20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 1 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP James I. Stang, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*) Iain A. W. Nasatir, Esq. Karen B. Dine, Esq. Brittany M. Michael, Esq. 780 Third Avenue, 36th Floor New York, New York 10017 (212) 561-7700 Telephone: Facsimile: (212) 561-7777 Email: jstang@pszjlaw.com inasatir@pszjlaw.com kdine@pszjlaw.com bmichael@pszjlaw.com

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF ROCKVILLE CENTRE, NEW YORK, Debtor. Chapter 11 Case No. 20-12345 (MG)

MOTION FOR FURTHER DISCLOSURE AND RESPONSE TO DECLARATION OF ERIC P. STEPHENS

The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "<u>Committee</u>") of The Roman Catholic Diocese of Rockville Centre, New York (the "<u>Diocese</u>" or the "<u>Debtor</u>") in the above-captioned case (the "<u>Case</u>"), through its undersigned counsel, submits this motion (the "<u>Motion</u>") for an order requiring further disclosure and discovery related to the Diocese's document review and production process and responding to the Declaration of Eric Stephens [Docket No. 2836] (the "<u>Stephens Declaration</u>"). The Committee requests the relief outlined at the end of the Motion (the "<u>Investigation Relief</u>") to enlighten the Committee and the Court as to the depth of the deficiencies with the Diocese's production of CVA documents to the Committee.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 2 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

1. The Diocese's Multiple Representations Regarding the Completeness of Its Productions

Frequent issues with discovery in this Case resulted in an off-the-record chambers conference with Judge Chapman in the April 2022.¹ As a result of that conference, the Diocese agreed to "complete its responses to the Committee's Requests" "no later than May 31, 2022."²

At the hearing on the Diocese's motion for a preliminary injunction in April 2023, the Diocese and its professionals repeatedly reasserted the completeness of the production of CVA documents. Specifically, Mr. Stephens testified that "the Diocese, in connection with the Chapter 11, has produced to the Committee *the complete* personnel file of *every* individual who has been accused of abuse by either a CVA plaintiff or a claimant with a POC to the extent that those are different. There were, however, a number of individual accused for whom the Diocese did not have a file."³ Mr. Stephens further clarified, upon the Court's questions regarding the Diocese's secret files, that "the complete personnel file, including those portions, have bene [sic] produced in connection with the Chapter 11."⁴ Finally, in response to questioning by the Committee, Mr. Stephens confirmed that he was not "aware of anything that was withheld other than on the grounds of privilege"⁵ and that "all the alleged abusers' disciplinary records, laicization documents, and confidential [documents] were collected and produced."⁶ Finally, Mr. Stephens

¹ Committee Letter to the Court dated March 28, 2022 [Docket No. 1043] ("The completeness of the Diocese's responses are suspect.").

² Stipulation and Order dated April 11, 2022 [Docket No. 1067].

³ Transcript of April 19, 2023 Hearing, attached as Exhibit C, at 200:16-22 (emphasis added); *see also Id.* 13:8-9 ("Last July, just after the diocese finished its final production of CVA merits materials. . . ."); *id.* at 31:10-12 ("But I know from talking to Mr. Stephens we believe we produced every file, every personnel file.").

⁴ *Id.* at 201:19-21.

⁵ *Id.* at 208:6-7.

⁶ *Id.* at 208: 11-22.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 3 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

stated that he was "not aware of additional documents that would need to be collected" if the state court actions proceeded.⁷

In conjunction with the Eighth Omnibus Objection, the Diocese represented that "[t]here is not otherwise any supported allegation or indication that the Diocese was aware, prior to the alleged abuse, that the alleged perpetrator was likely to engage in such conduct."⁸ At a hearing subsequent to the Court's decision on the Eighth Omnibus Objection, certain claimants' counsel raised concerns about the completeness of the potential notice documents previously produced, and therefore likely relied on for the Diocese's representations in the Eighth Omnibus Objection. In response to such concerns, Mr. Stephens protested against the need for any additional searches, stating "what I don't want this to turn into is an extensive frolic and detour into additional collections and requests when the parties have been operating from a place where for a year now, you know, we've understood that these records are complete. So clearly, the 10-day process that I've proposed, or that the debtor is proposing, you know, would need to, you know, would not accommodate, you know, frankly a do-over of what was years' long, you know, collection, review, and production process."⁹

Ultimately, the Court instructed the Diocese to certify "on the scope of the search that's been made."¹⁰ Only once instructed to make such a certification—and not prior to the Diocese's numerous, previous, adamant representations that all relevant files had been produced with no need for additional searches—did the Diocese locate in one day seven files that it had previously

⁷ *Id.* at 209 17 – 24; *see also id.* at 216:19 – 21 ("But to the extent that the name of the accused showed up in the diocesan personnel files, it was produced.").

⁸ The Debtor's Eighth Omnibus Claims Objections [Docket No. 1730-1] p. 13 of 32; see also The Debtor's Thirteenth Omnibus Claim Objections [Docket No. 2149].

 $^{^9}$ Transcript of May 16, 2023 Hearing, attached as Exhibit D, 45:6 – 14. 10 *Id*. 50:21 – 22.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 4 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

not located in the "years long collection, review, and production process."¹¹ Additionally, the Diocese located two files that, although previously located and added to counsels' electronic database, had neither been produced nor reviewed prior to any of those repeated representations. In total, the Diocese reviewed less than 75% of the files relevant to the objection (twenty-four out of thirty-three) before attesting to the lack of notice evidence. The Committee remains unaware what percentage of the Diocese's other files are missing despite numerous representations of the completeness of the Diocese's productions.

2. The Unproduced Files Were Not Hidden or Missing

Attached as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the transcript of a deposition of the Diocese's archivist taken in a state court matter. The Stephens Declaration and archivist's testimony tell two very different stories. The Diocese's archivist outlines a very simple process for obtaining files related to an alleged perpetrator from the Diocese's archive:

- 1. All personnel files are organized by the name of the former employee.¹²
- 2. To locate a file, the archivist need only search her database for the name.¹³
- 3. In a matter of minutes, the archivist can retrieve a file based on location indicated in her database.¹⁴

According to the archivist's testimony, it is also clear that absent finding a file by name, there is no other way to locate relevant documents amidst the five rooms of files that she manages.¹⁵ The process described by the archivist is binary: either she locates a file based on the name she is provided or she does not. There is no grey area in which archivist could conduct a "follow up

¹⁵ *Id*.

¹¹ Stephens Declaration, paras. 26 – 28.

¹² See Ex. B, Transcript of Deposition of Diocese Archivist, at 15:1–16:20; 22:3–9.

¹³ Id.

¹⁴ Id.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 5 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

search[] for personnel files"¹⁶ and find something different than she found for a previous search. Thus, here, archivist was either (1) previously asked for the file and found it based on the perpetrator's name and such file was subsequently withheld or (2) she was only asked for the file on or after May 31, 2023. The archivist testimony does not indicate an alternative scenario.

But the Stephens Declaration tells a very different story. The declaration glosses over the process actually undertaken by the Diocese to collect the relevant documents, stating broadly that Mr. Stephens and his team at Jones Day worked with the Diocese "including its Chancery, General Counsel's office, Office of Child Protection, Risk Department, and Archives" to gather the relevant documents.¹⁷ Mr. Stephens does not, however, certify that his team asked the archivist for every perpetrator's file during the initial almost two years of productions. And the archivist's

The archivist's testimony makes clear that any search for personnel-related documents should have required her to search the archive for each Alleged Abuser's (defined below) name.

The Stephens Declaration then proceeds to only vaguely describe how additional documents were discovered. First, Mr. Stephens carefully choses his language, noting that his team merely "searched the Debtor's electronic database" in making its representation to the Court that "[t]here is not otherwise any supported allegation or indication that the Diocese was aware, prior to the alleged abuse, that the alleged perpetrator was likely to engage in such conduct."¹⁸ Such a process and the ability to make such a representation relies on his team having sufficiently built the electronic database with all relevant documents, which was clearly not the case.

¹⁶ Stephens Decl., at para. 25.

¹⁷ *Id.* at para. 6.

¹⁸ *Id.* at paras. 26 - 27.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 6 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

After over two years of prolonged discovery with the Committee, after multiple representations of the completeness of its document production, after taking the extraordinary step of objecting to claims – which not only cost time and money but caused significant emotional turmoil for the survivors subjected to the process – and after representing to the Court that it had reviewed all relevant documents, only when the Diocese was being asked to certify the completeness of its efforts does it appear that the Diocese took the simple step of asking the archivist to locate the relevant files using the name of the perpetrator.

3. The Diocese's Continued Failure to Notify of and Produce the "Newly Discovered" Documents

Rather than immediately notifying the Court and the parties that, despite earlier statements, additional documents had been discovered, the Diocese attempted to avoid drawing attention to its misrepresentations. Contrary to its assertion that the Diocese "disclosed that additional files had been located," the Diocese's June 2023 letter only states that it would "include *any*" additional files in its production.¹⁹ Nothing in the letter states that the Diocese had found previously undisclosed entire files for almost one-third of the at-issue perpetrators. Nothing in the letter even confirms that a single additional document had *actually* been found, only the possibility that additional documents *might be* included, hidden amongst the entire dump the Diocese intended to provide to the claimants' counsel.

Further, while the Diocese tries to hide behind the stagnation of their discussions with claimants' counsel as an excuse for its failure to admit to the existence and extent of the additional files, that does not account for why the Diocese made no efforts to alert the Committee that it had found files it had previously represented to the Committee did not exist. Nor did the

¹⁹ Id. Ex. A, pg 15 of 36, fn. 2 (emphasis added).

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 7 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

Diocese apparently replicate the steps that miraculously turned up these additional files for the other perpetrators for which it had previously attested to having produced all relevant files. In fact, when the Committee heard of the production of files in state court that had not previously been produced in the bankruptcy, the Debtor denied the existence of such documents. In an email from Mr. Stephens dated December 18, 2023, Mr. Stephens stated: "To be clear, we have not identified any CVA documents that are to be produced in the state court litigations that were not previously produced to the Committee. Indeed, our review in connection with the state court subpoenas is only a few days old since subpoenas were being served until December 8. Of course, if we do identify truly 'new' CVA documents, we'll provide them to the Committee along with an explanation for why they were not previously identified as CVA documents."²⁰ The Committee has still not received the newly discovered documents (despite now repeated requests) nor has it received an "explanation for why they were not previously identified as CVA documents."

Finally, the Diocese took no steps to alert the Court to the changed circumstances that impacted its representations on which the Court relied on in ruling on the Eighth Omnibus Objection. The Diocese has also remained silent on whether additional, previously unperformed diligence may impact its assertions in other omnibus objections regarding the Diocese's historic relationship to other entities and any agreements regarding liabilities with the Diocese of Brooklyn at the Diocese's creation.²¹

 $^{^{20}}$ A true and correct copy of the email from Mr. Stephens to Ms. Dine on December 18, 2023 is attached as Exhibit E.

²¹See The Debtor's Fifth Omnibus Objection [Docket No. 1655]; Declaration of Thomas G. Renker [Docket No. 1656]; The Debtor's Sixth Omnibus Claim Objections [Docket No. 1677]; Declaration of Thomas G. Renker [Docket No. 1678]; The Debtor's Ninth Omnibus Objection to Claims that Pre-Date the Existence of the Debtor as a Religious Corporation [Docket No. 1744]; Declaration of Thomas G. Renker in Support of Debtor's Ninth Omnibus Claims Objection to Claims Objection to Claims Previously Disallowed, With Leave to Amend, Pursuant to Order on Debtor's Sixth Omnibus Objection to Claims [Docket No. 2372].

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 8 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

The Stephens Declaration does not satisfy concerns about the Diocese's due diligence and

productions and raises more questions than it answers. The Committee therefore requests a Court

order, substantially similar to the one attached as Exhibit A, requiring:

- 1. A representation, or representations if such statements must come from different qualified individuals, to the below facts, including the factual basis for why the Diocese believes the declarant has personal knowledge and a sufficient foundation to attest to the matters in their declaration. Specifically, the Diocese must represent that:
 - The Diocese has now produced all records in its possession regarding every individual alleged in a proof of claim filed in this Chapter 11, regardless of whether that claim has been subsequently disallowed, to have committed abuse (the "<u>Alleged Abusers</u>") and has identified any withheld or redacted records on a privilege log;
 - The Diocese has now produced all records in its possession that may indicate that an Alleged Abuser abused a child;
 - The Diocese has reviewed the production for each Alleged Abuser and certifies that no other documents relating to that individual were ever in its possession. To the extent that there is any correspondence, employment information, memoranda, or other records that are not within the production, the Diocese shall so state, including its position on why it believes such documents are missing;
 - Either (i) the production of documents in the Diocese's possession, custody, or control related to the Alleged Abusers is complete; or (ii) there are no documents in the Diocese's possession, custody, or control that related to a given Alleged Abuser;
 - The Diocese has reviewed all documents relevant to the creation of the Diocese and communications between the Diocese of Brooklyn and Rockville Centre in the 1950s and 1960s and certifies that no documents relating to the creation of the Diocese or any agreements among the two dioceses during that time period exist. To the extent that there are any correspondence, memoranda, or other records that exist but are not in the Diocese possession, custody, or control, the Diocese shall so state, including its position on why it believes such documents are missing;
 - Either (i) the production of documents in the Diocese's possession, custody, or control related to the creation of the Diocese and agreements between the Diocese of Brooklyn and the Diocese of Rockville Centre is complete; or (ii) there are no documents in the Diocese's possession, custody, or

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 9 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

control that relate to the creation of the Diocese and agreements between the Diocese of Brooklyn and the Diocese of Rockville Centre; and

- Any potential destruction or loss of documents in the past twenty years.
- 2. A declaration *detailing* the below, including the factual basis for why the Diocese believes the declarant has personal knowledge and a sufficient foundation to attest to the matters in their declaration. For the avoidance of doubt, the declaration should be as specific as possible.
 - The process that was followed to collect and electronically scan documents in connection with CVA documents, including from whom documents were collected, the search parameters and instructions given to those custodians, and the dates such requests were made.
 - The process that was followed to collect and electronically scan documents in connection with the creation of the Diocese and agreements between the Diocese of Brooklyn and the Diocese of Rockville Centre, including from whom documents were collected, the search parameters and instructions given to those custodians, and the dates such requests were made.
 - All documents relied on in Mr. Renker's declarations²² regarding the Diocese's relationship to non-debtor entities and any efforts Mr. Renker undertook to understand the historic relationship between the Diocese and the relevant entity at the time of the abuse as opposed to during his tenure at the Diocese.
 - The physical locations that have been searched for information regarding each Alleged Abuser and other CVA records in connection with the Chapter 11, including the locations identified in the index, inventory or similar record utilized by the Diocese and the date(s) searched.
 - The physical locations that have *not* been searched for information regarding each Alleged Abuser and other potential CVA documents.
- 3. The immediate production of the following:
 - The archivist's log of access to the documents in the archive;²³
 - The archivist's database, in native format;²⁴

²² Declaration of Thomas G. Renker [Docket No. 1656]; Declaration of Thomas G. Renker [Docket No. 1678].

²³ See Ex. B, at 27:6-12, 48:13-21.

²⁴ *Id.*, at 13: 11-23.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 10 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

- Any other index, inventory or similar record maintained by the Diocese, including, but not limited to the Chancellor's office and the Bishop's office regarding potential CVA documents;
- All additional CVA documents not previously produced to the Committee;
- All email communications with the archivist requesting the search of files for productions in this bankruptcy or the underlying state court actions; and
- The file of the parish, school, camp or other related entity at which any allegations of abuse occurred.²⁵
- 4. The deposition of the Diocese's archivist and chancellor.

CONCLUSION

In addition to the cost to the Debtor's estate, the Diocese's claims objections had a significant human toll. Despite the Diocese's portrayal of claims in this case as a data point on a graph, each objected to claimant is a human-being who no party disputes suffered horrific atrocities in his or her childhood. Before an individual is told that he or she was the Diocese's one free sexual abuse pass before the Diocese had a legal obligation to protect future children from that specific individual, the Diocese should have been absolutely certain that its representation of the facts was accurate. Instead, the Diocese's cavalier approach to discovery and the claims objections has potentially caused unnecessary additional trauma to individuals who have already suffered extreme harm. The Committee therefore respectfully requests the ability to fully understand the degree of litigation gamesmanship that occurred here in order to seek relief appropriate to attempt to recompense survivors, as fully remedying the emotional damage is impossible, the harm caused.

²⁵ *Id.*, at 30:24-25.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 11 of 529

Hearing Date and Time: February 12 at 12:00 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time) Objection Date and Time: February 7 at 5 p.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time)

Dated: February 2, 2024

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

/s/ Karen B. Dine

James I. Stang, Esq. Iain Nasatir, Esq. Karen B. Dine, Esq. Brittany M. Michael, Esq. 780 Third Avenue, 36th Floor New York, NY 10017-2024 Telephone: 212/561-7700 Facsimile: 212/561-7777 jstang@pszjlaw.com

Counsel for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 12 of 529

EXHIBIT A

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 13 of 529

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP James I. Stang, Esq. (admitted pro hac vice) Iain A. W. Nasatir, Esq. Karen B. Dine, Esq. Brittany M. Michael, Esq. 780 Third Avenue, 36th Floor New York, New York 10017 Telephone: (212) 561-7700 Facsimile: (212) 561-7777 Email: jstang@pszjlaw.com inasatir@pszjlaw.com kdine@pszjlaw.com bmichael@pszjlaw.com

Counsel for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF ROCKVILLE CENTRE, NEW YORK, Debtor. Chapter 11 Case No. 20-12345 (MG)

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION OF THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED CREDITORS FOR FURTHER DISCLOSURE

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 14 of 529

Upon consideration of the *Motion of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors for Further Disclosure* [Docket No. __] (the "<u>Motion</u>"),²⁶ filed by the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "<u>Committee</u>") pursuant to Sections 105 of the Bankruptcy Code, for further disclosure and discovery related to the Diocese's document review and production process and upon a hearing having been held before the Court on _____, 2024 (the "<u>Hearing</u>") to consider the relief requested in the Motion; and appearances of all interested parties having been noted on the record of the Hearing; and upon all of the proceedings had before this Court; and it appearing that this matter is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b); and this Court having determined that the relief requested in the Motion is in the best interest of the Debtor, its estate, its creditors, and other parties-in-interest; and it appearing that proper and adequate notice of the Motion has been given under the circumstances and that no other or further notice is necessary; and after due deliberation thereon; and good and sufficient cause appearing therefor,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED,

1. The Motion is GRANTED;

2. All objections to the Motion or the relief requested therein, if any, that have not been withdrawn, waived, or settled, and all reservations of rights included therein, are overruled;

3. Within ten (10) days of entry of this Order, the Diocese must file a representation, or representations if such statements must come from different qualified individuals, to the below facts, including the factual basis for why the Diocese believes the declarant has personal knowledge and a sufficient foundation to attest to the matters in their declaration. Specifically, the Diocese must represent that:

a) The Diocese has now produced all records in its possession regarding every individual alleged in a proof of claim filed in this Chapter 11,

²⁶ Capitalized terms used and not otherwise defined herein have the meaning ascribed thereto in the Motion.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 15 of 529

regardless of whether that claim has been subsequently disallowed, to have committed abuse (the "<u>Alleged Abusers</u>") and has identified any withheld or redacted records on a privilege log;

- b) The Diocese has now produced all records in its possession that may indicate that an Alleged Abuser abused a child;
- c) The Diocese has reviewed the production for each Alleged Abuser and certifies that no other documents relating to that individual were ever in its possession. To the extent that there is any correspondence, employment information, memoranda, or other records that are not within the production, the Diocese shall so state, including its position on why it believes such documents are missing;
- d) Either (i) the production of documents in the Diocese's possession, custody, or control related to the Alleged Abusers is complete; or (ii) there are no documents in the Diocese's possession, custody, or control that related to a given Alleged Abuser;
- e) The Diocese has reviewed all documents relevant to the creation of the Diocese and communications between the Diocese of Brooklyn and Rockville Centre in the 1950s and 1960s and certifies that no documents relating to the creation of the Diocese or any agreements among the two dioceses during that time period exist. To the extent that there are any correspondence, memoranda, or other records that exist but are not in the Diocese possession, custody, or control, the Diocese shall so state, including its position on why it believes such documents are missing;
- f) Either (i) the production of documents in the Diocese's possession, custody, or control related to the creation of the Diocese and agreements between the Diocese of Brooklyn and the Diocese of Rockville Centre is complete; or (ii) there are no documents in the Diocese's possession, custody, or control that relate to the creation of the Diocese and agreements between the Diocese of Brooklyn and the Diocese of Rockville Centre; and
- g) Any potential destruction or loss of documents in the past twenty years.

4. Within ten (10) days of entry of this Order, the Diocese must file a declaration *detailing* the below, including the factual basis for why the Diocese believes the declarant has personal knowledge and a sufficient foundation to attest to the matters in their declaration. For the avoidance of doubt, the declaration should be as specific as possible.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 16 of 529

- a) The process that was followed to collect and electronically scan documents in connection with CVA documents, including from whom documents were collected, the search parameters and instructions given to those custodians, and the dates such requests were made.
- b) The process that was followed to collect and electronically scan documents in connection with the creation of the Diocese and agreements between the Diocese of Brooklyn and the Diocese of Rockville Centre, including from whom documents were collected, the search parameters and instructions given to those custodians, and the dates such requests were made.
- c) All documents relied on in Mr. Renker's declarations²⁷ regarding the Diocese's relationship to non-debtor entities and any efforts Mr. Renker undertook to understand the historic relationship between the Diocese and the relevant entity at the time of the abuse as opposed to during his tenure at the Diocese.
- d) The physical locations that have been searched for information regarding each Alleged Abuser and other CVA records in connection with the Chapter 11, including the locations identified in the index, inventory or similar record utilized by the Diocese and the date(s) searched.
- e) The physical locations that have *not* been searched for information regarding each Alleged Abuser and other potential CVA documents.
- 5. Within ten (10) days of entry of this Order, the Diocese must produce the below

materials to the Committee.

- a) The archivist's log of access to the documents in the archive;²⁸
- b) The archivist's database, in native format;²⁹
- c) Any other index, inventory or similar record maintained by the Diocese, including, but not limited to the Chancellor's office and the Bishop's office regarding potential CVA documents;
- d) All additional CVA documents not previously produced to the Committee;
- e) All email communications with the archivist requesting the search of files for productions in this bankruptcy or the underlying state court actions; and

²⁷ Declaration of Thomas G. Renker [Docket No. 1656]; Declaration of Thomas G. Renker [Docket No. 1678].

²⁸ See Ex. B, at 27:6-12, 48:13-21.

²⁹ *Id.*, at 13: 11-23.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 17 of 529

- f) The file of the parish, school, camp or other related entity at which any allegations of abuse occurred.³⁰
- 6. This Court shall retain jurisdiction to hear and determine all matters arising from

the implementation of this Order.

