In the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada

IN THE MATTER OF THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY TRUST u.a.d. 10/11/16))	Jan 10 2019 08:11 a.m. Elizabeth A. Brown
SUSAN CHRISTIAN-PAYNE, ROSEMARY KEACH AND RAYMOND CHRISTIAN, JR. Appellants,))) Case No.:	Clerk of Supreme Court
-vs- ANTHONY L. BARNEY, LTD. and JACQUELINE UTKIN, Respondents.)))	
ANTHONY L. BARNEY, LTD., Cross-Appellant, -vs- SUSAN CHRISTIAN-PAYNE, ROSEMARY KEACH AND RAYMOND CHRISTIAN, JR. Cross-Respondents,)))))))))))	
and JACQUELINE UTKIN, Respondent.)))	
-)	

APPELLANT/CROSS-RESPONDENTS' APPENDIX - VOLUME 13b

Filed by:

/s/ Cary Colt Payne, Esq.

CARY COLT PAYNE, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No.: 4357

CARY COLT PAYNE, CHTD.

700 S. Eighth Street

Las Vegas, NV 89101

(702) 383-9010

carycoltpaynechtd@yahoo.com

DATE	DOCUMENT	Numbered
APPENDI	X VOLUME 1:	
7/13/17	Petition to Assume Jurisdiction of Trust; Confirm Trustees; Instructions, etc.	APP-ROA001-72
8/17/17	Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to NRCP 12(b)(1) and NRCP 12 (b)(5)	APP-ROA—73-97
8/22/17	Errata to Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to NRCP 12(b)(1) and NRCP 12(b)(5)	APP-ROA—98-101
9/15/17	Supplement and Addendum to Petition to Assume Jurisdiction of Trust; confirm Trustees' Instructions, etc. Alternatively to Reform Trust Agreement	APP-ROA102-105
	Trust Agreement	AIT-NOA102-103
9/15/17	Petitioner's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss	APP-ROA106-115
APPENDI	XX VOLUME 2:	
10/4/17	Reply to Petitioner's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss	APP-ROA116-156
10/13/17	Response to Petition to Assume Jurisdiction of Trust; Confirm Trustees; Insturctions, Etc. and Joinder in Motion to Dismiss Pursuant	
	to NRCP 12(b)(1) and NRCP 12(b)(5)	APP-ROA157-165
10/25/17	Accounting	APP-ROA166-173
10/25/17	Inventory and Record of Value	APP-ROA174-184
10/31/17	Notice of Entry of Order	APP-ROA185-193

DATE **DOCUMENT** NUMBERED **APPENDIX VOLUME 3:** Joint Petition for Review of Former Trustees 11/3/17 Refusal to Provide a Proper Accounting Pursuant to NRS 165.143 APP-ROA--194-222 APPENDIX VOLUME 4a: APP-ROA--223-298 11/13/17 Joint Objection to Petition Jurisdiction Etc. Part 1 **APPENDIX VOLUME 4b:** APP-ROA--299-373 11/13/17 Joint Objection to Petition Jurisdiction Etc. Part 2 **APPENDIX VOLUME 5:** Petitioner's Opposition to Motion for 12/4/17 Review/Proper Accounting APP-ROA--374-413 12/14/17 Petitioner's Opposition to Joint Counterpetition to Confirm/Breach of Fiduciary Duty, Etc. Request for Discovery APP-ROA--414-428 **APPENDIX VOLUME 6:** Motion for Compliance with and Enforcement 12/12/17 of Court Order, and for Sanctions Relating Thereto, for Order to show cause why Former Trustees should not be held in Contempt, for Order Compelling Former Trustees to Account, and for Access to and Investment Control of Trust Funds Belonging to the **Christian Family Trust** APP-ROA--429-452

DATE	DOCUMENT	Numbered
1/4/18	Notice of Suggestion of Death	APP-ROA453-454
1/11/18	Opposition to Motion for Compliance, Enforcement Sanctions, Contempt, Etc.; Counterpetition for Distribution and Vacating all Pending Matters and Dismiss Trust Proceedings	
APPENDIX	X VOLUME 7a:	
1/26/18	Petition to Confirm Successor Trustee Part 1	APP-ROA509-539
APPENDIX	X VOLUME 7b:	
1/26/18	Petition to Confirm Successor Trustee Part 2	APP-ROA540-569
APPENDIX	X VOLUME 8:	
2/6/18	Amended Notice of Entry-Omnibus Order	APP-ROA570-576
2/8/18	Petition for Fees and Costs	APP-ROA577-659
2/23/18	Notice of Non-Opposition and Limited Joinder to the Petition for Fees and Costs for Anthony L. Barney, LTD	APP-ROA660-663
2/23/18	Opposition to Petition to Confirm Successor Trustee; Counterpetition for Reinstatement of Petitioners	APP-ROA664-735
3/8/18	Monte Reason's Application for Reimbursement of Administrative Expenses	APP-ROA736-741

