
| redundant [2] | released [3] 62/1 | 119/14 171/17 | resorted [1] | /10 77/15 77/ |
| 27/17 152/16 | 51/18 203/13 | 176/22 204/4 | RESOURCES [39] | 8/1 143/22 168/7 |
| refer [2] 20/5 | relevance [1] | REPORTER'S [2] | 6/ | 4 197/9 |
| 108/3 | 89/1 | 1/15 204/ | 13/15 | 197/10 |
| reference [1] | relevant | represent [8] | 31/12 32/12 124/20 | reviewing [4] |
| 99/20 | 30/19 31/20 | 95/13 96/12 96/1 | 124/20 163/23 | 116/6 193/18 |
| referred [2] | 31/22 46/9 103/1 | 96/18 134/3 172/2 | 183 |  |
| 106/15 128/10 | 109/2 133/7 | 203/9 |  | rhetorical [1] |
| referring [8] 21/25 | reliable [1] 20/9 | rep | 194/10 194/13 |  |
| 48/23 69/21 101/10 | relieve [1] 73/11 |  | 194/14 194/19 | RICHARD [5] |
| 142/5 143/21 148/8 | rely [11] 30/1 | representat |  |  |
| 199/22 |  | 134/3 | 13 |  |
| refinanced [2] |  |  |  |  |
| 58/17 58/19 | 103/14 103/17 | representative $16 / 2545 / 2266 / 2$ | 196/25 200/3 200/9 |  |
| reflect [1] 149/5 | 103/20 104/14 | 124/22 | 200/14 200/22 | /24 24/12 25/3 |
|  | relying [1] 106/5 | represented [11] | 200/25 201/1 | 28/19 28/21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 147 / 20 \\ & {[1]} \end{aligned}$ | remainder [1] | 96/3 96/9 96/10 | 201/19 202 | /5 31/5 32/5 32/8 |
| refresh [3] 150/5 | 23/10 | 97/20 97/22 97/25 | 202/18 | /18 34/9 43/23 |
| 193/6 202/19 | remaining [3] | 173/1 196/4 196 | respectfully [2] | /1 48/2 48/14 |
| refused [1] 201/13 | 117/17 120/7 148/6 | 201/18 202/17 | 8/18 31/22 | 9/10 62/10 63/10 |
| refute [1] 156/13 | remember [16] | representing [10] | respond [1] 75/19 | 63/10 64/12 64/13 |
| regard [6] 14/23 | 93/25 95/2 97/3 | 37/20 82/23 96/7 | response [4] 34/1 | 64/21 65/1 65/14 |
| 15/25 31/9 42/11 | 97/25 98/3 127/6 | 134/3 138/19 | 49/12 172/12 | 5/20 69/8 70/22 |
| 59/13 146/15 | 130/14 130/15 | 176/25 194/2 | 200/16 | /21 76/10 76/22 |
| regarding [7] 10/ | 130/16 132/15 | 194/13 195/11 | responsibilities [1] | 80/15 80/17 81/4 |
| 42/15 63/21 117/16 | 158/19 164/21 | 195/15 | 70/15 | /11 81/14 81/18 |
| 18/5 118/19 122/3 | 170/5 170/21 | Republic [1] | responsible [1] | 82/14 82/24 84/16 |
| regardless [2] | 185/13 186/18 | 102/12 | 12 | 8/3 87/17 90/24 |
| 12/10 98/17 | 1] $41 / 3$ | st [4] | ate | 02/4 106/2 |
| regards [11] 26/21 | repayment [1] | 58 | restriction [1] | 1 118/2 1 |
| 27/6 29/18 34/25 |  | requested [5] |  | 13 |
| 45/25 47/15 50/4 | repeat [3] 91/4 | 41/11 49/9 53/7 | rict | $1 / 8151$ |
| 95/13 118/3 159/24 |  |  |  |  |
| 200/9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { rephrase [3] } \\ 101 / 15 \text { 113/23 } \end{gathered}$ |  | resu | 62/20 163/23 |
| register [1] 199/19 registered [1] | 202/14 | quire [1] 41/5 | resulted [1] 32/3 | 7/25 16 |
| registered [1] <br> 167/18 | replaced [1] | required [12] $15 / 2$ | retain [4] 158/14 | $1 / 31$ |
| 167/18 regular [3] 74/18 | 115/20 | /1 45/20 46/4 | 16/21 160/25 | 0/20 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { regular [3] } 74 / 18 \\ 143 / 1143 / 13 \end{array}$ | report [34] 100 | 46/18 47/5 57/9 | 161/9 | 86/8 187/1 191/25 |
| regularly [1] | $100 / 25 \quad 101 / 10$ | $93 / 3 \quad 121 / 11 \quad 135 / 11$ | retained [2] 97/2 | 92/19 199/16 |


| R | ruled [3] 15/5 | 96/8 96/10 96/ | sales [50] 7/15 | 158/21 160/1 160/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| right-hand [6] | /3 129/2 | 97/5 97/8 111/23 | 15/16 92/19 96/15 | 160/3 160/7 162/11 |
| 19/4 24/12 25/3 | rules [1] 95/6 | 112/1 112/10 | 98/15 98/16 118/24 | 168/18 168/23 |
| 28/21 106/2 200/5 | ruling [5] 127/8 | 112/20 113/7 | 121/14 124/11 | 169/13 177/24 |
| rights [5] 25/23 | 127/16 127/23 | 113/14 115/11 | 124/12 124/15 | 187/8 189/23 190/3 |
| 26/11 41/11 71/1 | 128/1 130/7 | 115/17 115/22 | 125/4 125/5 125/8 | 190/20 191/8 |
| 132/1 | runs [3] 86/5 | 116/10 116/14 | 125/13 125/13 | 191/10 191/25 |
| risk [4] 139/22 | 139/10 140/7 | 116/19 117/15 | 125/15 126/21 | 191/25 197/14 |
| 139/25 140/17 | Ryan [20] 93/19 | 118/4 119/6 119/25 | 127/7 127/14 135/9 | saying [5] 15/22 |
| 139/ | 93/23 94/1 94/17 | 120/24 121/9 122/9 | 137/6 137/10 | 60/16 71/17 129/7 |
| risks [2] 190/11 | 96/9 96/11 115/11 | 122/19 122/25 | 137/17 138/21 | 164/20 |
| 190/14 | 157/14 158/7 | 123/8 123/15 | 138/22 139/6 139/9 | says [86] 20/20 |
| RMR [2] 1 | 159/17 160/15 | 123/19 124/1 124/7 | 139/11 140/8 140/9 | 22/13 22/19 23/1 |
| $204 / 17$ | 161/6 165/7 168/7 | 124/9 128/4 128/17 | 140/22 156/11 | 23/9 23/22 24/1 |
| Robert | 180/11 195/17 | 128/19 129/14 | 174/16 180/14 | 24/13 24/16 25/3 |
| 94/16 147 | 196/5 200/5 200 | 132/11 132/11 | 184/18 184/21 | 25/6 25/8 25/18 |
| 195/17 195/18 | 201/13 | 133/23 134/6 | 185/15 187/4 187/7 | 25/20 25/22 34/18 |
| role [3] 47/8 47/11 | S | 134/10 134/11 | 187/8 187/15 | 36/25 38/16 39/6 |
| 94/20 |  | 134/13 134/14 | 187/19 187/19 | 40/14 40/16 40/24 |
| Rolling [39] 10/7 | sacr | 134/15 134/18 | 187/20 187/20 | 41/1 53/9 57/8 61/4 |
| Rolling [39] 10/7 | safeguards [1] | 134/22 135/12 | 187/21 189/20 | 61/15 61/17 72/9 |
|  | 30/10 | 135/13 135/16 | 190/10 197/25 | 73/13 73/14 73/17 |
| $42 / 8 \text { 69/9 77/10 }$ | SAGE [1] 2/19 | 135/17 135/20 | same [15] 22/2 | 73/23 74/4 74/8 |
|  | SAHARA [1] 2/ | 138/14 138/15 | 25/17 46/21 58/18 | 88/17 88/23 88/25 |
|  | said [33] 14/6 | 138/18 138/25 | 68/7 70/23 89/21 | 89/20 93/15 117/15 |
| 154/20 154/23 | 15/20 18/3 23/23 | 139/4 144/16 | 111/18 131/24 | 118/4 122/24 |
| 155/20 156/3 1 | 28/3 28/19 29/3 | 144/18 144/24 | 142/20 147/9 | 123/11 132/7 132/9 |
| $156 / 25$ | 47/17 55/17 73/11 | 145/1 145/4 145/13 | 166/18 179/15 | 132/22 136/7 156/5 |
| 164/6 166/13 | 74/14 76/17 76/18 | 145/18 145/22 | 190/8 190/14 | 163/14 163/23 |
|  | 84/15 92/21 111/4 | 146/3 146/4 146/5 | sanction [1] 197/4 | 163/23 166/9 |
|  | 117/15 118/15 | 146/5 146/7 146/16 | satisfy [2] 41/20 | 166/12 167/6 |
| 175/ | 120/18 121/23 | 146/17 146/21 | 43/24 | 167/18 167/24 |
| $177 / 14181 / 1$ | 129/9 131/24 | 146/22 147/13 | Saturday [1] | 168/1 168/6 169/21 |
| 183/8 183/2 | 132/20 133/15 | 149/23 149/24 | 187/13 | 169/24 170/12 |
| 196/17 200/9 | 134/17 145/9 | 150/6 153/3 154 | saved [1] 98/21 | 171/6 171/10 |
| 200/19 | 150/16 160/20 | 154/18 154/19 | saw [5] 125/13 | 171/11 171/22 |
|  | 161/15 175/17 | 156/8 156/15 | 138/1 139/12 161/3 | 171/23 172/3 |
| $79 / 21$ | 178/9 196/22 204 | 156/21 156/22 | 163/2 | 172/19 173/10 |
|  | sake [2] 140/5 | 157/14 158/12 | say [71] 9/15 53/7 | 174/21 176/3 |
|  | 170/15 | 158/22 159/15 | 53/12 54/5 54/10 | 176/10 176/13 |
| rooms [1] 128/21 | sale [189] $11 / 8$ | 160/7 161/5 161/14 | 54/13 56/14 56/15 | 177/16 179/1 179/2 |
| Rosay [1] $194 / 4$ | 11/12 11/12 11/17 | 162/18 163/9 | 58/7 58/25 59/20 | 179/20 180/2 181/1 |
| Rosay [1] 194/4 | 12/2 12/6 12/14 | 166/20 172/7 | 59/22 68/2 68/5 | 181/5 181/9 181/19 |
| ute [1] 2 | 13/5 13/5 13/6 13/7 | 172/11 172/16 | 72/23 73/2 77/1 | 181/21 200/3 200/5 |
| $\text { Rs [31] } 12 / 770 / 7$ | 13/11 13/12 13/18 | 184/8 184/9 184/25 | 77/8 89/25 90/2 | scanned [1] 44/19 |
| $70 / 1070 / 2571 / 3$ | 13/20 13/22 14/15 | 185/5 185/9 185/14 | 90/9 93/1 94/14 | scenario [1] 30/17 |
| 72/13 72/14 72/20 | 14/18 15/1 16/10 | 185/21 185/23 | 99/6 103/11 113/1 | schedule [4] |
| 72/20 73/1 73/25 | 16/18 28/7 28/9 | 186/4 186/19 | 113/15 119/1 119/4 | 169/13 169/18 |
| 74/3 74/5 74/23 | 28/9 28/14 32/3 | 188/13 188/24 | 124/17 125/7 | 174/6 174/24 |
| 74/24 75/2 75/4 | 32/17 32/21 33/4 | 189/17 190/3 190/9 | 125/19 129/20 | heduled [4] 28/8 |
| 75/21 75/22 75/25 | 33/12 47/12 50/3 | 190/18 190/21 | 129/24 130/5 | 28/9 28/14 68/10 |
| 76/4 76/7 76/9 | 50/5 50/6 50/20 | 191/5 191/9 191/14 | 130/10 130/24 | schedules [1] |
| 76/14 132/22 133/1 | 51/1 51/2 51/3 51/4 | 192/1 192/5 193/2 | 131/2 131/9 133/16 | 167/20 |
| 133/2 133/3 133/4 | 51/11 51/11 51/15 | 197/5 197/8 197/25 | 134/9 136/12 | school [3] 84/19 |
| 133/7 133/10 | 51/15 63/20 63/21 | 198/8 198/10 | 137/17 138/9 139/5 | 84/20 84/21 |
| rude [1] 180 | 73/11 73/18 73/21 | 198/11 198/14 | /23 140/16 | scratch [1] 116/18 |
| $\text { rule [2] } 80 / 12$ | 87/5 87/9 89/14 | 201/23 202/5 | 140/17 154/ | screenshot [2] |
| rule [2] 80/12 129/8 | $\begin{aligned} & 90 / 791 / 1394 / 9 \\ & 94 / 2294 / 2395 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | 202/25 | 156/21 158/5 158/8 | 29/7 29/13 |

(28) right-hand - screenshot

| S | $50 /$ | se | 18 | 23/24 80/5 200/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| scuttlebutt [3] | 51/10 51/13 53/10 | 8/12 54/ | seven [3] 131 | ] 168/1 |
| 126/22 127/3 | 57/15 61/18 64/6 | 55/10 57/20 60/17 | 160/18 187/8 | 70/4 |
| 128/11 | 65/21 66/18 69/20 | 76/18 99/4 100/1 | several [2] 110/9 | , |
| scuttlebutts [2] | 71/1 71/15 74/9 | 100/3 100/8 113/6 | 198/22 | 21/25 37/4 86/14 |
| 128/11 129/2 | 86/11 88/18 88/21 | 113/13 | SFR [9] 12/14 32/5 | 86/16 93/15 94/21 |
| se [1] 200/25 | 88/25 93/16 93/20 | sending [3] 48/23 | 126/19 127/ | 116/10 164/2 168/5 |
| search [1] 180/6 | 98/13 106/1 107/5 | 49/2 60/5 | 128/1 128/12 129/7 | 168/6 168/22 |
| searched [2] 44/ | 107/17 107/21 | senior [3] 26/ | 182/11 189/23 | 168/25 170/8 |
| 51/4 | 108/13 111 | 27/24 | Shadow [3] 14/ | 184/11 |
| searching [2] | 111/19 111/ | sense [2] 91/2 | 1/21 33/11 | signatures [2] |
| 44/16 55/9 | 112/14 117/ | 139/ | shake [1] 127/ | 37/1 37/2 |
| seated [4] 17/6 | 117 | sent [34] | shall [7] 57/ | signed [14] |
| 67/7 83/14 152/5 | 123/16 124/3 | 15/24 27/5 38/25 | 59/20 59/21 72/7 | 12/19 93/19 94/8 |
| second [11] 22/12 | 125/14 131/23 | 39/14 39/25 49/6 | 73/11 73/20 136/8 | 94/25 98/21 99/8 |
| 41/20 117/14 | 132/23 136/5 137/3 | 49/15 49/20 50/8 | shape [1] 126/13 | 115/11 157/14 |
| 123/10 132/8 | 137/9 137/16 138/7 | 53/18 56/2 56/11 | she [13] 7/19 9/20 | 170/4 201/9 202/1 |
| 143/11 171/10 | 142/25 148/4 | 60/25 75/15 75/19 | 63/1 85/25 110/19 | 202/5 202/25 |
| 171/15 176/10 | 149/12 157/ | 100/5 100/7 106/ | 137/25 179/9 180/9 | significant [2] |
| 199/14 | 162/23 163/25 | 107/18 108/8 112/8 | 198/23 199/1 199/2 | 46/17 65/10 |
| secret [1] 189/4 | 166/10 166/13 | 116/14 143/1 | 199/5 199/10 | signing [2] 94/5 |
| Section [9] 57/ | 166/23 167/7 | 143/13 143/17 | sheets [1] 16 | 170/5 |
| 61/15 71/19 71/25 | 167/17 167/24 | 143/18 143/20 | sheriff [2] 32/17 | similar [1] 99/12 |
| 72/3 74/1 74/4 74/7 | 168/1 169/21 171/6 | 144/11 145/1 145/4 | 32/21 | since [4] 35/4 |
| 136/4 | 171/13 171/19 | 145/5 198/7 198/7 | shoot [1] 12 | 107/12 182/23 |
| Section 11 [4] | 171 | sentence [8] 61/6 | shop [3] 129/ | 182/23 |
| 71/25 72/3 74/4 | 176/10 176/11 | 61/17 73/11 73/17 | 129/5 1 | sir [81] |
| 136/4 | 177/13 178/16 | 117/14 123/11 | short [11] 7/ | 48/6 56/21 59/8 |
| Section 16 [2] | 179/2 179/20 | 168/13 170/ | 16 63 | 2/17 66/13 6 |
| 57/5 61/15 | 181/6 181/18 | September [2] | 63/9 63/11 64/12 | 80/22 83/18 84/19 |
| Section 3 [2] | 181/25 183/5 186/3 | 122/5 122/7 | 65/4 97/23 125/22 | 85/13 86/11 86/16 |
| 74/7 | 186/4 186/18 188/9 | September 2011 | 141/14 | 86/23 100/21 102/5 |
| secure [5] 35/ | 189/12 190/9 | [1] 122/ | SHORTHAND [1] | 105/8 105/24 |
| 37/10 37/11 132/19 | 197/ | series [2] 19/ | 204/ | 106/23 107/12 |
| 181/24 | seeing [2] |  | should [9] 7/14 | 08/3 108/9 111/ |
| secured [18] | 197/12 | serious [1] 183/16 | 8/13 14/12 54/6 | 113/2 116/15 |
| 15/2 35/18 36/ | seeks [1] 12 | served [7] 11/16 | 60/16 82/2 112/1 | 116/20 117/4 117/7 |
| 40/17 46/6 46/20 | seem [2] | 11/17 11/25 12/ | 160/7 169/8 | 122/17 122/23 |
| 47/6 47/7 47/23 | 175/5 | 59/2 117/19 174/2 | show [12] 11/15 | 123/16 123/21 |
| 48/9 48/15 48/16 | seemed [3] 127/6 | service [5] 20/25 | 12/5 12/11 12/21 | 124/4 124/10 |
| 48/21 49/7 123/13 | 183/19 193/1 | 40/11 44/4 52/9 | 14/9 16/10 16/17 | 131/16 136/2 136/6 |
| 151/13 181/24 | seems [7] 27/17 | 97/14 | 104/10 161/17 | 141/16 141/20 |
| 151/13 181/24 | 30/24 88/24 91/15 | servicer [3] 113/22 | 185/18 185/19 | 145/15 151/18 |
| securing [2] | 152/16 175/21 | 114/2 114/9 | 193/5 | 151/20 152/17 |
| $56 / 17$ | 182/10 | services [15] 18/8 | showed [4] 163/10 | 153/2 153/5 153/8 |
| securi | seen [16] 18/24 | 38/17 38/19 53/13 | 163/12 192/9 | 54/13 154/15 |
| 23/5 24/3 24/3 | 19/9 28/25 29/10 | 84/14 85/20 95/4 | 199/20 | 155/19 163/19 |
| 33/7 41/10 49/24 | 93/9 93/12 93/12 | 95/17 96/6 97/8 | showing [4] 36/2 | 163/20 164/2 |
| 57/13 188/25 | 100/21 100/23 | 102/12 171/7 | 36/4 105/10 173/20 | 64/16 166/10 |
| see [106] 9/12 | 154/15 163/20 | 171/23 178/7 181 | shown [4] 12/2 | 66/14 166/24 |
| 9/19 15/13 20/18 | 166/23 167/1 | servicing [1] 29/1 | 108/5 108/25 | 167/8 167/10 |
| 22/12 22/25 23/21 | 177/22 178/19 | session [3] 65/24 | 109/11 | 167/15 169/11 |
| 24/5 24/13 24/18 | 186/ | 65/25 66/5 | shows [6] 102/6 | 171/13 171/25 |
| 25/11 26/7 34/17 | sell [2] 32/ | set [7] 9/19 67/2 | 102/8 102/14 | 172/13 172/21 |
| 34/22 36/25 37/2 | 131/18 | 115/17 146/3 146/5 | 102/15 174/21 | 74/7 175/14 176/9 |
| 38/4 38/16 39/6 | se | 157/4 197 |  | 178 |
| 40/14 41/14 42/5 | selling [2] 133/1 | setting [1] $8 / 5$ | 10 | 182/1 184/2 184/6 |
| 47/21 48/7 49/15 | 153/24 | settlement [1] | side [4] 23/23 | 184/19 186/4 186/6 |