Dated: _____, 2024 New York, New York

Hon. Martin Glenn United States Bankruptcy Judge

³⁰ *Id.*, at 30:24-25.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 18 of 529

EXHIBIT B

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 19 of 529

January 8, 2024

```
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NASSAU
----X
ARK457 DOE,
                            Plaintiff,
           -against-
HOLY FAMILY a/k/a/ HOLY FAMILY DIOCESAN HIGH
SCHOOL; and DOES 1-5 whose identities are unknown
to Plaintiff,
                           Defendants.
Index No. 900094/2021
  _____X
                            100 Merrick Road
                    Rockville Centre, New York
                            January 8, 2024
                            10:02 a.m.
    EXAMINATION BEFORE TRIAL of KRISTA AMMIRATI,
the Defendant for Holy Family in the
above-entitled action, held at the above time and
place, taken before Randi Horowitz, a Stenotype
Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New
York, pursuant to Notice and stipulations between
counsel.
```

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 20 of 529

[Page 2] January 8, 2024

(1) (2) A P P E A R A N C E S : (3) (4) JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES Attorneys for Plaintiff (5) 55 West 39th Street, 11th Floor New York, New York 10018 (6) BY: PATRICK STONEKING, ESQ. (7) PATRICK F. ADAMS PC (8) Attorneys for Defendants (9) 3500 Sunrise Highway - Suite 300 Great Rive, New York 11739 (10)BY: ERIC STEPHENS, ESQ. (11)(12)ALSO PRESENT: ALEXIS REDD, ESQ. (13)JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES. (14)(15)(16)(17)(18) (19)(20)(21) (22) (23)(24) (25)

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 21 of 529

[Page 3] January 8, 2024

(1)	
(2)	STIPULATIONS
(3)	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and
(4)	between (among) counsel for the respective parties
(5)	hereto, that;
(6)	
(7)	All rights provided by the C.P.L.R.,
(8)	including the right to object to any question,
(9)	except as to form, or to move to strike any
(10)	testimony at this (these) examination(s), are
(11)	reserved, and, in addition, the failure to object
(12)	to any question or to move to strike any testimony
(13)	at this (these) examination(s) shall not be a bar
(14)	or waiver to make such motion at, and is reserved
(15)	for the trial of this action;
(16)	
(17)	IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED by and
(18)	between (among) counsel for the respective parties
(19)	hereto, that this (these) examination(s) may be
(20)	sworn to by the witness(es) being examined, before
(21)	a Notary Public other than the Notary Public
(22)	before whom this (these) examination(s) was (were)
(23)	begun; but the failure to do so, or to return the
(24)	original of this (these) examination(s) to
(25)	counsel, shall not be deemed a waiver of the

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 22 of 529

[Page 4] January 8, 2024

(1)	
(2)	rights provided by Rules 3116 and 3117 of the
(3)	C.P.L.R., and shall be controlled thereby;
(4)	
(5)	IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED by and
(6)	between (among) counsel for the respective parties
(7)	hereto, that this (these) examination(s) may be
(8)	utilized for all purposes as provided by the
(9)	C.P.L.R.;
(10)	
(11)	IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED by and
(12)	between (among) counsel for the respective parties
(13)	hereto, that the filing and certification of the
(14)	original of this (these) examination(s) shall be
(15)	and the same hereby are waived;
(16)	
(17)	IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED by and
(18)	between (among) counsel for the respective parties
(19)	hereto, that all rights provided by the C.P.L.R.,
(20)	and Part 221 of the Uniform Rules for the Conduct
(21)	of Depositions, including the right to object to
(22)	any question, except as to form, or to move to
(23)	strike any testimony at this examination is
(24)	reserved; and in addition, the failure to object
(25)	to any question or to move to strike any testimony

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 23 of 529

L

[Page 5] January 8, 2024

(1)	
(2)	at this examination shall not be a bar or waiver
(3)	to make such motion at, and is reserved to, the
(4)	trial of this action;
(5)	
(6)	IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED by and
(7)	between (among) counsel for the respective parties
(8)	hereto, that a copy of the within examination(s)
(9)	shall be furnished to counsel representing the
(10)	witness(es) testifying, without charge.
(11)	
(12)	
(13)	
(14)	
(15)	
(16)	
(17)	
(18)	
(19)	
(20)	
(21)	
(22)	
(23)	
(24)	
(25)	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 24 of 529

[Page 6] January 8, 2024

(1)(2)K R I S T A A M M I R A T I, the Defendant (3)herein, having first been duly sworn by Randi Horowitz, a Notary Public herein, was examined and (4) testified as follows: (5) EXAMINATION BY MR. STONEKING: (6) (7) Q. State your name for the record, (8) please. (9) Krista Ammirati. Α. (10)Q. State your address, please. (11)440 West Neck Road, Huntington, New Α. York 11743. (12)Good morning. (13)Ο. (14)Hi. Α. (15)Have you ever taken a deposition Ο. (16)before? (17)I have. Α. (18) Q. Okay. (19)How many times? (20)Α. Once. (21)Q. Are you pretty comfortable with the proceeding? (22)(23)You can go over whatever you need to. Α. (24)Q. Okay. (25)My name is Pat Stoneking, I represent

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 25 of 529

[Page 7] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)the plaintiff in this case. With me is attorney, (3)Alexis Redd. I will be asking you questions (4) today. (5) If there is anything that you don't understand, let me know and I will rephrase for (6)(7) you. (8) Mm-hmm. Α. (9) Ο. You just need to answer verbally. (10)Sorry, yes. Α. (11)If that is a yes or no -- I'm not Ο. I just need a clean record. (12)trying to be rude. (13)Α. Okay. (14)We have to make sure that we don't Ο. talk over each other because we have a Court (15)(16)Reporter here who is taking down everything we (17)say. So wait for me to finish my questions, I'll (18)wait for you to finish your answers and it'll go (19)much more smoothly that way, okay? (20)Α. Okay. If you need a break, let me know. (21)Ο. The only thing is if there's a question pending, I (22)(23)may ask you to finish the question before we take (24)the break. I don't expect this to be very long. (25)Is that okay with you?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 26 of 529

[Page 8] January 8, 2024

(1) K. AMMIRATI (2)Α. Yes. (3) Ο. Okay. That is about -- what did you review (4) (5) prior to coming here today in preparation for (6) this? (7) I had a meeting with Eric, he had Α. (8) sent me a PDF of a file that I opened, looked at (9) the first couple of pages and stopped looking at (10)it. (11)Was that PDF about 198 pages or so? Ο. (12)Α. Yes. (13)MR. STONEKING: I'm going to (14)have this marked as Plaintiff's (15)Exhibit 1. (16)(The DOCUMENT was hereby (17)marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 for (18)identification, as of this date.) (19)Can you take a look at this, please? Q. (20)Α. Okay. (21)Ο. You looked at the top couple of pages, which is Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 is marked (22)1DRVC 9000942021, and it's marked from pages 1 to (23)198 I believe. (24)(25)Is that the document that you are

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 27 of 529

[Page 9] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)talking about that you referred? (3)Α. Yes, I only looked at the first (4) couple of pages. (5) Q. Okay. (6)Is Exhibit 1 -- can I fairly call that Exhibit 1 Michael Palagonia's employment (7) (8) file, is that what is in there? (9) Α. Yes. (10)Ο. Is there anything else beside (11)Mr. Palagonia's employment file? (12)Α. I would have to look closer at it, but -- should I look closer at it? (13)(14)Q. I would like you to. (15)Α. Okay. (16)I will. (17)And also, it's also two sided. Q. (18)Oh, from what I can see, this is Α. (19)everything that would be in a teacher's personnel (20)file. (21)It did look like they were some legal documents in there that I haven't seen before. (22)Т (23)don't know why they would be in his personal file. (24)Ο. That is what I'm going to get into (25)those with you. In there is some complaints,

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 28 of 529

[Page 10] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)legal filings and things like that. (3)Were those documents in (4) Mr. Palagonia's employment file? (5)Α. I don't remember specifically. (6)Ο. Okay. (7) There's a complaint in this case that (8) is, which is in the back of that about 13 pages in (9) about the Ark 457 case. (10)Was that in the employment file that (11)you saw and retrieved? (12)Α. I didn't see what was in his file. (13)When I was asked to retrieve it, I searched for (14)the name in my database and things that comes up (15)with the name I pull. I don't look in the files, (16)and I send them to whoever asked for them. (17)Q. Okay. (18) So we will put this aside for a (19)little bit and go more into the fundamentals of (20)your role is, who you are. (21)So you're the archivist for the Diocese of Rockville Centre? (22)(23)Α. Yes. (24)How long have you been in that role? Ο. (25)It'll be nine years in April. Α.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 29 of 529

[Page 11] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI Do you know who did the role before (2) Ο. (3) you? (4) Α. Her name was Jean Lynch. (5) Ο. Do you know how to spell Jean? (6) Α. J-E-A-N. (7) Ο. Do you know where she is now? (8) No. Α. (9) Ο. Do you know how long she was in that (10)role prior to you? (11)The archive was started in the early Α. (12)'90s, and she retired in 2014, so --(13)So you're saying that position was Ο. (14)created in the early '90s? (15)Α. Yes. (16)So she was the only one that did it Ο. (17)prior to you? (18)Α. Yes. (19)What is the role of archivist within Ο. the Diocese of Rockville Centre? (20)(21)I collect records, keep them in the Α. (22)archive, add the files to the database, and when (23)people ask for something for me the retrieve (24)something, I find it and provide it to them. (25)Q. Who else has access to the archives?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 30 of 529

[Page 12] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)I'm the only one who would retrieve Α. (3)The chancellor has a key and the files. (4) maintenance staff have a key, but they don't go in (5)there without my permission. The chancellor doesn't go in there (6)Ο. (7) without your permission? (8) Α. I mean, she could technically, but (9) she doesn't. (10)Ο. Who is the chancellor? (11)Sister Mary Anne Fitzgerald. Α. (12)Ο. And you gave an address when we (13)started the deposition in Huntington, is that the location of the archives? (14)(15)Yes. Α. (16)Is there anything else at that Ο. (17)location? (18)That building is the seminary of the Α. (19)Immaculate Conception, the seminary where it's a (20)prest school essentially. The building is now (21)used for meetings, retreats and things like that. Is there anybody else that has access (22)Ο. to the archives besides you, the chancellor and (23)the maintenance staff? (24)(25)Α. No.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 31 of 529

[Page 13] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)And it's held under a lock and key? Ο. (3)Α. Yes. (4) Ο. When you say access, we are talking (5)about paper documents? (6)Α. Yes. (7) Like, a big room full of rows and Q. (8) rows of shelves? (9) Yes, it's five rooms with rows of Α. (10)shelving and all of the documents are in boxes. (11)And you have an index that tells you Ο. where in those boxes certain things are? (12)(13)Α. A database, yes. (14)And the database is electric? Ο. (15)Yes. Α. You could do a search for certain (16)Ο. (17)names that would tell you which names to retrieve, (18)and then you'd go into the boxes, retrieve them (19)from the boxes wherever they are located? (20)Α. Yes. (21)Ο. Do you know what the name of the (22)software is? (23)Microsoft Access. Α. (24)Do you know who programs the access Ο. (25)program that you use? Is it something that

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 32 of 529

[Page 14] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI someone bought or someone in the house built? (2)(3)I know Jean set it up, and I have Α. (4) added to it. (5)What is your background prior to Ο. working with the Diocese, what did you do before (6)(7) that? (8) Α. Before this, I worked at Bed, Bath (9) and Beyond. I have a history degree. It was (10)always my intention to work in an archive or a (11)museum. I worked at Bed, Bath and Beyond for (12)three years. (13)Ο. Did you work for Bed, Bath and Beyond (14)in an archivist, recordkeeping sort of role? (15)Sort of. I did stock replenishment Α. (16)and warehouse management, organization, so it was (17)the same type of keeping everything organized in (18)its spot, that sort of thing. (19)Q. Okay. (20)Who codes the documents that -- for the purpose of the index, when things are filed in (21)the archives, who would determine whether a name (22)is on there or like, to find it electrically? (23)(24)I do. Whatever is in the box is what Α. (25)a description of it goes in the database.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 33 of 529

[Page 15] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Is the description in the database Ο. (3) what is searched for a name? (4) Α. Yes. (5)Ο. Okay. So if someone in your position (6) (7) doesn't put the person's name, that is not going (8) to come up on a hit for a search? (9) No, but in the case of a personnel Α. (10)file, it would be their name, and for a legal (11)document it would be the case name. (12)So as long as their name is in the (13)case name, it would come up. (14)Q. Okay. (15)Do you keep a scanned version of (16)everything electrically? (17)Α. No. (18)So in this particular case, you were Ο. asked to find documents on Mr. Palagonia, and you (19)searched for his name? (20)MR. STEPHENS: And you can (21)(22)answer the questions in general. (23)Just don't tell Mr. Stoneking, and I (24)don't think he is asking about any (25)specific conversations with lawyers.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 34 of 529

[Page 16] January 8, 2024

(1)		K. AMMIRATI
(2)	Q .	Okay.
(3)		I'm less concerned about who is doing
(4)	the asking a	and more what you are doing looking for
(5)	documents in	n this case to find what it was in
(6)	Exhibit 1 th	nat you recognized.
(7)		You did a search in your index for
(8)	Mr. Palagon:	ia, it came up with a list of hits; is
(9)	that right?	
(10)	Α.	Yes.
(11)	Q .	And those hits were located in one
(12)	box, several	L boxes?
(13)	Α.	I don't remember specifically.
(14)	Q.	It could have been both?
(15)	Α.	Yes.
(16)	Q .	And you went and retrieved all of the
(17)	documents fi	rom their source and determined that?
(18)	Α.	Yes.
(19)	Q .	How long did that search take?
(20)	Α.	A few minutes.
(21)	Q .	Do you have the ability to search for
(22)	Holy Family	documents in a similar way?
(23)	Α.	Yes.
(24)	Q .	If I were to ask you to find a list
(25)	of other tea	achers who were working at Holy Family

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 35 of 529

[Page 17] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)is 1984 and '85, would be able to generate a list like that? (3)(4) Α. No. (5)Why not? Ο. (6)Α. They were not filed that way. When (7) the Education Department sends me the files of the (8) terminated teachers, it's just as they are (9) terminated, it's not by school. (10)Q. Okay. (11)You mentioned the Education Department. You're here referencing the (12)Department of Education, which is a different (13)(14)entity within the Diocese of Rockville Centre? (15)Α. Yes. (16)You do all of the recordkeeping for Ο. (17)the Department of Education too? (18)MR. STEPHENS: Objection. You (19)can answer. (20)Some, I do keep the teacher file, the Α. (21)personnel files indefinitely, so I keep those (22)other documents that that department generates. (23)They may keep it in their own office, but I know I (24)get the teacher's files. (25)Q. So is it the case for current

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 36 of 529

[Page 18] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Department of Education files, the archive is kept (3)with you? (4) Α. Terminated files, yes. (5) Assumed the teacher is let go. Ο. (6)Let go, fired or dies, yes. Α. (7) So active teachers within the Q. (8) Department of Education, you don't have those (9) personal files on record yet? (10)Right. Α. (11)But you will when they're fired? Ο. (12)Α. Yes. (13)MR. STEPHENS: Objection. (14)MR. STONEKING: To what? (15)MR. STEPHENS: To fired. (16)Q. Okay. (17)Are there other records that are (18)within the Diocese archives in addition to teacher (19)employment files? (20)Α. Yes. (21)Ο. Do you keep records for every priest, for example? (22)(23)Terminated priest. Α. (24)Now, explain that to me. You said Ο. (25)you do not maintain the files while they are in

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 37 of 529

[Page 19] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)service? (3)Those files are kept at the Α. chancellor's office. If they are active, it's (4) (5)with the chancellors office. Once they are (6)either, died or laicized or just no longer working (7) in the Diocese, their file comes to me. So the chancellor's office; is that (8) Ο. (9) located here in Rockville Centre? (10)Α. Yes. (11)On the campus of Saint Marys? Ο. (12)Α. Mercy Hospital. (13)Ο. Okay. (14)That's true? (15)Α. Yes. (16)Is that also where the bishop sits in Ο. (17)the same office? (18)Α. Yes. (19)Do you have access to the Ο. (20)chancellor's files that she maintains here in (21)Rockville Centre? (22)Α. Yes. (23)Do you ever use them for time to time Ο. (24)in the course of your job? (25)I do not. Α.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 38 of 529

[Page 20] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Q. Are there other people that have (3) access to her files other than yourself? (4)Α. The secretaries in the office do. (5)How many secretaries are there in the Ο. office? (6) (7) Α. Two. What are their names? (8) Ο. (9) Rosa White and Debbie Devoe. Α. (10)Are there secretaries that you have Ο. (11)in Huntington? (12)Α. No. (13)Ο. Is it just you in the archives all alone, no one else works with you? (14)(15)Α. Yes. (16)Ο. Can you explain to me what the makeup is of the five rooms in the archives? (17)(18)How do you mean? Α. What are the five different rooms (19)Ο. (20)like, how are they different with each other? (21)Α. They are not very different. They (22)are rows of shelves. Three of the rooms have (23)mobile shelvings. One room has static shelving, (24)one room also has my office and my desk and (25) computer.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 39 of 529

[Page 21] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)All of the boxes are numbered, but (3)there is no other markings on the outside of them. Do any of the rooms have any (4) Ο. (5)different roles? For lack of a better words like, are all of the priest files in a certain room? (6)(7) Α. No. (8) Is everything indexed one to 10 Ο. (9) million? (10)Α. Yes. (11)Okay. Ο. (12)How many documents are in the archive? (13)(14)Α. There is about 3000 boxes. (15)Do you remember the search that you Ο. did in this case? (16)(17)Α. Not specifically. (18)Is it fair to say all of the Ο. (19)documents that you produced for Mr. Palagonia's (20)employment file are kept in the ordinary course of (21)business? (22)Α. Yes. (23)But as you sit here today, you don't Ο. (24)remember whether those legal documents came from (25)his employment file or came from somewhere else?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 40 of 529

[Page 22] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI Correct. (2)Α. (3) And you don't know whether or not you Ο. actually produced or came up with those document? (4) (5) Α. I would have been the only one that (6) would have pulled these files. (7) By these files, you mean the Q. (8) employment files or the legal documents? (9) Either. Α. (10)Ο. So is it fair to say that all of (11)Exhibit 1 is held in the ordinary course of business? (12)(13)Α. Yes. (14)And Exhibit 1, all of those documents Ο. (15)are authentic, and with the exception of (16)redaction, they were provided or the way they are (17)in your archives? (18)They looked like they would be, yes. Α. (19)Q. Okay. (20)When did you retrieve the documents in Exhibit 1? (21)(22)Α. I don't remember. (23)Did you have any estimation? Ο. Was it (24)within the last several months or years? (25)Α. I really don't remember.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 41 of 529

[Page 23] January 8, 2024

(1)	K. AMMIRATI
(2)	Q. Is there any way that you can tell me
(3)	if you look back in your search history?
(4)	A. I would have to look in my e-mails.
(5)	Q. So one of the documents that is in
(6)	there references the complaint in this case.
(7)	Would you have filed that complaint somewhere in
(8)	the archives yourself?
(9)	A. If it's as old as the date I can see
(10)	right here in 1984, I would not have filed this.
(11)	Q. It's from 2019 though. If that
(12)	document is in the archives, the complaint in this
(13)	case, which is at the end of Exhibit 1, would you
(14)	have filed it somewhere in the archives?
(15)	A. I guess so.
(16)	Q. Did it come from the archives?
(17)	MR. STEPHENS: Do you think we
(18)	can take a momentary break?
(19)	(A discussion was held off the
(20)	record.)
(21)	MR. STONEKING: Back on the
(22)	record.
(23)	Q. So we just had a discussion off the
(24)	record, and when it comes to the complaint in this
(25)	case, I believe you told me it would be a little

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 42 of 529

[Page 24] January 8, 2024

(1) K. AMMIRATI (2)bit too new to be sent to you, correct? (3) Correct. Α. (4) Ο. And that document that was prepared (5) and filed in 2019 was probably from the legal department's office? (6) (7) Α. That would be my best guess. (8) MR. STONEKING: Thank you. (9) I would put in a request for the (10)date of the search for the employment (11)file. (12)Ο. And you would be able to come up with (13)a document that shows that pretty quickly, wouldn't you? (14)(15)Α. Yes. (16)Q. Okay. (17)Does the bishop have access to the (18)archives? (19)Technically, yes, but he doesn't have Α. (20)a key. He would need either me or the chancellor (21)to let him in. If a document is removed from the (22)Q. archives, is there a record of that? (23)(24)Α. Yes. (25) How is that recorded? Ο.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 43 of 529

[Page 25] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI Depends on what is happening to it. (2)Α. (3)If someone is, quote on quote, borrowing it, (4) asking for something within their own department, (5)I would just I have a log. (6)They would get it, take it for (7) however long they needed it, give it back to me or (8) keep it indefinitely. I'd make a note of that (9) too. (10)Ο. Has anybody taken documents and kept (11)them indefinitely? (12)Α. Yes. Under what circumstances? (13)Ο. (14)They are using them. Again, they are Α. (15)redoing their own filing systems and they have (16)more room, so they're keeping their documents (17)closer or there have been priest files that have (18)been taken from the archives and are now in the (19)chancellor's office. (20)Ο. When you talk about the rule of (21)priest files and take to the chancery, is that while you have been the archivist? (22)(23)Α. Yes. (24)Did you pull those documents for Ο. (25)whoever took them to the chancery?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 44 of 529

[Page 26] January 8, 2024

(1) K. AMMIRATI (2)Α. Yes. (3)And you recorded which documents left Ο. your archive and went to the chancery? (4) (5)Α. Yes. (6)Ο. As far as the description of the (7) documents that are moved, is that recorded (8) somewhere or is that the same system that you (9) would use to find them in the first place, the (10)indexes? (11)Α. It would just be their name. (12)Ο. The person of the person that took (13)them? Tell me what you mean. (14)The -- you mean, the name of the file Α. (15)or the name of the person that took them? (16)ο. However you can best explain it to (17)me. (18)If someone asks for a file that they Α. (19)are going to keep, I would find whatever document (20)it is and give it to them, make a note that the (21)file is now moved elsewhere, make a note of where (22)it is now. I wouldn't necessarily put the name of (23)the person that took them, maybe the department (24)that has it now. (25)Or the contents of the file itself Q.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 45 of 529

[Page 27] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)that just the file is moved? (3)If it's a personnel file, it would Α. (4) just be their name. If I need more of a (5)description of the file, I would put that too. (6)Ο. And you keep that in your log? (7) Α. Yes. (8) Is there any information in your log, Ο. (9) other than those types of transactions with (10)documents moving? (11)It's a lot specifically for documents Α. (12)out of the archive out and back into. But you don't question -- if somebody (13)Ο. (14)comes to you and has authority to move the (15)documents, you don't question them and say why are (16)you doing this or anything like that? (17)Α. As long as they were documents within (18)their department, they have full access to (19)whatever they need. (20)Ο. So just so I'm clear, what are the (21)departments with this Diocese? (22)Α. It's any of the Diocese department. The chancellors office, the bishop's office, (23)(24)priest, personnel, education, finance, legal. (25)Gotcha. Q.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 46 of 529

[Page 28] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI Does it have to be the head of the (2) (3) department or anyone from the department can access them? (4) (5) Anybody from the department. Α. (6) Ο. So anybody from legal can access any of the archives to legal documents? (7) (8) Α. Yes. (9) Ο. You would just record it in the log (10)that they accessed and you gave it the them, and record it when they brought it back? (11)(12)Α. Correct. (13)Ο. So there are some legal documents in (14)Exhibit 1 that are older. They are from 1985. (15)There are some documents related to a court case (16)involving Mr. Palagonia. (17)Do you remember if that was within the material that you found in his employment (18)(19)file? (20)I don't remember. Α. (21)Ο. Would something from 1985 in a court (22)case, that old be in teacher's employment file? (23)Α. It could be or it could be in a box (24)from legal department. (25)Q. Do you know anything about the legal