DATE	DOCUMENT	Numbered
APPENDIX	X VOLUME 9:	
3/9/18	Petitioners Combined Opposition to (1) Barney Firm Petition For Fees, Etc. (2) Monte Reason's Application for Reimbursement	APP-ROA742-840
APPENDIX	X VOLUME 10:	
3/12/18	Reply to Opposition to Petition to Confirm Success Trustee; and Opposition to Counter-Petition for Reinstatement of Petitioners	sor APP-ROA841-848
3/13/18	Response to Opposition to Monte Reason's Application for Reimbursement of Administrative Expenses	APP-ROA849-863
3/13/18	Reply to Petitioner's Combined Opposition to (1) Barney Firm Petition for Fees, Etc., (2) Monte Reason's Application for Reimbursement	APP-ROA864-894
3/15/18	Minutes of Hearing – 4/4/18	APP-ROA895-898
3/29/18	Motion (1) to Expunge Lis Pendens and/or Strike Pleading; and (2) for Preliminary Injunction	APP-ROA899-921
APPENDIX	X VOLUME 11:	
3/30/18	Petitioner's Supplemental Response to Opposition to Petition for Fees (Barney Firm); Request for Evidentiary Hearing, Reopening Discovery	APP-ROA922-960

DATE	DOCUMENT	Numbered
APPENDIX	X VOLUME 12:	
4/2/18	Motion for Turnover of Assets and to Dissolve the Injunction Over Christian Family Trust Assets	APP-ROA961-998
4/3/18	Countermotion 1) to Strike Petitioner's Supplemental Response to Opposition to Petition for Fees (Barney Firm); request for Evidentiary Hearing, and Reopening Discovery; 2) To Find the Former Trustees to be Vexatious Litigants, and 3) For sanctions Against Cary Colt Payne Pursuant to NRS 7.085 and EDCR 7.60	APP-ROA999-1036
APPENDIX	X VOLUME 13a:	
4/4/18	Hearing Transcript Part 1	APP-ROA-1037-1061
APPENDIX VOLUME 13b:		
4/4/18	Hearing Transcript Part 2	APP-ROA-1062-1186
APPENDIX VOLUME 13c:		
4/4/18	Hearing Transcript Part 3	APP-ROA-1087-1111
APPENDIX VOLUME 13d:		
4/4/18	Hearing Transcript Part 4	APP-ROA-1112-1134

DATE **DOCUMENT** NUMBERED APPENDIX VOLUME 14a: 4/10/18 Motion for (1) Fees Pursuant to NRS 165.148 (2) Compliance with and Enforcement of Court Order and Sanctions; (3) for Order to Show Cause Why Former Trustees Should Not be Held in Contempt, and (4) for Extension of Discovery APP-ROA-1135-1279 Part 1 APPENDIX VOLUME 14b: 4/10/18 Motion for (1) Fees Pursuant to NRS 165.148 (2) Compliance with and Enforcement of Court Order and Sanctions; (3) for Order to Show Cause Why Former Trustees Should Not be Held in Contempt, and APP-ROA-1180-1224 (4) for Extension of Discovery Part 2 **APPENDIX VOLUME 15:** 4/12/18 Notice of Entry of Order (Barney Petition Fees) APP-ROA-1225-1232 4/19/18 Petitioner's Combined Opposition to (1) Motion to Turnover Assets and Dissolve Injunction over Trust Assets; (2) Motion to 1. Expunge Lis Pendens and 2. Preliminary Injunction and Countermotion for Distribution/ Termination of Trust; Alternatively for Stay/ Set Bond and Set Evidentiary APP-ROA-1233-1254 Hearing 4/19/18 Opposition to Motion for (1) fees, (2) compliance,

Property (2nd request)

(3) for Order to Show Cause and (4) Extension of Discovery, countermotion to Distribute Trust