| S | sorry [23] 28/ | $\mathbf{s p}$ | stating [3] | 18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sir... [5] 186/10 | 47/22 71/20 71/22 | 90/19 92/23 94/7 | 178/13 | tly [1] 160/5 |
| 192/15 193/8 | 73/13 78/14 78/25 | 46/2 | status [12] 14/3 | ke [3] 90/1 |
| 199/24 203/13 | 112/17 119/15 | speculat | 26/24 31/2 | 12/25 121/22 |
| site [2] 88/11 | 132/11 137/22 | 45/25 59/19 60/13 | 107/5 107/6 107/8 | strip [1] 8/22 |
| 100/6 | 145/7 145/15 | 92/7 92/23 93/3 | 142/8 142/9 142/13 | stuff [2] 128/6 |
| situation [2] 12 | 169/12 171/18 | 93/5 133/17 | 142/17 148/4 | 166/21 |
| 104/7 | 175/7 180/23 | spell [4] 17/7 67/8 | statute [3] 72/ | subject [14] 12/17 |
| six[2] $7 / 5127 / 2$ | 183/24 194/7 | 83/15 152/6 | 134/25 135/11 | 25/8 31/14 72/ |
| skipped [1] 180/ | 194/25 195/5 199/8 | spend [2] | statutes [1] 72 | 85/14 85/17 121/15 |
| sleep [1] $8 / 20$ | 201/7 | 122/15 | statutorily [1] | 126/9 132/4 171/12 |
| slightly [1] 27/17 | 3] | spending | 135/1 | 2/24 175/23 |
| slow [1] 132/12 | sounds [9] 3 | split [2] 148/2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stayed [2] } \\ & 135 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $182 / 15$ |
| small [1] 125/17 | 64/18 84/9 161/2 | 148/23 | staying [3] 8/1 | 12/9 32/14 72/7 |
|  | 162/22 177/4 183/7 | spoke [1] | 135/6 146/25 | 72/12 73/1 136/8 |
| [1] $163 / 17$ | 183/13 187/7 | ST [4] 3/5 39/ | STENOTYPE [2] | 136/18 |
| sold [9] 11/3 12/6 | sources [1] 108 | 1 | 204/8 | ubordinates |
| 92/25 93/3 121/20 | South [5] 58/5 | stack [2] 34/ | step [6] 62/ | 72/21 |
| 122/10 123/5 | 2 124/2 186/ | 50/2 | 62/20 64/9 80/23 | bordination |
| 123/13 123/20 | 187/2 | staff [1] | 124/16 151/20 | 2/7 72/3 136/4 |
| sole [1] 153/13 | Southwest | stake [1] 19 | Stevenson [3] | 137/7 |
| some [36] $7 / 10$ | /8 | stamp [1] | 78/25 79/13 79/22 | oe |
| 8/21 22/9 27/8 28/4 | 39/1 39/23 52/8 | stance [1] 72 | still [15] 16/14 | bpoenaed |
| 38/14 43/20 50/20 | 53/12 57/25 171/7 | stand [2] 83/2 | 29/1 31/4 31/8 31/8 | 65/1 |
| 94/23 96/21 97/2 | 171/23 178/7 181/6 | 151/24 | 31/10 33/10 43/11 | subpoenaed rig |
|  | speak [4] 27/6 | standard [8] 88/2 | 46/21 51/5 91/2 | [1] 65/1 |
|  | 74/21 85/22 131/13 | 88/4 117/10 120/24 | 112/7 115/13 | SUBSCRIBED [ |
| 125/9 126/22 | speaking [4] 45/13 | 121/11 143/2 | 163/14 190/ | 204/13 |
| 129/21 141/6 | 134/23 168/11 | 185/14 185/16 | stipulate [1] 155/9 | subsection [5] |
| 148/23 148/25 | 168/20 | stands [1] 20/6 | stipulated [4] | 25/8 25/17 25/21 |
| 160/19 162/2 | speaks [3] 11 | start [6] 65/ | 87/14 155/8 155/ | 102/6 102/15 |
| 163/18 170/25 | 18/25 121/3 | 66/12 96/16 132/13 | 165/19 | subsequent [1] |
| 174/22 175/5 175/6 | specialize [1] 4 | 150/4 190/18 | stipulation [ | 126/21 |
| 177/5 178/25 | specific [21] 55/ | started [4] 63/3 |  | ubstance [4] |
|  | 68/3 80/12 85/22 | 92/16 92/17 122/12 | Stone [39] 10/7 | 125/21 125/23 |
|  | 87/2 91/22 93/11 | starting [2] 66/4 | 13/14 23/6 26/11 | 125/24 142/19 |
|  | 100/22 124/9 | 177/22 | 35/19 37/11 37/12 | successful [1] |
| somebody [6] | 125/18 126/24 | starts [2] | 42/8 69/9 77/10 | 123/3 |
|  | 126/24 129/25 | 71/15 | 78/8 85/9 99/24 | such [7] 14/21 |
| 60/17 129/ | 130/9 136/15 | state [14] 14/5 | 152/21 152/23 | 20/10 41/6 42/20 |
| someone [ | 156/14 156/15 | 17/7 43/22 54/10 | 154/20 154/23 | 46/3 73/20 135/11 |
| $54 /$ | 156/18 185/13 | 54/13 60/21 67/8 | 155/20 156/3 | ues [1] 23/9 |
| 54/10 | 186/24 191/3 | 72/20 83/15 121/4 | 156/10 156/25 | uffering [1] |
| $48 / 2354 / 1167 / 24$ | specifically [10] | 136/25 152/6 204/2 | 156/25 164/7 | 137/24 |
| 78/11 80/15 82/2 | 40/10 42/19 48/12 | 204/14 | 166/13 169/1 | suffice [2] 9/24 |
| 116/18 130/8 | 61/2 68/6 71/14 | stated [5] 12/1 | 171/24 173 | 6/4 |
| 137/17 145/25 | 81/21 127/10 | 35/17 43/7 56/12 | 173/17 175/8 | ufficient [4] |
| 173/15 | 130/14 156/9 | 174/23 | 175/13 176/14 | 16/14 31/15 115/2 |
| sometime [2] | specifics [2] 97/ | statem | 181/2 182/9 | SUITE [4] 2/8 3/6 |
| 126/18 201/20 | 97/24 | 117/25 118/1 | 83/8 | 2 39/14 |
| sometimes [3] | specify [2] 56/1 | 18/2 | 200/1 | um [2] 117/18 |
| Some 133/9 169/9 | $56 / 10$ | $118 / 24118 / 25$ <br> statements [1] | $200 / 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 175 / 6 \\ & \text { summary [1] } \end{aligned}$ |
| somewhat [3] | spectrum [1] $187 / 23$ | statements [1] 9/16 | stood [1] 110/2 stopped [3] 28/5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { summary [1] } \\ & 167 / 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 7/15 152/24 152/25 | speculate [5] | states [5] | $28 / 13147 / 8$ | Sunday [1] 187/13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { somewhere [1] } \\ & 7 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | $109 / 23115 / 5$ | $43 / 161 / 272 / 6$ | street [4] 124/3 | superior [4] 41/18 |
| son [2] 27/3 28/11 | 119/10 137/1 137/3 | 133/23 | 186/20 186/25 | 41/23 42/11 43/17 |

(30) sir... - superior

| S | 86/2 87/4 107/11 | 132/7 | 17/2 | $27 / 18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| superpriority [5] | /16 109/4 109/4 | task [3] 143/2 | testimony [31] | 1/5 135/16 |
| 15/25 16/2 16/7 | 110/11 110/13 | 143/6 159/20 | 8/19 21/23 30/20 | 6/23 138/5 |
| /15 16/16 | 131/23 132/16 | tasks [1] 45/15 | 50/25 51/14 63/3 | 138/16 143/1 |
| supersede [1] | 133/12 134/21 | taught [1] 191/22 | 63/21 84/4 90/12 | 145/13 147/20 |
| $72 / 18$ | 135/4 135/6 135/7 | tax [1] 89/6 | 90/13 90/16 90/18 | 147/24 151/3 |
| SUPERVISION [1] | 135/14 136/21 | taxable [4] 88/18 | 91/5 102/21 106/19 | 156/17 162/25 |
|  | 141/14 147/22 | 89/1 89/20 89/23 | 109/12 110/11 | 166/18 167/24 |
| supplement [1] | 148/25 150/20 | taxes [2] 26/3 41/2 | 114/21 120/18 | 168/5 170/13 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { supple } \\ \text { 1044 } \end{gathered}$ | 159/2 160/3 160/16 | team [1] 47/1 | 127/13 137/4 | 170/25 173/10 |
| supply [1] 41/12 | 166/8 167/5 171/4 | technical [1] | 143/22 145/14 | 180/1 180/20 |
| supposed [4] 7/16 | 175/20 177/21 | 170/23 | 145/16 151/6 | 180/22 180/25 |
| 41/17 60/9 60/17 | 181/15 183/4 | telephonically [2] | 160/23 162/25 | 10 183/3 |
| Supreme [7] 14/5 | 184/23 185/8 | 9/8 9/10 | 170/2 178/9 192/23 | 183/17 184/11 |
| 15/5 126/18 128/3 | 186/17 186/17 | tell [25] 8/2 17/16 | 193/1 | 184/13 184/21 |
| 182/25 182/25 | 187/11 188/1 188/2 | 17/23 20/3 29/15 | than [23] 11/22 | 185/7 188/20 |
| 191/22 | 194/15 195/21 | 34/24 35/7 48/7 | 49/16 49/21 50/1 | 188/25 189/4 |
| sure [24] $7 / 22$ | 199/4 199/7 201/3 | 49/4 55/11 67/15 | 58/21 74/8 91/11 | 192/11 195/3 |
| 62/23 87/1 92/5 | taken [3] 51/4 | 75/13 84/1 106/18 | 91/19 104/19 112/4 | 198/16 200/8 |
| 96/21 96/23 97/15 | 111/10 122/8 | 106/20 107/11 | 113/21 118/14 | 200/20 200/21 |
| 97/19 97/24 104/4 | takes [1] 32/7 | 110/4 120/23 121/4 | 123/20 135/18 | their [26] 6/15 |
| 104/11 118/13 | taking [5] 22/7 | 123/5 131/8 171/1 | 139/20 142/14 | 16/24 30/15 35/21 |
| 121/25 136/16 | 65/4 78/23 116/13 | 173/13 193/12 | 145/18 153/18 | 39/1 39/18 44/4 |
| 137/23 163/17 | 198/18 | 193/15 | 160/18 189/3 189/9 | 49/7 60/15 67/20 |
| 172/19 175/21 | talk [17] 13/24 | telling [2] 53/17 | 189/9 189/22 | 68/21 72/12 79/5 |
| 177/3 185/12 | 38/14 62/11 82/6 | 136/16 | thank [38] 8/11 | 105/2 124/7 124 |
| 185/16 185/18 | 82/7 82/7 125/17 | template [2] | 12/24 12/25 16/19 | 126/22 130/7 14 |
| 191/10 191/11 | 127/6 127/17 | 116/24 117/1 | 16/20 34/6 45/2 | 149/13 158/1 16 |
| surprise [2] 97/5 | 127/23 128/9 130/6 | ten [1] 144/2 | 56/20 60/19 61/9 | 169/7 173/15 |
| 97/13 | 130/25 136/2 | tender [1] 31/5 | 62/17 62/18 62/2 | 173/25 175/11 |
| surprised [2] |  |  | 68/13 73/8 80/16 | them [37] 10/21 |
| 79/16 130/17 | talked [4] 64/24 | ter | 80 | 22/9 34/10 49/2 |
| urvives [1] | 106/21 | terms [8] |  |  |
| 33/23 | talking [55] $7 / 21$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { terms [8] } 23 / 11 \\ 25 / 1031 / 2245 / 20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 129 / 5141 / 814 \\ & 141 / 17141 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | $7 / 187 / 3100 / 17$ |
| ustain [4] 46/11 | 24/5 25/11 38/5 | 132/21 139/12 | 151/16 151/19 | 4/7 119/23 |
| 5/23 101/15 89/13 | 39/6 40/14 41/14 | 140/9 198/18 | 152/13 154/11 | /20 121/20 |
| sworn [4] 17/3 | 50/7 57/15 59/14 | testified [24] 17/5 | 186/7 189/14 | 124/12 124/13 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { sworn } 24] \text { 1//3 } \\ 67 / 483 / 11 \\ 152 / 2 \end{gathered}$ | 61/7 61/19 64/25 | 30/13 30/18 45/8 | 199/15 203/11 | / 130/15 |
| system [18] 20/3 | 86/11 88/18 88/20 | 52/1 67/6 83/13 | 203/14 203/19 | 130/16 133/5 140/2 |
| $20 / 520 / 770 / 9$ | 93/17 93/20 101/11 | 86/18 90/3 93/4 | 203/21 | 148/24 159/11 |
| 20/12 29/7 29/14 | 114/3 117/6 117/20 | 99/17 102/18 107/1 | that [833] | 161/24 161/25 |
| 29/24 30/1 30/16 | 123/16 124/4 | 108/15 128/14 | that's [84] $8 / 2$ | 162/2 165/7 168/7 |
| 34/17 42/3 44/17 | 126/19 127/24 | 130/21 139/19 | 10/3 12/17 14/21 | 168/8 168/10 |
| 44/20 53/16 98/12 | 128/2 129/2 129/2 | 150/24 152/4 | 16/17 16/22 18/25 | 175/23 176/1 |
| 110/24 111/5 | 129/4 129/5 129/6 | 161/11 164/6 | 20/17 22/21 29/25 | 193/15 193/18 |
| systems [2] 42/2 | 130/13 132/23 | 172/17 196/16 | 31/19 31/20 32/24 | then [103] 7/15 |
| $44 / 12$ | 136/5 163/25 | 201/23 | 45/25 51/23 52/17 | 12/15 19/4 19/5 |
|  | 166/10 166/13 | testify [14] 7/16 | 56/15 57/5 57/18 | 22/18 23/20 26/6 |
| T | 166/19 167/8 | 17/3 67/4 83/11 | 57/20 59/16 67/25 | 28/5 28/5 33/10 |
| [2] 69/18 98/22 | 169/10 169/15 | 90/21 90/22 99/7 | 68/1 70/8 72/9 73/7 | 34/15 36/3 40/16 |
| b 7 [1] | 171/13 171/14 | 99/11 100/16 | 73/13 73/14 73/23 | 42/19 43/11 44/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { take [60] } 7 / 77 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | 171/25 174/6 | 114/14 128/23 | 74/12 76/16 81/25 | 44/11 47/8 48/3 |
| 28/16 35/25 37/16 | 176/11 179/3 | 152/2 175/7 175/12 | 82/9 87/7 88/16 | 50/5 53/15 57/23 |
| $37 / 1841 / 148 / 1$ | 179/21 181/3 181/7 | testifying [6] | 103/11 104/11 | 61/24 63/11 63/13 |
| 48/10 51/19 61/6 | 181/25 183/5 | 85/23 91/25 122/14 | 109/1 109/10 115/6 | 68/19 71/25 73/5 |
| 63/9 63/10 63/10 | 189/20 197/15 | 141/9 146/1 175/5 | 116/2 116/18 | 73/10 73/17 73/24 |
| 63/11 66/15 69/3 | talks [2] 60/5 | testimonies [1] | 116/23 118/16 | 74/5 74/11 76/18 |