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 47 of 529

[Page 29] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)department or any other department's record (3)keeping practice or how long they maintain files like tat? (4) (5)Α. No, not specifically. (6)Ο. How long -- do you keep documents in (7) the Diocese and the archive indefinitely? (8) Α. Some, yes. (9) Ο. What sort of documents get maintained (10)indefinitely? (11)I would have to look specifically at Α. (12)our retention schedule, but I know personnel files (13)are kept indefinitely. (14)And that applies to any document Q. (15)within the personnel file? (16)Α. Yes. (17)Q. Okay. (18)Are there any documents that you (19)would expect to see for a teacher like Michael (20)Palagonia in his employment file that are not maintained? That's a terrible question. (21)I'm (22)going to start over. (23)When I go through Exhibit 1, there (24)is, you know, no real payroll information or (25)anything like that. Is that the sort of thing

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 48 of 529

[Page 30] January 8, 2024

(1) K. AMMIRATI (2)that is not held in an employment file in the (3) archives? (4) Α. Correct. (5)Ο. Okay. I started to ask you about the (6) (7) documents held at the chancellors office, and you (8) said you had access to those. Can you explain to (9) me how the documents are maintained at the (10)chancellor's office? (11)What kind of documents? Α. (12)Ο. Does the chancellor have a similar set up with a room full of boxes? (13)(14)Α. They have file cabinets. (15)How many? Ο. (16)Α. 20, maybe more. (17)Ο. Do you have access to those documents (18) because you work within? (19)The chancellors office. Α. (20)Ο. Yes? (21)Α. Yes. (22)Ο. What type of documents are in those file cabinets? (23)(24)Priest personnel files, and then Α. (25)files that pertain to the individual parishes.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 49 of 529

[Page 31] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI Can you explain that? What does that (2) Ο. (3)mean, what documents are those? (4) Α. For the parishes? (5)Yeah. Ο. (6)Α. Reports like, financial reports, (7) spiritual reports, any kind of -- any time anybody (8) sends a letter to the bishop's office or a (9) chancellor's office about the parish, those would (10)go in there. (11)If a priest from a different Diocese (12)is coming here to perform a wedding or baptism, a (13)letter of good standing, that would also go with (14)the parish. (15)Is it fair to say the parishes don't Ο. (16)keep their own records? (17)MR. STEPHENS: Objection. You (18) can answer. (19)Α. I'm sure they do. (20)Ο. But eventually, parish documents end up with the archives; is that fair? (21)(22)Α. No. (23)What sorts or documents don't end up Ο. (24)at the archives from the parish? (25)MR. STEPHENS: Objection.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 50 of 529

[Page 32] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Documents she doesn't know about or (3) doesn't have? (4) MR. STONEKING: Yeah. (5) MR. STEPHENS: You can answer if (6) that is an answerable question. (7) I don't get records from the Α. (8) parishes. (9) Q. Okay. (10)Just work with me through this. I'm (11)not trying to be difficult, but I just want to make sure that I understand it. (12)If there is a fair amount of (13)correspondence that goes between a bishop and a (14)(15)priest; is that fair to say? (16)Α. Sure. (17)Ο. Have you seen the letters that they (18)send back and forth through the year, Merry Christmas, how are you doing, checking in sort of (19)(20)things? (21)Α. Sure. (22)Ο. Does the bishop maintain those type (23)of correspondences? (24)They would go in the priest file, so Α. (25)I guess it's the chancellors office that keeps it

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 51 of 529

[Page 33] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI as opposed to the bishops office. (2)(3)Whatever happens to the letter on the Ο. priests end? You never see it or it's kept a file (4) (5)for that priest on his behalf? (6)Α. No. (7) Q. Okay. (8) In a case like Mr. Palagonia with the (9) school as a laid teacher, the archives doesn't get (10)anything until the teacher is terminated, the (11)entire file goes to the archive and held together in one place? (12)(13)Α. Correct. (14)As apart of your searchs, did you Ο. (15)ever do any type of reviews for relevance or (16)looking at documents that say I don't think this (17)is responsive to the search that I'm doing; is (18)that fair of your analysis? (19)Α. Yes. (20)Ο. Do you remember if you did that type (21)of analysis here? (22)Α. I don't remember specifically. (23)I'm sorry if we covered this a little Ο. (24)bit, can you explain what your process would have (25)been to find the Michael Palagonia file in Exhibit

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 52 of 529

[Page 34] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)1? (3)I would search for his name in the Α. (4) database and I'd pulled anything that came up in (5)the case of the personnel file, especially with a (6)name as uncommon as Palagonia, I would have pulled (7) everything, and then sent everything to whomever (8) asked for it. (9) Ο. Perfect. (10)We talked a little bit about the (11)Department of Education. If you do a search (12)within the Department of Education files, is that different from a search within the Diocese files? (13)(14)Α. Not really. (15)Do you have student records in the Ο. (16)record? (17)Α. Very, very few. (18) ο. Which ones do you have? (19)There are -- the oldest files that I Α. (20)have, at one time the archive was going to keep (21)students record but it become overwhelming very (22)quickly, so it's maybe only 20 boxes from the '50s (23)and '60s. (24)The Department of Education was Ο. (25)created in the mid to late '80s I believe; is that

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 53 of 529

[Page 35] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)your understanding? (3)Α. I don't know. But it wouldn't be true for me to say (4) Ο. (5)all of the student records prior to the formation of Department of Education, that would be (6)(7) incorrect? (8) Correct. Α. (9) So it was an effort keep track of Ο. (10)those type of documents for a while, and gave up (11)very quickly? (12)Α. The student records are kept now at (13)the school or at the parish that the school is (14)connected to. (15)So Holy Family is no longer an Ο. (16)operation, right? (17)Α. This is the high school? (18)ο. Yeah. (19)Α. Yes. (20)Ο. Do you know where those records are (21)kept? (22)Α. That school, if I'm not mistaken, (23)that school became Saint Anthony's High School. (24)The record are still in that building or should be (25)still in that building, so someone who graduated

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 54 of 529

[Page 36] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)from Holy Family High School would call Saint (3)Anthony's High School for their transcript if they (4) needed it. (5)Ο. If I were looking for yearbooks or rosters with teachers who were working in 1984, (6)(7) would I go there for that as well? (8) Α. Yes or the Department of Education. (9) Does the Department of Education have Ο. (10)documents other than what you maintain in the (11)archives? (12)Α. I would guess yes. I don't know (13)specifically. (14)Ο. If Mr. Palagonia was in a yearbook (15)and it was within the archives, would it have come (16)up on one of your hits? (17)Α. Yes. (18)So are you confident that you have no Ο. (19)yearbooks from Holy Family at the time that he was (20)teaching there? (21)Α. Yes. I'm a little curious about the (22)Ο. (23)indexes and how your search gets populated for the (24)results, and I think you said you're the one who (25)codes the document for the description of what it

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 55 of 529

[Page 37] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)is; is that right? (3) Α. Yes. Would a likely coding for (4) Ο. (5)Mr. Palagonia's employment file be Michael Palagonia employment file or something like that? (6) (7) Α. It would be his name, yes. (8) Ο. Okay. (9) So just literally Michael Palagonia (10)would come up as Michael Palagonia, and you would (11)qo to the box? (12)Α. Yes or Palagonia, Michael, but his (13)name, yes. (14)Ο. Okay. Is that true for documents that (15)(16)pertain to more than one person? How do you deal with that? (17)(18)What do you mean? Α. If there is documents that pertain to (19)Ο. (20)Holy Family, you know, in general, you don't OCR (21)your documents, right? (22)No, I don't know what that means. Α. (23)You don't scan them and have them Ο. (24)read by a computer? (25)No, it's not that advance. Α.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 56 of 529

[Page 38] January 8, 2024

(1)	K. AMMIRATI
(2)	Q. Your entire ability to search depends
(3)	on what you enter into the index?
(4)	A. Yes, and I always am as descriptive
(5)	as I can be when I put things in the database.
(6)	Q. Do you know if you have descriptions
(7)	that are several sentences long in the database?
(8)	A. Sometimes, yes.
(9)	Q. If I'm looking for an employment file
(10)	that would include concerns over a teacher
(11)	sexually abusing a student, you wouldn't be able
(12)	to search for that sort of term in your archive?
(13)	A. No.
(14)	Q. I would have to give you the name of
(15)	the teacher, pull the employment file. That is
(16)	the only way that you'd be able to find documents
(17)	that covers other teachers who were accused of
(18)	allegations of sexual abuse of a student. Right?
(19)	A. Right.
(20)	MR. STEPHENS: I'm sorry, Pat.
(21)	I think you meant sexual allegations
(22)	done to a student, right?
(23)	MR. STONEKING: I did. Thank
(24)	you for the clarification.
(25)	Q. As part of either this litigation or

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 57 of 529

[Page 39] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)any recent litigation involving allegations of (3)child and sexual abuse, have you personally gone into any of the documents in the archives and done (4) that level of review of the documents to see if a (5)certain individual had child and sexual abuse (6)(7) allegations? (8) Α. No. (9) Did you look to see if any documents Ο. (10)were previously removed from Michael Palagonia's (11)file? (12)Α. I wouldn't know if they had been. Did Ms. Lynch keep a similar log to (13)Ο. (14)you where she recorded whether documents came or left from the archives? (15)(16)I don't know. Α. (17)You don't know if she had a log, did Ο. (18)I get that right? (19)Α. Yeah. (20)Ο. So when she stopped working there, (21)she didn't leave anything behind stating this is the log of where documents came and went during (22)her time here? (23)(24)Not that I saw. Α. (25)Q. Did you have any communications with

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 58 of 529

[Page 40] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)her after when you started the role? (3)No. Α. Why is that? (4) Ο. (5)She -- I believe she retired in Α. I wasn't hired until April, so she was (6)December. (7) just gone. She left notes about the processes of (8) the archives and how to use the database, but that (9) I never spoke or met her. was it. What sort of improvements did you (10)Ο. (11)make to the database or since? To the database? (12)Α. (13)Ο. Yeah. (14)I've kept it the way she had it. Α. (15)Does a Diocese maintain records Ο. outside of the archive from the records that are (16)(17)kept in other facilities or with other entities? (18)They keep records within their own Α. (19)department, and I do believe there is another (20)facility. I don't remember where it is, but I've (21)never seen it. I've heard rumors that there is (22)this another building that has documents. (23)Q. Do you know where these rumors (24)originated from? (25)Α. Sister Mary Anne has mentioned it.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 59 of 529

[Page 41] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Do you know where the building is? Q. (3)It might be in Roosevelt. I can't Α. (4) remember. I just know that nothing is indexed. (5)It's just boxes. I'm not even sure what department the boxes belong to. (6)(7) Is it maybe just storage or something Q. (8) like that or does it have its own purpose? (9) It is storage, but again, I don't Α. (10)know when it was started or who even has access to (11)it anymore. Is it fair to say that Sister Mary (12)Q. Anne would have more information about those (13)(14)rumors and this facility? (15)Α. Yes. (16)You have never been to the facility Ο. (17)in Roosevelt or transmitted any documents from (18)there? (19)Α. No. (20)Ο. And don't know who works there for (21)sure? (22)Α. Right. (23)Or who has access to it? Ο. (24)Right. Α. (25)Q. Okay.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 60 of 529

[Page 42] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMTRATT There is a term that comes up in my (2) (3) context of priest cases called secret files. (4)Have you ever heard of that term, (5) secret files? (6) Α. Yes. (7) Ο. Is that a term that you use at the Diocese as an archivist? (8) (9) Α. Yes. (10)Ο. Where are the secret files kept? (11)Those are kept at the chancery. Α. There are no secret files that were (12)Ο. (13)pertained to a laid employee like Mr. Palagonia; (14)is that right? (15)Right. Α. (16)Ο. The secret files, are those related (17)only to priests? Yes, maybe deacon as well. (18)Α. (19)What is maintained in the secret Ο. files? (20)(21)I don't know specifically. Anything Α. (22)wrong that they have done. (23)Q. Have you ever seen a secret file? (24)I haven't looked in one, but I have Α. (25)seen the physical file folders.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 61 of 529

[Page 43] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Do you know if those are kept in a Ο. different file cabinet in the chancellors office? (3)(4) Α. They are. (5)So there would be a priest file, and Ο. then the same priest would have a secret file in a (6)(7)different file cabinet within the chancellors office? (8) (9) Correct. Α. (10)Ο. Are there documents kept along with (11)the secret files that pertain to the Diocese practices when it comes to childhood sexual abuse (12)(13)as a whole, like, is there anything that any file (14)that covers like, policies and procedures or (15)things related to child and sexual abuse all (16)together? (17)I don't know. Α. (18)ο. Okay. (19)If someone were to say that no (20)teacher at Holy Family was accused of having (21)sexual relationship with a student (22)inappropriately, you wouldn't be able to say that (23)without going through every single teacher (24)employment file? (25)MR. STEPHENS: Objection.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 62 of 529

[Page 44] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Α. I quess. (3)Because you can't search for that Ο. sort of allegation within your system; is that (4) (5)fair? (6)Α. Yes. (7) The principal of the school at Holy Q. (8) Family at that time was Father James Kelly as a (9) priest. I'll just tell you that. Would Father (10)Kelly's priest file contain documents that he has (11)pertaining to overseeing Holy Family School? (12)Α. I don't know. As apart of this case, did you review (13)Ο. (14)Father Kelly's priest file? (15)Α. No. (16)How long would it take you to pull Ο. (17)Father Kelly's priest file? (18)If I have it at the archives, it Α. would be quick. (19)(20)Ο. Minutes? (21)Α. Yes. There has been previous searches of (22)Ο. (23)the archives for these priest files as part of the (24)bankruptcy case and as part of these other similar (25)litigation cases; is that right?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 63 of 529

[Page 45] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Α. Yes. (3) Have you pulled priest files of Ο. priests who are not accused of abuse like, Father (4) (5)Kelly, it's never been touched? (6) MR. STEPHENS: Objection. (7) I don't know. Α. (8) Did you personally pull priest files Ο. (9) for the litigation? (10)I've pulled priest files when I'm Α. (11)I don't know what they were asked to. (12)specifically used for. (13)Ο. In the last three years, have you (14)pulled more priest files then normal? (15)Yes. Α. (16)Do you have personnel files for Ο. (17)employees like, Sister Mary Anne in the archives? (18)She is an active employee, so no. Α. (19)Where are active employee files kept? Q. (20)Α. HR. (21)Ο. Then when they are discharged, HR will send the file to you? (22)(23)They have in the past. They haven't Α. (24)recently. (25)Ο. Do you know why?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 64 of 529

[Page 46] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Α. No. (3) What do you mean by recently? Ο. (4) Α. I actually don't know if I ever (5)received personnel files from HR since I've been in this job, but I know there are ones that were (6) (7) there when I already got here. (8) So HR may have its own policy, and Ο. (9) one that is to send the file to you? (10)That could be it. Α. (11)Is the archives -- I've never been to Ο. (12)the seminary. Is it one building, is it a group of buildings like a campus? (13)(14)Α. It's one big building. (15)And you are in there? Ο. (16)Α. Yes. (17)Ο. Are you in the basement? (18)It's the ground floor. I'm not under Α. (19)ground. (20)Ο. It's not an active seminary anymore; (21)is that right? (22)It's not active as a seminary, but Α. (23)there are things going on in the building like (24)retreats, meetings and things like that. (25)Ο. We talked about departments and

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 65 of 529

[Page 47] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)access. You as the archivist have access to the documents in the legal department? (3)(4) Α. No. (5)You described it as an office of Ο. priest affairs? (6)(7) Α. Clergy personnel, is that what you (8) mean. (9) Ο. Is that its own department? (10)Α. Yes. (11)Do you have access to those document? Ο. (12)Α. They would be the same priest files that are under the chancellors office. (13)(14)Ο. So that office doesn't maintain its (15)own files, they just use the archives to get their own documents; is that fair? (16)(17)Yes. Α. (18)Then you have access to their Ο. (19)documents because they are archives files? (20)Α. Yes. (21)Ο. Do you know if you searched for Mr. Palagonia's file prior to 2023? (22)(23)I don't know specifically. Α. Have there been vendors that have (24)Ο. (25)been coming in and scanning documents out of the

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 66 of 529

[Page 48] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)archives? (3) Α. Yes. Are you working for those vendors? (4) Ο. (5) Α. Not currently. In the last couple of years though, (6) Q. (7) you did? (8) Yes. Α. (9) Ο. Did the vendors literally come to the (10)archives and do scans of documents? (11)They have done that, and also taken Α. (12)files to scan off site. And you've kept track of what they (13)Ο. (14)took? (15)Yes. Α. (16)Ο. And you've kept track of it coming back in and put it in your log? (17)(18) Α. Yes. (19)Would you be able to see if a Q. (20)vendor's accessed Mr. Palagonia's file and when? (21)Α. Yes. (22)MR. STONEKING: I'm going to (23)request for that information, a log (24)of vendor access for Mr. Palagonia's (25)file.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 67 of 529

[Page 49] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Do you know who the vendor was or was Ο. (3)there several? (4) Α. It's one company. I don't remember (5)the name of the company. (6)It's fair to say that you didn't give Q. (7) any vendors instructions or what they could or (8) could not look, they had instructions from (9) elsewhere; is that true? (10)Right. I would assume they scanned Δ (11)everything they took. Why would you assume that? Is that (12)Q. just all they did, came and took files, scanned it (13)(14)and gave it back to you? (15)Α. Yes. (16)Did they do the scanning on site with Ο. you in your office? (17)(18)Α. At one point, yes. (19)What was that point? Ο. (20)Α. They were -- it was only about the (21)box of files, and they were priest files, so they (22)couldn't remove them from the archives. (23)They set up a computer and a scanner (24)and over the day and a half, two days, someone (25)came and scanned all of those documents there.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 68 of 529

[Page 50] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Was there an attorney from elsewhere Ο. (3) over seeing any of this? (4) Α. No. (5) During COVID, you were the archivist Ο. the whole time, right? (6) (7) Α. Right. (8) Did you have difficulty and Ο. (9) challenges accessing this during COVID? (10)No. Α. (11)Did you go into work every day during Ο. (12)COVID because you don't have anyone else or you worked from Holy? (13)(14)Α. I worked from Holy. (15)How did you work from Holy? Ο. (16)Α. A lot of what I do is waiting to be (17)asked to find something, so I would get asked a (18)question, I would go in and fill the request. (19)Q. How many requests do you get in a (20)normal day? (21)Α. A day, one or two. It's been less (22)since COVID. (23)Ο. Oh, really? (24)Α. Yes. (25) Why do you think that is? Ο.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 69 of 529

[Page 51] January 8, 2024

(1)	K. AMMIRATI
(2)	A. I think people are working a little
(3)	slower. Things aren't as urgent, so I can wait
(4)	until I have more requests so that's it's, you
(5)	know, a day of fulfilling requests instead of
(6)	having to go in for one thing.
(7)	Q. Is there anybody covering for you now
(8)	or you're going to return to a bunch of unanswered
(9)	e-mails?
(10)	A. I'll return to a bunch of e-mails.
(11)	Q. Okay.
(12)	The way that the files are indexed,
(13)	and specifically Mr. Palagonia's file, if you were
(14)	to look in the box where you found Mr. Palagonia's
(15)	file, what would be the documents nearby
(16)	physically in that box with it?
(17)	A. Other teacher files, which are
(18)	alphabetically close to his name.
(19)	Q. So not necessarily Holy Family, but
(20)	other teachers within the system?
(21)	A. Correct.
(22)	Q. Alphabetically with the last name?
(23)	A. Correct.
(24)	Q. That might be like, a Mr. P who
(25)	worked at, you know, Saint Agnes back in the '60 s

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 70 of 529

[Page 52] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)or something like that? (3)Α. Correct. Would you have any idea of how to (4) Ο. (5)find a list of teaches that were at Holy Family at (6)a certain time? (7) Not from the archives. Α. (8) Who would you have to ask? Ο. (9) I would ask the Department of Α. (10)Education. (11)Is that the sort of e-mail that you Ο. get from time to time that someone needs a list of (12)teachers from a certain school, and you'd be like, (13)(14)you don't know how to would find that, call the (15)Department of Education? (16)Α. Yes. (17)But -- and I want to be clear. Ο. Ιt (18)seems like of you're holding the DOE stuff too, (19)but it's just a select population of documents (20)that go to you from the DOE? (21)Α. Yeah, I only have what people give (22)me. Mm-hmm. (23)Ο. (24)Are you familiar with what the DOE (25)has for it's own record?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 71 of 529

[Page 53] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)Α. No. (3)Ο. You have never been other there? (4) Α. No. (5)Where is it? Ο. (6)Α. I believe it's at Holy Trinity High (7) School in Hicksville. After the building in (8) Rockville Centre sold, all of the departments (9) I'm not sure. scattered. (10)Ο. Okay. (11)I just want to say, if they are at Holy Trinity, it's something that they moved there (12)after they sold the chancellor building? (13)(14)Α. I believe so. (15)Do you know who is your counter part Ο. (16)sort of person that you would call at the DOE to (17)make a request like that? (18)I would just pick one of the Α. (19)secretaries. I don't have anyone specific. (20)Ο. Has there ever been any occasions where anybody has told you to remove or destroy a (21)document without you recording what happened to (22)that document? (23)(24)No. Α. (25)So as far as -- I quess you can't say Q.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 72 of 529

[Page 54] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)what Sister Mary Anne may or may have not done, (3) but as far as instances where you've accessed files and they've gone somewhere else from the (4) (5)time that you worked there, every document is counted for in your log? (6) (7) Α. Yes. (8) Does Sister Mary Anne keep a similar Ο. (9) log? (10)I don't know. Α. (11)Are there any occasions that you are Ο. (12)aware of that Sister Mary Anne has removed documents from the database or the archives? (13)(14)Not that I'm at ware of. Α. (15)Are you aware of the bishops Ο. (16)recordkeeping, does he have file cabinets like (17)Sister Mary Anne? (18)I don't know. Α. (19)Have you ever been in the bishop's Q. (20)office? (21)Α. No. Are any files maintained with the (22)Ο. (23)Vatican? (24)I don't know. Α. (25) Ο. Are you aware of any situations where

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 73 of 529

[Page 55] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)documents have been sent to the Vatican? (3)Α. No. (4) Ο. Would you have been alerted to that (5)if documents did go to the Vatican? (6)Α. No, if someone asked me for (7) something, I'd give it to him. What they did with (8) it after, I have no idea. They don't tell me. (9) But you would have a document of it Ο. (10)going to them in the first place? (11)Yes. Α. (12)Ο. Is your log computerized? (13)No. Α. (14)It's all written down in the log? Ο. (15)Yes. Α. (16)How many pages? Ο. (17)Α. It's a binder. I don't know how many (18)pages specifically, and I may have some typed (19)pages. (20)Ο. When you make entries in your log, does it say who is taking something like, someone (21)(22)came to me and took a certain file on a certain (23)date, and then you have a similar entry that they (24)brought it back? How do you describe everything? (25)Α. The department and the person who