APP-ROA-1255-1292

DATE **DOCUMENT** NUMBERED **APPENDIX VOLUME 16:** 5/8/18 Response to Combined Opposition to (1) Motion to Turnover Assets and Dissolve Injunction Over Trust Assets; (2) Motion to 1. Expunge Lis Pendens and 2. Preliminary Injunction and Opposition to Countermotion or Distribution/ Termination of Trust; Alternatively for Stay, Set Bond and Set Evidentiary Hearing APP-ROA-1293-1333 5/11/18 Supplement to response to Combined Opposition to (1) Motion to Turnover Assets and Dissolve Injunction Over Trust Assets; (2) Motion to 1. Expunge Lis Pendens and 2. Preliminary Injunction and Opposition to Countermotion for Distribution/Termination of Trust; Alternatively for Stay/Set Bond and APP-ROA-1334-1337 Set Evidentiary Hearing **Hearing Transcript** 5/16/18 APP-ROA-1338-1390 APPENDIX VOLUME 17: Notice of Entry of Order (Utkin suspension) 6/1/18 APP-ROA-1391-1401 10/8/18 Notice of Entry – Probate Commissioner R&R (Hearing re Utkin removal) APP-ROA-1402-1408 11/13/18 Notice of Entry – Order Affirming Probate Commissioner R&R (Utkin removal) APP-ROA-1409-1414

accident in the first place that caused the death. You just don't -- oh, sorry, you're -- we -- we rear ended you into traffic and now you're deceased. Oh, sorry, well, I --

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: So is there more pleadings coming or if I --

MR. POWELL: Well, Your Honor, at this point what the issue is is that was the ini -- that -- you have to understand this. What -- what -- and -- and I want to correct Mr. Kirschner on this quickly on this. The right to remove the trustee wasn't beholden on showing anything about the trustee acting in bad faith or anything about that. That was not the standard. That's not the applicable standard. You can remove the trustee at any time. You have to keep in mind and conceptualize the fact that this is their trust, their assets. They control the rules. If you tell me that we're going to play a game of baseball and it takes five strikes to strike you out, well, that -- you're -- you're the one -you're the one dictating the rules of the game. We play it under your rules, because it's your ball, it's your bat. We're playing how you -- you dictate it. That's no different than the way that a trust is created.

I can form a trust with my wife and say this is how it's going to -- this is how it's going to lay out. I'm not subject to -- to saying oh, well, this is how it's normally

done or this or that, whatever. No.

And I will tell you off the bat, what is concerning is the fact is why were the children trustees in the first place? That's highly abnormal, Your Honor. I don't know if you have a trust. I have a trust. I'm the trustee of my own trust along with my wife. No one else is. I want to control my stuff. If you've setup your business entity, you want to be the president, I'm sure. You want to -- you want to be the man that -- that man that calls the shots. That's your right because it's your -- your things.

THE COURT: Number one, do we need to answer that question? And if we do, how do we -- how do we answer that question? I mean, is that going to be part of the litigation?

MR. POWELL: Well, the -- the issue right now is -- is Nancy made these claims for -- for the assets during her life. So what happened Your Honor is that she then removes the trustees, the acting trustees, and she doesn't have to say why. The --

THE COURT: Do you -- do you remember what date that was, approximately?

MR. POWELL: The removal?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. POWELL: Yeah, the removal was in June I want to say.

MR. PAYNE: June 12th, 2017.

MR. POWELL: It was -- it was in June. She had enough of trying to fight the trustees to get her own money. They said we're not giving you anything and she says fine, great. I have the power to remove you. So I'm going to remove you.

THE COURT: And --

MR. POWELL: They --

THE COURT: -- then that brings us to your point that you just made. Why did she appoint her son?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ POWELL: Because she wanted to and she could. And she could have --

THE COURT: All right. But you --

MR. POWELL: -- appointed herself.

THE COURT: -- you were asking me why the three children were the trustees and then she did the same thing.

MR. POWELL: Because she obviously figured out is my -- my children that I named obviously don't have my best interest in mind because they're deciding that I'm apparently not worthy of getting my own assets and -- and living off of -- and benefitting from my own assets. So she decides, well, I'm going to appoint Monte.

Your -- Your Honor, you have to keep in mind too, there was no prohibition. She could have appointed herself if

she wished to. She didn't. And -- but -- but that doesn't create an issue.

You also happen to keep in mind in -- when she did
the appointment, they want to allege is, oh, somehow Monte
influenced her. You have -- you have an independent review by
Sean Tanko who sits as the pro tem judge when Commissioner
Yamashita is not available, who has a great reputation in this
community, he is the attorney that signed that document, Your
Honor, which verified yes, this is what Nancy wants to do.
And the verification said -- the -- the independent
certification says this is what she's doing. She's not acting
under any duress --

THE COURT: I really --

MR. POWELL: -- and influence.