(31) superpriority - then

| T | 112/16 113/5 113/5 | 174/5 179/1 | 130/8 131 | 70/1 89/23 98/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| then... [69] 80/6 | 113/21 117/22 | 179/19 188/14 | 131/25 134/8 | 98/16 103/8 108/5 |
| then... [69] 80/6 | 117/24 118/7 | THEREAFTER [1] | 137/10 137/14 | 111/7 111/8 111/20 |
|  | 118/11 118/13 | 204/7 | 139/22 139/25 | 113/17 114/6 |
| 91/4 93/19 100/13 | 118/17 118/24 | thereby [1] 26/4 | 140/11 140/15 | 115/21 119/11 |
| 102/7 102/14 | 119/1 120/12 | therefore [1] 21/9 | 140/21 143/5 143/7 | 120/2 121/22 122/8 |
| 102/14 106/15 | 120/19 120/19 | therein [1] 73/12 | 145/23 150/21 | 125/8 127/11 |
| 106/25 109/9 | 120/21 121/2 121/2 | thereof [1] 73/19 | 150/23 151/3 | 127/12 128/16 |
| 109/21 111/11 | 121/5 121/18 | these [59] 7/23 | 159/13 159/16 | 129/22 130/15 |
| 111/12 112/10 | 121/21 121/21 | 9/13 60/3 70/11 | 167/21 169/7 169/8 | 130/18 142/7 |
| 113/23 114/21 | 122/2 123/11 | 72/13 72/20 72/20 | 174/13 179/6 | 144/23 174/21 |
| 115/19 115/23 | 123/23 127/15 | 72/23 73/1 74/3 | they're [16] 12/23 | 174/23 175/17 |
| 118/18 120/10 | 128/21 129/10 | 86/20 86/24 92/12 | 52/18 55/14 60/16 | 180/21 182/19 |
| 121/7 122/9 140/20 | 129/17 129/18 | 92/24 98/14 104/19 | 66/5 66/11 69/20 | 193/11 193/13 |
| 142/18 144/14 | 130/1 131/17 133/9 | 105/17 105/18 | 87/17 113/18 129/1 | though [11] 15/10 |
| 144/23 149/11 | 135/21 137/25 | 106/6 116/4 121/19 | 129/6 142/15 143/6 | 27/10 49/12 94/8 |
| 150/8 151/2 158/12 | 138/23 140/15 | 122/4 123/10 126/4 | 174/15 176/7 176/8 | 97/7 109/6 112/7 |
| 159/6 160/14 161/5 | 145/21 147/12 | 126/8 128/11 | thing [8] 8/14 | 127/13 168/6 |
| 161/8 161/14 162/4 | 148/15 149/19 | 129/18 134/5 134/5 | 13/21 56/22 127/7 | 169/20 200/21 |
| 163/22 164/9 166/2 | 151/7 151/11 | 134/6 134/20 135/8 | 127/18 131/24 | thought [4] 121/11 |
| 166/12 167/25 | 153/16 154/13 | 137/7 137/13 139/6 | 138/10 181/13 | 126/8 129/19 |
| 169/10 171/9 | 154/14 156/5 158/5 | 139/9 139/11 140/8 | things [5] 32/6 | 182/14 |
| 172/10 173/2 | 159/18 159/19 | 140/8 140/18 | 65/6 75/16 90/10 | thousan |
| 175/22 175/25 | 160/13 160/15 | 140/22 140/22 | 113/16 | 104/10 |
| 176/6 177/16 | 161/3 161/4 161/9 | 140/23 142/8 | think [54] 9/8 28/8 | three [11] 15/12 |
| 180/13 180/22 | 161/19 162/4 | 142/14 142/14 | 30/11 52/10 55/5 | 15/22 19/3 30/25 |
| 181/5 181/9 181/14 | 162/12 162/14 | 154/6 162/10 168/3 | 58/16 59/6 63/7 | 31/2 113/17 115/1 |
| 181/23 182/17 | 162/15 162/16 | 174/10 174/20 | 65/4 65/10 79/5 | 134/10 135/12 |
| 185/11 188/5 | 162/24 163/2 | 175/4 175/4 175/10 | 79/13 80/25 81/12 | 135/14 177/12 |
| 192/25 200/5 201/2 | 163/23 164/2 | 176/3 180/6 183/15 | 83/1 90/15 92/20 | rough [35] |
| 201/22 202/24 | 166/12 167/15 | 185/15 193/14 | 92/21 104/16 | 44/20 48/2 48/4 |
| there [168] 10/22 | 167/16 168/19 | they [99] 11/16 | 106/25 112/5 119/2 | 48/6 49/3 58/18 |
| 11/20 12/5 12/13 | 169/21 173/10 | 15/8 15/10 15/11 | 127/14 128/10 | 69/21 78/6 86/5 |
| 14/19 15/6 | 174/22 175/10 | 15/22 15/23 28/5 | 129/12 136/16 | 86/19 86/20 88/9 |
| 16/13 18/15 18/20 | 177/17 178/14 | 32/7 37/20 38/22 | 139/17 139/19 | 89/20 90/1 90/6 |
| 25/4 25/5 26/9 | 182/11 182/24 | 39/22 40/6 40/9 | 140/5 141/7 145/21 | 91/8 91/20 104/24 |
| 27/24 28/7 28/18 | 185/23 186/8 188/1 | 42/6 43/3 43/3 | 150/24 160/14 | 105/21 106/10 |
| 29/2 29/6 32/16 | 188/2 188/7 188/11 | 43/10 44/15 51/3 | 161/11 163/3 | 126/23 132/8 |
| 36/1 40/6 42/1 43/6 | 188/11 189/18 | 53/8 55/10 55/19 | 164/21 169/15 | 137/24 142/24 |
| 43/6 43/15 43/15 | 189/19 192/2 | 57/19 59/2 60/16 | 170/6 170/6 172/17 | 149/14 150/16 |
| 43/19 43/20 43/20 | 199/22 199/24 | 61/25 65/23 65/25 | 174/22 175/9 | 150/20 150/21 |
| 44/3 44/21 45/16 | 200/1 200/2 | 66/1 66/2 66/4 | 175/16 176/16 | 55/3 167/2 167/3 |
| 47/4 47/21 48/7 | there's [44] 7/18 | 67/23 67/24 68/5 | 176/24 188/1 | 176/2 184/17 185/4 |
| 48/7 49/5 50/3 50/8 | 9/9 9/12 13/23 | 68/6 72/18 74/5 | 188/25 189/4 | 185/10 |
| 51/3 51/5 51/20 | 14/21 19/3 19/5 | 75/16 75/16 75/17 | 191/22 194/15 | throw [3] 85/5 |
| 51/21 52/17 52/18 | 20/12 31/5 33/7 | 75/17 75/18 75/18 | 199/22 200/18 | 119/17 120/12 |
| 54/1 58/16 58/17 | 38/3 43/11 44/21 | 75/19 76/22 76/25 | 201/3 202/9 | Throwing [1] |
| 62/7 74/4 74/13 | 49/5 54/18 69/17 | 77/1 77/2 77/3 77/4 | thinks [2] 129/1 | 163/16 |
| 75/3 75/5 75/24 | 74/14 74/25 76/10 | 80/4 82/7 91/20 | 129/13 | time [101] 6/24 |
| 76/21 78/3 78/24 | 80/12 86/9 87/24 | 92/16 92/17 94/19 | third [4] 173/10 | 10/19 11/6 13/18 |
| 86/13 86/16 88/12 | 102/12 106/17 | 94/20 96/12 96/14 | 199/23 199/25 | 13/22 14/18 15/1 |
| 92/18 94/18 96/21 | 107/22 108/25 | 100/16 110/2 | 200/2 | 27/8 28/4 35/10 |
| 97/1 97/13 97/22 | 112/3 115/17 117/9 | 111/12 111/14 | this [454] | 35/14 35/25 46/24 |
| 99/18 100/19 | 117/9 118/4 121/1 | 114/17 115/22 | THOMAS [3] 2/5 | 47/24 48/10 51/2 |
| 103/10 103/12 | 128/6 143/25 | 118/12 119/25 | 6/16 82/19 | 3/8 77/21 |
| 104/20 105/9 | 167/25 168/22 | 121/14 125/9 125/9 | those [39] 7/22 | 80/15 80/24 81/9 |
| 109/20 110/15 | 171/9 171/15 | 127/16 128/12 | 41/20 41/21 49/3 | 89/3 89/15 89/17 |
| 111/7 111/19 112/4 | 172/19 173/14 | 128/15 129/7 130/6 | 51/7 55/14 65/6 | 94/16 94/17 95/5 |

(32) then... - time

| T | 104/9 104/13 | 2] 120/15 | 15 | 112/1 113/7 115/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| time... [73] 95/25 | 6/23 | 120/15 | 31/14 32/4 32/13 | 2 116/14 |
| 96/23 97/16 97/23 | 108/18 108/20 | towards [2] 35/5 | 35/23 36/8 36/11 | 116/19 118/3 |
| 100/11 109/2 109/4 | 108/21 109/17 | 148/7 | 37/17 37/21 38/15 | 118/23 120/24 |
| 110/13 115/16 | 109/21 111/1 | town [1] 13/10 | 39/19 40/1 40/7 | 121/9 122/9 122 |
| 115/19 115/20 | 117/16 118/5 118/8 | Townhome [1] | 41/18 43/21 44/2 | 123/8 125/4 125/5 |
| 116/18 123/14 | 118/12 118/20 | 10/25 | 48/17 49/16 49/22 | 128/17 128/19 |
| 123/25 124/7 | 119/5 119/20 123/2 | Townhomes [12] | 49/25 50/1 50/8 | 132/17 134/10 |
| 124/25 128/18 | 126/13 129/15 | 47/23 48/9 48/14 | 50/10 51/23 52/21 | 134/14 134/15 |
| 129/18 130/14 | 140/10 140/23 | 49/6 66/24 67/19 | 53/24 54/2 54/6 | 134/18 134/22 |
| 130/19 136/3 | 150/21 152/18 | 93/16 94/6 95/18 | 54/17 55/18 57/19 | 135/17 138/25 |
| 137/21 140/1 140/4 | 158/1 158/2 158/3 | 115/12 132/19 | 57/21 58/4 58/12 | /16 144/18 |
| 140/19 141/14 | 158/3 158/6 158/8 | 201/9 | 58/14 58/17 58/2 | /21 155/22 |
| 143/7 145/10 | /13 | tracking | 61/ | 155/24 164/6 |
| 146/17 148/13 | 159/3 | 137/21 | 99 | 183/8 |
| 149/8 149/10 | 159/21 160/4 | trade [1] 189/4 | 102/24 103/13 | 184/1 |
| 156/21 156/22 | 160/17 162/13 |  |  | 85/21 |
| 157/9 158/2 158/15 | 175/6 175/10 190/7 | ] $42 / 19$ | 109/2 | 5/23 196/17 |
| 158/19 158/21 | 190/19 194/20 | /13 45/19 | 109/14 | /21 196/23 |
| 158/22 159/14 | 11 | 45/23 | 111/12 | /24 197/25 |
| 160/7 160/19 162/7 | 197/14 201/5 | action [1] | 112/12 112/14 | 1/1 201/21 |
| 162/8 162/9 162/13 | es [1] 159/11 | 31/3 | 112/19 113/13 | 202/21 |
| 162/16 162/19 | today [26] 8/24 | transactions [1] | 113/15 113/18 | trustee's [15] |
| 164/19 165/1 165/2 | 9/6 17/20 26/21 | 153/25 | 113/21 113/25 | 94/25 122/18 |
| 169/12 172/22 | 27/10 32/20 36/7 | TRANSCRIBED [1] | 114/2 114/4 114/9 | 122/25 123/4 |
| 173/8 174/12 | 37/20 37/25 42/3 | 204/8 | 114/10 114/18 | 123/19 154/18 |
| 174/21 175/2 | 65/7 65/10 81/10 | transcript [4] 1/15 | 114/20 120/6 | 154/19 157/14 |
| 175/20 182/10 | 83/24 85/8 85/25 | 79/21 80/4 204/10 | 138/15 138/18 | 166/19 184/8 |
| 183/1 183/3 183/15 | 86/22 87/23 89/5 | transfer [8] 23/12 | 150/25 151/3 | 188/18 191/6 |
| 184/14 184/15 | 107/20 124/21 | 23/16 25/25 34/15 | 154/20 154/23 | 191/15 201/4 |
| 185/4 188/10 190/5 | 132/5 152/14 | 73/11 73/18 73/22 | 155/20 155/22 | trusts [3] 52/14 |
| 192/13 196/7 197/3 | 152/17 172/20 | 164/5 | 155/25 156/1 156/2 | 102/7 162/1 |
| 203/4 204/7 | 200/9 | transferable [1] | 156/3 156/18 | th [13] 17/3 |
| timed [1] 83/6 | today's | 20/20 | 156/19 156/19 | 1/4 17/4 67/4 67/5 |
| times [13] 9/13 | told [6] 7/18 15/10 | transferred [2] | 156/24 157/4 157/6 | 6/5 83/11 83/12 |
| 52/14 52/16 90/3 | 50/21 50/21 119/24 | 13/16 164/9 | 157/13 158/5 160/8 | 83/12 152/2 152/3 |
| 125/14 127/22 | 164/21 | Treasurer | 161/4 161/8 161/9 | 2/3 173/14 |
| 131/13 138/23 | tomorrow [5] | 187 | 161/20 161/24 | 1] 173/5 |
| 148/23 158/16 | 8/23 8/25 81/4 | trial [17] 1/16 8/3 | 161/25 162/5 16 | try [8] 45/23 46/13 |
| 158/17 160/24 | 203/17 | 8/4 30/25 64/3 65/ | 17 | 11 |
| 160/24 | too [3] 68/10 | 66/ | 162/23 163/13 | 133/12 135/7 193/6 |
| TIMOTHY [1] 1/18 | 120/18 138/2 | 67/23 67/25 68/7 | 163/14 164/7 | g [7] 32 |
| tiny [1] 154/7 | took [8] 23/4 172/8 | 80/15 82/10 83/3 | 164/14 166/10 | 65/2 81/18 107/4 |
| title [88] 13/13 | 172/10 180/14 | 84/4 110/11 | 166/21 168/4 | 135/19 138/2 138/3 |
| $14 / 7 \quad 14 / 1114 / 12$ | 184/25 185/6 | trials [1] 18/1 | 168/15 168/18 | Ts [1] 169/7 |
| 14/13 14/14 16/19 | 186/19 204/5 | Tropicana [1] 8/16 | 170/11 170/17 | TUESDAY [2] |
| 37/23 40/25 41/8 | tools [1] 135/11 | true [8] 9/14 19/21 | 174/9 178/17 |  |
| 52/14 55/9 55/12 | top [20] 15/13 | 70/6 86/21 167/21 | 179/25 183/9 | tune [1] 182/21 |
| 55/13 55/15 71/16 | 21/23 22/2 22/12 | 194/20 196/19 | 183/11 195/22 | turning [1] 109/9 |
| 90/6 91/9 91/14 | 23/1 88/17 88/23 | 204/10 | 196/17 196/21 | twice [3] 130/2 |
| 91/20 96/4 96/18 | 89/18 105/19 166/9 | truly [3] 32/9 | 198/3 198/7 199/23 | 130/3 130/5 |
| 96/19 98/4 100/19 | 167/6 167/9 169/14 | 192/3 192/7 | 200/19 201/1 | two [23] 7/12 |
| 100/20 100/25 | 169/22 171/11 | trust [146] 5/5 | 201/21 202/21 | 11/17 12/3 15/18 |
| 101/1 101/7 101/10 | 172/2 172/3 176/10 | 10/14 10/18 11/18 | 203/9 | 16/12 31/2 32/6 |
| 101/17 101/19 | 179/18 194/16 | 12/4 12/6 12/7 12/9 | trustee [55] 6/11 | /25 80/3 81/4 |
| 102/19 102/24 | total [5] 7/6 88/17 | 12/13 12/17 12/24 | 7/15 13/3 13/15 | 8/22 90/10 103/8 |
| 103/3 103/8 103/24 | 89/1 123/12 123/20 | 13/3 13/14 13/15 | 15/16 32/13 94/22 | 104/19 128/20 |
| $104 / 2 \text { 104/5 104/8 }$ | touch [1] 94/1 | 13/17 14/2 14/7 | 102/23 111/23 | 130/11 142/7 |


| T | 33/13 41/22 48/19 | 84/23 85/6 88/21 | 50/21 50/22 51/10 | 87/12 88/9 88/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| two... [6] 142/14 | 49/13 56/16 68/11 | 89/21 105/16 | 52/1 52/3 52/6 | USB0035 [2] 88/9 |
| 164/5 177/12 | 72/16 140/20 175/1 | 109/21 115/19 | 52/11 52/19 52/22 | 88/17 |
| 181/23 184/23 | 201/22 | 127/16 129/15 | 52/23 52/25 53/5 | USB0046 [1] |
| 187/11 | understanding | 130/7 136/19 | 53/6 53/7 53/17 | 98/23 |
| type [9] 45/17 | [47] 7/8 19/24 | 139/17 139/21 | 53/18 54/15 55/16 | USB0047 [1] 98/6 |
| 45/24 50/4 111/18 | 22/15 23/4 23/12 | 140/15 157/4 | 56/1 57/24 58/5 | USB0049 [3] |
| 119/20 121/16 | 24/8 24/21 26/12 | 160/23 161/17 | 58/11 58/18 58/20 | 100/18 101/11 |
| 140/10 186/15 | 26/18 26/23 27/9 | 163/10 163/12 | 58/23 58/25 61/24 | 101/19 |
| 190/8 | 27/12 27/19 27/23 | 173/20 179/19 | 61/25 63/20 82/20 | USB005 [1] 19/5 |
| types [6] 119/11 | 31/10 32/10 37/3 | 182/24 183/25 | 83/1 86/22 87/23 | USB0051 [1] |
| 120/2 121/22 122/8 | 37/9 39/21 40/2 | 185/18 185/19 | 88/2 89/5 100/14 | 102/2 |
| 130/18 187/19 | 40/5 41/16 57/17 | 192/10 197/2 | 100/17 101/2 101/9 | USB0053 [2] |
| TYPEWRITING [1] | 58/2 58/6 61/24 | 197/17 199/17 | 102/24 103/3 | 101/11 101/20 |
| 204/8 | 61/25 68/16 74/2 | upfront [2] 148/24 | 104/19 104/20 | USB0075 [4] |
| typical [1] 188/8 | 75/22 83/2 85/14 | 149/1 | 106/21 107/18 | 105/5 106/14 107/1 |
| typically [7] 20/5 | 85/21 87/7 89/22 | upon [17] 32/25 | 107/20 108/8 108/9 | 111/4 |
| 35/21 45/23 103/6 | 90/4 90/20 91/6 | 43/21 90/5 94/9 | 108/12 108/13 | USB0077 [3] |
| 103/7 188/4 188/23 | 101/12 102/4 | 94/22 94/25 104/14 | 109/7 109/12 110/6 | 110/10 110/15 |
| U | 132/25 136/9 | 148/14 154/18 | 112/11 112/12 | 123/9 |
| Uh [2] 136/1 194/9 | 136/14 | 154/19 157/14 | 112/13 112/14 | USB0081 [2] |
| Uh-huh [2] 136/1 | understandings | 166/19 184/8 | 112/18 112/19 | 111/15 112/4 |
| 194/9 | [1] 20/22 | upper [3] 38/16 | 113/6 113/11 | USB0084 [2] |
| ultimate [2] 32/2 | Understood [5] | 52/1 53/9 | 114/12 114/16 | 115/9 117/6 |
| 32/25 | 88/14 92/8 93/6 | us [178] 2/2 6/16 | 114/22 114/25 | USB0089 [2] 93/7 |
| ultimately [1] | 100/8 112/3 | 6/19 6/20 10/9 | 114/25 132/4 145/1 | 94/22 |
| 31/11 | undisputed [1] | 10/11 10/19 11/15 | 145/22 148/18 | USB00897 [1] |
| Um [6] 33/15 74/15 | 176/7 | 11/21 11/25 12/20 | 148/24 148/25 | 122/13 |
| 88/16 138/12 | unfairness [1] | 12/21 16/24 16/25 | 151/3 151/8 151/12 | USB0154 [1] |
| 189/21 194/17 | 14/20 | 17/16 17/18 17/21 | 172/20 181/10 | 69/19 |
| Um-hum [3] 74/15 | unfortunate [1] | 17/24 18/4 18/6 | 183/14 183/20 | USB0160 [1] |
| 189/21 194/17 | 9/13 | 18/7 18/7 18/12 | USB [2] 112/4 | 71/15 |
| unable [1] 32/21 | University [1] | 18/25 19/16 19/17 | 163/18 | USB0161 [1] |
| uncertainty [3] | 84/22 | 19/22 21/17 22/3 | USB0 [1] 131/12 | 71/22 |
| 140/17 190/5 | unless [2] 57/9 | 23/4 24/8 24/22 | USB00 [1] 86/6 | USB0164 [3] 71/1 |
| 192/25 | 104/20 | 26/10 26/11 26/13 | USB0006 [1] | 135/25 136/4 |
| unclear [1] 182/11 | unmarried [1] | 26/20 27/5 27/10 | 22/11 | USB0168 [1] |
| under [33] 12/19 | 61/23 | 27/12 27/14 27/18 | USB0007 [3] | 73/25 |
| 14/25 24/23 25/6 | unpaid [3] 123/12 | 27/19 29/24 30/14 | 22/25 23/21 24/13 | USB0169 [1] |
| 25/10 25/14 25/20 | 149/10 176/13 | 31/18 34/17 35/5 | USB0008 [1] 25/2 | 69/25 |
| 26/17 27/13 28/1 | unreasonable [1] | 35/8 35/14 35/21 | USB0010 [2] 19/6 | USB0175 [1] 86/6 |
| 33/11 37/17 37/22 | 14/19 | 36/9 36/12 37/9 | 20/17 | USB02 [1] 86/20 |
| 40/7 40/13 40/17 | unrecorded [2] | 37/19 37/25 38/7 | USB0011 [2] 36/3 | USB0308 [4] |
| 58/12 61/22 62/1 | 98/7 98/9 | 38/8 38/11 38/15 | 57/23 | 28/17 28/20 30/6 |
| 65/1 66/9 71/8 | unrelated [1] | 38/22 39/3 39/8 | USB0013 [1] | 34/2 |
| 73/25 95/5 132/18 | 164/5 | 39/11 39/12 39/15 | 40/13 | USB101 [1] 107/5 |
| 138/15 138/18 | unsecured [1] | 39/18 39/21 40/1 | USB0016 [1] 57/3 | USB120 [1] 147/10 |
| 167/19 170/2 | 181/25 | 40/2 40/5 40/9 | USB0017 [1] | USB124 [1] 149/12 |
| 172/17 174/24 | Unsigned [1] 98/8 | 40/11 40/21 40/21 | 36/23 | USB125 [3] 147/20 |
| 190/13 204/9 | until [4] 65/15 | 41/18 41/21 41/23 | USB0019 [1] 36/3 | 149/4 149/19 |
| undergraduate [1] | 81/20 96/16 115/19 | 42/1 42/2 42/5 | USB0026 [1] 86/5 | USB164 [2] 71/14 |
| 84/20 | unusual [1] 97/4 | 42/10 42/14 42/17 | USB0028 [1] | 72/1 |
| underlying [1] | up [40] 9/19 11/3 | 42/22 43/2 44/3 | 86/13 | USB313 [3] 166/8 |
| 31/18 | 18/15 22/5 31/10 | 44/6 44/12 48/12 | USB0032 [1] | 169/11 174/6 |
| understand [14] | 34/10 38/14 52/17 | 48/23 49/1 49/4 | 107/24 | USB318 [4] 170/14 |
| 7/9 7/24 9/5 30/23 | 52/17 67/2 82/2 | 49/6 49/8 50/8 | USB0034 [3] | 171/5 175/16 |