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 74 of 529

> [Page 56] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)requested it, the description of the files, the (3)box that it came from, the day they requested it, (4) the day they received it and the day it came back (5)to the archive. (6)Ο. So you do have a description of what they took, even if it's maybe just a name of the (7) (8) file or something like that? (9) Α. Yes. (10)Ο. Do people make requests for (11)individual documents, do you have individual documents in any way within the archive? (12)(13)Α. Not really. (14)Everything is grouped in some sort of Ο. (15)fashion? (16)Α. Yes. (17)Q. Okay. (18) What other types of files like, (19)pertains to a school, would the archive have in (20)addition to employment teacher files? (21)Α. There may be some correspondence, (22)different reports or self studies. There might be (23)some financial records or grants or applications. (24)That's all can I remember specifically. (25)So if you did like a Holy Family Q.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 75 of 529

[Page 57] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)search, you would come up with that those types of (3)documents? (4) Α. I would, but I believe that when I (5)looked for something from Holy Family recently, (6)maybe in the course of this, there was a note in (7) the database that because the closure of Holy (8) Family proceeded the founding's of the archives, (9) those files never came to the archives, and are (10)being held elsewhere. (11)You don't know where though? Ο. (12)Α. I don't remember specifically. (13)Ο. Can you describe that note? Did that (14)come up on your database screen? (15)Α. Yes. (16)Would you be able to find what that Ο. (17)note says and communicate it to Mr. Stephens? (18)Α. Yes. (19)MR. STONEKING: I'll put in a request for the contents of that (20)(21)alert. (22)Ο. But that -- you probably did a Holy Family search, probably gave you a note that (23)(24)because of the dates involved, it's somewhere (25)else. You just don't remember where it said?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 76 of 529

E

[Page 58] January 8, 2024

(1)	K. AMMIRATI
(2)	A. Correct.
(3)	Q. Did it likely say another location?
(4)	A. I believe it did.
(5)	Q. Do you think it was Holy Trinity?
(6)	A. It's possible. I do think it was
(7)	another school. I just don't remember which one
(8)	it was.
(9)	Q. Do you know anything about the Saint
(10)	Agnes Cathedral School and how does that fit in?
(11)	There's a reference to Mr. Palagonia's file in the
(12)	lawsuit involving Saint Agnes Cathedral School,
(13)	and I know you may not know if those lawsuits
(14)	papers with in this file or not, we'll find out
(15)	later, but did you have if Saint Agnes had a
(16)	separate employment file for Mr. Palagonia, would
(17)	you have access to that too?
(18)	A. Yes.
(19)	Q. Would that been all together with the
(20)	Holy Family employment file?
(21)	A. As far as I know, he should have one
(22)	employment file no matter where he was teaching.
(23)	It would have followed him to whatever schools he
(24)	was at, and it'd come to me when he was
(25)	terminated.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 77 of 529

[Page 59] January 8, 2024

(1)	K. AMMIRATI
(2)	Q. So he did he started at Holy
(3)	Family for a long period of time, and then at
(4)	Saint Agnes, and then he was terminated, but
(5)	you're saying the employment record for Saint
(6)	Agnes and Holy Family should be together in the
(7)	same binder?
(8)	A. To the best of any knowledge.
(9)	Q. And it would have been produced in
(10)	this search?
(11)	A. Yes.
(12)	Q. There is a different level of file
(13)	that is contained within Holy Family file, and
(14)	there's very little from Saint Agnes, why he got
(15)	hired or anything like that.
(16)	Beyond the lawsuit, you wouldn't know
(17)	where other similar employment reviews and things
(18)	like that would be held from his time at Saint
(19)	Agnes if they were not in here?
(20)	A. I don't know.
(21)	Q. And you don't know what sort of
(22)	search you'd have to do to find that?
(23)	A. No.
(24)	Q. As far as your recordkeeping in the
(25)	Diocese in recordkeeping, is there nothing that

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 78 of 529

[Page 60] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI (2)would indicate that those documents were destroyed (3)or put somewhere else for any reason? (4) Α. No. (5)MR. STONEKING: All right. (6)As far as this case goes, I have (7) no further questions. I may see you (8) some time down the road with a group (9) of other people like me. (10)I appreciate your time coming in (11)here. Thank you. (12)MR. STEPHENS: Just before we go (13)off the record -- thank you for your (14)time. I just have one last question. EXAMINATION BY MR. STEPHENS: (15)(16)In your time as the archivist for the Ο. Diocese of Rockville Centre, has any material from (17)(18)the archives been destroyed? (19)Α. No. (20)MR. STEPHENS: I don't have any (21)other questions. (22)MR. STONEKING: Let me ask (23)something about this then. EXAMINATION BY MR. STONEKING: (24)(25)You wouldn't know if material was Q.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 79 of 529

[Page 61] January 8, 2024

(1)K. AMMIRATI taken and not return was destroyed, right? (2)(3) I quess. Α. And there been has material that has (4) Ο. (5) taken and not returned? (6) Α. But it's been kept at Diocesan (7) department. But if they destroyed it there, you (8) Ο. wouldn't know, would you? (9) (10)Α. No, I would not. (11)MR. STONEKING: Okay. (12)Nothing further. (13)(Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 11:10 a.m.) (14)(15)(16)KRISTA AMMIRATI (17)(18)Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ (19)day of ____, 2024. (20)(21) (22)NOTARY PUBLIC (23) (24) (25)

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 80 of 529

[Page 62] January 8, 2024

Г			1
(1)			
(2)		INDEX	
(3)	WITNESS	EXAMINATION BY	PAGE
(4)	KRISTA AMMIRATI	PATRICK STONEKING	7/60
		ERIC STEPHENS	60
(5)			
(6)			
		REQUESTS	
(7)			
	DESCRIPTION		PAGE
(8)			
	DATE OF SEARCH FOR	FILE OF EMPLOYMENT	24
(9)	VENDOR'S ACCESS OF	PALAGONIA'S FILE LOG	48
	CONTENTS OF ALERT		57
(10)			
(11)			
(12)			
(13)			
(14)			
(15)			
(16)			
(17)			
(18)			
(19)			
(20)			
(21)			
(22)			
(23)			
(24)			
(25)			
L			

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 81 of 529 [Page 63]

January 8, 2024

	r		1
(1)			
(2)		I N D E X	
(3)			
		EXHIBIT	
(4)			
	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
(5)			
	1	DOCUMENTS	8
(6)			
(7)			
(8)			
(9)			
(10)			
(11)			
(12)			
(13)			
(14)			
(15)			
(16)			
(17)			
(18)			
(19)			
(20)			
(21)			
(22)			
(23)			
(24) (25)			
(20)			

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 82 of 529

Г

[Page 64] January 8, 2024

(1)	
(2)	CERTIFICATION
(3)	STATE OF NEW YORK)
(4)	COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)
(5)	
(6)	I, Randi Horowitz, a stenotype
(7)	reporter and Notary Public within and for the
(8)	State of New York, do hereby certify that:
(9)	
(10)	KRISTA AMMIRATI
(11)	
(12)	The witness whose
(13)	Examination Before Trial is hereinbefore set
(14)	forth, was first duly sworn by me, and that such
(15)	Examination Before Trial is a true and accurate
(16)	record of the testimony given by said witness; and
(17)	I further certify that I am not related to any of
(18)	the parties of this action by blood or marriage
(19)	and that I am in no way interested in the outcome
(20)	of this matter.
(21)	
(22)	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
(23)	hereunto set my hand this 21st of January, 2024.
(24)	Λ μ σ
	Komi Maarin
(25)	RANDI HORÓWITZ

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 83 of 529

January 8, 2024

	ERRATA SHEET FOR: KRISTA AM	IMIRATI
	KRISTA AMMIRATI, being d	
	says: I have reviewed th	
	proceeding taken on 01/0	
	changes are necessary to	
_		
	PAGE LINE CHANGE	REASON
		·
		·
		·
		·
	Witness Signature:	
	Subscribed and sworn to, be	fore me
	this day of,	20
	(NOTARY PUBLIC)	COMMISSION EXPIRES

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 84 of 529

January 8, 2024

	[Page	661
--	-------	-----

A	18:7 19:4	13:1 14:1	Anthony's (2)	10:21 11:19
	45:18,19	15:1 16:1	35:23 36:3	14:14 25:22
a.m (2)	46:20,22	17:1 18:1	anybody (7)	42:8 47:2
1:14 61:14	ADAMS (1)	19:1 20:1	12:22 25:10	50:5 60:16
a/k/a/(1)	2:8	21:1 22:1	28:5,6 31:7	Ark (1)
1:7	add (1)	23:1 24:1	51:7 53:21	10:9
ability (2)	11:22	25:1 24:1	anymore (2)	ARK457 (1)
16:21 38:2	added (1)	27:1 28:1	41:11 46:20	1:4
able (7)	14:4	29:1 30:1	apart (2)	aside (1)
17:2 24:12	addition (4)	31:1 32:1	33:14 44:13	10:18
38:11,16	3:11 4:24	33:1 34:1	applications	asked (8)
43:22 48:19	18:18 56:20	35:1 36:1	56:23	10:13,16 15:19
57:16	address (2)	37:1 38:1	applies (1)	34:8 45:11
above-entitle	6:10 12:12	39:1 40:1	29:14	50:17,17 55:6
1:19	advance (1)	41:1 42:1	-	asking (4)
abuse (6)	37:25	43:1 44:1	appreciate (1) 60:10	7:3 15:24 16:4
38:18 39:3,6	affairs (1)	45:1 46:1	April (2)	25:4
43:12,15 45:4	47:6	47:1 48:1	10:25 40:6	asks (1)
abusing (1)	against- (1)	49:1 50:1	archive (15)	26:18
38:11	1:6	51:1 52:1	11:11,22 14:10	ASSOCIAT
access (22)	Agnes (8)	53:1 54:1	18:2 21:13	2:4,13
11:25 12:22	51:25 58:10,12	55:1 56:1	26:4 27:12	assume (2)
13:4,23,24	58:15 59:4,6	57:1 58:1	29:7 33:11	49:10,12
19:19 20:3	59:14,19	59:1 60:1	34:20 38:12	Assumed (1)
24:17 27:18	AGREED (6)	61:1,16 62:4	40:16 56:5,12	18:5
28:4,6 30:8	3:3,17 4:5,11	64:10 65:1,1	56:19	attorney (2)
30:17 41:10	4:17 5:6	amount (1)	archives (39)	7:2 50:2
41:23 47:2,2	alert (2)	32:13	11:25 12:14,23	Attorneys (2)
47:11,18	57:21 62:9	analysis (2)	14:22 18:18	2:4,8
48:24 58:17	alerted (1)	33:18,21	20:13,17	authentic (1)
62:9	55:4	ANDERSON	20:13,17 22:17 23:8,12	22:15
accessed (3)	Alexis (2)	2:4,13	23:14,16	authority (1)
28:10 48:20	2:12 7:3	Anne (8)	24:18,23	27:14
54:3	allegation (1)	12:11 40:25	25:18 28:7	aware (3)
accessing (1)	44:4	41:13 45:17	30:3 31:21,24	54:12,15,25
50:9	allegations (4)	54:2,8,12,17	33:9 36:11,15	54.12,15,25
accurate (1)	38:18,21 39:2	answer (5)	39:4,15 40:8	В
64:15	39:7	7:9 15:22	44:18,23	back (12)
accused (3)	alphabeticall	17:19 31:18	45:17 46:11	10:8 23:3,21
38:17 43:20	51:18,22	32:5	47:15,19 48:2	25:7 27:12
45:4	Ammirati (62)	answerable (1)	48:10 49:22	28:11 32:18
action (4)	1:17 6:9 7:1	32:6	52:7 54:13	48:17 49:14
1:19 3:15 5:4	8:1 9:1 10:1	answers (1)	57:8,9 60:18	51:25 55:24
64:18	11:1 12:1	7:18	archivist (8)	56:4
active (6)	11.1 12.1	/ • • •		
	I	I	I	I

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 85 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page 67]

[[rage o/]
background	33:2 54:15	43:3,7	25:19 30:10	11:21
14:5	bit (4)	cabinets (3)	31:9	come (10)
bankruptcy (10:19 24:2	30:14,23 54:16	chancellors (8)	15:8,13 23:16
44:24	33:24 34:10	call (4)	19:5 27:23	24:12 36:15
baptism (1)	blood (1)	9:6 36:2 52:14	30:7,19 32:25	37:10 48:9
31:12	64:18	53:16	43:3,7 47:13	57:2,14 58:24
bar (2)	borrowing (1)	called (1)	chancery (4)	comes (6)
3:13 5:2	25:3	42:3	25:21,25 26:4	10:14 19:7
basement (1)	bought (1)	campus (2)	42:11	23:24 27:14
46:17	14:2	19:11 46:13	CHANGE (1)	42:2 43:12
Bath (3)	box (8)	case (20)	65:5	comfortable
14:8,11,13	14:24 16:12	7:2 10:7,9 15:9	changes (1)	6:21
Bed (3)	28:23 37:11	15:11,13,18	65:3	coming (5)
14:8,11,13	49:21 51:14	16:5 17:25	charge (1)	8:5 31:12
begun (1)	51:16 56:3	21:16 23:6,13	5:10	47:25 48:16
3:23	boxes (11)	23:25 28:15	checking (1)	60:10
behalf (1)	13:10,12,18,19	28:22 33:8	32:19	COMMISSI
33:5	16:12 21:2,14	34:5 44:13,24	child (3)	65:25
believe (9)	30:13 34:22	60:6	39:3,6 43:15	communicat
8:24 23:25	41:5,6	cases (2)	childhood (1)	57:17
34:25 40:5,19	break (3)	42:3 44:25	43:12	communicati
53:6,14 57:4	7:21,24 23:18	Cathedral (2)	Christmas (1)	39:25
58:4	brought (2)	58:10,12	32:19	company (2)
belong (1)	28:11 55:24	Centre (8)	circumstanc	49:4,5
41:6	building (11)	1:12 10:22	25:13	complaint (5)
best (3)	12:18,20 35:24	11:20 17:14	clarification	10:7 23:6,7,12
24:7 26:16	35:25 40:22	19:9,21 53:8	38:24	23:24
59:8	41:2 46:12,14	60:17	clean (1)	complaints (1)
better (1)	46:23 53:7,13	certain (8)	7:12	9:25
21:5	buildings (1)	13:12,16 21:6	clear (2)	computer (3)
Beyond (4)	46:13	39:6 52:6,13	27:20 52:17	20:25 37:24
14:9,11,13	built (1)	55:22,22	Clergy (1)	49:23
59:16	14:2	certification	47:7	computerize
big (2)	bunch (2)	4:13 64:2	close (1)	55:12
13:7 46:14	51:8,10	certify (2)	51:18	Conception (1)
binder (2)	business (2)	64:8,17	closer (3)	12:19
55:17 59:7	21:21 22:12	challenges (1)	9:12,13 25:17	concerned (1)
bishop (4)		50:9	closure (1)	16:3
19:16 24:17	С	chancellor (7)	57:7	concerns (1)
32:14,22	C (1)	12:3,6,10,23	codes (2)	38:10
bishop's (3)	2:2	24:20 30:12	14:20 36:25	concluded (1)
27:23 31:8	C.P.L.R (4)	53:13	coding (1)	61:14
54:19	3:7 4:3,9,19	chancellor's	37:4	Conduct (1)
bishops (2)	cabinet (2)	19:4,8,20	collect (1)	4:20
~ more (#)		19.1,0,20		
	1	l	1	1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 86 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page 68]

confident (1)	22:11 57:6	deacon (1)	47:5	40:15 42:8
36:18	court (4)	42:18	description (9)	43:11 59:25
connected (1)	1:2 7:15 28:15	deal (1)	14:25 15:2	60:17
35:14	28:21	37:16	26:6 27:5	discharged (1)
contain (1)	covered (1)	Debbie (1)	36:25 56:2,6	45:21
44:10	33:23	20:9	62:7 63:4	discussion (2)
contained (1)	covering (1)	December (1)	descriptions	23:19,23
59:13	51:7	40:6	38:6	document (16)
contents (3)	covers (2)	deemed (1)	descriptive (1)	8:16,25 15:11
26:25 57:20	38:17 43:14	3:25	38:4	22:4 23:12
62:9	COVID (4)	Defendant (2)	desk (1)	24:4,13,22
context (1)	50:5,9,12,22	1:18 6:2	20:24	26:19 29:14
42:3	created (2)	Defendants (2)	destroy (1)	36:25 47:11
controlled (1)	11:14 34:25	1:9 2:8	53:21	53:22,23 54:5
4:3	curious (1)	degree (1)	destroyed (4)	55:9
conversation	36:22	14:9	60:2,18 61:2,8	documents (
15:25	current (1)	department (determine (1)	9:22 10:3 13:5
copy (1)	17:25	17:7,12,13,17	14:22	13:10 14:20
5:8	currently (1)	17:22 18:2,8	determined (1)	15:19 16:5,17
correct (13)	48:5	25:4 26:23	16:17	16:22 17:22
22:2 24:2,3	40.3	27:18,22 28:3		21:12,19,24
28:12 30:4	D	27.18,22 28.3	Devoe (1) 20:9	21:12,19,24 22:8,14,20
33:13 35:8	D (2)	28.3,3,24 29:2 34:11,12		23:5 25:10,16
	62:2 63:2	34:24 35:6	died (1) 19:6	25:24 26:3,7
43:9 51:21,23	database (15)			,
52:3 58:2 65:3	10:14 11:22	36:8,9 40:19	dies (1)	27:10,11,15
	13:13,14	41:6 47:3,9	18:6	27:17 28:7,13
corresponde 32:14 56:21	14:25 15:2	52:9,15 55:25	different (11)	28:15 29:6,9
	34:4 38:5,7	61:7	17:13 20:19,20	29:18 30:7,9
corresponde	40:8,11,12	department'	20:21 21:5	30:11,17,22
32:23	54:13 57:7,14	24:6 29:2	31:11 34:13	31:3,20,23
counsel (9)	date (5)	departments	43:3,7 56:22	32:2 33:16
1:23 3:4,18,25	8:18 23:9	27:21 46:25	59:12	35:10 36:10
4:6,12,18 5:7	24:10 55:23	53:8	difficult (1)	37:15,19,21
5:9	62:8	depends (2)	32:11	38:16 39:4,5
counted (1)		25:2 38:2	difficulty (1)	39:9,14,22
54:6	dates (1)	deposes (1)	50:8	40:22 41:17
counter (1)	57:24	65:1	Diocesan (2)	43:10 44:10
53:15	day (10)	deposition (2)	1:7 61:6	47:3,16,19,25
COUNTY (2)	49:24 50:11,20	6:15 12:13	Diocese (16)	48:10 49:25
1:2 64:4	50:21 51:5	Depositions (1)	10:22 11:20	51:15 52:19
couple (4)	56:3,4,4	4:21	14:6 17:14	54:13 55:2,5
8:9,21 9:4 48:6	61:20 65:24	describe (2)	18:18 19:7	56:11,12 57:3
course (4)	days (1)	55:24 57:13	27:21,22 29:7	60:2 63:5
19:24 21:20	49:24	described (1)	31:11 34:13	DOE (5)
L				

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 87 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page 69]

				[rage 07]
1:4 52:18,20	56:20 58:16	8:15,17,22 9:6	far (6)	12:3 17:7,21
52:24 53:16	58:20,22 59:5	9:7 16:6	26:6 53:25	17:24 18:2,4
doing (5)	59:17 62:8	22:11,14,21	54:3 58:21	18:9,19,25
16:3,4 27:16	enter (1)	23:13 28:14	59:24 60:6	19:3,20 20:3
,				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
32:19 33:17	38:3	29:23 33:25	fashion (1)	21:6 22:6,7,8
duly (3)	entire (2)	63:3	56:15	25:17,21 29:3
6:3 64:14 65:1	33:11 38:2	expect (2)	Father (5)	29:12 30:24
E	entities (1)	7:24 29:19	44:8,9,14,17	30:25 34:12
$\frac{\mathbf{L}}{\mathbf{E}(4)}$	40:17	EXPIRES (1)	45:4	34:13,19 42:3
2:2,2 62:2 63:2	entity (1)	65:25	file (68)	42:5,10,12,16
,	17:14	explain (6)	8:8 9:8,11,20	42:20 43:11
e-mail (1)	entries (1)	18:24 20:16	9:23 10:4,10	44:23 45:3,8
52:11	55:20	26:16 30:8	10:12 15:10	45:10,14,16
e-mails (3)	entry (1)	31:2 33:24	17:20 19:7	45:19 46:5
23:4 51:9,10	55:23	F	21:20,25	47:12,15,19
early (2)	Eric (3)		24:11 26:14	48:12 49:13
11:11,14	2:10 8:7 62:4	F (1)	26:18,21,25	49:21,21
education (15)	ERRATA (1)	2:8	27:2,3,5	51:12,17 54:4
17:7,11,13,17	65:1	facilities (1)	28:19,22	54:22 56:2,18
18:2,8 27:24	especially (1)	40:17	29:15,20 30:2	56:20 57:9
34:11,12,24	34:5	facility (3)	30:14,23	filing (2)
35:6 36:8,9	ESQ (3)	40:20 41:14,16	32:24 33:4,11	4:13 25:15
52:10,15	2:6,10,12	failure (3)	33:25 34:5	filings (1)
effort (1)	essentially (1)	3:11,23 4:24	37:5,6 38:9	10:2
35:9	12:20	fair (11)	38:15 39:11	fill (1)
either (4)	estimation (1)	21:18 22:10	42:23,25 43:3	50:18
19:6 22:9	22:23	31:15,21	43:5,6,7,13	finance (1)
24:20 38:25	eventually (1)	32:13,15	43:24 44:10	27:24
electric (1)	31:20	33:18 41:12	44:14,17	financial (2)
13:14	examination	44:5 47:16	45:22 46:9	31:6 56:23
electrically (2)	1:17 4:23 5:2	49:6	47:22 48:20	find (15)
14:23 15:16	6:6 60:15,24	fairly (1)	48:25 51:13	11:24 14:23
employee (3)	62:3 64:13,15	9:6	51:15 54:16	15:19 16:5,24
42:13 45:18,19	examination(familiar (1)	55:22 56:8	26:9,19 33:25
employees (1)	3:10,13,19,22	52:24	58:11,14,16	38:16 50:17
45:17	3:24 4:7,14	Family (22)	58:20,22	52:5,14 57:16
employment	5:8	1:7,7,18 16:22	59:12,13 62:8	58:14 59:22
9:7,11 10:4,10	examined (2)	16:25 35:15	62:9	finish (3)
18:19 21:20	3:20 6:4	36:2,19 37:20	filed (6)	7:17,18,23
21:25 22:8	example (1)	43:20 44:8,11	14:21 17:6	fired (3)
24:10 28:18	18:22	51:19 52:5	23:7,10,14	18:6,11,15
28:22 29:20	exception (1)	56:25 57:5,8	24:5	first (6)
30:2 37:5,6	22:15	57:23 58:20	files (57)	6:3 8:9 9:3
38:9,15 43:24	Exhibit (14)	59:3,6,13	10:15 11:22	26:9 55:10
	()			
I			1	I

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 88 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page 70]