THE COURT: -- appreciate the education, but today is not the day for trial.

MR. POWELL: Oh, I understand, but you -- you're -you led off this hearing Your Honor was -- with asking Mr.
Kirschner is why don't we just distribute the -- the assets
right now, what's the problem. And I'm trying to give you the
background of what the problem is.

THE COURT: What is the problem?

MR. POWELL: The problem is the fact is that Nancy Christian's rights didn't terminate because of her death.

```
They're still in effect. And -- and the fact that the
1
   trustees didn't like the fact that they were removed --
2
             THE COURT: What is Nancy claiming now?
3
             MR. POWELL: There -- there's -- there's multiple
4
   claims, Your Honor. But I -- if -- if you're going to ask me
5
   right now to -- to give you all my pleadings on my strategy,
   I'm -- I'm not -- I -- I can't do it right now.
7
             THE COURT: Well, when -- when will I get that?
8
   Because I don't think that you have -- I have -- I read most
 9
   of the pleadings. I haven't got to these new ongoing claims.
10
             MR. POWELL: Okay.
11
             THE COURT: Or have you filed something?
12
             MR. POWELL: No, I -- I have not, Your Honor.
13
             THE COURT: Okay.
14
              MR. POWELL: I have not. And that -- and that's
15
    another issue in terms of what -- what course I have to take.
16
    And -- and just to be candid with you, I'm not sure
17
    necessarily it has to be done. You're obviously sitting as a
18
    judge in probate court in this matter. This may turn into a
19
    civil matter as well. So --
20
              THE COURT: Okay.
21
              MR. POWELL: And -- and I'm not being disrespectful.
22
23
    I'm just saying --
```

P-17-092512-T CHRISTIAN FAMILY TRUST 04/04/2018 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

THE COURT: No, I --

24

```
MR. POWELL: -- is that --
 1
             THE COURT: -- I --
 2
 3
             MR. POWELL: -- you may not --
              THE COURT: I -- I'm -- I'm not trying to --
 4
 5
             MR. POWELL: -- you may not be hearing some of
 6
   the --
 7
             THE COURT: I'm not trying --
             MR. POWELL: -- the claims.
 8
              THE COURT: -- to see all your cards. I'm just
 9
10
   saying --
              MR. POWELL: Oh, I hear you.
11
              THE COURT: -- whether there was something I
12
13
   missed --
14
             MR. POWELL: No.
              THE COURT: -- before --
15
             MR. POWELL: No.
16
              THE COURT: -- or these are something that may be
17
18
    coming.
              MR. POWELL: No. But -- but what launched this
19
    litigation, you have to keep in mind is Nancy does all of this
20
    -- the -- the -- what she has the right to do to remove them
21
    and to say you're not acting in my best interest, I don't -- I
22
    want to remove you, she appoints Monte, there's an independent
23
    certification by, again, Sean Tanko, who he's an independent
24
```

third party attorney here who has no skin in this game at all. 1 2 You -- you all went to the settlement conference yesterday? 3 MR. POWELL: Yes. THE COURT: And it --4 5 MR. HOLYOAK: At your direction, Your Honor, we -we did not attend. 6 7 MR. BARNEY: We --THE COURT: Okay. 8 MR. BARNEY: -- didn't, because you -- you asked 9 10 us --THE COURT: And it --11 12 MR. BARNEY: -- not to be there. THE COURT: Was it close or was it not close? Any 13 progress made? I don't need to know -- I don't want to hear 14 it, but I just wondered if you guys negotiate. Was it close, 15 not close? Didn't even get started. 16 MR. KIRSCHNER: What I will tell you Your Honor is 17 that there is a framework that I think that can be -- that 18 might be workable, but the details and the meat that's going 19 to be put on that framework really has to be either worked out 20 between Counsel. And it's probably going to take a little bit 21 of time at a minimum for it. So I $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ I would say that there 22 23 is a framework discussed, but --

P-17-092512-T CHRISTIAN FAMILY TRUST 04/04/2018 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

24

THE COURT: My number one goal with all due respect

to all the attorneys here is to reduce your fees as much as 1 possible. So I'm trying to terminate the litigation as soon 2 as possible. I'm -- I don't know where he's going and -- and 3 where -- if he's going to go to a different courthouse or --5 and -- and file something different, but this is what I have before me. What do we need to set a trial date? 6 7 MR. KIRSCHNER: All right. THE COURT: And I don't want to rush it, but I don't 8 want to prolong it either -- and -- and create a lot more fees for the attorneys. I -- I love attorneys, they're nice 10 people, for the most part, and they need to make a living. 11 But, you know, I think Nancy and Raymond didn't 12 expect to see this -- this show and hopefully this -- this is 13 what they were trying to avoid, I think. 14 MR. KIRSCHNER: I think that we can break that up 15 into different pats, Your Honor. And I want to try to -- I --16 and I guess --17 THE COURT: So --18 MR. KIRSCHNER: -- on --19 THE COURT: -- do you --20 MR. KIRSCHNER: $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ on the fly here trying to get a 21 pathway for -- for us. 22

P-17-092512-T CHRISTIAN FAMILY TRUST 04/04/2018 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

settlement, I'm willing to try.