(34) two... - USB318

| U |  |  |  | 112/25 113/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USB318... [1] | 170/11 170/17 | 103/22 | We'd [1] 32/19 | 13/15 114/16 |
| 75/22 | 174/9 178/16 | 139/22 | we'll [15] $8 / 58 / 6$ | 117/23 121/3 |
| USB32 [4] 142/5 | 179/25 183/10 | vis-à-vis [2] | 8/9 27/18 34/3 64/9 | 121/22 122/5 |
| 143/12 144/14 | value [26] 11/4 | 103/22 139/2 | 65/12 68/8 81/3 | 122/24 127/4 12 |
| 145/8 | 11/7 12/18 14/17 | vocabulary [1] | 81/11 81/12 81/20 | 133/15 135/10 |
| USB324 [2] 176/9 | 88/18 89/1 90/4 | 127/2 | 81/21 82/6 197/4 | 137/13 139/19 |
| 183/24 [2] 176 | 90/19 90/22 90/23 | void [1] 133/13 | we're [28] 7/5 7/6 | 143/23 145/8 |
| USB325 [1] 183/4 | 91/5 91/10 91/17 | voidable [1] 133/3 | 7/21 7/25 16/18 | 149/12 150/17 |
| USB327 [1] 177/10 | 140/9 140/19 | voided [1] 133/3 | 19/1 19/12 29/12 | 150/20 156/4 163/3 |
| USB329 [2] 167/13 | 169/22 171/12 | voluntary [2] 15/9 | 31/11 65/2 65/4 | 168/5 169/20 |
| 170/3 | 174/21 174/23 | 23/17 | 66/6 70/7 83/5 | 170/25 172/6 174/ |
| USB33 [1] 148/8 | 175/11 178/1 | vote [1] 74/6 | 101/10 101/10 | 177/7 180/20 |
| USB340 [1] 179/15 | 178/25 180/15 | voting [1] 71/17 | 105/7 111/17 | 180/20 180/23 |
| USB343 [1] 177/22 | 180/16 192/4 192/8 | W | 121/5 | 181/12 183/9 |
| USB344 [3] 178/4 |  | wa | 130/13 131/15 |  |
| 180/13 181/1 | Van [2] 179/7 | walk [4] 124/12 | 154/17 169/15 | $\begin{aligned} & 192 / 4192 / 5 \text { 192/ } \\ & 192 / 11193 / 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| USB347 [2] 181/14 | 180/7 | 185/10 188/2 188/7 | 178/21 183/3 | 195/18 199/7 202/4 |
| 181/18 | various [1] 126/23 | walked [1] 138/2 | we've [12] 7/12 | went [8] 65/20 |
| USB359 [1] 199/7 | VEGAS [12] $2 / 9$ | want [24] 9/25 | 34/14 34/14 34/15 | 98/11 124/2 138/17 |
| USB41 [1] 147/1 | 6/1 10/7 23/6 85/9 | 31/24 37/16 50/19 | 44/14 62/25 90/1 | 170/6 184/12 197/5 |
| USB46 [1] 143/24 | 124/3 169/17 | 53/1 55/17 62/12 | 106/20 107/13 | 199/10 |
| USB462 [3] 186/5 | /24 173/17 | 63/9 63/24 66/20 | 141/11 176/2 | were [97] 10/15 |
| 201/23 202/24 | /2 182/9 186/21 | 69/20 80/3 81/14 | 190/16 | 11/2 11/16 11/17 |
| USB466 [5] 154/5 | vendors [1] 68/24 | 81/19 82/7 93/14 | website [8] 104/2 | $1812 / 312 / 5$ |
| 155/2 184/4 201/5 | verbally [1] 45/18 | 105/4 117/3 123/9 | 134/15 135/18 | 18 17/20 18/3 |
| 201/12 | verbatim [1] 75/14 | 127/21 129/24 | 162/23 185/24 | 7/1 27/3 30/10 |
| USB468 [1] 163/19 | Verne [1] 84/22 | 131/23 162/3 | 186/1 197/11 | 35/11 42/20 44/8 |
| USB469 [1] 163/22 | versa [1] 126/2 | 181/15 | 197/16 | 44/16 45/11 45/13 |
| USB49 [1] 150/9 | version [2] 19/21 | wanted [13] 10/20 | Wednesdays [1] | 45/15 45/19 54/21 |
| USB57 [2] 109/12 | 99/9 | 11/21 11/24 11/25 | 127/14 | 66/1 76/14 84/11 |
| 109/14 | versus [7] 110/7 | 15/23 15/23 38/1 | week [5] 8/7 | 84/13 84/24 86/21 |
| USB75 [2] | 162/5 193/22 | 40/6 55/19 59/2 | 156/11 184/20 | 91/19 92/12 92/21 |
| 144/7 | 194/10 194/19 | 60/3 77/1 151/14 | 187/8 187/10 | 94/18 94/19 99/16 |
| USB81 [1] 144/21 | 195/1 195/22 | wants [3] | weeks [6] 135/1 | 103/10 106/6 |
| USB82 [1] 144/23 | very [25] $8 / 20$ | 56/10 82/6 | 156/11 184/20 | 107/12 111/20 |
| USB85 [1] 147/22 | 9/13 20/17 24/12 | warranty [3] | 184/23 187/9 | 113/1 114/18 118/6 |
| USBOO1 [1] | 55/14 64/8 69/16 | 117/16 118/4 | 187/10 | 124/12 125/9 125/9 |
| 135/25 | 76/8 88/17 117/3 | 118/19 | well [95] 6/18 | 128/12 128/15 |
| use [5] 26/1 101/2 | 119/9 128/25 141/8 | was | 11/10 12/7 12/14 | 128/21 129/16 |
| 104/1 106/9 129/6 | 143/2 150/5 154/7 | wasn't [11] 15/3 | 18/2 19/7 26/18 | 130/18 131/24 |
| used [5] 12/3 | 156/18 162/1 17 | 16/14 96/24 97/19 | 29/21 32/13 33/1 | 133/9 |
| 15/16 30/10 135/10 | 171/22 181/14 | 113/4 113/4 121/6 | 36/4 41/19 42/2 | 133/21 |
| 144/20 | 181/18 190 | 121/12 134/1 155/1 | 46/3 | 134/23 135/6 |
| username [1] | 198/16 198/16 | 190/8 | /16 | 135/21 137/10 |
| 142/12 | vested [1] |  |  |  |
| uses [1] 80/14 | vesting [1] | watch [3] 62/19 $80 / 23 \text { 151/20 }$ |  |  |
| using [1] 53/14 | via [2] 13 | $80 / 23151 / 20$ way [22] $9 / 15$ |  |  |
| Usually [1] 104/7 | 143/13 | way ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 25]/19 38/22 39/2 | $64 / 166 / 1068 / 2$ $69 / 1072 / 1472 / 2$ |  |
| utilities [1] 41/3 | view [1] 60/25 | 39/11 45/24 65/3 | 74/4 74/7 75/13 | 149/10 |
| V | VILKIN [8] $2 / 17$ | 85/24 91/4 110/12 | 76/5 78/11 79/11 | 150/11 150/2 |
| validated [1] | 8 6/10 64/25 | 114/19 119/3 | 81/11 84/3 86/ | 16 |
| 134/25 | 82/21 141/6 199/20 | 122/15 126/13 | 88/11 91/7 94/25 | 62/8 162/10 |
| Valley [15] 12/15 | 200/23 | 126/22 135/4 156/5 | 100/7 102/14 | 162/12 163/8 |
| 12/18 13/3 13/17 | VILKINLAW.COM | 158/24 159/16 | 104/22 106/20 | 166/18 169/10 |
| 32/13 164/14 166/9 | [1] 2/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 175 / 21190 / 10 \\ & \text { ways [1] } 148 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | 107/3 107/11 | 173/16 177/4 |


| W | 15/20 15/22 15/23 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| were... [14] |  |  | ] 7/15 |  |
| Were... [14] | 22/19 23/1 23/9 | 96/3 | 1/15 12/5 | work [12] 8/8 8/9 |
|  | 24/13 25/3 34/17 | 124/17 130/12 | 2/11 12/21 14/15 | 18/8 45 |
| 195/21 195/25 | 36/25 37/19 37/20 | 138/25 178/2 | 15/13 17/7 21/4 | 6/8 76/19 157/2 |
| 196/9 196/17 | 38/16 39/5 40/13 | 186/13 | 21/13 22/21 24/3 | 57/23 161/13 |
| 196/22 196/23 | 40/24 43/1 50/8 | white [1] 85 | 25/20 30/25 31/15 | 61/13 201/16 |
| 198/7 198/14 | 54/16 60/17 65/7 | who [51] 7/15 7/18 | 32/6 32/20 40/17 | d5] 42 |
| 203/23 204/8 | 84/19 88/17 88/2 | 13/6 27/5 28/10 | 41/2 41/8 59/24 | 5/8 79/3 94/3 |
| weren't [3] 92/3 | 89/19 90/7 91/13 | 30/9 37/19 37/24 | 60/14 60/22 61/1 | /15 |
| 134/24 135/19 | 91/20 93/15 101/1 | 38/19 41/12 47/1 | 62/7 63/1 64/15 | rking [3] 84 |
| west [19] 10/25 | 103/23 104/7 | 47/13 52/15 53/6 | 67/8 82/10 83/15 | 1/9 184/24 |
| 47/22 48/9 48/14 | 106/21 107/24 | 53/14 54/5 54/24 | 113/19 115/7 | rks [2] 93/24 |
| 49/6 66/24 67/19 | 109/11 117/14 | 57/19 60/9 61/22 | 117/15 152/6 | 93/25 |
| 79/13 93/16 94/6 | 124/6 128/3 129/19 | 63/19 78/9 89/13 | 165/25 166/4 185/5 | worried [1] 8/7 |
| 94/13 95/18 102/16 | 131/24 142/16 | 89/16 93/22 94/19 | 201/2 | th [7] 89/6 |
| 115/12 132/19 | 149/22 151/3 158/ | 108/19 110/5 | WILLIAMS [1] | /2 90/9 91/11 |
| 186/6 201/8 201/10 | 167/1 167/17 168/ | 110/18 110/20 | 1/18 | 0/14 170/12 |
| 202/6 | 169/15 169/21 | 115/6 115/20 116/4 | willing [2] 63/5 | 17/5 |
| what [220] | 171/6 172/16 | 116/25 123/2 | 65/8 | uld [362] |
| what's [5] 9/4 | 174/20 176/10 | 143/17 157/9 | winding [1] | wouldn't [19] 47 |
| 63/14 68/17 71/16 | 180/9 181/3 181/19 | 164/25 165/6 171/4 | winking [1] 137/25 | 47/8 47/9 54/10 |
| 191/23 | 183/3 183/5 183/5 | 173/6 194/2 194/7 | winning [2] | /25 55/16 63/4 |
| whatever [8] 9/6 | 183/25 184/25 | 194/7 194/13 | 188/18 191/7 | /14 97/5 100/16 |
| 32/19 34/5 55/18 | 185/5 185/20 | 195/11 195/13 | wiped [1] 12 | $8115 / 5$ |
| 65/9 81/2 129/14 | 185/22 186/18 | 195/15 196/4 197/2 | wished [1] 39/22 | /16 118/25 |
| 143/6 | 186/22 201/4 | 200 | withdraw [4] | /23 158/1 |
| whatso | 201/24 201/25 | who's [4] | 0/16 90/25 90/2 | 175/9 19 |
|  | wh | 6/5 66/ | 199/8 | writ [1] 32/16 |
| when | 8 | ever [6] 53/11 | draw | ting [1] |
| 10/9 16/6 16/10 | wherefore [2] | 82/6 104/4 104/8 | 43/10 | ng [5] |
| 25/4 28/18 40/17 | 181/19 181/21 | /9 116/6 | within [10] 8/7 | /25 77/8 102/ |
| 41/4 42/1 44/15 | wherein [1] 97/20 | whole [6] 1 | 20/4 60/3 71/25 | 194/24 |
| 44/16 45/13 47/12 |  |  |  | X |
| 48/17 48/22 64/15 | whether [23] 31/1 | why [58] 8/2 17/16 | 145/24 146/25 | XVI [1] 1/3 |
| 65/16 73/4 78/14 | 32/3 45/20 46/3 | 18/19 30/19 31/19 | without [9] 14/10 |  |
| 80/24 89/25 90/2 | $46 / 1849 / 459 / 16$ | $32 / 532 / 845 / 25$ | $21$ | Y |
| 90/9 92/13 98/13 98/18 110/15 | 80/7 90/5 90/6 |  |  | yeah [26] 9/3 20/5 |
| 98/18 110/15 |  |  |  | 22/24 33/18 37/22 |
| 113/15 115/16 | $133 / 17133 / 25$ | $56 / 956 / 13 \text { 56/14 }$ | witness [29] $4 / 2$ | 49/14 55/13 58/16 |
| 118/12 121/19 | $\begin{aligned} & 133 / 17133 / 25 \\ & 136 / 13137 / 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 65/18 66/21 66/22 |
| 122/11 124/12 | $\begin{aligned} & 136 / 13137 / 1 \\ & 137 / 14151 / 2 \quad 176 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | $87 / 18 \text { 88/4 89/1 }$ |  | 68/9 102/11 107/25 |
| 124/25 127/15 | $\begin{aligned} & 137 / 14151 / 2 \\ & 179 / 24198 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | $92 / 15 \text { 94/5 98/9 }$ | $46 / 8 \text { 59/7 62/8 63/1 }$ | 108/22 108/22 |
| 129/1 129/6 135/6 | $\begin{aligned} & 179 / 24198 / 6 \\ & 199 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92 / 1594 / 598 / \\ & 100 / 25103 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46 / 859 / 7623863 / 863 / 9 \\ & 63 / 263 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | 121/24 124/18 |
| 145/13 147/5 150/6 | which [39] 10/25 | $107 / 11109 / 1$ | $63 / 1163 / 1463 / 17$ | 130/4 138/12 141/2 |
| 154/13 167/15 | which [39] $11 / 611 / 1111 / 17$ | 109/20 109/2 | 63/23 64/12 65/4 | 41/15 151/21 |
| 174/2 185/15 | 11/18 11/25 12/1 | 112/5 112/16 | 66/15 79/16 80/18 | 51/23 158/18 |
| 189/16 190/1 192/9 | 12/15 15/4 15/12 | 112/18 113/6 | 81/22 141/12 | 192/18 |
| 192/24 192/25 | 20/6 22/2 22/11 | 113/10 114/15 | 141/13 193/6 | year [11] 32/18 |
| 193/7 193/12 | 28/13 32/23 46/8 | 117/22 119/8 | 204/13 | 74/10 84/23 127/3 |
| 193/15 196/22 | 46/25 49/22 55/10 | 123/23 131/3 135/2 | witnesses [7] 7/4 | 138/24 156/12 |
| 197/5 197/14 | 56/1 56/10 73/21 | 137/17 138/10 | 7/6 7/7 7/12 7/23 | 62/21 184/19 |
| $8 / 13$ 198/21 | 81/9 89/4 89/5 | 140/23 145/2 |  | 184/20 187/9 |
| 199/24 whenever [3] |  |  |  | 187/ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}  \\ 62 / 1182 / 7 & 162 / 16 \end{array}$ | 106/1 106/5 106 | 162/4 162/4 164/16 |  | year right [1] |
| where [76] 9/12 | 107/8 107/8 140/23 | 170/21 170/25 | [2] 129 |  |
| 11/25 12/17 15/14 | 147/2 160/22 170/3 | 173/2 182/17 | 2 | 76/5 89/20 89/23 |

(36) were... - years
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LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2017
9:21 A.M.
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\mathbf{P} & R & O & C & E & E & D & I & N & G & S\end{array}$

*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         * 

THE COURT: All right. Let's go ahead and note our appearances for the record. Good morning also.