				[rage /o]
64:14	generate (1)	56:14	40:6 59:15	40:10
fit (1)	17:2	guess (7)	history (2)	inappropriat
58:10	generates (1)	23:15 24:7	14:9 23:3	43:22
Fitzgerald (1)	17:22	32:25 36:12	hit (1)	include (1)
12:11	give (6)	44:2 53:25	15:8	38:10
five (3)	25:7 26:20	61:3	hits (3)	including (2)
13:9 20:17,19	38:14 49:6	01.5	16:8,11 36:16	3:8 4:21
floor (2)	52:21 55:7	Н	holding (1)	incorrect (1)
2:5 46:18	given (1)	half (1)	52:18	35:7
folders (1)	64:16	49:24	Holy (28)	indefinitely (6)
42:25	go (20)	hand (1)	1:7,7,18 16:22	17:21 25:8,11
followed (1)	6:23 7:18	64:23	16:25 35:15	29:7,10,13
58:23	10:19 12:4,6	happened (1)	36:2,19 37:20	index (5)
following (1)	13:18 18:5,6	53:22	43:20 44:7,11	1:10 13:11
65:2	29:23 31:10	happening (1)	50:13,14,15	14:21 16:7
follows (1)	31:13 32:24	25:2	51:19 52:5	38:3
6:5	36:7 37:11	happens (1)	53:6,12 56:25	indexed (3)
form (2)	50:11,18 51:6	33:3	57:5,7,22	21:8 41:4
3:9 4:22	52:20 55:5	head (1)	58:5,20 59:2	51:12
formation (1)	60:12	28:2	59:6,13	indexes (2)
35:5	goes (4)	heard (2)	Horowitz (4)	26:10 36:23
forth (2)	14:25 32:14	40:21 42:4	1:20 6:4 64:6	indicate (1)
32:18 64:14	33:11 60:6	held (9)	64:25	60:2
found (2)	going (11)	1:19 13:2	Hospital (1)	individual (4)
28:18 51:14	8:13 9:24 15:7	22:11 23:19	19:12	30:25 39:6
founding's (1)	26:19 29:22	30:2,7 33:11	house (1)	56:11,11
57:8	34:20 43:23	57:10 59:18	14:2	information
fulfilling (1)	46:23 48:22	hereinbefore	HR (4)	27:8 29:24
51:5	51:8 55:10	64:13	45:20,21 46:5	41:13 48:23
full (3)	good (2)	hereto (6)	46:8	instances (1)
13:7 27:18	6:13 31:13	3:5,19 4:7,13	Huntington (3)	54:3
30:13	Gotcha (1)	4:19 5:8	6:11 12:13	instructions
fundamental	27:25	hereunto (1)	20:11	49:7,8
10:19	graduated (1)	64:23		intention (1)
furnished (1)	35:25	Hi (1)	<u> </u>	14:10
5:9	grants (1)	6:14	idea (2)	interested (1)
further (8)	56:23	Hicksville (1)	52:4 55:8	64:19
3:17 4:5,11,17	Great (1)	53:7	identificatio	involved (1)
5:6 60:7	2:9	high (6)	8:18	57:24
61:12 64:17	ground (2)	1:7 35:17,23	identities (1)	involving (3)
	46:18,19	36:2,3 53:6	1:7	28:16 39:2
G	group (2)	Highway (1)	Immaculate	58:12
general (2)	46:12 60:8	2:9	12:19	it'd (1)
15:22 37:20	grouped (1)	hired (2)	improvemen	58:24
	5 I ()			
		1	1	1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 89 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page 71]

				[Iage /I]
it'll (2)	60:1 61:1	41:10,20	28:13,24,25	longer (2)
7:18 10:25	keep (16)	42:21 43:2,17	47:3	19:6 35:15
7.10 10.23	11:21 15:15	44:12 45:7,11	letter (3)	look (11)
J	17:20,21,23	45:25 46:4,6	31:8,13 33:3	8:19 9:12,13
J-E-A-N (1)	17:20,21,25	47:21,23 49:2	letters (1)	9:21 10:15
11:6	26:19 27:6	51:5,25 52:14	32:17	23:3,4 29:11
James (1)	29:6 31:16	53:15 54:10	level (2)	39:9 49:8
44:8	34:20 35:9	54:18,24	39:5 59:12	51:14
January (2)	39:13 40:18	55:17 57:11	LINE (1)	looked (6)
1:13 64:23	54:8	58:9,13,13,21	65:5	8:8,21 9:3
Jean (3)	keeping (3)	59:16,20,21	list (5)	22:18 42:24
11:4,5 14:3	14:17 25:16	60:25 61:9	16:8,24 17:2	57:5
JEFF (2)	29:3		52:5,12	looking (5)
2:4,13		knowledge (1) 59:8		8:9 16:4 33:16
job (2)	keeps (1) 32:25	59:8 Krista (7)	literally (2) 37:9 48:9	36:5 38:9
19:24 46:6		1:17 6:9 61:16		
	Kelly (2) 44:8 45:5	62:4 64:10	litigation (4) 38:25 39:2	lot (2) 27:11 50:16
K	Kelly's (3)			
K (56)	44:10,14,17	65:1,1	44:25 45:9	Lynch (2) 11:4 39:13
6:2 7:1 8:1 9:1	· · ·	L	little (7) 10:19 23:25	11:4 39:13
10:1 11:1	kept (18) 18:2 19:3	lack (1)		M
12:1 13:1	21:20 25:10	21:5	33:23 34:10 36:22 51:2	M (2)
14:1 15:1	29:13 33:4	laicized (1)	59:14	6:2,2
16:1 17:1		19:6		maintain (6)
18:1 19:1	35:12,21	laid (2)	located (3)	18:25 29:3
20:1 21:1	40:14,17	33:9 42:13	13:19 16:11 19:9	32:22 36:10
22:1 23:1	42:10,11 43:2 43:10 45:19	late (1)		40:15 47:14
24:1 25:1		34:25	location (3) 12:14,17 58:3	maintained (5)
26:1 27:1	48:13,16 61:6	lawsuit (2)	lock (1)	29:9,21 30:9
28:1 29:1	key (4) 12:3,4 13:2	58:12 59:16	13:2	42:19 54:22
30:1 31:1	24:20	lawsuits (1)	log (15)	maintains (1)
32:1 33:1	kind (2)	58:13	25:5 27:6,8	19:20
34:1 35:1	30:11 31:7	lawyers (1)	28:9 39:13,17	maintenance
36:1 37:1	know (60)	15:25	39:22 48:17	12:4,24
38:1 39:1	7:6,21 9:23	leave (1)	48:23 54:6,9	makeup (1)
40:1 41:1	11:2,5,7,9	39:21	55:12,14,20	20:16
42:1 43:1	13:21,24 14:3	left (3)	62:9	management
44:1 45:1	17:23 22:3	26:3 39:15	long (12)	14:16
46:1 47:1	28:25 29:12	40:7	7:24 10:24	marked (4)
48:1 49:1	29:24 32:2	legal (13)	11:9 15:12	8:14,17,22,23
50:1 51:1	35:3,20 36:12	9:21 10:2	16:19 25:7	markings (1)
52:1 53:1	37:20,22 38:6	15:10 21:24	27:17 29:3,6	21:3
54:1 55:1	39:12,16,17	22:8 24:5	38:7 44:16	marriage (1)
56:1 57:1	40:23 41:2,4	27:24 28:6,7	59:3	64:18
58:1 59:1	10.20 11.2,1		0,0	
	I	I	I	I

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 90 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page 72]

40:9	10:15 11:4	6:4 61:22	17:10 18:16	P
met (1)	6:7,25 10:14	1:21 3:21,21	15:5,14 16:2	
32:18	name (28)	Notary (7)	10:6,17 14:19	34:21
Merry (1)	2:2 62:2 63:2	45:14 50:20	8:3,20 9:5,15	overwhelmin
1:12	N (3)	normal (2)	7:19,20,25	44:11
Merrick (1)	N N	10:25	6:18,24 7:13	overseeing (1)
19:12		nine (1)	okay (34)	21:3 40:16
Mercy (1)	14:11	64:3,8	9:18 50:23	outside (2)
17:11 40:25	museum (1)	2:9 6:11 24:2	Oh (2)	64:19
mentioned (2)	27:10	1:2,12,21 2:5,5	49:17 54:20	outcome (1)
12:21 46:24	moving (1)	new (10)	47:13,14	40:24
meetings (2)	53:12	57:9	43:3,8 47:5	originated (1)
8:7	26:7,21 27:2	46:11 53:3	32:25 33:2	3:24 4:14
meeting (1)	moved (4)	41:16 45:5	30:19 31:8,9	original (2)
38:21	27:14	33:4 40:9,21	27:23 30:7,10	14:17
meant (1)	3:9,12 4:22,25	never (8)	25:19 27:23	organized (1)
37:22	move (5)	52:12	20:24 24:6	14:16
means (1)	3:14 5:3	needs (1)	19:17 20:4,6	organization
46:3 47:8	motion (2)	25:7 36:4	17:23 19:4,5,8	21:20 22:11
31:3 37:18	6:13	needed (2)	office (26)	ordinary (2)
22:7 26:13,14	morning (1)	24:20 27:4,19	37:20	33:2
12:8 20:18	22:24	6:23 7:9,12,21	OCR (1)	opposed (1)
mean (9)	months (1)	need (7)	53:20 54:11	35:16
58:22 64:20	23:18	6:11	occasions (2)	operation (1)
matter (2)	momentary (1)	Neck (1)	43:25 45:6	8:8
61:4	20:23	65:3	31:17,25	opened (1)
28:18 60:17,25	mobile (1)	necessary (1)	17:18 18:13	34:18 46:6
material (4)	7:8 52:23	26:22 51:19	Objection (6)	ones (2)
19:11	Mm-hmm (2)	necessarily (2)	3:8,11 4:21,24	6:20 19:5
Marys (1)	35:22	51:15	object (4)	Once (2)
54:2,8,12,17	mistaken (1)	nearby (1)	0	34:19
41:12 45:17	16:20 44:20	1:2		oldest (1)
12:11 40:25	21:9 minutes (2)	13:17,17 20:8 NASSAU (1)	numbered (1) 21:2	older (1) 28:14

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 91 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page 73]

				[lage /J]
15:19 16:8	7:22	53:18	25:17,21	Public (7)
28:16 29:20	people (6)	place (4)	27:24 30:24	1:21 3:21,21
33:8,25 34:6	11:23 20:2	1:20 26:9	31:11 32:15	6:4 61:22
36:14 37:6,9	51:2 52:21	33:12 55:10	32:24 33:5	64:7 65:25
37:10,12	56:10 60:9	plaintiff (4)	42:3 43:5,6	pull (5)
42:13 58:16	Perfect (1)	1:5,8 2:4 7:2	44:9,10,14,17	10:15 25:24
Palagonia's (34:9	Plaintiff's (3)	44:23 45:3,8	38:15 44:16
9:7,11 10:4	perform (1)	8:14,17,22	45:10,14 47:6	45:8
21:19 37:5	31:12	please (3)	47:12 49:21	pulled (6)
39:10 47:22	period (1)	6:8,10 8:19	priests (3)	22:6 34:4,6
48:20,24	59:3	point (2)	33:4 42:17	45:3,10,14
51:13,14	permission (2)	49:18,19	45:4	purpose (2)
58:11 62:9	12:5,7	policies (1)	principal (1)	14:21 41:8
paper (1)	person (7)	43:14	44:7	purposes (1)
13:5	26:12,12,15,23	policy (1)	prior (6)	4:8
papers (1)	37:16 53:16	46:8	8:5 11:10,17	pursuant (1)
58:14	55:25	populated (1)	14:5 35:5	1:22
parish (5)	person's (1)	36:23	47:22	put (9)
31:9,14,20,24	15:7	population (1)	probably (3)	10:18 15:7
35:13	personal (2)	52:19	24:5 57:22,23	24:9 26:22
parishes (4)	9:23 18:9	position (2)	procedures (1)	27:5 38:5
30:25 31:4,15	personally (2)	11:13 15:6	43:14	48:17 57:19
32:8	39:3 45:8	possible (1)	proceeded (1)	60:3
part (5)	personnel (12)	58:6	57:8	00.5
4:20 38:25	9:19 15:9	practice (1)	proceeding (2)	Q
44:23,24	17:21 27:3,24	29:3	6:22 65:2	question (12)
53:15	29:12,15	practices (1)	proceedings	3:8,12 4:22,25
particular (1)	30:24 34:5	43:12	61:13	7:22,23 27:13
15:18	45:16 46:5	preparation	process (1)	27:15 29:21
parties (7)	47:7	8:5	33:24	32:6 50:18
3:4,18 4:6,12	pertain (4)	prepared (1)	processes (1)	60:14
4:18 5:7	30:25 37:16,19	24:4	40:7	questions (5)
64:18	43:11	PRESENT (1)	produced (3)	7:3,17 15:22
Pat (2)	pertained (1)	2:12	21:19 22:4	60:7,21
6:25 38:20	42:13	prest (1)	59:9	quick (1)
PATRICK (3)	pertaining (1)	12:20	program (1)	44:19
2:6,8 62:4	44:11	pretty (2)	13:25	quickly (3)
payroll (1)	pertains (1)	6:21 24:13	programs (1)	24:13 34:22
29:24	56:19	previous (1)	13:24	35:11
PC (1)	physical (1)	44:22	provide (1)	quote (2)
2:8	42:25	previously (1)	11:24	25:3,3
PDF (2)	physically (1)	39:10	provided (5)	
8:8,11	51:16	priest (26)	3:7 4:2,8,19	$\frac{\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{R}}$
pending (1)	pick (1)	18:21,23 21:6	22:16	R (3)
				2:2 6:2,2

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 92 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page	74]
-------	-----

				[rage / r]
Randi (4)	redoing (1)	24:9 48:23	35:16 37:2,21	Rules (2)
1:20 6:3 64:6	25:15	50:18 53:17	38:18,19,22	4:2,20
64:25	reference (1)	57:20	39:18 41:22	rumors (3)
read (1)	58:11	requested (2)	41:24 42:14	40:21,23 41:14
37:24	references (1)	56:2,3	42:15 44:25	10.21,25 11.11
real (1)	23:6	requests (5)	46:21 49:10	S
29:24	referencing (1)	50:19 51:4,5	50:6,7 60:5	s (3)
really (4)	17:12	56:10 62:6	61:2	2:2 6:2 51:25
22:25 34:14	referred (1)	reserved (4)	rights (3)	Saint (11)
50:23 56:13	9:2	3:11,14 4:24	3:7 4:2,19	19:11 35:23
reason (2)	related (4)	5:3	Rive (1)	36:2 51:25
60:3 65:5	28:15 42:16	respective (6)	2:9	58:9,12,15
received (2)	43:15 64:17	3:4,18 4:6,12	road (3)	59:4,5,14,18
46:5 56:4		4:18 5:7	1:12 6:11 60:8	saw (2)
	relationship 43:21	4:18 3:7 responsive (1)	Rockville (8)	10:11 39:24
recognized (1) 16:6		33:17	1:12 10:22	saying (2)
record (17)	relevance (1) 33:15	results (1)	11:20 17:14	11:13 59:5
6:7 7:12 18:9		36:24	19:9,21 53:8	says (2)
	remember (17)		60:17	57:17 65:2
23:20,22,24	10:5 16:13	retention (1)		scan (2)
24:23 28:9,11	21:15,24	29:12	role (7)	37:23 48:12
29:2 34:16,21	22:22,25	retired (2)	10:20,24 11:2	scanned (4)
35:24 52:25	28:17,20	11:12 40:5	11:10,19	15:15 49:10,13
59:5 60:13	33:20,22	retreats (2)	14:14 40:2	49:25
64:16	40:20 41:4	12:21 46:24	roles (1)	
recorded (4)	49:4 56:24	retrieve (6)	21:5	scanner (1) 49:23
24:25 26:3,7	57:12,25 58:7	10:13 11:23	room (6)	
39:14	remove (2)	12:2 13:17,18	13:7 20:23,24	scanning (2) 47:25 49:16
recording (1)	49:22 53:21	22:20	21:6 25:16	
53:22	removed (3)	retrieved (2)	30:13	scans (1)
recordkeepi	24:22 39:10	10:11 16:16	rooms (5)	48:10
14:14 17:16	54:12	return (4)	13:9 20:17,19	scattered (1)
54:16 59:24	rephrase (1)	3:23 51:8,10	20:22 21:4	53:9
59:25	7:6	61:2	Roosevelt (2)	schedule (1)
records (13)	replenishme	returned (1)	41:3,17	29:12
11:21 18:17,21	14:15	61:5	Rosa (1)	school (20)
31:16 32:7	reporter (3)	review (3)	20:9	1:7 12:20 17:9
34:15 35:5,12	1:21 7:16 64:7	8:4 39:5 44:13	rosters (1)	33:9 35:13,13
35:20 40:15	reports (4)	reviewed (1)	36:6	35:17,22,23
40:16,18	31:6,6,7 56:22	65:2	rows (4)	35:23 36:2,3
56:23	represent (1)	reviews (2)	13:7,8,9 20:22	44:7,11 52:13
redaction (1)	6:25	33:15 59:17	rude (1)	53:7 56:19
22:16	representing	right (23)	7:12	58:7,10,12
Redd (2)	5:9	3:8 4:21 16:9	rule (1)	schools (1)
2:12 7:3	request (5)	18:10 23:10	25:20	58:23
L				

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 93 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page 75]

				[lage /J]
screen (1)	10:16 32:18	Sister (8)	51:13 55:18	14:15
57:14	45:22 46:9	12:11 40:25	56:24 57:12	Stoneking (17)
search (21)	sends (2)	41:12 45:17	spell (1)	2:6 6:6,25 8:13
13:16 15:8	17:7 31:8	54:2,8,12,17	11:5	15:23 18:14
16:7,19,21	sent (4)	sit (1)	spiritual (1)	23:21 24:8
21:15 23:3	8:8 24:2 34:7	21:23	31:7	32:4 38:23
24:10 33:17	55:2	site (2)	spoke (1)	48:22 57:19
34:3,11,13	sentences (1)	48:12 49:16	40:9	60:5,22,24
36:23 38:2,12	38:7	sits (1)	spot (1)	61:11 62:4
44:3 57:2,23	separate (1)	19:16	14:18	stopped (2)
59:10,22 62:8	58:16	situations (1)	staff (2)	8:9 39:20
searched (4)	service (1)	54:25	12:4,24	
10:13 15:3,20	19:2	slower (1)	standing (1)	storage (2) 41:7,9
47:21	set (5)	51:3	31:13	Street (1)
searches (1)	14:3 30:13	smoothly (1)		2:5
44:22	49:23 64:13	7:19	start (1) 29:22	2.5 strike (4)
searchs (1)	49:23 04:13 64:23	software (1)	started (6)	3:9,12 4:23,25
33:14	sexual (7)	13:22	11:11 12:13	student (7)
secret (9)	38:18,21 39:3		30:6 40:2	34:15 35:5,12
42:3,5,10,12	39:6 43:12,15	sold (2) 53:8,13	41:10 59:2	,
42:3,5,10,12	43:21	somebody (1)	State (6)	38:11,18,22 43:21
42.10,19,25		27:13	1:2,21 6:7,10	
secretaries (4)	sexually (1) 38:11		64:3,8	students (1) 34:21
	SHEET (1)	sorry (3) 7:10 33:23	static (1)	studies (1)
20:4,5,10 53:19	65:1	38:20	20:23	56:22
	shelves (2)			
see (9) 9:18 10:12	13:8 20:22	sort (13) 14:14,15,18	stating (1) 39:21	stuff (1) 52:18
23:9 29:19	shelving (2)	29:9,25 32:19		Subscribed (2)
33:4 39:5,9	13:10 20:23	38:12 40:10	stenotype (2) 1:20 64:6	61:18 65:23
48:19 60:7		44:4 52:11		SUFFOLK (1)
seeing (1)	shelvings (1) 20:23	53:16 56:14	Stephens (17) 2:10 15:21	64:4
50:3		59:21		-
	shows (1)		17:18 18:13 18:15 23:17	Suite (1) 2:9
seen (5) 9:22 32:17	24:13 sided (1)	sorts (1) 31:23	31:17,25 32:5	Sunrise (1)
40:21 42:23	sided (1) 9:17		38:20 43:25	2:9
40:21 42:25		source (1) 16:17	45:6 57:17	SUPREME (1)
	Signature (1) 65:23			SUPREME (1) 1:2
select (1) 52:19	similar (7)	specific (2) 15:25 53:19	60:12,15,20 62:4	sure (8)
self (1)	16:22 30:12	specifically (STIPULAT	7:14 31:19
56:22	39:13 44:24	10:5 16:13	3:3,17 4:5,11	32:12,16,21
seminary (5)	54:8 55:23	21:17 27:11	4:17 5:6	41:5,21 53:9
12:18,19 46:12	59:17	29:5,11 33:22	stipulations (sworn (6)
46:20,22	single (1)	36:13 42:21	1:22 3:2	3:20 6:3 61:18
40:20,22 send (4)	43:23	45:12 47:23	stock (1)	64:14 65:1,23
		\rightarrow	I SIULA LII	$1 0 \rightarrow .1 \rightarrow 0.0.1.2.0$
	45.25	13.12 17.23	stoom (1)	0

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 94 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page 76]

				[Iaye /0]
system (3)	technically (2)	45:13	33:20 35:10	wait (3)
26:8 44:4	12:8 24:19	time (19)	typed (1)	7:17,18 51:3
51:20	tell (6)	1:19 19:23,23	55:18	waiting (1)
systems (1)	13:17 15:23	31:7 34:20	types (3)	50:16
25:15	23:2 26:13	36:19 39:23	27:9 56:18	waived (1)
23.13	44:9 55:8	44:8 50:6	57:2	4:15
Т	tells (1)	52:6,12,12	57.2	waiver (3)
T (2)	13:11	54:5 59:3,18	U	3:14,25 5:2
6:2,2	term (4)	60:8,10,14,16	unanswered	want (3)
take (7)	38:12 42:2,4,7	times (1)	51:8	32:11 52:17
7:23 8:19	terminated (7)	6:19	uncommon (1)	53:11
16:19 23:18	17:8,9 18:4,23		34:6	
25:6,21 44:16	· · · · ·	today (3) 7:4 8:5 21:23	understand (2)	ware (1)
taken (8)	33:10 58:25		7:6 32:12	54:14
1:20 6:15	59:4	told (2)	understandi	warehouse (1)
25:10,18	terrible (1)	23:25 53:21	35:2	14:16
	29:21	top (1)		wasn't (1)
48:11 61:2,5	testified (1)	8:21	Uniform (1)	40:6
65:2	6:5	touched (1)	4:20	way (10)
talk (2)	testifying (1)	45:5	unknown (1)	7:19 16:22
7:15 25:20	5:10	track (3)	1:7	17:6 22:16
talked (2)	testimony (6)	35:9 48:13,16	urgent (1)	23:2 38:16
34:10 46:25	3:10,12 4:23	transactions	51:3	40:14 51:12
talking (2)	4:25 64:16	27:9	use (6)	56:12 64:19
9:2 13:4	65:3	transcript (2)	13:25 19:23	we'll (1)
tat (1)	thank (4)	36:3 65:2	26:9 40:8	58:14
29:4	24:8 38:23	transmitted (42:7 47:15	wedding (1)
teacher (12)	60:11,13	41:17	utilized (1)	31:12
17:20 18:5,18	thing (4)	trial (5)	4:8	went (3)
29:19 33:9,10	7:22 14:18	1:17 3:15 5:4		16:16 26:4
38:10,15	29:25 51:6	64:13,15	V	39:22
43:20,23	things (12)	Trinity (3)	Vatican (3)	West (2)
51:17 56:20	10:2,14 12:21	53:6,12 58:5	54:23 55:2,5	2:5 6:11
teacher's (3)	13:12 14:21	true (5)	vendor (2)	WHEREOF
9:19 17:24	32:20 38:5	19:14 35:4	48:24 49:2	64:22
28:22	43:15 46:23	37:15 49:9	vendor's (2)	White (1)
teachers (7)	46:24 51:3	64:15	48:20 62:9	20:9
16:25 17:8	59:17	trying (2)	vendors (4)	witness (5)
18:7 36:6	think (9)	7:12 32:11	47:24 48:4,9	62:3 64:12,16
38:17 51:20	15:24 23:17	two (4)	49:7	64:22 65:23
52:13	33:16 36:24	9:17 20:7	verbally (1)	witness(es) (2)
teaches (1)	38:21 50:25	49:24 50:21	7:9	3:20 5:10
52:5			version (1)	
teaching (2)	51:2 58:5,6	type (6)	15:15	words (1)
36:20 58:22	three (3)	14:17 30:22		21:5
50.20 50.22	14:12 20:22	32:22 33:15	W	work (6)
		I		<u> </u>