23

24

THE COURT: Whatever I can do to -- to try to get a

```
MR. KIRSCHNER: All right.
 1
             MR. BARNEY: Your Honor, may I add something? I --
 2
 3
    WP --
             MR. PAYNE: Just for the record, I'm going to
 4
 5
    object.
             He's not a party, but I want --
              THE COURT: Okay.
 6
 7
             MR. PAYNE: I know you're going to let it --
              THE COURT: Just for the record --
 8
 9
             MR. BARNEY: It was my understanding it's my
10
    petition.
11
                         Today is your day. Yes.
              THE COURT:
             MR. POWELL: Yes.
12
13
             MR. HOLYOAK: Yes.
14
             MR. BARNEY: Yeah. It is --
15
             THE COURT: We'll get to your claim.
16
             MR. BARNEY: It is my petition. Your Honor, I -- I
17
    can't --
18
                         Are you're suggesting something to try
             THE COURT:
   to resolve this? Is that what I'm -- I'm going to hear?
19
20
              MR. BARNEY: Well, I'm -- I'm suggesting that
21
   getting us paid pursuant to the terms of the trust which I
22
   don't think is in dispute at this point. You sign the order.
    Jackie Utkin is the trustee that's been confirmed.
23
24
              Irrespective of that issue, these aren't prevailing
```

party fees. You know, I mean, we -- we sent -- we essentially indulged the Court on the -- on the issue of the -- on the Brunzell factors. It's -- Brunzell factors really don't come into play on a trust payment, because the terms of the trust control in terms of us getting paid.

We frankly would like to be out of this case at this point, Your Honor. Our fees have already been approved by the trustees, both trustees. The confirmation has occurred. Essentially, you get one less party in here once -- once the -- the funds are released so that their approval can take effect. And then we don't have to appear anymore.

Believe me, I would really appreciate Your Honor to not have to appear anymore on this matter.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. BARNEY: Unfortunately now, I have to file a motion to strike because there's been something put on the record that the judges are quiet -- are -- are quietly and succinctly striking in the different courts that they're in. Judge Sturman just sealed it. We're waiting for Betsy Gonzalez to seal it. I will now have to ask you to seal it, Your Honor.

Mr. -- Mr. Payne has about 14,000 in sanctions that are outstanding that he's fighting right now for doing just this what he did again.

1 I would like to be out of the -- this case because I don't like being defamed on a regular basis. And I --3 frankly, I think it's bad policy to like beat other attorneys up and try to besmirch their character. I -- I would just 5 like to get paid. THE COURT: Okay. 6 7 MR. BARNEY: And I would like to be out of this. 8 of course unfortunately unless Mr. Payne will stipulate to remove what he put on the record, I'll have to file another --10 I'll have to renotice my countermotion to strike if the Court 11 isn't inclined to strike it today. 12 But yes, I -- I would like to be paid and I don't 13 think there's anything that prevents me from being paid because I have both of the prior trustees that approved my 14 15 fees. 16 I think at this point essentially --17 THE COURT: Then why did you ask me to approve it? 18 MR. BARNEY: Only -- we only asked to approve to 19 release --20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. BARNEY: -- to -- yeah, you don't have to 22 approve the fees, just to release the funds so that we can be 23 paid.

P-17-092512-T CHRISTIAN FAMILY TRUST 04/04/2018 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

THE COURT: Okay.

24

MR. BARNEY: Yeah.

THE COURT: Well, I -- I appreciate -- and this is your day and if you need more time to argue your fees, I'll -- I'll give you more time, but I was working to try to get a framework to try to resolve this matter as soon as possible without having to keep coming back. And you were kind of saying that there's a framework but it needs more skin.

MR. KIRSCHNER: All right. The first question that needs to be resolved which is resolved by this Court's order is who's the trustee of -- who's the trustee of the trust?