MR. GEISENDORF: Good morning, your Honor.
MR. VILKIN: Good morning, your Honor. Your Honor, Richard Vilkin for defendant and counter claimant.

MR. GEISENDORF: Charles Geisendorf for defendant and counter claimant.

MR. BECKOM: Thomas Beckom on behalf of the US Bank. My colleague Priscilla Baker will be joining us here momentarily. She stepped out for a moment.

THE COURT: I understand. All right. Do we have something to address outside the presence? Well there's no presence to be out of.

MR. VILKIN: Your Honor, we just have one matter. Counsel and $I$ are stipulating to the admission of the following exhibits. $1,2,5,6,8,9,15$, and 16.

THE COURT: Did You get that, Madam Clerk?
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THE COURT CLERK: I did.

THE COURT: Okay. So admitted.
(Exhibit 1 admitted)
(Exhibit 2 admitted)
(Exhibit 5 admitted)
(Exhibit 6 admitted)
(Exhibit 8 admitted)
(Exhibit 9 admitted)
(Exhibit 15 admitted)
(Exhibit 16 admitted)

MR. BECKOM: I guess, and $I$ join in the
stipulation, so we have a clean record to that.
THE COURT: All right. That's fine. So where does that leave us?

MR. BECKOM: US Bank would like to call as their first witness today George Holmes.

THE COURT: And is this the appraiser?
MR. BECKOM: Yes.

THE MARSHAL: George, last name?

MR. BECKOM: Holmes.

THE COURT: SO, I guess, for the rest the two remaining witnesses are appraisal witnesses.

MR. VILKIN: Correct.
THE COURT: Which makes perfect sense to me.

MR. VILKIN: So our goal is to get done before

10:59:4415
lunch, but we'll see.
THE COURT: I'm going to tell you this. I thought yesterday, ultimately, ended up being a very efficient date.

MR. VILKIN: It was.
MR. BECKOM: We do try. We think so. GEORGE PETERSEN HOLMES, having been first duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated. And if you will state and spell your name for the record, please.

THE WITNESS: George Petersen Holmes.
G-E-O-R-G-E. Petersen, P-E-T-E-R-S-E-N. Holmes, H-O-L-M-E-S.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Holmes.
A. Good morning.
Q. So I'm going to start with a couple of quick questions about your background here today. What do you do for a living, sir?
A. I'm a residential real estate appraiser.
$11: 00: 22$
$11: 00: 30$
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Q. Okay. Did you go to school for that?
A. I did.
Q. Where did you go to school at?
A. There's a bunch of different schools. I started my training in 2002 with the Chicopee Group. That was my initial appraiser, basic appraiser requirements, $C E$ requirements. Seventy-five hours of that. Then $I$ got my appraiser trainee license then. And then $I$ worked under somebody for three years learning how to appraise, going with them and doing inspections and writing up reports and talking to clients and things. And then 75 more hours of advanced appraisal theory. And then $I$ got my appraisal license then.
Q. Okay. And then who were you licensed through, sir.
A. The Nevada Department of Business and Industry.
Q. And did they license you as a real estate appraisal; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Okay. Where have you - - where have you worked at? How many years have you worked as a residential appraiser?
A. Since 2005 I've been licensed, so for the past

11:01:30
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12 years.
Q. Okay. And you've been continuously employed at various places throughout those last 12 years?
A. Yes. Independent fee appraising since then. About on average maybe 250 reports per year depending on how busy we were that year.
Q. Okay. Do you continue with your, $I$ guess, ongoing education in terms of appraisal practice?
A. Yes. $W e{ }^{\prime} r e$ required to take 30 continuing education units. Seven units of Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice. And then, yeah, seven hours of that every two years.

So I've gone through six cycles since 2005 . So that's like about 180 hours of continuing education. About 50 USPAP applies.
Q. Okay. Let's ask you a couple more questions about like you referred to the USPAP; correct?
A. Okay.
Q. And that is the, $I$ think you said, the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that -- like, what is the USPAP exactly? If you'd like to elaborate on that a little bit more.
A. Basically it separates us from -- separates appraisers from Realtors, the guy next door, or Zillow.
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A. Yes. It appears to be my appraisal report.
Q. Okay. And was this the appraisal report for 4254 Rolling Stone Drive?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And through this appraisal report, were you asked to provide a -- or an opinion of fair market value for the 4254 Rolling Stone Drive?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Okay. And did you provide that opinion?
A. I did.
Q. Okay.

MR. BECKOM: With that $I$ would like to move to admit Exhibit 13 for all purposes.

MR. VILKIN: No objection.
THE COURT: Okay. So admitted.
(Exhibit 13 admitted)
BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Okay, Mr. Holmes. So you were retained to provide an appraisal of real property that we just -the subject property we just discussed with a retrospective date of January 25, 2012; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Can you explain to me the methodology that you used in coming up with this opinion of value?
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A. We used the sales comparison approach for this report. It looks like there was six -- looks like I used six comparables. Yeah, six comparables. Bracketing the square footage looks like. And the car -- the garage, the bracketing meaning to like having some with and some without.

The square footage, the bathroom. Looks like the bathroom count was one and two. And the lot size. And then after all the adjustments, the six comparables. Looks like it was - there's a range of value from, like, 48,000 - sorry. The range of value is $\$ 43,900$ to $\$ 50,900$.

So we choose in that range what our opinion of value is, and we reconcile it. And my reconciled opinion of value was $\$ 48,000$.
Q. And as of what date?
A. As of that date. The retrospective date January 25, 2012.
Q. Okay. I think you said you used the sales comparison approach for this; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Is that a -- sorry. I apologize profusely once again. Is that a recognized methodology for appraisers when appraising residential real property, the sales comparison approach?

11:08:1710
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A. It is.
Q. Okay. Can you explain to me a little bit more in depth about that approach. I think you mentioned various comparable real estate?
A. Yes. You use close sales to compare what you have as a subject to the comparable sales, and you make adjustments. That's how you use the sales comparison approach.
Q. Okay. And then how many -- how many, I guess, typical - how many typical sales are required or, you know, are generally used in a sales comparison appraisal?
A. I think for lending three is the requirement.
Q. And then how many did you use, sir?
A. In this report $I$ used six.
Q. Okay. Any reason why you used six?
A. There was six that $I$ found that were relevant.
Q. Okay. So you included all relevant comparable properties in your report?
A. There could be some more relevant properties that $I$ didn't include, but six data points is usualy enough to come up with an opinion of value using the sales comparison approach.
Q. Okay. Now, a couple of things that $I$ want to ask you. Let's go over to the third page of your

| 11:09:08 | 1 | report. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | A. Okay. |
|  | 3 | Q. The very bottom it says the client signed the |
|  | 4 | report the effective date. The appraiser has completed |
| 11:09:20 | 5 | the assignment developing an unimpaired opinion of |
|  | 6 | market value. Do you see what I'm talking about, sir? |
|  | 7 | A. I do. |
|  | 8 | Q. Can you explain to me and the court and |
|  | 9 | everything else here what is your definition of market |
| 11:09:33 | 10 | value? |
|  | 11 | A. It's the most probable price between an |
|  | 12 | informed and willing buyer and seller in an open |
|  | 13 | market. |
|  | 14 | Q. Okay. And that is assuming no forced sales or |
| 11:10:01 | 15 | anything like that; correct? |
|  | 16 | A. That's correct. |
|  | 17 | Q. Okay. The only other question I had, sir, was |
|  | 18 | that you used the term extraordinary assumption. In |
|  | 19 | respect to the regards of the appraiser made an |
| 11:10:20 | 20 | exterior only inspection which involves the use of an |
|  | 21 | extraordinary assumption that no adverse -- the |
|  | 22 | appraiser made an exterior only inspection which |
|  | 23 | involves the use of an extraordinary assumption that no |
|  | 24 | adverse condition exists that may affect the |
| 11:10:39 | 25 | livability, soundness, or structural integrity. |

Do you see what I'm talking about, sir?
A. I do.
Q. Is extraordinary assumption, you know, a term of art that appraisers use in their practice?
A. Yes. Extraordinary assumption and hypothetical conditions, yes.
Q. Can you explain to me what the term extraordinary assumption means?
A. It means that I'm making assumptions that the inside has not been completely torn up or completely rehabbed.
Q. Okay.
A. Like there's not gold faucets in there, and it's not infested, and doesn't have copper wiring. So the assumption that $I$ 'm making is it's in a typical condition, average condition from the data that we have and the photos that were from MLS, or wherever we found them.
Q. Okay. So absent some kind of severe detrimental internal condition with the property, the extraordinary assumption really doesn't come into play?
A. Typically. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Okay. And so based on the assumption that you made that the interior was in a good condition and with your six comparable points which were in excess of the
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amount required generally for acceptable appraisal practices, $I$ think you mentioned this before, but your conclusion as to the value of this property on January 25, 2012, was what?
A. $\$ 48,000$ I think.
Q. And - -
A. Yes.
Q. -- that was the price between a willing buyer and a willing seller in an open market; correct?
A. Yes. $I$ think $I$ added the informed willing buyer and willing seller --
Q. Okay.
A. - in an open market.

MR. BECKOM: Fair enough. I'll reserve time to, $I$ guess, answer additional questions depending on what my colleague does on cross-examination.

THE COURT: Okay. Sir.
MR. VILKIN: Thank you, your Honor.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. VILKIN:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Holmes.
A. Good morning.
Q. If $I$ could direct you to Exhibit 13 , page 3 of 13 of your report.

11:13:0910
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A. Yes.
Q. If you can look at the last paragraph on the page, the sentence that starts -- that starts, The client assigned. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. In that sentence, it goes on to state that the appraiser has completed assignment developing an unimpaired opinion of market value. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What did you mean by unimpaired opinion of market value?
A. At the time $I$ wrote this report $I$ was aware that they were "HOA foreclosures," so $I$ put that in there saying that this was my unimpaired opinion respected to the date whether it was before the 25 th, after the 25 th, just going to leave that up to the Court to decide when if there was as impairment or not an impairment. But this was my unimpaired opinion of market value.
Q. Okay. And $I$ understand that.
A. Okay.
Q. What $I^{\prime} m$ trying to find out is what, what is your definition of the word impaired or unimpaired. I'm trying to find out what you meant by that?
A. An unimpaired opinion would be part of the
$11: 14: 13$

11:14:31
definition of market value. So if it was impaired, that's not what my assignment or my intent was to do.
Q. Well, can you give us some examples of something that would impair market value?
A. I guess, for example, a condition could impair the market value, the environmental conditions. If it was next to a super fund site. External, if there's some functional obsolescence, that type of thing would be impaired value.
Q. Well, you indicated that you're familiar with HOA foreclosure sales, correct?
A. I wouldn't say $I$ was familiar. I was aware.
Q. Well, what are you aware of? What do you know about them?
A. I'm aware that there were some sales that were sold as HOA foreclosures. And they're going through the court system right now. That's basically what Im aware of.
Q. Are you aware of what happens or how an HOA foreclosure sale is conducted?
A. I couldn't say $I$ was familiar with that, no.
Q. Do you know whether the fact that a property was sold at an HOA foreclosure sale would constitute impairment under your definition?
A. It's possible, but that wasn't my assignment.
$11: 15: 44$
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11:16:3415

11:17:0125
Q. If you could, take a look on page 9 of 13 of your report in Exhibit 13 .
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. That's where you give a statement of assumptions and limiting conditions; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And one of your assumptions in that first item is that title is good and marketable; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you know whether title sold at an HOA foreclosure sale pursuant to NRS 116 is considered good and marketable title?
A. I do not.
Q. If you could take a look at page 10 of 13 of your report. Exhibit 13?

THE COURT: What was the prior page, sir, again?

MR. VILKIN: Page 9 of 13 of Exhibit 13. Exhibit 13, page 9 . BY MR. VILKIN:
Q. SO, Mr. Holmes, are we at page 10 of your report.
A. Yes.
Q. And in that paragraph you give a definition - or down at the bottom you give a definition of market
$11: 17: 04$
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value; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And one of the elements of your definition of market value is that the buyer and seller are typically motivated; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. What is your understanding, or how do you use - - what do you mean by typically motivated?
A. It means they're not in under undue stress to buy or sell. So in a typical market, it would be some exposure time. Like if your neighbor needed to sell a house that that they inherited from their parents, they wanted to do it right away. That wouldn't necessarily be typical. Typical would be something that was exposed to the market probably on MLS. Maybe on the internet.
Q. Well, if the --
A. So go ahead.
Q. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you. Were you done?
A. NO.
Q. Were you done, or?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. If the seller was an HOA selling a property in an HOA foreclosure sale pursuant to
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NRS 116, would you consider that typical motivation?
A. I would say that's beyond my scope of work. That's beyond my assignment. So I didn't really - I haven't really thought about that. $I$ haven't researched that. I haven't gone through the steps to see.
Q. Okay. And then in Item 5 of your definition of market value, you indicate that the price represents the normal consideration for the property sold unaffected by, and I'm going to skip a few words, but the last item is sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale. Do you see that language?
A. I do.
Q. What did you mean by sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale?
A. Sometimes a typical market transaction, the seller will give the buyer some concessions for carpet, or some other cash considerations, and you'll see it listed as, you know, concession of $\$ 5,000$ or $X, Y$, and Z. So ...
Q. Well, if --
A. Go ahead.
Q. I'm sorry. If the property was being sold at in an HOA foreclosure sale, would that fall into the definition of a sales concession?

11:19:38
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A. Once again, that would be beyond my scope of work and my assignment.

MR. VILKIN: I don't have anything further.
MR. BECKOM: Just one additional question, your Honor.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. On page 10 of 13 , $I$ think we're still there; are we still there?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So the definition of market value, $I$ just want to ask you one question. If $I$ were to say this -- well, let me ask you this: Is market value pretty synonymous with a price which a purchaser willing, but not obligated to buy, would pay an owner willing, but not obligated to sell?
A. I would say that's synonomous, yes.
Q. Okay. And that is the definition of value that you used as part of this appraisal?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. BECKOM: I have no further questions, your Honor.
$11: 20: 34$
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## RECROSS -EXAMINATION

BY MR. VILKIN:
Q. Was that the definition you used, sir?
A. The definition market value has been changed since $I$ started appraising. And they modify it every year at USPAP. So they add and subtract some words and I think legalese. So the answer is, yes, that is the definition.
Q. Well, is that what you recorded on page 10 of your report at the bottom as the definition of market value?
A. It is. That's what's written here. I'm not sure the attorney quoted that exactly, so that's why I didn't want to say 100 percent, yes, to what he had said. That's why $I$ said it was synonymous.
Q. Well, is the definition that you just agreed to is that -- does that include the assumption that it's an unimpaired opinion of market value?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And does it also include the assumption that title is good and marketable?
A. Yes, it does.

MR. VILKIN: Okay. Nothing further.
MR. BECKOM: Nothing.

THE COURT: Okay. Sir, we're going to release
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you. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.
THE COURT: So are we --

MR. BECKOM: I have no further witnesses to

THE COURT: So at this point the plaintiff rests; is that correct, sir?

MR. BECKOM: I'm going through the list of the witnesses. Yes, at this point the plaintiff rests.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. VILKIN: Your Honor, the defendant will call Mike Brunson, our appraisal expert.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. VILKIN: He should be in the hallway. MICHAEL BRUNSON,
having been first duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated. And if you will state and spell your name for the record, please.

THE WITNESS: My name is Michael Brunson, spelled $M-I-C-H-A-E-L . \quad B-R-U-N-S-O-N$.

11:24:0410

11:24:2415
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## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. VILKIN:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Brunson. Thank you for coming. Can you tell us what your current employment is?
A. I am a managing partner at Brunson and Jiu.
Q. And what kind of entity is that?
A. We are predominantly a real estate valuation and analytics firm.
Q. How long have you been employed there?
A. The firm has existed for six years.
Q. And what are your particular job duties at that firm?
A. As a partner, my duties revolve around real estate damage cases specifically litigation cases. We often do divorce and probate as well. When we - when it's necessary for $I$ and my team, welll also consider doing some traditional residential appraisal assignments for VA. And we also take commercial assignments when necessary for the firm.
Q. Okay. How long have you worked in the real estate appraisal field?
A. This is my 21st year.
Q. Okay. And can you give us a brief description of your employment prior to your current employment

11:24:58
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starting whenever you started in real estate appraisal work?
A. Yes, sir. In 1995, I went to work as an office manager and an intern for a local firm called Berry and Associates.

I completed my required two-year internship. And in fourth quarter of 2007 obtained my certified residential credential and opened my first firm Ascent Appraisal Incorporated.

That firm existed until approximately six years ago when we dissolved that firm, and $I$ took on a partner, Mr. Craig Jiu. And have been doing real estate appraisal ever since.
Q. Can you just tell us what licenses you have that relate to real estate appraisal?
A. I am credentialed in the state of Nevada as a certified general appraiser. I am credentialed in the state of California as a certified general appraiser. I'm authorized to teach appraisal qualifying and continuing education.

I honestly don't know how many states, quite a few. And I'm also what's known as a QB certified USPAP instructor. And AQB stands for Appraiser Qualification Board. And USPAP stands for the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.
$11: 26: 34$
Q. Can you give us just briefly your educational background that relates to real estate appraisal work?
A. Sure. So $I$ have a BA in psychology from UNLV. We are every day trying to use the rules of economics to determine probable behavior from past results.

In order to obtain a credential as a certified appraiser, you have 300 hours of qualifying education, 3,000 hours of practical experience. A certain amount of time that you have to have been performing appraisals, and you have to submit those, both the education and the experience log, to the state in order for them to issue the credential.
Q. And can you give us an estimate of how many real estate appraisals you've completed in the state of Nevada?
A. I didn't prepare for that one, but it would be thousands.

MR. VILKIN: Your Honor, I'll ask that he be admitted as an expert in real estate appraisal.

MR. BECKOM: No objection. But we reserve rights to object to the substance of his testimony at a later time.