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 95 of 529

January 8, 2024

[Page 77]

				[rage //]
14.10.10		0.14.01		
14:10,13	York (9)	28:14,21	5	
30:18 32:10	1:2,12,22 2:5,5	1DRVC (1)	50s (1)	
50:11,15	2:9 6:12 64:3	8:23	34:22	
worked (6)	64:8		55 (1)	
14:8,11 50:13		2	2:5	
50:14 51:25	Z	20 (3)	57 (1)	
54:5		30:16 34:22	62:9	
working (7)	0	65:24	02.7	
14:6 16:25	01/08/2024 (1)	2014 (1)	6	
19:6 36:6	65:2	11:12	60 (2)	
39:20 48:4		2019 (2)	51:25 62:4	
51:2	1	23:11 24:5		
works (2)	1 (15)	2023 (1)	60s (1)	
	8:15,17,22,23	47:22	34:23	
20:14 41:20	9:6,7 16:6	2024 (3)	7	
wouldn't (9)	22:11,14,21	1:13 61:20		
24:14 26:22	23:13 28:14		7/60 (1)	
35:4 38:11	29:23 34:2	64:23	62:4	
39:12 43:22	63:5	21st (1)	8	
59:16 60:25	1-5 (1)	64:23		
61:9	1:7	221 (1)	8 (2)	
written (1)	10 (1)	4:20	1:13 63:5	
55:14	21:8	24 (1)	80s (1)	
wrong (1)		62:8	34:25	
42:22	10:02 (1)		85 (1)	
	1:14	3	17:2	
X	100 (1)	300 (1)		
X (4)	1:12	2:9	9	
1:3,11 62:2	10018 (1)	3000 (1)	900094/2021	
63:2	2:5	21:14	1:10	
	11:10 (1)	3116 (1)	9000942021 (
Y	61:14	4:2	8:23	
Yeah (6)	11739 (1)	3117 (1)	90s (2)	
31:5 32:4	2:9	4:2	11:12,14	
35:18 39:19	11743 (1)	3500 (1)	,	
40:13 52:21	6:12	2:9		
year (1)	11th (1)	39th (1)		
32:18	2:5	2:5		
yearbook (1)	13 (1)	2.3		
36:14	10:8	4		
	198 (2)	440 (1)		
yearbooks (2)	8:11,24	6:11		
36:5,19	1984 (3)			
years (5)	17:2 23:10	457 (1)		
10:25 14:12		10:9		
22:24 45:13	36:6	48 (1)		
48:6	1985 (2)	62:9		
	1	1		

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 96 of 529

EXHIBIT C

12040 11	Pg 97 of 529
	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	Case No. 20-12345-mg
4	Adv. Case No. 20-01226-mg
5	x
6	In the Matter of:
7	
8	THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF ROCKVILLE CENTRE, NEW YORK,
9	
10	Debtor.
11	x
12	THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF ROCKVILLE CENTRE, NEW YORK,
13	Plaintiff,
14	v.
15	ARK 320 DEO, et al.,
16	Defendants.
17	x
18	
19	United States Bankruptcy Court
20	One Bowling Green
21	New York, NY 10004
22	
23	April 19, 2023
24	9:00 AM
25	
L	Veritext Legal Solutions

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

.2345-m	Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Pg 98 of 529	Main Document
		Page 2
1	BEFORE:	
2	HON MARTIN GLENN	
3	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE	
4		
5	ECRO: KEVIN SU & F. FERGUSON	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	Page 3
1	HEARING re Adversary proceeding: 20-01226-m The Roman
2	Catholic Diocese of Rockville Centre, Nev. ARK 320 DOE,
3	et al.
4	Hybrid Hearing RE: Motion For Preliminary Injunction Under
5	Sections 362 And I 05(A) Of The Bankruptcy Code. (related
6	document(s)167, 168, 126 to 135, 147, 148, 157, 158, 161 to
7	177, 179 to 192) The Parties anticipate that an evidentiary
8	hearing on the Motion will be set for two days on April 19
9	and April 20, 2023, with an extra day reserved on April 21,
10	2023. The evidentiary hearing will start at 9:00 AM (EST)
11	each day. Unless the Court determines otherwise, the hearing
12	will be conducted as a hybrid hearing and the parties and
13	witnesses may appear in person or by Zoom.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

Γ

	Pg 100 of 529
	Page 4
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	JONES DAY LLP
4	Attorneys for the Debtor
5	51 Louisiana Avenue
6	Washington, DC 20001
7	
8	BY: CHRIS DIPOMPEO
9	
10	PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
11	Attorneys for Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors
12	780 Third Avenue, 34th Floor
13	New York, NY 10017
14	
15	BY: KENNETH H. BROWN
16	IAIN A.W. NASATIR
17	GAIL S. GREENWOOD
18	
19	ALSO PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY:
20	CHARLES J. ADAMS
21	JASON P. AMALA
22	JEFFREY R. ANDERSON
23	JESSE BAIR
24	CORINNA BALL
25	KENNETH H. BROWN

20-12345-r	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Pg 101 of 529	Main Document
		Page 5
1	JOHN BUCHEIT	
2	ANDREW BUTLER	
3	LA ASIA S. CANTY	
4	JOHN DALY	
5	JENNIFER L. DEL MEDICO	
6	CHRISTOPHER DIPOMPEO	
7	KAREN B. DINE	
8	TODD GEREMIA	
9	GAIL S. GREENWOOD	
10	JOSHUA T. HOYT	
11	ANN V. KRAMER	
12	MICHELLE MCMAHON	
13	STUART S. MERMELSTEIN	
14	MIKE MISKELL	
15	JAMES MOFFITT	
16	CHARLES MOORE	
17	KAREN MORIARTY	
18	NURLAN ORUJLU	
19	KENNETH F. PORTER	
20	WILLIAM P. QUARANTA	
21	BENJANMIN ROSENBLUM	
22	ANDREW SILVERSHEIN	
23	THOMAS R. SLOME	
24	ERIK SORENSEN	
2 5	JAMES I. STANG	

	1 g 102 01 323		
		Page	6
1	ERIC PETER STEPHENS		
2	PATRICK STONEKING		
3	CATALINA SUGAYAN		
4	CHRISTOPHER A. ZEPF		
5	BRIAN R. DAVEY		
6	KAREN MORIARTY		
7	MALLORY C. ALLEN		
8	GEORGE CALHOUN		
9	EMILY CHARLTON		
10	ANGELA CIPOLLA		
11	SYDNEY E. CODD		
12	MITCHELL GARABEDIAN		
13	TRUSHA GOFFE		
14	UDAY GORREPATI		
15	WILLIAM C. HEUER		
16	JAMES N. HULME		
17	BRITTANY MITCHELL MICHAEL		
18	SIOBHAIN PATRICIA MINAROVICH		
19	JOHN G. REFIOR		
20	CHELSIE WARNER		
21	MATTHEW WILLIAMS		
22	CHARLIE B. D'ESTRIES		
23	ELIZABETH CATE		
24	ARIELLE FELDSHON		
25	CHARLOTTE ACHELAIS SCHERER		

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 103 of 529					
				I	age 7?
1		:	INDEX		
2					
3	WITNESSES:	DIRECT:	CROSS:	REDIRECT:	RECROSS:
4	KENNETH F. PORTER	94	98		
5	CHARLES MOORE	149	153	184	191
6	ERIC P. STEPHENS	196	207/256		
7					
8	EXHIBITS:				PAGE:
9	Insurance policies				10
10	Rebuttal Exhibit AF	A			264
11	Rebuttal Exhibit BE	3			265
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
l		VaritartIa	ral Solutions		

	Page 8
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE COURT: Please be seated. All right, good
3	morning, everybody. Do you wish to begin with short opening
4	statements? I read everything, okay, but I'll permit each
5	side to make short opening statements.
6	MR. DIPOMPEO: Sure, we'd be happy to, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: I'm sorry?
8	MR. DIPOMPEO: We'd be happy to, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Go ahead.
10	MR. DIPOMPEO: And Christopher DiPompeo, Jones
11	Day for the Debtor. Your Honor, we're here on
12	THE COURT: I'm having a little trouble. You have
13	to speak up.
14	MR. DIPOMPEO: I'm sorry.
15	THE COURT: Your last name is?
16	MR. DIPOMPEO: DiPompeo, with a D.
17	THE COURT: Yeah. Go ahead. Go ahead.
18	MR. DIPOMPEO: I'll try to speak up, Your Honor.
19	We're here on the Debtors' motion for a preliminary
20	injunction under Sections 362(a) and 105(a) of the
21	Bankruptcy Code to enjoin state court litigation filed
22	against the Debtor and particularly against related parties
23	under the New York's Child Victims Act. The diocese would
24	be presenting legal argument as well as the testimony of
25	three witnesses.

Page	9
	-

	Page 9
1	Before we get started, Your Honor, just a piece of
2	housekeeping. The I'd like to move, to the extent it's
3	not already in evidence, all of the Debtors' exhibits listed
4	on the joint pretrial order, with the exception of the
5	Kenneth Porter declarations, to which there's an exhibit.
6	We've confirmed with the Committee, we don't intend to move
7	the declaration itself into evidence. We do intend to move
8	the exhibits which are the insurance policies
9	THE COURT: Okay. Response?
10	MR. BROWN: No objection.
11	THE COURT: Yeah. Just want to tell me your name.
12	You're a new face to me.
13	MR. BROWN: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I'm Ken Brown
14	from Pachulski firm.
15	THE COURT: Thanks, Mr. Brown.
16	MR. BROWN: And we'll introduce ourselves as well.
17	THE COURT: Well, why don't you do that now?
18	MR. NASATIR: Iaian Nasatir, Your Honor, Pachulski
19	Stang.
20	THE COURT: Good.
21	MS. GREENWOOD: Gail Greenwood, also Pachulski
22	Stang.
23	THE COURT: Thank you very much. Okay. All
24	right, hearing no objection, the exhibits are in evidence
25	and we'll deal with the what about the insurance policies
	Varitavt Lagal Solutions

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 106 of 529 Page 10 1 that are attached to the Porter declaration? MR. NASATIR: We're fine with admitting them, Your 2 3 Honor. THE COURT: All right, so they'll be admitted into 4 5 evidence as well. 6 (Insurance policies entered into evidence) 7 MR. DIPOMPEO: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: What I would ask is to make sure --8 9 you could do this after the evidentiary hearing is over. 10 Just give me a separate exhibit list showing what -- that 11 they're each admitted in evidence, okay? 12 MR. DIPOMPEO: We'll easily be able to give you 13 something that's stipulated. 14 THE COURT: That's fine. Okay. Thanks. All 15 right, go ahead. 16 MR. DIPOMPEO: Your Honor, I have some binders to 17 hand up. 18 THE COURT: I got a lot of binders here. Is this 19 something different than --20 MR. DIPOMPEO: They're just slides, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. DIPOMPEO: May I approach? THE COURT: Yes, please. Thank you. Have you 23 shared the slides in advance with --24 25 MR. DIPOMPEO: We have not. We have not shared

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 107 of 529

Page 11

1	them in advance.
2	THE COURT: You know, I guess you raised my
3	basic view about slides is they should have been exchanged
4	before the hearing.
5	MR. DIPOMPEO: Yes, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: They're demonstrative purposes of
7	argument and not in evidence. Let's proceed.
8	MR. DIPOMPEO: I apologize, Your Honor.
9	Okay, thank you, Your Honor. First, I thought it
10	would be helpful to start with just a word about how we got
11	here, and I don't mean to belabor the point, but we filed
12	preliminary injunction on the first day of the case. At the
13	time, there were a little over 200 state court actions that
14	were pending against the Debtor and certain DRVC related
15	parties as the briefs call them.
16	The related parties are typically coinsureds under
17	the diocese program. Often they're parishes or affiliates.
18	Sometimes they are nonaffiliated entities that are covered
19	by insurance. Prior to the petition date, essentially all
20	of the CVA actions named both the diocese and the related
21	parties as defendants. Believer there were only five
22	prepetition lawsuits that didn't name the diocese and we'll
23	take a look at some of those cases in a bit, but generally
24	the complaints allege joint and several liability between
25	the diocese and the parish, based on theories of negligence,

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 108 of 529

Page 12

negligent supervision, and negligent hiring and assignment
 of the individual perpetrators.
 Because of the nature of the allegations and the

4 relationship between the DRVC related parties and the 5 Debtor, the DRVC always took an active role in litigating 6 those cases. You're going to hear testimony today from two 7 of the Debtor's professionals who were involved with this 8 before the petition date and they'll talk about their 9 observations of those -- of that litigation.

10 Ultimately, the state court litigation led the
11 Debtor to file for bankruptcy to because it could not
12 continue to litigate these cases piecemeal in state courts.
13 At the same time, the Debtor sought to stay litigation
14 against the parties because again, given the relationship of
15 --

16 THE COURT: Did any of the prepetition actions go 17 to judgment?

18 MR. DIPOMPEO: I don't believe any of them did, no. Many went past the answer stage into discovery. None 19 20 got to judgment. And the goal has always been to coordinate 21 and come with -- come up with a consensual Chapter 11 plan 22 that globally resolves all claims in a way that's equitable 23 for all survivors and allows the Debtor to continue its 24 charitable mission going forward, and that was always the 25 goal of the preliminary injunction.

Page 13

1	Now, the Committee initially opposed the
2	preliminary injunction but ultimately agreed to it
3	consensually in exchange for discoveries that would have
4	been provided in CVA actions and so on January 22nd, 2021,
5	Judge Chapman entered the preliminary injunction. The
6	original order is Docket 59 of the adversary proceeding.
7	Since that time, the PI has been extended several
8	times. Last July, just after the diocese finished its final
9	production of CVA merits materials, the Committee indicated
10	it would no longer support a continued PI. Now at that
11	time, Your Honor had just taken over the case. The case was
12	at a critical phase. It was just starting mediation. We
13	didn't think it was appropriate to shift focus to state
14	court litigation, so we moved for a contested preliminary
15	injunction.
16	Ultimately, after a conference with Your Honor and
17	per the negotiations, we agreed to another consensual
18	extension which went to January 13th. At that point, the
19	Committee again expressed an unwillingness to extend. That
20	ultimately put in motion where we are today. And we'll
21	discuss this more as we go along, but the diocese's
22	overarching point is that we're at an important point in the
23	restructuring process.
24	Mediation is about to resume with Judge Cave.
25	That's expected to last until May 31st or so. We don't

Pg 110 of 529

Page 14

1 believe it's the time to shift focus to state court 2 litigation where the focus will necessarily be on establishing liability rather than establishing value and 3 4 allocation. That's why we're seeking a time limited four 5 month extension of the stay to permit the mediation process 6 to play out. 7 We're not seeking an indefinite stay of the cases 8 and there may be a time when the PI is no longer necessary 9 or justified. We just don't think that is today. Think the 10 parties should be able to finish the mediation process 11 before resuming state court litigation. 12 Now, I think it would be helpful to spend a little 13 bit of time looking at the state court actions themselves 14 just to see what they look like. There are 490 state court 15 actions that are currently subject to the PI. At this 16 point, the Committee is only challenging the continued PI 17 with respect to 228 state court actions. Those are actions 18 that either don't name the Debtor or implicate Ecclesia 19 Insurance coverage. 20 We actually on further review, have identified five of those cases that we no longer believe should be 21 22 subject to the PI and we conferred with the Committee and 23 have removed those from the list. We filed a letter this 24 morning with Your Honor --25 THE COURT: I didn't see that.

212-267-6868

Page 15

MR. DIPOMPEO: That's okay.

1

15

25

2 THE COURT: Why did you conclude with respect to 3 these five additional ones that you don't want them to be 4 subject to the stay?

5 MR. DIPOMPEO: So there were 17 cases of the 228 6 that did not have a corresponding proof of claim. So we 7 reviewed those. We were able to identify proofs of claim 8 for 12 of those cases. Five of them were not, we could not 9 find a proof of claim so we concluded that because there's 10 no proof of claim, there's no claim against the estate and 11 there's no potential for impact on shared insurance. It 12 wasn't necessary to stay those.

As you'll see in the letter and I have an
unredacted copy I'd like to hand up the Court --

THE COURT: Sure. Thank you.

MR. DIPOMPEO:

16 MR. DIPOMPEO: You'll see on the letter also it 17 lists the proofs of claim with respect to the other 12 18 cases, just to fill out the record. So we're down to 223 19 contested state court actions. Let's take a closer look. 20 Can we go full screen on this? Is that possible? 21 THE COURT: What pages of the slide? 22 MR. DIPOMPEO: This should be Page 1 after the 23 cover page. 24 THE COURT: Okay. I have it in front of me.

It's okay. Let's go on to the next

Pg 112 of 529

Page 16 1 This is a preview of coming attractions on the left slide. 2 side. All of these alleged abuse occurring before 1986. That's when the Ecclesia program kicked in. None of the 3 cases named the diocese as a defendant and all but one of 4 5 the cases are related to a proof of claim. 6 I had mentioned earlier, they're all -- in 7 reality, there's actually one case that there's no proof of claim, but it was a prepetition case that was scheduled and 8 9 so it's functionally the same. There's a claim against the 10 estate with respect to every one of the contested cases. 11 THE COURT: Ask you this. Are any of these 223 12 subject to any of the omnibus claim objections that have been filed? 13 14 MR. DIPOMPEO: That is a good question that I'm 15 not --16 THE COURT: I just -- you know, we just issued 17 another opinion this morning with respect to the fifth 18 omnibus objection, sustaining the objections, but that just 19 got filed within the last half hour or so. 20 MR. DIPOMPEO: We will have to do a little work to 21 reconcile, but we will do that, Your Honor. 22 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I believe that they are. 23 THE COURT: So we have a clear record, each time 24 one of you speaks, you need to identify your name. 25 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, this is Ken Brown for the

	Page 17
1	Committee and in answer to your question, although as I sit
2	here I cannot identify which ones of the 23 223 are
3	subject to claims objections, it's my understanding that
4	some of them are and I'm sure that we can identify them for
5	you.
6	THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Thanks, Mr.
7	Brown.
8	MR. DIPOMPEO: Thank you, Mr. Brown. So as I
9	said, they're all subject to a proof of claim, some may be
10	subject to objections, but that's not a coincidence. It's
11	really because of the nature of the CVA actions and the type
12	of liability that's alleged against the parishes and the
13	diocese. That's why as I mentioned, generally all CVA cases
14	before bankruptcy named the diocese as a defendant.
15	Let's pull up next slide. This is ECF No. 169, DX
16	1. It's in evidence. It's a Rule 1006 summary of CVA
17	complaints that are subject to the PI. It contains a number
18	of very important information. CVA number. There's an
19	entry for related proofs of claim, list of the causes of
20	action are in there, a summary of the dates of alleged
21	abuse, notation about the insurance policies potentially
22	implicated.
23	We put this together and stipulated with the
24	Committee so the Court wouldn't have to review everything.
25	This is all the information the Court needs. But I think

Pg 114 of 529

Page 18 1 what I'd like to do, which would be helpful to understand 2 just the nature of these claims is to look at the case that's right in the middle of that chart. It's --3 4 THE COURT: Not anymore. 5 MR. DIPOMPEO: Yeah, not anymore. It's in your 6 binder. 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 MR. DIPOMPEO: I think we're going to pull out the 9 actual case and it actually should be in the back folder of 10 your binder. It CVA Index No. 9058 of 2020. 11 (Counsel conferring) MR. DIPOMPEO: So this is that is -- it was a case 12 13 filed against the diocese and against parishes. It's not part of the 223 cases. This is a prepetition case. 14 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. DIPOMPEO: But it's -- it will help --17 THE COURT: Let me just -- it's ion the binder. MR. DIPOMPEO: It's in the back of the binder. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Give me -- because there's a 20 bunch of (indiscernible) in the back. Let me just see if I 21 can find it. Okay, I've got it. 22 MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay. So I thought it would be helpful to look through this, just to see the nature of the 23 24 kind of complaints that are alleged when the diocese is 25 involved in the case. Let's go to Paragraph 6. As you can

212-267-6868

Page 19

1	see, Paragraph 6 identifies the diocese as a defendant.
2	Paragraph 8. Let's go to Paragraph 8. Diocese
3	"(indiscernible) several programs that seek out the
4	participation of children. The diocese through its
5	officials has complete control over these activities and
6	programs involving children. Diocese has the power to
7	appoint, train, and supervise, monitor, move, terminate
8	every person working with children within the diocese."
9	Paragraph 9 identifies the parish of the
10	defendant. You'll notice Paragraph 9 does not actually make
11	the same kind of allegations about power to appoint, train,
12	supervise that are made against the diocese. Paragraph 10
13	then alleged
14	THE COURT: Just so I'm clear, this involves the
15	diocese, not one of the non-debtors operated by religious
16	order?
17	MR. DIPOMPEO: Exactly. This involves the diocese
18	and a parish.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	MR. DIPOMPEO: And again, we're just trying to
21	illustrate what the cases look like
22	THE COURT: Sure.
23	MR. DiPOMPEO: when the diocese is involved.
24	Paragraph 10 alleges that the parish was and continues to be
25	under the direct authority, control, and province of

Pg 116 of 529

Page 20 1 defendant diocese and the bishop of the diocese and at all 2 times material, defendant St. Dominic's and diocese owned, operated and managed, maintained control of the school. 3 4 Moving down to Paragraph 14, this is the 5 individual perpetrator. All times material, Father Huneke 6 was Roman Catholic cleric employed by the diocese and St. 7 Dominic, so they're together in the allegations. There's no 8 distinction between the diocese and the parish with respect 9 to that, and that's what you'll see as we keep going through 10 this and we look at the claims. 11 There's no individualized claims of allegations 12 against the parish. The allegations are always against the 13 parish and diocese together, and so let's go to the first --14 THE COURT: And the priest. 15 MR. DIPOMPEO: And -- well, actually, no. 16 THE COURT: No? 17 MR. DIPOMPEO: Generally, the claims of 18 negligence, negligent supervision are just against the 19 diocese and the parish. There are intentional tort claims 20 in some but not all the cases against the individuals. So 21 let's go to the actual claims. 22 The first count is for negligence and this is typical. You'll see in the chart that most, all -- think 23 24 actually all -- it is all -- cases allege some form of 25 negligence against the parish or the diocese. And again,

Pg 117 of 529

you can see it's against all defendants. So defendants had a duty arising from this special relationship. Each defendant owed a duty of care.