And that needs to be resolved in -- it -- because fundamentally there's the threshold issue as we're going through this being able to ask the questions who's going to be taking these fines out?

So we have that. Mr. Monte Reason has made two potential problems. One that arguing that there's undue influence and that two that there's potential claims from Nancy's lifetime that can be made against the trust or the former trustees. Okay.

THE COURT: I hope they don't get too carried away with that.

MR. POWELL: I -- I sincerely hope so too, Your

Honor, because at -- at the end of the day being blunt, if it

goes to a civil matter and you have extended discovery,

everybody loses. There's no point. Okay.

But as the first matter, we need to have somebody in control of this. And right now my client is the one who has been ordered by this Court to be in control. There has been no shown -- we want to get control of the assets. We want to get the information about the assets --

THE COURT: Well --

MR. KIRSCHNER: And -- be able to sit --

THE COURT: -- if you're --

MR. KIRSCHNER: -- serve --

THE COURT: -- really serious about that first point, can we get a neutral trustee?

MR. KIRSCHNER: I don't believe I can take that position one, Your Honor, because that wasn't before the Court. I haven't briefed this issue and I'm --

THE COURT: No, I'm not --

MR. KIRSCHNER: -- and forgive me for --

THE COURT: I'm not --

MR. KIRSCHNER: -- being on the fly here.

THE COURT: I'm just saying that -- that there's this side and this side and you want a trustee but they pick the trustee. I'm sure they don't like the trustee. Maybe with a neutral trustee, maybe some professional trustee, we can get this resolved quicker.

```
MR. KIRSCHNER: I don't think there's been any
 1
    showing that my client has done anything wrong in her role as
 3
    trustee or show favoritism. If anything, I fought both sides
    on this matter, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Well, maybe --
 5
 6
              MR. KIRSCHNER: So --
 7
              THE COURT: -- I'm wrong.
 8
              MR. KIRSCHNER: So I \operatorname{--} I \operatorname{--} as a starting point, I
    don't think that there has been --
10
              THE COURT: I'm not --
11
              MR. KIRSCHNER: -- any statement --
12
              THE COURT: I don't even know --
13
              MR. KIRSCHNER: -- on either side.
14
              THE COURT: I don't even know your client.
15
    think we ever met. But I'm just saying just from the history
16
    of this case it seems that that's going to be a stone in
17
    someone's shoes and it's not going to lead to a guick
    resolution.
18
19
              MR. KIRSCHNER:
                              I can say at this time Your Honor my
20
    client is not prepared to resign as the trustee. I -- I think
21
    I can say --
22
              THE COURT: No.
23
              MR. KIRSCHNER: -- and -- and I can't --
24
              THE COURT: I'm just putting that out there --
```

1	MR. KIRSCHNER: really take a position on that.
2	
3	THE COURT: for negotiations.
4	MR. KIRSCHNER: Okay. As far as negotiations, I
5	apologize. If we're doing we're kind of at a quasi
6	settlement right now. I mean, I
7	THE COURT: We're not
8	MR. KIRSCHNER: want to be clear.
9	THE COURT: No. No. But I just asked you how much
10	progress you've made yesterday and you said there was some
11	progress and
12	MR. KIRSCHNER: Yes, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: and that it could lead to a
14	resolution.
15	MR. KIRSCHNER: Yes. So the the first question
16	is cement the
17	THE COURT: And you but you said we need to know
18	who the trustee is first.
19	MR. KIRSCHNER: We need we we need to cement
20	the trustee, which
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MR. KIRSCHNER: we've done through order. But
23	also for me, I need to know whether or not somebody's going to
24	be contesting the trust, because that's a different battle

that we're going to be preparing.

So for us, we're going to seek whether or not we're going to have a --

THE COURT: Well, I think --

MR. KIRSCHNER: -- Rule 55 challenge.

THE COURT: -- Monte Reason, the person who picked this trustee, is going to be contesting the will. I don't know if that's a conflict or not, but --

MR. KIRSCHNER: Contesting the will or the --

THE COURT: Oh, the trust.

MR. KIRSCHNER: -- or the trust.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. He's going to be asking -- he's going to be filing more claims some place.

MR. KIRSCHNER: All right. Well, I think that there's two different sets. First, if he has a contest regarding the trust, he's got to come here for it. For NE 155, undue influence. This Court has jurisdiction over the trust. No other court or anybody, where else, is going to be able to take jurisdiction over this trust because you have it first. So 155 claims of undue influence this Court is going to have to answer, if they so bring those claims.

As far as any civil claims, that would be a separate matter that they would have to bring before another court.