THE COURT: I understand. So admitted. BY MR. VILKIN:
Q. Mr. Brunson, were you asked to perform a job

11:27:42
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with regard to the property at 4254 Rolling stone Drive?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What were you asked to do?
A. I was asked to conduct an appraisal review, what's known as a standards three appraisal review of the work conducted by Mr. Holmes.
Q. And so you were given a copy of his report; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir. The purpose of an appraisal is to determine two things. Predominantly - - I'm sorry. An appraisal review is to determine prominently two things. One, whether or not the conclusions are credible. And two, whether or not the work is conducted according to the Uniform standards of Professional Appraisal Practice and in compliance with generally accepted appraisal methodologies.
Q. Can you take a look at Exhibit 13 and tell us is that the report that you reviewed.
A. Yes, sir, it is.
Q. Okay. And can you tell us what your opinions are with regard to that report. Just summarize them initially.
A. Sure. My general findings are that Mr. Holmes purports to provide an unimpaired value of the market

11:29:13
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value of the subject property. But that he does so in a manner that is neither compliant with the uniform standards nor generally accepted methodologies, and, therefore, the results are misleading.
Q. Okay. And what about the issue of his report being an unimpaired value? Did you have any opinion with regard to that?
A. So the concept of unimpaired value, the short answer is no. I don't have a challenge with him providing an unimpaired value. The issue is, is that under uniform standards, that unimpaired value is a hypothetical. When professional appraisers conduct an analysis based on a hypothetical, we have very specific requirements. Namely, to clearly and conspicuously identify the hypothetical and then to indicate the fact that the use of that assumption may have affected the credibility of the assignment results.
Q. Well, if you could tell us what your opinions are with regard to his report in more detail?
A. So in greater detail, just on the first page of Mr. Holmes's general purpose appraisal report, I find seven errors. The uniform standards certainly don't require perfection, but it does have a rule called Standards Rule 1-1 sub C.

That requires an appraiser to conduct an
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appraisal and report an appraisal in a manner that if you make a single error that in and of itself might not be significant. If you conduct a series of errors, when you take those errors in combination, it draws the credibility of the report into question.
Q. What are the errors that you found?
A. So he reports tenant occupied. He reports that the property is tenant occupied, but then issues a value of fee simple rights. Those two things don't go together. It's either tenant occupied lease fee. Or it's owner occupied vacant and fee simply. Unless he's, again, issuing another hypothetical.

There's challenges with his indicated market conditions. He indicates that the market is stable when data clearly indicates that that market was slow. He indicates that property values are stable in a market that clearly demonstrates declining values. He reports supply and demand as imbalance when the market data indicates there was an over supply in the market at that time.

He reports the predominant occupancy as owner when the data indicates that this particular sub market had 66.3 percent tenant occupancy.

There's numerous assumptions in Mr. Holmes' report that are lacking disclosure of the potential
effect of the use of those assumptions. This is a retrospective assignment. Nowhere in the four corners of his report do $I$ find anything that talks about an assumption regarding the condition of the report. Clearly, an unknown very easy thing to simply say we're assuming the condition is $x$. It doesn't exist in the report.

The offsite improvements for the subject property are reported as public when in reality they're private.

There's numerous examples of conflicting information provided in the report. The adjustments that are utilized in the sales comparison. We conducted our own analysis utilizing the criteria and the delimiters indicates in Mr. Holmes' report and our analysis fails to find anything near the adjustments that he was utilizing.

I can't say definitively that he is incorrect there lacking his work file, but our results cannot be -- cannot duplicate his findings.

In one of the comps he reports sales one as a fee simple property and indicates that it was tenant occupied. Those two things single are contradicting facts.

There are known seller concessions on sale
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three that Mr. Holmes fails to report let alone consider in his analysis. Would you like me to continue?
Q. Well, let me ask you this. Did you prepare your own report analyzing Mr. Holmes' report?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And is that contained in Exhibit 14?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. VILKIN: I would move to admit Exhibit 14, your Honor.

MR. BECKOM: I think that's premature. There's a lot of findings in Exhibit 14 other than just a rebuttal report including an independent methodology of value pursuant to Hallmark standard. $\quad$ think we need more testimony as to the methodology that Mr. Brunson was using, especially as to the market value determinations that he ultimately comes to.

THE COURT: He just wants more foundation.
MR. VILKIN: Yeah, I understand.

THE COURT: So why don't you do that?

BY MR. VILKIN:
Q. Mr. Brunson, can you tell us the procedures you used to compile the opinions in your report?
A. Yes. The uniform standards can be used as a checklist to determine whether or not an appraiser

11:35:10
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complied with those standards. So what I've done, do you want me to refer to my report or no?

THE COURT: YOu can.

BY MR. VILKIN:
Q. You can.
A. On page $16, ~ I$ don't see Bates-stamped on this. But page 16 of my report you'll find a chart that runs down the list of the requirements of standard 2 , which is the reporting requirements for a residential appraisal.

In conducting my review of Mr. Holmes, I simply went down this list and read his report, did independent analysis to determine whether or not he complied with the individual components of standards Rule 2? My table is color coated. I'm not sure that yours is.
Q. It's not. Ours is not.
A. Okay. The way that $I$ do this is that there are certain issues in uniform standards that are very clear-cut and easy to determine without having the work file. There are other issues lacking the work file where that becomes a little more difficult.

So $I$ will answer, no, they did not comply with -- Mr. Holmes did not comply with uniform standards and color code that box red. If $I$ can

11:36:5510
definitively demonstrate that that particular section or rule in uniform standards was not complied with. In instances where he did comply, I'll mark, yes, and indicate it's green.
Q. Let me interrupt you if I may. What we're interested in right now is the methodology that you used to compile your report. Now, I understand you're talking about this particular page. Can you tell us about the rest of the report, just the methodology?
A. Well, certainly. So the review, 1 conducted the review utilizing the uniform standards to determine whether or not Mr. Holmes complied, and then whether or not he utilized generally recognized appraisal methodologies in doing so.

When conducting an appraisal review, standards Rule 3-2C indicates that an appraiser's scope of work can be staged so that if you agree with the findings of the appraisal under review, that you may simple say so. If you disagree with the findings, the scope of work may include developments of independent findings so that the user of the report will understand the correct methodologies that should have been employed.

My conclusion, ultimately, was that Mr. Holmes' report lacked credibility and therefore we
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went ahead under standards Rule 3-2C and developed an opinion according to proper methodologies.

We ruled the sales comparison approach just like Mr. Holmes did; however, the appraisal of real estate is very clear that when you're appraising a property in determining which properties are and are not comps, you have to be very sure that the sales comp you're considering sold with the same rights as the property that you're valuing.

In this context at an HOA foreclosure, you have a detrimental condition affecting the subject property that impairs its value. To simple say that you're going to provide an unimpaired value without disclosing the hypotheticals or even mentioning the HOA foreclosure that occurred on the same date, requires additional analysis. And that's one of the reasons that we went forward with our own. Our sales comparison looked at properties that are truly similar to the subject property in both rights and risk.

We arrayed those on a graph to demonstrate what contemporaneous sales similar in physical characteristics and in rights were doing as of the effective date. Those graphs are found - those tables and graphs are found on pages 28 and 29 .

Ultimately, what the data demonstrates is that
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sales similar in rights and risk as of the effective date were selling for between 2 percent and 12 percent of the taxable value. That equates to roughly $\$ 900$ to $\$ 5,500$.

The subject sale was $\$ 5,331$. So utilizing standard sales comparison techniques it's clear that the subject price falls within the indicated range of similar data. And so we, ultimately, conclude that the price paid at auction is a reasonable representation of the price for similar properties as of that day.

MR. VILKIN: Your Honor, $I$ move again to admit the report.

MR. BECKOM: I would vigorously object. Under Hallmark -- I'm sorry. So under Hallmark and all their expert standards this has to be relevant to a dispositive issue in this case. Repeatedly in Shadow Wood Homeowners Association versus New York Community Bank Justice Pickering refers to fair market value over and over and over again. And that is a term of art defined by Unruh $v$ streight, which is the most probably price between a willing buyer and willing seller.

Mr. Brunson has just testified that the entirety of his sales comparables are based on HOA forced sales. It is entirely his --

THE COURT: But tell me what's wrong with
$11: 40: 53$

11:41:05

11:41:3010
that? Because at the end of the day what we have here -- I don't know if Justice Pickering addressed this issue, but we have an $H O A$ forced sale. And the reason why $I$ think that's important, $I$ mean, $I$ do understand and $I$ listen very patiently at the prior expert. And it's my understanding he formed a - or his opinion is based upon a residential real estate appraisal. He uses the USPAP method, and it's based upon the assumption that we have unimpaired market value. And so I'm listening to that; right?

And so, in essence, is that what we have here? Because we don't have a willing buyer and a willing seller. We have a forced sale. And the reason why $I$ think that's important to point out because in a traditional real estate transaction, what type of title do you obtain as a result of an arm-length transaction? You have a - you have a couple of things.

Number one, you have title insurance, right, which kind of protects it. You have a grant and sale deed, right, and those types of things. And you have a marketable title under the circumstances of this - of these cases, do you have a grant and sale deed? Do you have protections of title insurance? Do you have a marketable title as soon as the sale commences? Probably not.
$11: 42: 20$
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And just as important too, and this is one of the things $I$ think is important to point out, and $I$ don't have the statute right in front of me, but pursuant to Chapter 116 , it discusses the type of title obtained at an HOA foreclosure sale. And I'm just paraphrasing here. It says without warranty or right of redemption; right? Isn't that what it says?

And so here we have title that, $I$ guess, at the very most would be akin to a quitclaim deed; right? I mean, that's -- and if I'm wrong, please tell me. But these -- and the reason why I'm bringing this up is I just want to make sure - and $I$ don't mind being the first case. I don't. I really and truly don't. That goes up and really deals with these issues.

But $I$ think it's important as a trial judge to articulate on the record the things I'm thinking of. And the reasons why $I$ do that, it always serves me very well in front of the supreme court. It does. So because to me, that's an important issue.

Now, I'll let you address that. And then, Counsel, you can address it. But this is what I'm thinking of. I'm just telling you this because $\quad$ have to deal with this. And so in light of the fact that - because $I$ read these reports. $I$ just want to tell you this because $I$ read the report of the plaintiffis
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expert. And one of the things that jumped out at me was this - a couple of things. Number one, and this is the assumption.

On -- I don't know if $I$-- on page 13 of the report at the very bottom, when he talked about the assignment, this is what was set forth in his report.

The client assigned the report effective date the appraisal - the appraiser has completed assignment developing an unimpaired opinion of the market value. So I'm -- so is this an unimpaired opinion? I mean, really.

And then just as important too, I looked at the definition of market value. And $I$ understand what happened from cross-examination perspective. But understand this, I'm a fact finder. And this is in front of me. And $I$ see definition of market value. And this is on page 10 of the report.

And it says, number one, and understand this, and these definitions aren't just made up because I looked at the source of the definition. This is definition is from regulation published by federal regulatory agency pursuant to Title 9. I'm sorry, Title 11 of the Financial Institutions Reform Recovery and Enforcement, Ferera, 1989 between July of 1990 . So these are federal regulations is how this is defined.
$11: 45: 15$
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And $I$ understand why because you have -- probably on a lot of these homes you have FHA, you have VA and all those -- you know, HUD and all these federal agencies involved.

But $I$ look at it this way, and I'm just seeing here it says buyer. Number one, it talks about buyer and seller are typically modified. Two, both parties are well formed and advised in acting whether to consider their own best interests.

So when you're looking at that, that's talking about arms-length transactions that occur in the market place. And that would result in an unimpaired value. And $I$ get that. But that's not what we have here; right?

Three, a reasonable time allowed for exposures in open market. I guess that talks about how long it's been on the mLS; right?

And then Four, payment. I get that. Money. From either cash or from a financial institution.

But Number Five, it seems to me important that the price represents the normal consideration for the property sold unaffected. I'm sorry if I'm going too fast. Unaffected by special or creative financing or sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale.
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You know, so I'm looking at this. And so what you're asking, and $I$ haven't made my decision yet, but I'm going to have to make a decision when $I$ make my decision as to what the appropriate method, means, modalities, that $I^{\prime m}$ going to rely upon, $I$ guess, the best way $I$ can say it when it comes to which approach I will accept. You know, and like $I$ said, $I$ don't mind being the first up there. You know.

And so tell me why $I$ should not accept this man's opinion in light of what $I$ just discussed.

MR. BECKOM: I appreciate that, your Honor. And thank you for giving me a time to least, like, you know, lodge --

THE COURT: $I$ always give you time. And I always tell you what I'm thinking about; right?

MR. BECKOM: That's why I love appearing in front of Department 16 .

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. BECKOM: I mean, Justice Pickering's - I mean, like, it is somewhat of a hypothetical analysis on the legal basis --

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. BECKOM: - - that this Court is going to have to go through here. Justice Pickering, you know, in $S h a d o w$ wood repeatedly she refers back to that, you
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know, the golden standard. She also refers back to comment $B$ of the Restatement of Mortgages, which Ive got sitting right here right in front of me. And it says over and over again, gross inadequacy can not be precisely defined in terms of a specific percentage of, and here's the key term here, fair market value. A court is warranted in invalidating the sale where the price is less than 20 percent of, again, fair market value. And that's just not a throw away term in this jurisdiction. It's specifically defined by Unruh v Streight going back to the $1980 s$, which says that, you know, it's generally defined as the price which a purchaser willing but not obligated to buy would pay an owner willing but not obligated to sell.

THE COURT: Why is that relevant to this case?
MR. BECKOM: It is our contention here today on behalf of US Bank that that is the Shadow wood standard. The Shadow Wood standard requires this Court to take into consideration not the impaired value that Mr. Brunson is testifying to by comparing other forced sales and coming to a $\$ 5,000$ value conclusion. It requires this Court to take a look at, again, the Unruh v streight standard which is, you know, the price a willing -- between a willing buying and a willing seller. And that's been the law in Nevada since 1980 .
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THE COURT: But here's my question. Isn't this the first case involving -- mean, not your first case literally, but we haven't had any decision as it relates to what is the appropriate standard a trial court should utilize when it comes to determining fair market value at a forced sale pursuant to Chapter 116 . Right? $W e$ can talk about fair market value, and it can -- it can include a lot of different theories; right? It can.

But at the end of the day $I$ can't say this, you know, that this is not a normal arm's length sales transaction where a real property has been placed on the -- in the MLS, and it's up for sale, and you have an open house. And parties come in. And they knock on the wood. And they visually inspect the property. And they conduct an inspection; right? This isn't that case.

MR. BECKOM: It is -- I mean, like, I think even going to the restatement they talk about it in a case called BFP versus Resolution Trust Corp for the US Supreme Court. I'll give you the full citation. It's BFP versus Resolution Trust Corp. 511 U.S. 531, (1994.) I know a federal supreme Court case is not going to be binding on your interpretation of state law. But that being said, in that opinion - -

THE COURT: What do they say? I mean, it should be potentially instructive, but tell me.

MR. BECKOM: The entire nexus of that opinion has to do with the difference between forced sale foreclosure value and fair market value. They're two different standards. And it's our interpretation and, you know, it's the willing price. But it's a price between a willing buyer and a willing seller. And in this case, yes, it is probably a hypothetical. But it's the standard that -- it is our contention that that's the standard that was advanced by the Nevada Supreme Court in Shadow Wood Homeowners Association versus US Bank.

And any kind of opinion as to the impaired value of the real estate when comparing nothing but other foreclosures is not probative. It's more prejudicial. It's not helpful to an ultimate issue in this case, and it's simply irrelevant.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, here's my next question: When it comes to categorizing the sale in this case, how do $I$ categorize it? Is it an unimpaired market value type sale? Or is it a forced sale?

MR. BECKOM: I think based on the opinion in Justice Pickering you have to categorize it as an unimpaired fair market value sale. That's what - -

11:51:38
$11.51: 38$

11:52:0110

11:52:4525
that's - I think they used it about 5 , 10 times in that opinion. And that it's a defined term of art as I'm sure this Court is well aware.

THE COURT: But my question is this: In order for that to occur, does it have to meet a certain factual criteria? Right? Do $I$ have to make a factual determination, Okay, this is an unimpaired market value type sale, arm's length transaction on the open market, and all these factors that the federal regulations apparently feel that should be considered; right?

You know, and so $I$ just want to tell you what I'm thinking about because this is an important issue. It really is in all these cases. And $I$ don't mind saying this, I've kept my mind really open on these issues regarding how would I, ultimately, value or what type of determination $I$ would make as it relates to the standard. I really have. This is the first case Ive really had to do that.

You want to add anything, sir?
MR. VILKIN: Your Honor, I would only add that I think what plaintiffis expert did was compare apples to oranges. And what our expert is doing is comparing apples to apples. And $I$ think that's the issue the Court is grappling with me. And to me, you got to compare apples to apples.

11:53:0910

THE COURT: Anything else, sir? $\quad$ just want to make sure.

MR. BECKOM: $I$ think $I$ made it very clear in our closing statement when $I$ quoted -- I actually pulled Unruh $v$ streight up on my iPad and quoted it directly at our expert asking is there the value you gave in this opinion. And, ultimately, he said yes that is syonymous with the market value that was provided in this report.

That is the value we should be using here. We should not be using other forced sales to determine the fair market value. It's a fair market, and that is the value we are determining. Not an impaired market value.

THE COURT: I understand. I do.
MR. VILKIN: Your Honor, I think if I just might add, your Honor, $I$ think the Court focused on the most important factor is in order for determine the fair market value under the standard that plaintiff wants to use, you have to make factual determinations. And how can you do that if they didn't occur?

THE COURT: I think in a hypothetical sense if this was a jury trial, the jury would be given instructions how to determine market value; right? It's typically what they do. And so I'm looking. This
is what I'm going to do as far as the objections are concerned regarding the admissibility of this witness's testimony, and it's my understanding it was based upon the Hallmark standards, I'm going to overrule that objection. And I'm going to focus on the assistance requirement of Hallmark. It's my opinion that this expert meets that requirement.

I'm focusing on the reliability component of that. And based upon what I've -- and just as important too, I'm going to accept his methodology; right? Isn't that all those wonderful things they talk about in Hallmark? So I'm going to accept that and weigh and balance that versus the plaintiffis expert's opinion. And then, ultimately, I'll decide which one I'll decide.

MR. BECKOM: Right.
MR. VILKIN: Thank you, your Honor. Since the report is admitted, $I$ have no further questions.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else, sir? You know, what $I$ have to do. I have -- I actually have a meeting at noon. $I$ meet with Judge Gonzalez at noon.

MR. BECKOM: You know, Mr. Brunson, he's been doing a real great job of looking stoic up there. I know that would kill me if we all need a break. $\quad$ have no objection to that.
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THE COURT: Yeah. What I'm going to --
MR. BECKOM: We can finish it up after.
THE COURT: How much cross do you think you have?