4 Paragraph 26, count two is -- we can go to count 5 two. It's for negligent supervision and training. Again, 6 you'll see the same thing. The allegations are always 7 against both defendants. There's not a distinction between 8 the two in terms of this. We can go to Paragraph 43 just to speed this up. "At all times material, Father Huneke was 9 10 employed by defendants and under each defendant's direct 11 supervision and control."

12 And we could keep going through this, but I think 13 the point has been made. There's just -- they're always 14 together. So let's take this down. Let's go to now 15 Committee Exhibit B which is ECF 173. This is the list of 16 the 228 which is now 223 cases that the Committee filed. 17 Again, it's the same summary. It's just been redacted down 18 to the actual cases that are contested. So all of these 19 cases now, none of these cases actually name the diocese, so 20 all of these cases are solely against third parties. 21 THE COURT: These filed before or after the 22 Chapter 11 petition? 23 MR. DIPOMPEO: All but five of these were filed 24 after, which normally would not be surprising. Obviously, 25 the automatic stay normally would prohibit a claim against

Page 21

	Page 22
1	the Debtor. One thing that's interesting here is that the
2	PI order in Paragraph 5 has always allowed for CVA actions
3	to be commenced after the petition date. It lifts the stay
4	to allow the cases to be filed.
5	THE COURT: But not to prosecute.
6	MR. DIPOMPEO: Not to prosecute. Exactly.
7	Okay, so again, let's same information from the
8	charts. We've already seen the bigger chart. This is the
9	focus chart. Again, let's look at the case right in the
10	middle. It's 900148/2021. This is one of the 223 cases for
11	which a PI is contested. We'll pull it up in a second.
12	It's also in your binder. And this, it's from the same
13	counsel. We thought that'd be helpful just to clarify.
14	THE COURT: Who is the counsel?
15	MR. DIPOMPEO: It's the Anderson Anderson firm,
16	I believe. Just to be able to compare apples to apples, we
17	thought that would be helpful. We'll look at another case
18	with another counsel in just a second. But as you can see,
19	the complaint looks very similar. So we can go to Paragraph
20	5. Actually didn't point this out in the earlier complaint,
21	but Paragraph 5 is interesting and maybe more interesting
22	when it's a claim against where the diocese is not
23	involved, because Paragraph 5 does say whenever a reference
24	is made to a defendant, the reference also includes that
25	defendant's affiliates and others.

Page 23

1 So it's just a notable thing, because then we turn 2 to Paragraph 8, you see here, even though the diocese is not 3 a defendant in this case, there's still an allegation of 4 control. "At all material times, defendant St. Brigid was 5 under the direct authority, control, and province of the d 6 diocese." Again, the diocese is front and center even in 7 this complaint.

8 Let's go to Paragraph 10. You see the same thing. 9 This is the second defendant. There's two parishes kind of 10 merged at one point, but it's the same thing that's alleged 11 here. "The Carle Place Chapel remained under the direct 12 authority, control, and province of the diocese."

13 Let's go down to the negligence count. It's the 14 first count. So again, same thing. This looks very 15 familiar. Defendants had a duty arising. Defendants owed 16 plaintiff a duty of reasonable care. It's the same 17 allegations that were made in the prior complaint. The only 18 difference now is that because the diocese is not a 19 defendant, it's not names there, but it's --

THE COURT: Ask -- does the complaint contain allegations about notice? This is a subject of one of the omnibus objections. The argument is that applicable New York State law, there's no vicarious liability if it's a negligent supervision, hiring, et cetera, that is the issue about was there prior notice to the diocese or parish that

Pg 120 of 529

Page 24 1 the alleged abuser had been subject to an abuse claim. 2 MR. DIPOMPEO: So generally they do. I would have 3 to look more closely. I would not be surprised if this one 4 does, but notice foreseeability is always alleged because 5 it's an issue. 6 THE COURT: -- the state court -- the state law 7 cause of action. 8 MR. DIPOMPEO: Exactly. And it's an interesting 9 point, too, because the, you know, notice is going to be a 10 central issue in these cases from both sides, both on the 11 plaintiff side and the defense side, because plaintiffs 12 would want to prove notice to be able to prove the violation 13 of the duty of care, particularly the parish though will 14 often point to the diocese and say they may have had notice 15 because they have all the files for the perpetrator. 16 We didn't have the files. We were just assigned 17 the individual and so we didn't have notice. And so there's 18 -- when these cases were litigated before, there was kind of a mutual finger pointing. We actually have a chart which 19 20 will show some of that as we go. But notice is --21 THE COURT: Was there an answer to this complaint? 22 MR. DIPOMPEO: Not to this one because this was a 23 post-petition case. We have a chart of answers which we'll 24 get to. 25 THE COURT: Okay.

Page 25 1 MR. DIPOMPEO: We'll look at some of those. Okay. 2 Anyway, I think we can move on from some of this. Let's 3 just look at count two real quick. It's the same count as 4 before. It's negligent. Negligent training and 5 supervision. Same kind of allegations. And then count 6 three, let's look at that. 7 THE COURT: I'm just curious. It doesn't directly 8 relate to what is before me now, but in the independent 9 review process that existed before, was notice an issue that was addressed in those matters before the -- Ken Feinberg 10 11 and his colleague? 12 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow my colleague, Todd Geremia. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Geremia. 14 MR. GEREMIA: Your Honor, was the question, was --15 were issues like notice addressed before the --16 THE COURT: Just -- yeah, just identify yourself. 17 MR. GEREMIA: Sorry. Todd Geremia from Jones Day 18 for the Debtor. Thank you, Judge. 19 THE COURT: Yes. 20 MR. GEREMIA: Was your question whether issues 21 like notice, were they -- were those addressed before the 22 IRCP? 23 THE COURT: Yes. 24 MR. GEREMIA: Generally, no. The focus before the 25 IRCP was the credibility of the accusation with respect to

Page 26 1 the alleged abuse. 2 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay, let's look at -- let's look 3 at one more complaint. This one is CVA Index No. 4 5 400094/2021. This one is actually -- was exhibit, was in 6 the exhibits to the Committee's objection, was in Exhibit C, 7 so this is a case that the Committee has identified as 8 representative. Probably be helpful to look at that one as 9 There's a few notable things about this case. Let's well. 10 go to Paragraph 6. And this, by the way, is from a 11 different counsel. I don't remember exactly the counsel for this 12 13 case, but it's not the Anderson firm. But again, you see 14 the same kind of allegation that whenever reference is made 15 to the defendant entity, it includes the affiliates, again, 16 arguably implicating the diocese through that. 17 Let's go to Paragraph 22. This actually goes to 18 your question about notice and foreseeability. There's an 19 allegation. Again, this is a complaint that's one of the

20 223. It's not against the diocese and yet here we have in
21 Paragraph 22 an allegation that the pattern of practice of
22 intentionally refusing or failing to disclose identities and
23 locations of sexually inappropriate or abusive clerics has
24 been practiced by the diocese continues through the current
25 day.

	Page 27
1	THE COURT: So I just I take it there was no
2	discovery in state court in this action?
3	MR. DIPOMPEO: That's correct. This was also a
4	post-petition case that has been stayed.
5	THE COURT: You know, in any of the prepetition
6	state court actions, was there discovery regarding documents
7	or records that the diocese or the parish had with respect
8	to history of abuse claims regarding the alleged abuser?
9	MR. PHILLIPS: So my understanding and Mr.
10	Stephens will testify, can answer that question directly
11	later, but I'll give you my understanding is that there was
12	discovery in some of the prepetition cases, but it did not -
13	- I don't believe it went to the merits. I think the
14	initial discovery was written discovery and then financial
15	discovery of the diocese, general practices. Mr. Geremia
16	may be coming up here to correct me on that. Okay, he's
17	not.
18	But Mr. Stephens will be able to answer that.
19	Now, once we entered into Chapter 11 process as a condition
20	of the consensual PI, the diocese did agree to provide all
21	merits discovery to the Committee and has done that, so
22	THE COURT: So I last week was searching the
23	docket and I saw most of what I saw discovery requests
24	and responses well, I didn't see the responses, I mean,
25	but most of the discovery requests were of financial

Pg 124 of 529

Page 28 1 information and I didn't come across discovery requests that 2 address the issues of any documents relating to the notice issue, short handing (indiscernible), but I think you all 3 understand what I'm talking about. 4 5 MR. DIPOMPEO: We do. Now, are you referring to 6 the discovery in the Chapter 11 case or --7 THE COURT: Well, that's why I looked at the 8 docket only in the Chapter 11 case, but I was particularly 9 interested in whether -- particularly because there wasn't 10 discovery in the state court actions, at least the post --11 certainly the post-petition ones, whether there was 12 discovery during the Chapter 11 case that focused on the 13 issues of notice of, you know, any records that were kept. 14 Certainly, you know, if -- well, I looked at the 15 grand jury report, for example, which is many years ago. It 16 suggested that there were -- I'll use this term, but I'm not 17 -- I don't mean to be -- secret files that -- of alleged I don't know whether there in fact were or were not. 18 abuse. 19 But I guess my question was, was there discovery during the 20 course of the Chapter 11 case that would have required the 21 diocese to produce whatever records, previously secret or 22 otherwise, showing a history of alleged abuse by any priests 23 or others who have been accused of being abusers. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: So the answer is yes, there was. 25 It may not show up in the docket, because it was generally

Page 29 1 handled through informal requests. 2 THE COURT: I -- that's what -- I actually looked on the docket, but I couldn't find anything in the docket. 3 4 Mr. Brown, do you --5 MR. BROWN: Yeah, if -- I'm sorry to interrupt and 6 I -- it was only by way of trying to be additive and perhaps clarify something for the Court. I'm being told to say my 7 8 name. 9 THE COURT: I said your name. Go ahead. 10 MR. BROWN: Ken Brown. So in the Chapter 11 case, 11 and this would not show up on the docket, the document is in 12 evidence. It's one of the stipulations between the 13 Committee and the Debtor pursuant to which this injunction 14 was continued nine times. One of those nine times somewhere

15 in the middle, a condition of the stipulation was that the 16 diocese produce -- and I think the language -- Gail, do you 17 have the language?

18 The language of the stipulation is the document --19 that the diocese would produce all documents relevant to the 20 CVA litigation. And so that's a very broad request. I 21 believe it was complied with and the Debtor has said it was, 22 so we have no reason to believe it's not. But I can't say specifically that I have looked and seen whether or not 23 24 there were notice related discovery there. But the 25 assumption is that during the course of the Chapter 11 case,

Page 30 1 all documents relevant to the CVA were produced to the 2 Committee. 3 THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: It's Exhibit P is the original PI 4 It's docket 59. At the end of that, there's an 5 order. 6 appendix and it says the condition which Mr. Brown just 7 mentioned, which is the diocese agrees to produce all the 8 documents that would have been produced in CVA actions. 9 THE COURT: Yeah, that's fine. We can come back 10 to that. I mean, you know, there may have been lots of 11 discussions that went on between counsel about what was 12 intended by the scope of that request and agreement to 13 produce. My particular interest was -- on this question is 14 whether there was a diligent search made for any documents 15 from the diocese relating to the issue of notice. 16 You know, I certainly noted that the grand jury

17 reportedly suggested there were secret files. Whether there 18 were or were not is -- and I'm not asking about that. It's 19 -- but it was understood by the diocese and its counsel that 20 it was required and did produce any documents that related 21 to the issue of notice. So it would be if Father X was the 22 subject of an abuse claim, any records that would show 23 whether there had been issues raised with the diocese 24 before, before that alleged abuse involving the same priest, 25 for example. And I couldn't -- that's what I couldn't tell

Page 31 1 from, you know -- nothing drilled down to the issue I'm 2 asking about. 3 MR. BROWN: It's not something the --4 THE COURT: Mr. Brown, go ahead. 5 MR. BROWN: -- the Committee drilled down on, so 6 we don't know the answer. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. So on. I don't --8 MR. DIPOMPEO: It's okay. It's a good question, 9 and in fact, I would invite you to ask Mr. Stephens that 10 question because he actually led the process. But I know 11 from talking to Mr. Stephens we believe we produced every 12 file, every personnel file. 13 THE COURT: All right, go ahead. 14 MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay. We're on Paragraph 22. 15 Again, the focus is on the diocese. Let's go to 37, 16 Paragraph 37. Again, it's the nature of the Catholic 17 church, pressured plaintiff not to report, so there's again 18 an emphasis on the diocese and the broader process. But 19 let's get down to the causes of action. Again, the first is 20 negligence. It's the same kind of cause of action. Again, 21 this is a case just against the parish so the diocese is not 22 named as a defendant, but it's the same sort of allegation, 23 the theory being --24 THE COURT: On this specific point, is there a 25 proof of claim against the diocese involving this specific

Page 32

1	alleged abuse?
2	MR. DIPOMPEO: There is, there is. For every one
3	and of the 223. Yep. And that's the underlying point. There
4	is what happened in all of these cases is there is an
5	alleged incident or a series of incidents of sexual abuse.
6	There's often claims against the individual perpetrator but
7	not always. There are always claims against the related
8	party and the diocese for negligence, negligent supervision,
9	negligence training, but their role roles in allowing
10	this to potentially happen.
11	So, you know, what should we take away from all
12	this? And you can put this down.
13	We don't think the liability of the parishes and
14	the liability of the diocese can be separately litigated.
15	They're bound up with each other. There may be factual
16	differences, but the underlying conduct is always the same,
17	the legal theories are always the same, and ultimately,
18	because of the overlap of legal theories underlying facts,
19	the diocese is going to have to involved in the defense.
20	THE COURT: But you I think you said this
21	already. These complaints allege joint and several
22	liability.
23	MR. DIPOMPEO: Correct.
24	THE COURT: And so, you know, when I faced this
25	issue before in other cases, I mean, you've argued in your
	Waritant Land 10 shating

Pg 129 of 529

Page 33 1 pleadings about necessary parties, joint and several 2 liability. The laws is, it's not necessary parties. Ι 3 mean, it can go forward against some but not all defendants, correct? 4 5 MR. DIPOMPEO: That's correct, yes. There are 6 rules of apportionment, potentially, that could be 7 implicated. 8 THE COURT: Ultimately there might be. That's 9 true. 10 MR. DIPOMPEO: But it's true that there could be 11 joint and several liability. Now, if a joint and several 12 judgment were entered against the parish, obviously the result would be a claim for contribution --13 14 THE COURT: I understand. I understand. But you 15 know, if the survivor recovers a judgment against the non-16 debtor and it's joint and several liability, if the judgment 17 is satisfied, the -- let's assume that the parish is solvent 18 or insurance covers, whatever. The judgment is satisfied in 19 full. 20 The parish asserts a claim for contribution and/or 21 indemnity against the diocese and if that claim is allowed 22 and the diocese is insolvent, meaning its assets -- you 23 know, its liabilities exceed its assets, those claims are 24 paid in bankruptcy dollars, meaning a pro rata distribution 25 among the same class of creditors.

Page 34

1	So the abuse survivor can recover 100 cents, but
2	the parish on its claim for contribution and/or indemnity
3	recovers only what creditors assuming that that claim is
4	ultimately allowed recovers only, let's just
5	hypothetically say 50 percent. The survivor recovers
6	everything that he or she is entitled to, but the parish
7	recovers only whatever claims in that class recovered.
8	Correct?
9	MR. DIPOMPEO: I think the yes. I think the
10	complicating factor, though, is insurance. So in this
11	scenario, the parish potentially got reimbursed from
12	insurance and when seeking contribution, it's not clear to
13	me that the diocese could recover the insurance proceeds
14	that the parish group would've been paid.
15	THE COURT: Well, if that was one of, you know,
16	I asked this question when we had a phone hearing the other
17	day, was about single satisfaction rule. And I'm interested
18	in that as well. I mean, some of this really kind of ties
19	together. I don't know what if the survivor recovers 100
20	percent of its claim, then the issue is going to be whether
21	there's an indemnification or contribution claim. If the
22	insurance has paid it in full and the insurance covers the
23	diocese as well, there may be nothing separately to recover
24	from the diocese.
25	MR. DIPOMPEO: It's possible. I do also want to

Pg 131 of 529

Page 35 1 say, though, that it's in that scenario, I think from an 2 economic perspective, it's easy to see how the diocese would 3 be neutral. You're substituting one claim for the other, 4 substituting the parish's indemnity claim for the 5 plaintiff's. 6 THE COURT: One may get paid in full and the other 7 not. 8 MR. DIPOMPEO: Right. However, I do think it's 9 important to note that in that scenario, the diocese would 10 have lost merits-based defenses that it could have asserted 11 in the underlying case. And so --THE COURT: Maybe, maybe not. I don't know. 12 If 13 the diocese believes that it has defenses, I don't --14 nothing that I read in any of the briefs convinces me that 15 they'll lose them if the parish, you know, if its claim is -16 - if the claim of the abuser survived, is paid in full and 17 if the parish then asserts a contribution claim in the 18 bankruptcy case. 19 It's -- why is it -- what -- I didn't see caselaw 20 that says that the diocese loses the ability to assert 21 whatever defenses it may have. It may have defenses. It 22 may not have defenses. I don't know. 23 MR. DIPOMPEO: Well, that -- I think --24 THE COURT: There's not vicarious liability. Ι 25 mean -- at least my reading of the caselaw, New York caselaw

	Page 36
1	is there is not vicarious liability. There has to be you
2	know, it would have to be shown not just that a parish was
3	negligent, but the diocese was negligent, otherwise
4	because there's I am wrong? I mean, I've been digging
5	into this New York State caselaw on this. There's not
6	vicarious liability.
7	MR. BROWN: You just stole my oral argument.
8	MR. DIPOMPEO: There is certainly not vicarious
9	liability.
10	THE COURT: Well, we didn't identify Mr. Brown,
11	but that's okay. The record should reflect that Mr. Brown
12	said I stole his argument.
13	MR. DIPOMPEO: There's certainly not vicarious
14	liability with respect to individual perpetrator up the
15	chain.
16	THE COURT: Is there vicarious liability for the
17	diocese where a contribution claim is asserted?
18	MR. DIPOMPEO: So the issue is that the
19	THE COURT: The claim is for negligence, negligent
20	supervision, negligent hiring, but maybe I missed the case
21	that says it's vicarious liability for the diocese.
22	MR. DIPOMPEO: I think issue, the reason these
23	allegations have control often show up in these complaints
24	is because the plaintiffs will ultimately want to impute the
25	knowledge of the diocese down to the parishes and impute

	Page 37
1	knowledge of the parishes up to the diocese. Now that is
2	something we would resist.
3	THE COURT: I'm sure you would contest that.
4	MR. DIPOMPEO: Right.
5	THE COURT: (indiscernible) go ahead.
6	MR. DIPOMPEO: But the point is that I think at
7	this stage, we need to take the allegations and particularly
8	when we're talking about Section 105, we're looking for
9	THE COURT: Allegations are not what give rise to
10	an ultimate allowance of a claim.
11	MR. DIPOMPEO: That's certainly true.
12	THE COURT: There's got to be proof.
13	MR. DIPOMPEO: That's certainly true. But I think
14	if the 105 injunction
15	THE COURT: Proof and the applicable these are
16	issues of state law and so I'd have to look at the
17	applicable principles of New York State law with respect to
18	any claim for indemnification or contribution. And I
19	none of the cases I've read so far suggested that because as
20	I understand it, there's no written indemnity agreement with
21	the parishes, so it would be common law, indemnity or
22	contribution. You I'm right about
23	MR. DIPOMPEO: That's correct. Yes. Yes. I
24	think we go I think we end up with issues of res
25	judicata, but my broader point is I think at this stage

Г

Pg 134 of 529

Page 38 1 we're looking for risks and I think Your Honor's decision in 2 1031 Tax Group case shows that when we're looking at a 3 Section 105 injunction --4 THE COURT: You've missed something. I granted a

90-day stay, injunction for 90 days subject to possible
extension. Not reflected in the opinion is the history of
what happened. That 90-day injunction was consensually
extended until there was a global settlement. But I only -I made clear, I only granted a 90-day injunction.

We're now almost three years into this case and you know, last week I wrote an opinion in Silicon Valley Bank Financial Group, SVB Financial Group and I granted a 12 day preliminary injunction.

Not reflected in the opinion was something I said on the record during the hearing. I grant -- I'm granting this, you know -- I hadn't ruled yet but I said, if I grant this requested relief, don't come back and ask for the 121st day. Okay. They're for limited periods of time.

MR. DIPOMPEO: Absolutely, Your Honor. And I -we recognize that completely and I do want to emphasize that we're also looking for a -- I realize the stay has been in place consensually for a very long time. And that just is where we are. And we also recognize the stay is not going to last forever, was not meant to last forever. But we think we're at an reflection point now where the mediation

Page 39

1	process is about to play out over the next month and a half.
2	And so what we're asking for is a limited period
3	of time on a nonconsensual basis, and it may be that we
4	don't come back and ask for the 121st day because your order
5	says, don't ask for the 121st day. But we think that four
6	months to allow the mediation process to play out and either
7	move toward confirmation
8	THE COURT: I mean, the as I understand
9	look, I didn't see the orders that got entered by the
10	District Court with respect to Magistrate Judge Cave. But
11	in my communications with both the Committee and the
12	Debtors' counsel regarding the appointment of a magistrate
13	judge as the mediator, I ask that you seek to agree on a
14	date by which the magistrate judge would no longer be the
15	mediator, unless she approved and that was May 31st.
16	MR. DIPOMPEO: Thirty-first. Yes.
17	THE COURT: So you know, as I understand it,
18	Magistrate Judge Cave is committed to be a co-mediator
19	through May 31st, and beyond that will be some you know,
20	I mean, she'll decide whether to extend it but she has no
21	obligation to remain as the co-mediator beyond May 31st.
22	So, that's not four months, that's not however long out that
23	you're asking for. It's a very short period of time and I
24	guess the only certainly in colloquy with counsel, I get
25	very different views about whether the mediation is making

Page 40 1 progress, but there's no reason to go -- we're not going to 2 go into that now. 3 Yes, I hope that, you know, over the month of May, substantial progress will be made and move this case off of 4 5 where it is now, which is not a good place. 6 MR. DIPOMPEO: You're right, Your Honor, and we'll 7 move on in a second, but I agree completely that the next 45 days or so between now and May 31st is -- I mean, from our 8 9 perspective, a very critical time. We have the mediator at 10 that time. I think we should be focused on mediation and we 11 are just concerned that if tomorrow the stay were lifted, 12 and we had to scramble to figure out how to help defend 200 13 cases in state court that would just necessarily divert 14 attention.