There is a statute of limitations on those deadlines and if

they're going to be making claims, at a minimum we would appreciate some notice of what claims are going to be brought forward so we can work through them, because they're -- whatever they are, whatever they are, they just need to be asserted so we can deal with it.

But as far as challenges to the trust, we need to get the trustee in place. We need to find out whether or not we're going to have a 155 challenge on our hands. If we are, that's going to be subject to an evidentiary hearing that this Court can set. It can set it on the -- on -- on that. Do we have an undue influence problem? Are they going to challenge it?

In the meantime, Your Honor, knowing that there's a 155 challenge that's coming, if you set it out for a hearing six months in advance, I think that people are going to take a very serious assessment of their positions if they have to worry about whether or not this trust is going to be invalidated. Now it's going to be obviously the trustee's position that this is a valid trust. That's the position that she wants to take. That's the position she has to take.

But if we're going to have serious settlement negotiations, let's put it out for an evidentiary hearing on the 155, undue influence, find out whether or not this is going to take place. The parties in the meantime can seek to

negotiate and/or bring any other claims that need to be brought.

But that's probably going to be the single greatest thing that this Court can do, to bring pressure on all the parties here to bring a settlement negotiation.

THE COURT: In addition to the 155 challenge, what else should we hear to keep the pressure on everyone?

MR. KIRSCHNER: I think that we need enforcement of this Court's prior order. Actually, that's one of the petitions that will -- I can't remember if we filed it or we're looking to file it, which is enforcement of this Court's prior order which was simply put provide us the documents that you are required to provide, explicitly laid out. It wasn't a -- a guess. We said bank statements, receipts, invoices.

Second thing is we need that inventory going back to the moment they became trustee. If you look at the inventory that was provided in the 2018 accounting, it says refer back to our previous inventory. That was her justification. But the problem is their previous inventory didn't cover the entire period of time.

So referring back to an -- an old inventory is appropriate, if you have a first good one, okay, we don't have a first --

1	THE COURT: Now
2	MR. KIRSCHNER: first good one.
3	THE COURT: regarding the order I already issued
4	in February, what's a good time frame to say after X period of
5	time, then there may be your it may be your
6	responsibility for any fees that are caused by your delay or
7	refusal to provide information?
8	MR. KIRSCHNER: I think this Court needs to do an
9	order to show cause on that question, set it out for 60 days,
10	which would be vacated in the event that all the documents are
11	provided.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
L3	MR. KIRSCHNER: This gives a fair opportunity for
L 4	everybody to be heard. It gives a fair opportunity to read
L 5	the documents, to amend
L 6	THE COURT: Do you have any problem
L7	MR. KIRSCHNER: any inventory that they have
L 8	provided.
L 9	THE COURT: with 60 days?
20	MR. PAYNE: Your Honor, yes. Can I be heard on this
21	issue?
22	THE COURT: Okay. Wait. Wait. Let me let him
23	finish. He's
24	MR. KIRSCHNER: So

THE COURT: -- trying to get the case settled, I think. So 60 days order to show cause to provide us that information. If we get that information, they can come back. Let's do a very -- let -- let's do an electronic service to these documents or let -- let's sign off so that we know who -- where these documents are.

We don't have Counsel coming in on -- on either my side or anybody else's side saying I gave these to you. No, let's have something electronic that shows that these were going back and forth whether it be by email or, you know, electronic service through the Court so that we know and this Court can rely upon something that's got a file stamp or has a date and time to it. This is what was turned over to the parties. I think that would be incredible helpful just for verification purposes. Okay.

So 60 days for them to provide that information.

After six days, we review that information, we have the subpoenas out, the institutions. They'll come in and we'll say all right, did we get anything else besides what you've provided us, if there's nothing new. I think that settles a lot of the questions --

THE COURT: Well --

MR. KIRSCHNER: -- regarding assets.

THE COURT: -- go ahead and prepare that order.

MR. PAYNE: Wait. Wait. Wait, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: I didn't say I was going to grant it. I 3 just said -- asked him to prepare it and submit it to everyone 4 for their review and we're going to hear your opposition to 5 following my discovery order that was already issued in February, but I -- go ahead. You can -- you can address that. 6 7 MR. PAYNE: Your Honor, when --8 THE COURT: But I'm not accepting that there's 9 nothing out there that has been hidden or --10 MR. PAYNE: Right. THE COURT: -- missing. 11 MR. PAYNE: Right. 12 THE COURT: All I'm saying is after 60 days that 13 will be the deadline. And if they find more -- more, then 14 there may be consequences after that. 15 MR. BARNEY: Your Honor, I can address some of those 16 17 documents for you. We don't have all the documents, but -and -- and of course, we -- we have -- we're asserting our 18 19 retaining lien, but we were given a significant amount of 20 documents just recently by Mrs. Payne's husband that outline things that I think Your Honor needs to see. They're very, 21 22 very concerning. I think Your Honor as you -- as you view

these documents, you will see that there has not been

compliance with your order.