MR. BECKOM: I feel bad because you --
THE COURT: I don't want to limit you. Of course, I don't.

MR. BECKOM: I don't know. She keeps telling me $I$ speak fast, so it might be 15 minutes; it might be half hour if I listen to what I'm supposed to do.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BECKOM: I have no problem with taking a lunch break. And coming back after.

THE COURT: Let's take a lunch break now. Let's come back at 1:15. We'll still be done by 2:00 o'clock.

MR. VILKIN: That's fine. Yeah.
THE COURT: We'll do that. That's probably what we'll do. That way we're not rushing. And you can take as much time as --

MR. BECKOM: Again, thank you for your thoughtful analysis on that issue. We always do appreciate it.

THE COURT: I'm always going to tell you what I'm thinking about. I'll never just say rule one way

| 11:55:59 | 1 | or another. I'm going to tell you. <br> Okay. The clerk is telling me only Exhibit 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | was admitted. |
|  | 4 | THE COURT CLERK: Not -- |
| 11:56:07 | 5 | THE COURT: Which one? |
|  | 6 | THE COURT CLERK: Was not admitted. |
|  | 7 | MR. VILKIN: Only Exhibit 10 was not admitted? |
|  | 8 | THE COURT: Yes. |
|  | 9 | MR. GEISENDORF: All the others were. |
| 11:56:16 | 10 | MS. BAKER: Well -- |
|  | 11 | MR. VILKIN: That's fine. I think that's |
|  | 12 | accurate. |
|  | 13 | MR. BECKOM: No. I think that's -- |
|  | 14 | THE COURT: 1:15, gentlemen. |
| 11:56:26 | 15 | IN UNISON: Thank you. |
|  | 16 | $\begin{gathered} -000- \\ \text { (Lunch Recess) } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 17 | -000- |
|  | 18 | THE COURT: Okay. Let's go ahead and note our |
|  | 19 | appearances for the record. |
| 01:28:37 | 20 | MR. BECKOM: Thomas Beckom. |
|  | 21 | MR. VILKIN: I'm sorry. Go ahead. |
|  | 22 | MR. BECKOM: Thomas Beckom and Priscilla Baker |
|  | 23 | on behalf of US Bank. |
|  | 24 | MR. VILKIN: Richard Vilkin and Charles |
| 01:28:46 | 25 | Geisendorf on behalf of defendant and the counter |
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BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. Can you remind myself and the court what was your ultimate determination of value for this property, sir?
A. My final conclusion was that the price paid was a reasonable indication of the impaired value for the property, \$5100.
Q. $\$ 5100$ ?
A. Let me double check that. $\$ 5300$.
Q. Explain to me, sir, how you came to that determination.
A. Yes. As $I$ stated earlier, I utilized a sales comparison approach according to generally recognized appraisal methodologies.
Q. And what -- and what kind of comparables did you use, sir?
A. I used comps that were truly similar to the

01:29:50
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subject property in accordance with the Appraisal of Real Estate 14 th Edition.
Q. Okay. I also noticed in your report that you said this property was subject to a Class II detrimental conditions; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Where - and it looks like that you were referring to the -- there's a text that's sub-highlighted down there by Randall Bell, Real Estate Damages: Applied Economics; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Could you explain to me how that text asks you to assess Class II detrimental conditions?
A. Sure. So Dr. Bell's book addresses the concept of detrimental conditions and tries to help provide the fact and the user of appraisal services and the provider of appraisal services the proper methodologies for analyzing detrimental conditions. First to qualify and then to quantify those conditions and their effect, if any, on the value of real property.

The theory is a little complex, but I'll water it down for you. Basically, it says if there's a condition that adversely affects the value or the marketability of property, that it will go through a
$01: 31: 04$
$01: 31: 15$
$\square$
life cycle of three stages. And that at any point in those three stages there will be three types of damages. The three stages will be the assessment stage, the repair stage, and the ongoing stage. And the three types of damages will be costs, use and risk. Dr. Bell provides that matrix that explains the life cycle of a detrimental condition, and he also provides a chart that sort of explains the typical life cycle of a detrimental condition on a property over time.

Being very familiar with that book and the methodologies described in it, we followed the recommendations of Dr. Bell in addition to the generally accepted practices found in among other treatises the real estate or the valuation of Real Estate 14 th Edition.
Q. Question: Does Dr. Bell require as part of his detrimental condition analysis, does he suggest that you perform an unimpaired value analysis as the first step?
A. When necessary, yes.
Q. Did you perform that type of analysis in reviewing this property that brings us here today?
A. It was not necessary, so no.
Q. Why was it not necessary?
$01: 32: 37$
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A. So the concept of detrimental conditions is it's sometimes hard to understand. I have an example that $I$ can show you if you'd like to see it to maybe make you understand a little bit better what it is we're measuring.
Q. I'm just more interested in the process that you use to come to your determination that a condominium here in Las Vegas was worth $\$ 5,003$-- or \$5100, $I$ think. Well, the question, though, is you said that the treatise you relied on by Dr. Bell in some circumstances requires you to do an unimpaired value analysis; is that correct?
A. In some circumstances, yes.
Q. Okay. Then, I guess, I was just looking for a real, you know, quick, easy answer. Why did you not think it was necessary to do an unimpaired value analysis despite Dr. Bell's suggesting that that kind of analysis may need to be done in certain circumstances?
A. Well, as the question implies, there are circumstances where it will not need to be done. And in this case, the analogy $I$ like to use is dented cans. It's not often that you have a detrimental condition where there's a fully measurable market of properties with a similar detrimental condition that you can look
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at and determine how the market responds.
In this case we actually have a very viable market of data that we can look at and determine how the market responds to properties with an almost identical detrimental condition. What we really have is a market for dented cans. So what I'm able to do in this case is go straight to the question why in my mind is was the price paid reasonable. As an appraiser before $I$ can answer any question about value, $I$ have to ask at least two additional questions. The first would be when, and the second would be under what specific circumstances.
Q. Okay. So nowhere, like -- so you relied on Dr. Bell's book for the use of the, you know, phrase Class II detrimental condition, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And at any point in time in Dr. Bell's book does it discuss using the sales comparable approach in assessing detrimental conditions?
A. Yes.
Q. What does it say?
A. Well, $I$ can open the book if you'd like. I have that with me.
Q. Absolutely.
A. It will take me a few seconds to find it. But
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I can quote to you from his book out of my report. Dr. Bell in talking about Class II detrimental conditions - and I'll backup just for the benefit of the court and the record to explain that what Mr. - what Dre Bell does is he divides all potential detrimental conditions into ten classes. A Class II detrimental condition deals specifically with issues related to title. And he specifically addresses things like ReO sales and foreclosures. In the text he says and $I$ quote, "Other types of value might be more appropriate for properties when a forced sale or some other form of distress is influencing the decisions of buyer or the seller."

If you'll give me a moment I'll open the book and read you the sections that tells you that you should use the sales comparisons analysis.
Q. Please.
A. Okay. It's a newer edition than I'm used to using, and $I$ haven't bookmarked it yet, so forgive me for a second.
Q. Take your time.
A. So on page 4 , Dr. Bell describes the appraisal process. It's also described in the uniform standards, and in the appraisal of real estate. And he talks about the importance of defining the appraisal problem,
$01: 36: 29$
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to develop credible assignment results. And then Three, discuss the scope of the work in the report.

He goes on and he talks about the various definitions of the term value and how it's often market value that the laymen uses when they talk about value. But he also talks about those circumstance where a different definition of value may be warranted.

Then he goes into research methodology. And he talks about empirical research. Hermeneutics, such as public tests.
Q. That's h-e-r-m-e-n-e-u-t-i-c-s.
A. He then goes on to talk about surveys and then comparative research and adjustment grids. In this context, he talks about a real estate appraiser would be creating an adjustment grid or comparing contrasting case studies. And I'm looking for where he
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specifically talks about the sales comparison approach. The thing to remember about Dr. Bell's book is that he's applying generally recognized methodologies, and the appraiser only has three approaches to value to utilize: Sales comparison, cost approach or income approach.
Q. If you'd like to take the time to find where he reference the sales comparison approach.
A. Sure. So on page 30 , he talks about the application of three approaches to value. In the last paragraph in the center under application of the three approaches he says, and I quote "the impact of detrimental conditions on property values is ultimately an empirical question that requires the application of one or more of the three traditional approaches to value."

The next section is a discussion of the cost approach. And on page 32 he has a whole section talking about the use of the sales comparison approach applied to detrimental conditions.
Q. Okay. Now, let's take a -- so you -- you utilized the sales comparison approach to determine the market for Class II detrimental conditions, as you're testifying to here today, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
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Q. Okay. Let's take a look at, go to page 27 of your report, sir.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, I noted, so is this -- is this the portion on page 27 and 28 , this is the portion where you discussed these comparable sales, correct? Or the comparable sales that you used for the market that you were defining?
A. So this whole section of my report is talking about valuation methodology. It talks about the importance of considering the rights, any adverse effect on the rights. It cites the 14th Edition regarding the choice and selection of comparable properties that are similar in rights and risk.

On page 24 , I've got a quote there. It's citing an article by David Lenhoff entitled ryou can't get the value right if you get the rights wrong."

On 25 I explained the detrimental condition, generally what it is and what they are and how risk affects value in properties.

When we finally get to page -- what page were you on, 27?
Q. 27 and 28 .
A. I am talking to you specifically about my selection of comparable properties. What I looked at
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was foreclosure properties and trustee's deeds in the MLS tax assessors records.
Q. Okay.
A. And then $I$ narrowed that down to townhomes that are similar to the subject in physical characteristics. And then utilizing, again, the concept of sales comparison, we compare the subject to properties that are similar to the subject in rights and risk and similar as possible in physical characteristics.
Q. Now, I'm confused though. And it's a common characteristic, as like many people close to me in my life will tell you. $\quad$ only see two properties listed that you used at least right there under comparable sales. Are there more properties that you used?
A. Yes. If you read the paragraph before that and if you read the sentence after the paragraph after it, you'll see that two things are going on in this period of time. This is January of 2012 if $\quad$ recall our effective date properly; is that right?

Yeah. So January 25, 2012. This is very early in the life cycle of 116 foreclosures in southern Nevada. There aren't a lot of examples of properties that sold at 116 foreclosure prior to the effective date of this analysis.
$01: 42: 55$
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There's even less if you look specifically for townhomes between 1300 square feet of GLA. I'm sorry, less than 1300 square feet of GLA built between 1974 and 1994. So they're of a similar era of construction.

So what we did after we found that only two sales, one of them being our subject met our initial criteria. The proper methodology in that instance is to expand your criteria. And as $I$ explain, because it's early in the life cycle of 116 foreclosures, we looked at all 116 foreclosures that had occurred in Southern Nevada within that specified period of time. Instead of having two sales, we now have a 117 properties that we can look at. $\quad$ give you on page 28 the points statistics from that sample and then explain that we have a range from 1.1 percent to 14.7 percent of the taxable value. The concept here is it would be extremely timely to go back and appraise every single one of these 117 comparable properties to determine what a market value was to use as comparisons. so we have readily available an independently derived figure. The taxable value that we can use for solely the purpose of comparison.
Q. And so your initial -- like, your initial methodology found insufficient comparable sales to moot the criteria for the sales comparison approach. And so
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you were forced to expand. Is that my - is that a correct understanding?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. How many - do you know exactly, like, I mean, like, under USPAP and the professional appraisal standards, how many comparables should you ideally use to derive a value?
A. There's no ideal number. For residential lending purposes, there's a minimum requirement of 3 . Mr. - - I'm sorry I forget which -- I have a case tomorrow and we had a case last week. so this was Mr. Chip -- what's his last name?
Q. Holmes.
A. Holmes? Mr. Holmes, I believe, used three sales and two listings; is that correct? He uses six sales in his analysis. As far as the number that you need to have, I'd say three is adequate. six is good. 117 is maybe better.
Q. But two would be insufficient for residential lending purposes?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, can you explain to me a little bit more in depth about what you -- what - you assessed this as having a Class II detrimental condition, correct?
$01: 45: 56$
$01: 46: 03$
$01: 46: 1610$

11
$01: 46: 3415$
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Based on Dr. Bell's text, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you, $I$ guess, give me your definition of like, you know, your Class II detrimental condition. If you want to refer directly back to Dr. Bell's text, you can.
A. I quote it in my report on page 25. A Class II transactional condition relates to situations in which some particular and unique issue impacted a specific transaction. This classification includes transactions in which a buyer pays more than necessary to acquire a property or a seller disposes of a property at a discount.
Q. Okay. And then you've - you cite page 76 and 77 of Dr. Bell's text; correct?
A. Among others, but in this section, yes.
Q. Okay. So what exactly did you assess as being a detrimental condition?
A. I explained that on the next page that we have risk. I mentioned earlier that in the -- well, if you look at page 25, you'll see the detrimental condition matrix. Risk is one of the classifications of damages that is present in all three of the stages of a detrimental condition.
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My opinion is that at this point in time there was so little known about li6s that we're still well into the assessment stage. Which means that the market is trying to understand what these properties are and what these properties aren't.

They're trying to go assess the dents in the can. They're trying to determine whether or not the can has any value at all given the real circumstances that affect it. And if it does, what definition of value they should apply in determining how much, if anything, to invest to acquire the rights.

So risk, as $I$ define it on page 26 , has to do with the unknowns. $\quad$ give you a different example in this case of buying a car without turning over the engine or opening the hood. And $I$ specifically talk about the dented can example here. What we have here is beyond the discount necessary to incentivize a purchase. We have the probability that even after the sale, even after the purchase at auction, the lienholder might -- the original lienholder my ignore any ownership rights that were conveyed at the auction sale and sale the property out from under you.

The concept here is that these unknowns equate to risk. And the number one thing that diminishes the value of property is uncertainty.
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Q. Okay. I think I recall, if you want to turn to page 24 of your report, sir.
A. Sure.

THE COURT: What page again?
MR. BECKOM: 24. The people close to me also state that $I$ speak functional gibberish at times. So I get used to it after a while. BY MR. BECKOM:
Q. It looks like on page 24 , at least my assessment of it, and you can correct me if I'm wrong here, sir, is that you kind of break down specifically what you thought the detrimental conditions were. Is that a correct assessment?
A. Yeah. I break down the components of the risk, yes.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar - you said - you said you were, $I$ guess, an appraisal institute instructor?
A. I'm AQB certified USPAP instructor.
Q. Okay.
A. I do not teach for The Appraisal Institute.
Q. Okay. And so, but you are familiar with the, you know, the USPAP guidelines as far as what you're supposed to do and not do as an appraiser.
A. I'm one of 470 people in the world qualified
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as an expert that's allowed to teach that subject, yes.
Q. Are you familiar with the recordkeeping rules, sir?
A. I am.
Q. Can you explain that to me?
A. Recordkeeping rule says that an appraiser is required to maintain a work file documenting the support for their opinions and conclusions, and that it must be in existence prior to issuance of a report.
Q. Okay. I'm assuming you kept - you know, you kept a work file for this appraisal here?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Couple of things $I$ want to ask you about. You talk about the other considerations including limitations on saleability and financing in paragraph 2. Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. And then as of the effective date of January 25, 2012; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Where did you come to that - where did you come to -- how -- what supporting documentation did you use to support your assumption that saleability in financing was impaired on these properties?
A. Well, first of all, the concept of saleability
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is one of the fundamental bundle of rights. Often envisioned as a bundle of sticks. You can call it saleability, transferability disposition, but it's right of the property owner to dispose of that property hopefully for a profit.

As far as where $I$ came up with this limitation on saleability, it has to do with the concept that as of the effective date, there was not one title company that $I l^{\prime}$ aware of in all of Nevada that was willing to issue insurable clear title. Without insurable clear title, you are unable to obtain financing, you are only able to a sell to a very narrow group of potential purchasers. Therefore, that's a clear restriction on the right of saleability.
Q. Do you have any phone logs in your work file pursuant to the recordkeeping rule where you contacted title companies and asked if you were insuring properties from HOA foreclosures in January of 2012?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Which ones did you call?
A. I spoke to a gentleman named -- his last name is Williams, first name is Andre. I believe he works with National Title. He referred me to the gentleman in his office who at the time would have made a decision regarding questionable properties as 1 recall
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the conversation.
Andre is a longtime friend. And the results of that conversation and the notes in my work file will demonstrate that the gentleman was very hesitant to go on formal record. But what he said was he had no knowledge of any property facing 116 or subsequent to a 116 auction that had been granted insurable clear title. When $I$ asked him whether he thought it was probable that his company or any other title company would issue such a policy, he said he couldn't speak definitively, but, generally, said it would be unlikely.
Q. So you talked about to one person?
A. No. I made other phone calls, but you can imagine few people were willing to go on record.
Q. Understood. And this person -- the one person that actually did discuss this with you, you based your report on, was a friend; correct?
A. No. It was a referral, an employee of the company for whom a friend works.
Q. Okay. And he told you he did not want to go on record definitively stating that they would not insure title to this property?
A. Whenever $I$ have do an interview like this, $I$ always tell him who $I$ am and what I'm doing, and that
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it might be used as a case study. In this context, I'm going to have a note somewhere in my work file, a handwritten note probably, or a note typed in PDF on a specific property that says $I$ spoke to this person on this date, asked this general question, and this was my general response.
Q. Okay.
A. I will also tell you that $I$ follow up with Andre, and with other contacts in the title industry, with other attorneys, with other experts that are doing work related to title. And to this date nobody has been able to give me even one example of a property that was issued insurable clear title when it was sold at a 116 foreclosure auction.
Q. But we can agree none of these people were willing to go on record definitively at this point?
A. I can't prove a negative. I agree that - I agree that they won't go on record, but 1 can't - I can't prove that it doesn't exist by the fact that it doesn't exist, $I$ guess.
Q. I understand. Looking at the last paragraph. You talk about as of the retrospective - and I'm talking about the last paragraph of your report on page 24. As of the retrospective effective date numerous district court cases or cased -- oh, you
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should see my pleadings sometimes. They're horrendous. I'm sure your Honor Judge Williams will tell you that too.

But case had ended with decisions both in favor and opposed to a buyer's position, and that was in January of 2012; correct?
A. Yeah. And clearly, that's an example of the USPAP not requiring perfection either in diction or accuracy.

In this case, $I$ would say that that's an error. That's wrong. As of January 2012 , there may have been a case. But the real issue for me is that prior to December 12 of 2012 , there was very little known about these 116 properties.

On December 12, 2012 , the Nevada Real Estate Division issued their advisory opinion that basically said that a superpriority lien was, in fact, a true superpriority lien.

What we see in the data at that point is that the discount demanded for these properties reduced significantly, and prices spiked because people felt there was less risk.