23

24

THE COURT: And where did you receive this information?

MR. BARNEY: I got it from a witness, from Mrs. Payne's husband.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BARNEY: He appeared at --

THE COURT: They're in a --

MR. BARNEY: Yes.

THE COURT: -- divorce proceeding?

MR. BARNEY: Yeah, he -- he provided us numerous documents that regard the affidavit. And these will clearly show that there are assets in the Christian Family Trust we didn't get in discovery. So we know that there's a likelihood they didn't get them in their discovery in which Your Honor really needs to see that the issue that we have is we have a retaining lien on file which we would love to release. We just -- we -- we want to get paid so that we can release these documents. I think it'll be -- bring great clarity to this Court if you can just see these documents.

THE COURT: Okay. So you were objecting to the order for -- an order to show cause that he's going to prepare that doesn't take effect for another 60 days and if you provided them everything and you don't have anything to worry about, if there's something missing, you have 60 days to -- to

1.0

MR. PAYNE: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- with --

what -- having said that, what -- what other objections do you have today?

show them what's missing or what's been not represented. So

MR. PAYNE: First of all, Cary Colt Payne on Mrs. Keach and Mrs. Payne is also present, Your Honor. This is so disingenuous, I just -- I -- I just -- I don't -- I don't understand how this can keep going forward. The inventory and record of value that we originally filed that Your Honor told us to file which was on October 25th, 2017. We referenced the date of -- of Mr. Christiansen's (ph) death. And so because like Your Honor said, Mr. Christiansen still was in control, we figured that the date of the inventory would be the date that he died. So we filed it from that date, the date of death.

Arguably, it missed three months. And in that inventory that we filed, and this came up at the last hearing and the hearing before, there is two pieces of real estate and essentially the proceeds from four bank accounts which comes out to 796 --

today. If you provided them everything, then you've provided them --

THE COURT: We're not going to do the discovery

2 misrepresentation to you --3 THE COURT: What is what? 4 MR. PAYNE: -- that's -- well, first of all, that 5 there's this new asset. Now I don't understand what he's doing here. He's now apparently representing Mr. Payne in 6 7 this divorce proceeding who's now submitting affidavits on 8 hearsay. And it all surrounds a statement that was -- that is regarding the Voya account. Okay. Wells Fargo had four 10 investments. 11 THE COURT: I don't want to get into discovery 12 today. We're only here for his attorney's fees. I'm just 13 saying I'm going --MR. PAYNE: But you --14 15 THE COURT: -- to issue -- do you have -- what 16 opposition do you have an -- for an order for discovery that 17 has a day of 60 days, after that, then discovery will start? 18 MR. PAYNE: You've already -- you've already entered 19 that order. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. PAYNE: And -- and the last --22 THE COURT: He then -- you don't have to -- then --23 that'll -- he's going to update it with an order to show cause

MR. PAYNE: -- they keep making this

1

24

P-17-092512-T CHRISTIAN FAMILY TRUST 04/04/2018 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

and give everyone an opportunity on every -- on both sides to

bring any new information to light regarding the size of this estate, the items involved, the bank accounts, the houses, the titles.

MR. PAYNE: It's not going to stop, Your Honor.

It's just going to keep going on. Because now what they're saying is is there's -- there's more. And then -- and then we come back next time there's going to be more.

Let me just address the Voya account just briefly. The Voya account apparently because we just got the documents from Counsel names my three clients as the beneficiary. They're the beneficiaries of this Voya account which was the hundred and fifty-thousand dollars.

When we filed the original inventory, my clients didn't marshal that asset because Voya/Wells Fargo said we don't know what to do. We're not sure if this is a trust asset or it's a pay on death asset, but -- payable on death.

So when we updated the accounting which we just filed and we put a little footnote down on there because we still didn't know, but it's the -- still -- it's the -- it's -- it's the still starting point, the 796,000 -- 796,748, and we put an asterisk here. This amended accounting does not include the Voya account and slash Wells -- in paren, Wells Fargo, the the 143, which has not been marshaled. It's an asset of Raymond Christian, Sr., beneficiary unknown, and it