Prior to 12-12 of 2012, the period in which our effective date falls, there was just so much unknown that we find discounts greater than 90 percent,
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sometimes as high as 99 percent.
Q. But - -
A. Just of the taxable value.
Q. But this statement regarding court cases you would not have support for that in your file pursuant to the recordkeeping rule; correct?
A. I would say that that is an error.
Q. Okay. But that is pursuant to this report one of the basis that you used to assess a Class II detrimental condition. Can we agree on that?
A. No. I wouldn't say that it's a specific condition. Your pleadings and my report sometimes have things in them that shouldn't be in there.

I've done about 700 of these cases. And I don't reinvent the wheel. So $I$ can tell what mostly happened was that the last report that we issued was on a date subsequent to December 12 of 2012 when we did have some actual cases involving 116 foreclosures. And I just failed to catch it.

When $I$ do my analysis, I'm always looking at the data; right? The Class II detrimental conditions clearly affects this property. I can demonstrate it in 117 properties within a contemporaneous period of time.

The actual buyers, not HOA buyers, but actual buyers and bidders demanded a significant discount.
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And that's the basis for my conclusion of a detrimental condition, both in the qualitative and the quantitative sense.
Q. So what is your definition of the difference between qualitative and quantitative?
A. So it would be wrong of me to assume that there is a detrimental condition just because there was a foreclosure pending.

It's generally understood that foreclosure sales sell for less than normal market value. But as we saw in the period of 2006 , say fourth quarter through 2000 -- early 2012 , the period where this property occurred, that isn't always the case.
Q. Because my understanding -- you can correct me if I'm wrong. My understanding of qualitative research data requires an in-person observation; is that an accurate - -
A. What I'm talking about is you have to qualify the detrimental condition.
Q. Okay.
A. What is the basis for the fact that it does or does not exist? And if it does exist, then you move on to the step of quantifying it. How does it actually affect the property? There's been cases where we can say that there is a detrimental condition, but when we
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do the quantifying data analysis we find that the condition is benign. That was not the case in this circumstance.
Q. Okay. You know, another question that $I$ had here about your report on page 20 .
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You issued a finding when you were reviewing Mr. Holmes's report that the appraisal is seven months subsequent to the HOA foreclosure auction. Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. Second mistake in my report.
Q. And then going back to page 13, we can both agree, but then you also identify both the foreclosure date and the effective date of the appraisal being the same date; correct?
A. As $I$ mentioned, not perfect. We make some mistakes. That was in a prior report and should have been removed, and it wasn't.
Q. Sounds like you do a lot of these HOA foreclosure -- you do a lot of testimony and expert reports for this kind of HOA foreclosure litigation. Is that a fair assumption?
A. It's the truth, yes.
Q. You said you did 700 of them?
A. We've written over 700 reports.
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Q. Okay. Who do you primarily do those reports for, sir?
A. In every case that I've been engaged, I've been engaged by either the HOA or the investor.
Q. Either the HOA or the investor; correct?
A. And sometimes co-clients, both the HOA and the investor in some cases have engaged me, yes.
Q. Okay. So you are - so you are - for 700 times you have been retained by either an investor or homeowners association to testify to a Class II detrimental condition as it relates to value of property; correct, sir?
A. Well, so to clarify, I've issued over 700 reports. $\quad$ don't know if that equates to 700 individual cases. Sometimes we issue an initial report, then a rebuttal report. Sometimes we issue a review as we did in this case. so that 700 -and-however-many cases might only equate to 600 , or 580, 1 don't know, individual cases.
Q. Out of those, like, you know, 700 times you've issued a report, are you aware of any time that your report has been excluded by any federal or state court in Nevada?
A. There is one case, yes, where a motion in limine excluded my report.
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Q. Okay. Why did they exclude your report?
A. In this particular case, my understanding of the order is that it was a senior judge. That the senior judge's position was that fair market value was the only value that can be considered.

As an appraiser, I'm unaware of either a statute or a specific case that actually says that in a 116 foreclosure that you're required to analyze the property based on fair market value. And, ultimately, my client in that case was preparing challenge to that motion, but they won on summary judgment so quickly that they decided not to pursue it.
Q. Understood. But we can both then agree, at least based on that statement, that you aren't testifying to fair market value in this report; are you?
A. So the short answer is no. I don't know if you want the longer answer.
Q. It's your testimony. In any event, so you are not testifying as to the fair market value in this report.

Let me see if $I$ have any other questions.
A. What $I$ am testifying is is that fair market value does not apply to a 116 property just on the simple basis of the assumptions required in the

| 02 | 1 | definition. From a purely economic standpoint, it's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | hippopotamus. I don't know. |
|  | 4 | MR. BECKOM: I have no further questions. |
| 02:02:34 | 5 | MR. VILKIN: Thank you. |
|  | 6 |  |
|  | 7 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
|  | 8 | BY MR. VILKIN: |
|  | 9 | Q. Mr. Brunson, how many times have you testified |
| 02:02:37 | 10 | in court in Nevada as to a real estate appraisal |
|  | 11 | opinion? |
|  | 12 | A. I believe it's 13 currently. Let me double |
|  | 13 | check. Fifteen trials -- |
|  | 14 | Q. And how many - - |
| 02:02:58 | 15 | A. -- if you include deposition. I'm sorry. |
|  | 16 | Q. If you know, how many different judges sat in |
|  | 17 | those trials? |
|  | 18 | A. I believe it's six. |
|  | 19 | MR. VILKIN: Nothing further. |
| 02:03:16 | 20 | THE COURT: Anything else? |
|  | 21 | MR. BECKOM: Just closing. |
|  | 22 | THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. |
|  | 23 | THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor. |
|  | 24 | THE COURT: All right. Does the defense rest |
| 02:04:03 | 25 | at this time, sir? |
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MR. VILKIN: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Closings.
MR. BECKOM: Your Honor, for two purposes, we are here to determine whether or not US Bank can have their deed of trust equitably reinstated against this property and whether or not they can foreclose.

I think the foreclosure part is probably the easiest part here. As this Court heard at the beginning of this trial, Mr. Heifner testified that they both had a note and a deed of trust. Both exhibits were admitted.

We had three different breaches, and that there was a death of the grantor. Grantor transferred the property to another entity through some involuntary means. And also they had not paid. Then it all comes back to the important part of it: Whether or not US Bank has the ability to foreclose on this property.

I -- based on an equitable security interest we would ask this court to grant here today, we renew or objection to Mr. Brunson's testimony and believe that Mr. Holmes $\quad$ testimony is the correct indicator here. This property has the fair market value of $\$ 48,000$.

This Court just heard Mr. Brunson in his own words approximately ten minutes ago testify that he has
$02: 05: 23$
$02: 05: 345$
$02: 05: 5310$
$02: 06: 08 \mathbf{1 5}$
not testified as to the fair market value of this unit. That he did not testify as to the fair market value of this unit, and that Exhibit 14 - -

THE COURT: But why -- here's my question, and this is something the Nevada supreme Court is going to have to answer. Why would fair market value be the standard utilized to determine the propriety of a Chapter 116 HOA foreclosure sale? And the reason why I bring that up, because $I$ thought about this, and maybe my background is a little different than a lot of judges because $I$ worked for Chicago Title as my first job before $I$ became a tort lawyer in Chicago. Before I moved to Las Vegas.

And the reason why $I$ bring that up is this: Traditionally, in scenarios where you look at fair market value, $I$ think it would be premised upon the fact that typically in fair market value transactions, what is being transferred? Typically, you have a warranty deed; right? You know, arm's-length transaction; right? And the property has been placed on the market for a period of time and listed. Then you have a willing buyer and seller come together, and you decide for a fair price - - right -- and the market demands that.

And the reason why $I$ think it's important to


$02: 10: 07$

THE COURT: NO. I'm not talking about me. I'm talking about other decision makers.

MR. BECKOM: Here's the thing, like, I mean, like, you know, and, you know, Mr. Brunson is correct. I'm standing here looking at the treatise of this guy. It's entitled to real estate damages. I mean, he's essentially testifying, like, you know, what he's testifying to is tantamount to, you know, if $I$ get angry and go file a lis pendens on somebody's property just because I'm mad, and, you know, they sue me for slander of title, you know, well, there. That's the quality of your damages right there.

What Shadow Wood requires, what the restatement of property requires, what Golden $v$ Tomiyasu, and what this type of test which has gone back, like, you know, over a hundred years, you know, the entirety of all of our lifetimes, is an analysis of the hypothetical fair market value.

THE COURT: No, but here's my question.
MR. BECKOM: That's what it requires.

THE COURT: Here's my question on that. And, I guess, doesn't fair market value depend on the market upon which the transaction occurs? And the reason why I bring that up is this: You take a look at a Chapter 107 sale. What type of title is transferred?
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You look at a government foreclosure sale for maybe taxes. What type of title is transferred? They're all different; right? And so $I$ understand what those cases stand for. But none of those cases really and truly address what happens under the circumstances of a Chapter 116 sale. Because it's a different animal. It just is.

MR. BECKOM: I think it comes down to - I cited that US Supreme Court opinion which, again, I know is not binding on this Court, you know, to interpret the federal law. But, you know, for the - they really highlight the difference between forced sale value and fair market value. They're two separate terms.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BECKOM: They've always been two separate terms. And he's just testifying to fair market value in an impaired market, not a fair market. He's testifying as to the impaired market value.

And, you know, my experience, $I$ mean, like, $I$ love Thursday. It's like, you know, when a new movie comes out, and $I$ get to go read new supreme court opinions. And, you know, our -- you know, on the appellate judges in this jurisdiction, you know, especially the judges -- Justice Pickering, she's a
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real smart cookie. She knows the weight of her words and what they mean.

And if she's stating, five, six, seven, eight, ten times the term fair market value, she knows that the thoughtful trial judges in this district are going to look at it and they're going to interpret it in terms of Unruh $v$ Streight because that's what the case law says.

And Mr. Brunson here, very qualified, very nice man, and he, you know, just hit the nail on the head himself. He is not testifying to fair market value.

There is - and it is somewhat of a hypothetical analysis, but that is the analysis this Court has been tasked with. And that is the analysis that we are required to do here.

Mr. Vilkin talked about how it's apples to oranges. Well, unfortunately, you know, Nevada supreme Court is throwing an apple harvest festival, and he's trying to bring a glass of orange juice. It's just - it's not the appropriate standard under this circumstance. And it's -- that's what our contention is.

If we're talking about actual real estate damages, which is what he was relying on, that's a
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different story. But we're not talking about that. We're talking about this court sitting in equity saying what is the fair market value of this property between the willing buyer and a willing seller.

THE COURT: Are you telling me that $I$ overlook the facts? And what $I$ mean by that is this: $I$ guess, it all comes down to how do you define fair market value. But it appears to me that could be a fairly large basket. And the reason why $I$ say that is this: You look at the facts of this sale; right? And it was an HOA sale.

Are you - - am $I$ just to sit back and say, Well, Judge, you know, forget it. Forget what really happened here. You look at this as a typical private transaction involving a willing seller and buyer. That's what I'm being asked to do. And so the facts are this, and we know this, and $I$ think he's probably right on this issue. But and at least this is the expert's opinion because $I$ really thought about this. And I'm going to page 24 of his report. And this is what he's - what he testified to. And this is in his report. I mean, he testified about this. He said - and this is on page 24 . And this would be the second paragraph. And $I$ think you actually questioned him on this.
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But as of that date, there was no title company in Southern Nevada willing to issue title insurance following an HOA foreclosure sale.

The lack of clear -- I'm sorry. The lack of insurable clear title would have precluded traditional financing options to a typical buyer. This represents risk to the right of transfer and precludes typical financial options for future buyers.

The issues were not present in the traditional, short sale, REO, or non-HOA foreclosure transactions.

And the way $I$ read that is this because it comes back to the type of title being transferred.

And so normally, you have marketable title as a result of a typical transaction. But we don't have that here. And then later on down here, and yes, he might have been wrong on -- and didn't include this, you know, improperly included this one comment, but at the end of the day, $I$ think he was right in this regard because this is what he said.
"As of the retrospective effective date, numerous district court cases" -- he says case -- "but cases had ended with decisions in favor of both -- in favor of and opposed to the buyer's position."
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I happen to be one of the judges that was opposed to the buyer's position; right? And so, and I don't want to go down that road because we talk - you know my history on that. But, I'm looking at it from this perspective: Now, $I$ have $S F R$ in front of me. And one of the things $I$ try to do is this, if the law is there and the supreme Court has given me their specific marching orders, I'll follow them, you know, whether $I$ agree or disagree with the decision. That's just how I do it, you know, because we have to have predictability.

But it's been my experience, and you can tell me if $I$ Im wrong or not, $I$ don't think the supreme court or the court of appeals have specifically addressed the issues I'm confronted with right now with what $I$ would consider particularity. Do you understand what I'm saying?

MR. BECKOM: Sounds pretty accurate to me.
THE COURT: There you go. I use that term on purpose "particularity" because I'm being very fact specific to what the evidence that has been presented in this case. Because it's my understanding, I don't know if very many of the cases to date have been argued in front of some of the other district court judges specifically focusing on this type of methodology from
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a valuation standpoint. And that's one of the reasons why $I$ wanted to wait before $I$ ruled on a lot of summary judgments to hear what the experts have to say.

Because, $I$ mean, at the very beginning at first blush, $I$ don't mind saying this, $x$ was saying to myself it should be fair market value. That was my first blush, my first instinct. But $\quad$ said, no, you got to sit back and you got to wait and to see how this all develops. Because $I$ can see potentially where that specific provision under the statute as to the types of title that was transferred can have an impact. I wanted to hear what an expert had to say about that. So my mind was completely open.

MR. BECKOM: That's why we like trying things in front of you, your Honor. You know, $\quad$ just - THE COURT: So what do $I$ do with that?

MR. BECKOM: I do -- I do continue to contend, you know, $I$ mean, you're talking about jury instructions there. I mean $I$ think the model jury instruction in that situation would be just Unruh v Streight standard, you know, price between a willing buyer and a willing seller. By its bare nature, this is a forced sale value. You know, it's a hypothetical situation that the Nevada Supreme Court has tasked this Court with engaging into.
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But, you know, all of the stuff -- and, like, he only used two sales comparables. He had to actually expand out his definition. And by his own testimony it wasn't fair market value. And then every single last one of those was forecloses. That is the antithesis of fair market value.

He's defined sub market based on forced sale that's the standard that Christen and Pinkering -Pickering as well as the other justice on the Nevada Supreme Court tasked this Court to make. You know, if -- and $I$ think that's just -- we continue to assert that the fair market value is the only proper indication of the value here. It's the issue of law, not an issue of fact. And $I$ think --

THE COURT: Here's my next question, though: Moving on, does it really matter?

MR. BECKOM: As far as the unfairness?
THE COURT: Well, that's where I'm going. Because, hypothetically, this could be the scenario: I can accept the fair market evaluation based upon a traditional commercial transaction. And then $I$ can make a determination because that's not the end of the analysis -- right -- under Nevada law. I have to make a decision as to fraud, oppression, and unfairness; right?
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MR. BECKOM: I think you've got that here. Of course, I'm going to say that because I'm the bank lawyer. But, no, $I$ think, 100 percent you've got that here. I mean, this Court heard testimony - -

THE COURT: There was no fraud; right?

MR. BECKOM: We heard different testimony that Mr. Kerbow was doing -- I mean, like, we actually saw a court docket where Mr. Kerbow represents Resources Group just the same as these gentlemen right here. You're months after that sale. And, like, Mr. Haddad couldn't even clear the record when he obtained Mr. Kerbow. I would contend that it is inappropriate for - -

THE COURT: Is that fraud?

MR. BECKOM: I'll let the Court judge the law and fact - -

THE COURT: NO, no, no.
MR. BECKOM: Oh, you're going to make me name call.

THE COURT: No. I'm just asking the question. Is that fraud? That's all. Because, I mean - because we can't overlook the fact $I$ could buy your market analysis approach, and say, okay, that's the basis - is going to be the basis for my decision. Because this is not a tender case. And $I$ think we can all agree to
$02: 20: 49$
$02: 21: 04$
$02: 21: 1410$
$02: 21: 2615$
that. But even if $I$ do buy that, that's not the end of my analysis; right?

MR. BECKOM: You know, I grew up in Virginia and Texas. And my parents always raised me to not name call. $\quad$ will say this.

THE COURT: That's - -

MR. BECKOM: If it looks like a duck and a quacks like a duck, it's probably a duck. And, I mean, like, you know, you can confer whatever you would like to from that.

This is, $I$ mean, this is -- this is the same attorneys Mr. Haddad testified, or his lawyers conducting the sale and selling him the property. And I think we discussed this that, like, unfairness standard is not a set standard, your Honor.

You know, going back to that fair market value analysis, let's just say for a minute, you know, that Mr. Holmes' valuation of the property is the one that's there. That is 11 percent of his testified value. And even Justice Pickering in Shadow Wood stated that anything less than 20 percent, she called it, obviously, inadequate. But if you look at the expansive case law concerning that issue, the level of unfairness as this court sitting in equity, and kind of harkens back to, you know, you've got -- it's like a
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fairness goes down as the price goes down. And the sale of 11 percent of value where you've got people testifying up here that their attorney, the people who conducted the sale were also their lawyers.

We had other testimony here. I mean, I still contend that a lack -- a complete failure, and it was undisputed between everyone that a complete failure to serve US Bank with a notice of default when they had a policy to pay these liens, I believe, that that actually renders the sale void. And that's not even covered under Shadow Wood. That is a failure to cover the statute.

THE COURT: Here's my question for you in that regard. Then $I$ have question on the other - -

MR. BECKOM: Of course.
THE COURT: What standard I should use. I think our Nevada Supreme Court has - our Nevada Supreme Court has been pretty clear on this one issue.
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And it's regarding the opt-in notice requirement; right? And they said that was constitutional. I guess, they decided -- was it Bourne valley? They went opposite; right? $\quad$ think it was Bourne valley.

MR. VILKIN: Saticoy Bay was the state court case.

THE COURT: Saticoy Bay. Yeah. I kind of messed that up. You know, there's so many cases out there. But anyway, factually in this case there was never a request by $U S$ Bank -- a specific request by US Bank to the HOA requesting notice if there's a delinquency as far as the HOA assessments are concerned; was there? $I$ don't think that's - -

MR. BECKOM: I would -- I was -- two points I would make in that regard, if the Court would like me to do so.

Saticoy Bay versus Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, they bounced that case under the state action requirement. Which, honestly, I'll give Nevada Supreme Court credit for this. They could have easily dealt with it on state law grounds. But they actually looked at the Ninth Circuit Federal Court of Appeals and said, No, you're wrong under federal law.

They never ever reached the point whether that is an actual opt-in noticing statute. And, I mean, I