15 You know, the four month request was the request 16 made in July. We think that's an appropriate time to allow 17 the mediation process to play out and either move towards 18 confirmation or get things organized to attempt to resolve 19 the state court litigation in the coordinate fashion. THE COURT: Well, it -- I'm not saying it is, but 20 21 it might be appropriate if I were to rule that no 22 preliminary injunction will remain in place but have the effective date of an order as June one subject to, you know, 23 24 an application to extend it beyond that, if the, you know, 25 if Magistrate Judge Cave reported, yes, we're making real

	Page 41
1	progress. I don't think any of you, if you really thought
2	there was real progress being made in the mediation
3	MR. DIPOMPEO: Wouldn't be here.
4	THE COURT: I don't think any of you would be
5	saying no, we want to go spend our resources on litigating.
6	Okay. The question is, is real progress being made. And so
7	I mean, that's not I'm not, I haven't decided this yet.
8	There are strong arguments made on both sides about the
9	injunction. But if I were to decide there should be no
10	preliminary injunction going forward, the effective date of
11	that order might be June 1 subject to further extension, you
12	know.
13	I would much rather you all get this resolved in
14	mediation than spending your resources litigating it.
15	That's why I raised in the telephone hearing earlier, I
16	didn't I don't look, not looking for a response now on
17	the motion to dismiss, which is now scheduled for May 16th,
18	whether that should be put off until after, you know, June
19	1st after you know, spend your time figuring out how to
20	solve this case rather than litigating these issues. I
21	don't want an answer on that now. Go ahead.
22	MR. BROWN: Just, Your Honor
23	THE COURT: Mr. Brown.
24	MR. BROWN: I think that we
25	THE COURT: Mr. Brown, just name yourself, Mr.

	Page 42
1	Brown.
2	MR. BROWN: Pardon me?
3	THE COURT: Your name.
4	MR. BROWN: Ken Brown. I apologize. I do think
5	that we owe you a response to the question on whether the
6	preliminary the motion to dismiss is going to be put off,
7	and we will address that at the appropriate time
8	THE COURT: I don't need an answer now. go ahead.
9	MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: I kind of got diverted on a bunch of
11	issues here.
12	MR. DIPOMPEO: That's okay. We're here to answer
13	your questions. And okay. So the upshot of this is even
14	with the diocese not the named defendant, it's always its
15	conduct is always at issue; 223 state court actions with
16	related proof of claim which is necessarily going to have to
17	be litigated in parallel and we're setting up dueling
18	litigation which will just require the diocese to be
19	involved in the defense, even if it's not a defendant.
20	Let's move on. Let's move on. So I think we'll
21	shift gears to legal argument here. We think a preliminary
22	injunction is justified for two reasons. One is, we think,
23	Section 362(a), both (a)(1) and (a)(3) of the Bankruptcy
24	Code, likely automatically stays all the cases anyway, but
25	even if not, if there are some cases that fall outside of

212-267-6868

Г

Page 43

	-
1	that or some defendants that fall outside of that,
2	preliminary injunction under Section 105 is appropriate.
3	THE COURT: Let me suggest this. I'll let you go
4	forward with this argument. I've read everything. My
5	clerks and I have spent a lot of time analyzing the law and
6	I'm not ruling at this point. This would be more
7	appropriate at a closing argument, it seems to me, when the
8	facts are in, what you think. But if you want to go ahead
9	with it now, fine. But I understand the law.
10	MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay. We can put it off until
11	later. It's no problem at all. Let me just jump forward
12	and we may just
13	THE COURT: I see you've got slides that deal with
14	the insurance policy. That's a different that's a
15	factual issue.
16	MR. DIPOMPEO: Let's jump ahead to the insurance.
17	Let's go to the slide with respect to the insurance buckets.
18	Here we go. So the Debtors' insurance program is on the
19	screen. You'll hear testimony today from Mr. Porter about
20	the program, the policies. The underlying policies are all
21	in evidence. And the insurance coverage applicable to the
22	223 cases generally falls under two buckets. It's Royal 137
23	cases there, and London, there's 99 cases there. There's
24	also the Ecclesia policies. Again, those are not subject to
25	the contested stay here.

Page 44 1 So let's go on. So Courts generally -- and know 2 this --3 THE COURT: Are there claims that overlap? In other words, that involve where alleged abuse was --4 5 MR. DIPOMPEO: There are. 6 THE COURT: -- repeated and more than one policy 7 potentially is called on to respond? 8 MR. DIPOMPEO: There are. We have numbers. 9 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. 10 MR. DIPOMPEO: Your Honor knows this, but -- well, 11 actually, this may be a closing argument point, too, but 12 I'll preview it here. 13 It was well established in case in caselaw that policies themselves are property of the estate. There's 14 15 always a question as to whether the proceeds of those 16 policies are property of the estate. There's --17 THE COURT: I've addressed that issue in D&O 18 cases. MR. DIPOMPEO: Exactly. Now, the Court has always 19 20 focused on aggregate limits there because you're dealing 21 with a separate claim, D&O claim versus the aggregate. Boy 22 Scouts decision in the bankruptcy court is helpful in that 23 the Boy Scouts opinion look at a situation like ours, where 24 there's not an aggregate limit there are per occurrence 25 limits and you have liability asserted against the Debtor

Page 45

1	and the third party, and what Boy Scouts says is that
2	because of these per occurrence limits, and because of the
3	fact that the allegations allege a single occurrence, that
4	is sufficient to make policies with per occurrence limits
5	property of the estate, too, because there's a limit that
6	would be depleted if paid to one joint and several
7	tortfeasor and not available to the Debtor.
8	THE COURT: That's one of the reasons I asked the
9	question about a single satisfaction before. You know, if
10	an abuse survivor got a million-dollar judgment against the
11	parish, does the survivor have a separate claim against the
12	diocese for something above the million dollars? It didn't
13	seem to me they did and if they don't and if it's satisfied,
14	the single satisfaction rule comes into play, so I'm not
15	sure how the per occurrence limit would it would have
16	been paid.
17	There wouldn't be an issue of a claim exceeding
18	the per you know, per occurrence limits of the parish,
19	per occurrence limits for the diocese. But if the
20	occurrence was the million dollars and the judgment was
21	satisfied either from insurance or from assets of the
22	parish, now does the per how does this argument about the
23	per excuse me, per occurrence limit come into play for
24	the diocese?
25	MR. DIPOMPEO: I think there's two ways. One

Pg 142 of 529

Page 46 1 would be, the plaintiff may not agree that the million 2 dollars is the appropriate damages. It's possible they 3 asked for more and the jury gave something less. 4 THE COURT: I'm sorry, say --5 MR. DIPOMPEO: The plaintiff in the state court 6 action may not agree that a million is the appropriate level 7 of damages. And so they may seek to relitigate that. Now, 8 we would of course assert collateral estoppel and preclusion from that judgment, but that's an uncertain question as to 9 10 whether that would be applied, so there could potentially be 11 an effort to recover more. 12 THE COURT: It's certainly not -- this is not a 13 slam dunk issue for you. That's why I asked the question on 14 the phone a few days ago about single satisfaction. It may 15 be that the survivor has different theories of liability for 16 parish or school or the diocese, but the survivor has to 17 prove up his or her damages. And it may be that those 18 damages are recoverable on a variety of theories, but what's 19 the law? That's why I asked -- that was a question. I'm 20 not prepared. I don't know what the answer is. 21 MR. DIPOMPEO: So I think the second reason would 22 be because of the apportionment rules under New York, state It's Article 16 of the CPLR. And so in this 23 law. situation, with this million-dollar judgment against the 24 25 parish, that could potentially have been -- maybe the

Pg 143 of 529

Page 47 1 damages were \$4 million but the jury determined that the 2 parish was 25 percent liable so it issued a judgment for a 3 million dollars against the parish. Parish then goes and 4 collects that from insurance or the insurance pays the 5 plaintiff directly. 6 THE COURT: Let's assume that there was no stay 7 and the jury returned a \$4 million verdict. I don't know 8 what was the -- I don't know what the per occurrence limits 9 were in the different policy years. 10 MR. DIPOMPEO: It varies. At the low end it's 11 \$150,000. At the high end, it's \$45 million. 12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So let's assume 13 that the jury returns a verdict in excess of the per 14 occurrence limit and allocates -- you know, the judgment 15 says that the -- obviously the diocese is not in the trial, 16 but says that the judgment against the parish is for \$1 17 million of the four, total \$4 million, 25 percent of the 18 total. 19 That -- I mean, in the absence of the bankruptcy, 20 you know, the insurance would respond up to the per 21 occurrence limit and the balance would be left to the 22 judgment debtors. So I don't see, if the jury determined 25 23 percent fault for the parish with joint and several 24 liability, how much gets paid by the parish when it's the 25 only -- I assume only pays the million dollars.

	Page 48
1	MR. DIPOMPEO: Well, if it's joint and several, so
2	there's no apportionment, then
3	THE COURT: Okay, but you were positing the case
4	where the jury has determined percentage of fault.
5	MR. DIPOMPEO: Yes. So in that situation
6	THE COURT: If it hasn't, you know, if the jury
7	says joint and several liability, \$4 million and there's a
8	\$1 million per occurrence limit, insurance that's going to
9	respond, the first response to the million, and there's
10	three million that's not covered.
11	MR. DIPOMPEO: That's right, which would be the
12	responsibility of the parish and we should deal with these
13	separately, because I think
14	THE COURT: Okay, go ahead.
15	MR. DIPOMPEO: So just to focus on that one for a
16	second. Be a million dollars against the parish, \$3 million
17	from insurance, \$3 million from the parish's other assets to
18	the extent it has it. Parish would then assert a
19	contribution claim against the diocese and say we're only 25
20	percent at fault or whatever it would be. If the insurance
21	has already been paid to the parish, it's not clear that the
22	diocese would be able to recover any of that amount.
23	THE COURT: But that would be true if there was no
24	stay, if you weren't a Debtor and insurance you know, if
25	the jury had allocated fault and the parish was 25 percent

Page 4	19
--------	----

1	liable, it recovers a million dollars from the parish and,
2	you know, the diocese winds up with a \$3 million judgment
3	against it. If so I mean, there's a difference between
4	the joint and several liability and a fault based system.
5	MR. DIPOMPEO: It's true and I think the issue
6	comes up with respect to the timing break here because
7	there's potentially could be litigation against the
8	parish while the litigation against the diocese and the
9	proof of claim process is playing out. So there's the
10	difference of timing and actually the harder case is the
11	apportionment case, so let's just focus on Royal, for
12	example. There's many years in the Royal policies where
13	there's a \$300,000 per occurrence limit.
14	Now, to be fair, those are the lowest. There's
15	150 and 300. Those were some of the lowest. It gets higher
16	as you go later in time, but for sake of illustration, let's
17	look at the 300. So \$4 million judgment and the jury says
18	the parish is 25 percent responsible. The non-present
19	parties are 75 percent responsible. The parish now is
20	responsible to pay a million dollars and only a million
21	dollars.
22	And so we turn to the insurance company and say
23	300,000 of that, I need to be reimbursed to be able to pay
24	my share of this judgment. \$300,000 of insurance money
25	would go to the plaintiff, \$700,000 of parish money would go

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

516-608-2400

Page 50

1	to the plaintiff.
2	Later in the proof of claim process, we'd be here
3	and the claim the plaintiff would say, well, I already
4	I have a \$4 million judgment. A million was paid by the
5	parish because they were 25 percent at fault. The diocese
6	is 75 percent at fault, or whatever they would say, and so
7	we want to collect the other \$3 million from the diocese.
8	THE COURT: There's be a question of whether there
9	is preclusive effect from a judgment, an action when the
10	diocese was not a party.
11	MR. DIPOMPEO: There would absolutely be a
12	question. And it's be a question on 200 cases the Court
13	would have to resolve, 200 proofs of claim. But I think the
14	point is, let's just say it is for let's just say it is
15	because it makes the illustration easier. At that point,
16	there's a \$3 million allowed claim against the diocese, but
17	the diocese no longer has access to that \$300,000 of
18	insurance because it was already paid to the parish to
19	satisfy its million dollars. And so that's the situation
20	that we're concerned about with respect to these per
21	occurrence limits.
22	THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
23	MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay, let's move on and look at
24	some of the facts here with respect to these here is
25	actually the chart of per occurrence limits. As you can
l	Varitaret Lagal Calutions

212-267-6868

Page 51 1 see, it starts out --2 THE COURT: And it shows the years. I see that. 3 MR. DIPOMPEO: It shows the years, yeah. It's 4 just an illustration. 5 Okay, real policies with no aggregate limits. 6 This is the first bucket. It's 1950 --7 THE COURT: Are you going to cover how much of the 8 premiums were paid by the parish and how much by the -- is 9 that in your charts? 10 MR. DIPOMPEO: It's not in my charts. I do have 11 estimate of that, to respond to the Court's question. Happy 12 to --13 THE COURT: Go ahead. Go ahead with your 14 presentation. 15 MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay. We'll come back to this at the end of the insurance material. So first is the Royal 16 17 policies with no aggregate limits. It's 1957 to 1970. 18 Provides coverage to both Debtor and non-debtor parties. 19 They're very -- they're low limits on the primary policies. 20 As the years go on, the umbrella policies kick in and there 21 are higher limits, two to four, but they're still not 22 enormous limits. There is coverage for defense costs outside of the policy limits. So it's not -- doesn't 23 24 deplete limits. There are 64 cases in this bucket and I 25 believe those are all exclusively within --

Page 52 1 THE COURT: May I ask this question? Prepetition, 2 were the relevant insurers, depending on the policy years 3 involved, responding for defense costs? MR. DIPOMPEO: I believe the -- maybe we should 4 5 fact check on this, but I believe the Royal Arrowood company 6 was paying the defense costs. I believe that the London 7 insurers were not because they ultimately regard that as 8 part of the ultimate net loss. 9 I'm sorry, I couldn't hear that. THE COURT: 10 THE COURT: I don't believe the London insurers 11 were because I think that they regard this as part of the 12 ultimate net loss and so they'll pay at the end when there's 13 a full damage. Okay. 14 Okay, so let's move on. So the first bucket is 15 Royal policies with no aggregate limits. The second is 16 Royal with aggregate limits. They're actually policies from 17 1970 to 1976 that you have aggregate limits. That's our 18 only aggregate limit bucket in the insurance world until you 19 get to 1986 and after with Ecclesia, but here the aggregate 20 limits are fairly low. It's \$4 million to \$12 million. And 21 so you don't have even the question the Court was just 22 asking which is what do you do with respect to a per 23 occurrence limit. 24 Any judgment that's paid is going to deplete the

25 \$4 million to \$12 million aggregate limit and so for the 73

Pg 149 of 529

Page 53

1	cases that fall into that bucket, and there are some
2	overlapping, any amounts paid for those cases is going to
3	deplete money available to everybody else. That's 73 cases
4	that we think at a minimum should probably still be subject
5	to automatic stay. Those these cases are all shaded in
6	gray in the stipulated chart at ECF 173 which is, believe,
7	Committee Exhibit B, so you can quickly identify what they
8	are.

9 Okay. One more point on Royal. So I've mentioned 10 defense costs are paid outside policy limits, but there is 11 actually a practical limit on the ability to recover defense costs and that's that Arrowood's financial statements which 12 are in the record -- it's DX-9 -- note that the Delaware 13 14 Department of Insurance, that there is recognized financial distress of Arrowwood, the risk-based capital ratios befall 15 16 the statutory levels, below the statuary level and the 17 Department of Insurance could seek to put Arrowood in 18 rehabilitation any time.

And so we regard that as a practical limitation that has -- if defense costs are being paid on the state court actions as they go out, while there is no aggregate limit and the defense costs would be outside of the policy limits themselves, they're taking from a limited pot of money at Arrowwood.

25

THE COURT: Are these same insurers, the insurers

Pg 150 of 529 Page 54

1 in many of the other diocese insolvency proceedings around 2 the country? 3 MR. DIPOMPEO: Yes. Yes, they are. Yeah. Okay, let's move on to the London policies, slightly different 4 facts here. It's 1976 to 1986. They also provide coverage 5 6 to the Debtor and the related parties. There's per 7 occurrence limits. There's no aggregate limits. Per occurrence limits range from \$5 million to \$45 million, 8 9 depending on the policy period. We saw the chart. 10 Here, defense costs do delete policy limits. So 11 as the defense costs are incurred, it depletes the insurance 12 available on the same claim, the same occurrence for others. 13 There's 99 cases in this bucket. Seventy are exclusively in 14 London years and then there's 29 that overlap with later 15 Royal years, the Royal aggregate policies. One thing that I 16 think is -- well --17 THE COURT: And you said the London policies have 18 not been responding for defense costs? 19 MR. DIPOMPEO: They've been crediting defense 20 costs, but they've not been paying defense costs. So let's 21 just --22 THE COURT: Is that an issue that's being 23 litigated in the coverage cases in the District Court? 24 MR. NASATIR: Excuse me, Your Honor. Iain 25 Nasatir, Pachulski Stang. The LMI policies don't have any

	Page 55
1	obligation to pay defense costs. They don't have a duty to
2	defend. They have a duty to reimburse defense costs and as
3	Mr. DiPompeo said, they do not do that until there is an
4	ultimate net loss, be it a settlement or judgment at which
5	time they reimburse for defense costs.
6	THE COURT: Is that an issue that's being
7	litigated in any of the coverage cases pending in the
8	District Court as to whether they have an obligation to
9	respond with respect to defense costs?
10	MR. NASATIR: Yes, Your Honor. I mean, in this
11	case, the diocese has maintained that they want to be paid
12	for defense costs and LMI said, my policy says I don't have
13	to do that. I hate to be on the side of arguing the
14	insurer's position, but I
15	THE COURT: I just always wanted to know whether
16	this issue was is one of the issues that's
17	MR. NASATIR: LMI in its answer denied any
18	obligation to reimburse until the end of the case.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
20	MR. DIPOMPEO: We agree. Okay, so let's just sum
21	up here, just a summary of what we've gone over. Aggregate
22	limits in the Royal aggregate years, per occurrence limits
23	in the other cases. London defense costs do deplete limits,
24	Royal, the don't deplete limits under the policies, but
25	given Arrowood's financial state we think that there's a

Pg 152 of 529

practical limitation there and so therefore we think because all of these are limited that they are property of the state.

4 Okay, let's move on to Section 105. This --5 again, we can come back to this at closing. We don't need 6 to go over it now. We think there's jurisdiction here. We 7 think it's pretty clear. We think under the Second Circuit's opinions there just has to be a risk of 8 9 intertwinement of the cases. We think there clearly is. 10 We've seen that, so we can move on from there. I'm 11 certainly happy to address this at closing -- necessary. 12 THE COURT: I think it would be more appropriate 13 to address it at closing. Okay?

14 MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay, so moving on to the merits of 15 Section 105. This -- couple of preliminary points which 16 we'll come back to at closing. We think the Court has ruled 17 in 1031 Tax Group and you don't have to consider the Rule 65 18 factors. We don't think it really matters. We think and we 19 say in our briefs we think we meet any standard, but there's 20 least the threshold question of that, which we can address 21 later. But turning to some of the factual issues, the 22 factors that the Court looks at in Section 105 -- let's to go the prior slide. There it is, right at the bottom of the 23 24 screen here. "Threatened the Debtor's insurance coverage, 25 increased indemnification liability result in inconsistent

Page 56

Page 57 1 judgments." 2 THE COURT: I really am familiar with the 3 arguments you're making. MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay, great. Then I will --4 5 THE COURT: It would be most helpful when we get 6 to closing when you specifically relate it to the facts. 7 MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay. Happy to move on. We talked 8 about shared insurance already. We've actually talked 9 already about increasing indemnification risk and you'll 10 hear testimony today about that as well. One thing I'd to 11 highlight when we talk about indemnification because you'll see this come up, are the charts, so let's go forward to the 12 13 chart slides. Skip over all this. Here we go. So, this is 14 in evidence. It's helpful for the Court to see. This was, these two charts were attached as Exhibit A and Exhibit B to 15 16 Mr. Stephens' testimony. You'll hear from Mr. Stephens 17 today. That's DX-13, DX-14. These are Rule 1006 summaries of the complaints --18 19 THE COURT: Yeah (indiscernible). 20 MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay. And the answers which we 21 mentioned before. Okay, piecemeal litigation. We think 22 we've talked about that as well. Collateral estoppel, res 23 judicata. Again, the cases are all overlapping. 24 The last point, I think just to preview some 25 factual issues that are going to come up is burden and

Pg 154 of 529

Page 58

distraction. I think that's actually what most of the testimony today is going to go to. And so you'll hear from Mr. Stephens and from Mr. Moore about their observations of the diocese's efforts --

THE COURT: You know, the problem I have with this 5 6 argument about distraction, it was largely the basis for the 7 SVB Financial Group preliminary injunction that I approved 8 last week or the week before, but it focused on the fact 9 that the case was a couple of weeks old and that the efforts 10 had to be entire -- couldn't have the distraction, needed 11 the complete focus on moving the case forward, coming up 12 with an exit strategy. And I granted 120 day preliminary 13 injunction.

14 In 1031, I granted a 90 day stay that consensually 15 the parties agreed that they were making progress and 16 ultimately settled, but I have a real problem with the 17 notion that three years into a case when, you know, your 18 colleagues have all said that the diocese is committed to 19 compensating the abuse survivors who are entitled to be 20 compensated and they're the ones who have really suffered by 21 a complete freeze on their efforts to litigate their claims 22 -- litigate or settle their claims.

And that's what's really bothering me, okay, that you know, the effect of an injunction is to insulate the non-debtors from having to resolve the claims of the abuse

Page 59

1	survivors. And I think the diocese acknowledged that can't
2	last forever. You know, I'm not resolving any legal issues.
3	You've got arguments about why you think the automatic stay
4	applies. I think that's a real stretch and I think the
5	issue is more whether 105 and the caselaw that's developed
6	about it this far into this case can further justify having
7	the abuse survivors be the one who are most impacted because
8	they can't prove up and recover for their claims. That's
9	the thing that's bothering me the most.
10	MR. DIPOMPEO: Absolutely understood, Your Honor,
11	and we'll certainly address that today in the proof and I
12	think we can wrap up here very quickly here, because I
13	while I recognize we are two years in and there is a great
14	burden borne by the parties who can't pursue litigation at
15	this time, it's been consensual this whole time. This is
16	our first but I understand
17	THE COURT: Well, it's not exactly your first. I
18	mean, you made the motion when the Committee said no, we
19	won't agree to extend the preliminary injunction. You made
20	the motion. You all said you wanted a hearing like right
21	away and I said, no, my schedule is such, there will be a
22	hearing somewhere down it wasn't like a year away, it was
23	a couple of months away. And then you consensually agreed
24	to continue. Okay. Now they're saying no more. Okay.
25	That's essentially what I'm seeing. It wasn't they said

Page 60 1 You filed your motion. A hearing was scheduled and no. 2 then, if you'll excuse my words for this, you all came to 3 your senses and continued to try a little longer. Okay. And you know, and now you wanted a judicial co-mediator. 4 5 You've got a judicial co-mediator at least through May 31st. 6 MR. DIPOMPEO: Right, and that's all I meant to 7 say is we think we are still at a critical point. It's 8 different from the start of the case for sure. We don't 9 think the PI should last forever, but we think the next 45 10 days in particular and some period of time after that, to be 11 able to figure out where we're going are really important to 12 finish the mediation process, see where things are. And so 13 that's why we're asking for limited relief in that form. 14 It's a possibility that whether the THE COURT: 15 motion to dismiss is heard on May 16th or hopefully sometime 16 after, you know, in June or something, you may not have a --17 there may not be any issue about, you know, preliminary 18 injunctions. There won't be a case. 19 MR. DIPOMPEO: Which is why we think the next 45 20 days is just a critical period. 21 THE COURT: You say 45 days, but I -- you know, 22 Magistrate Judge Cave, er clock runs out unless she agrees 23 to extend it, on May 31.

24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Right, which is roughly 45 -25 THE COURT: Okay.

Page 61 1 MR. DIPOMPEO: I may be off by a few days. 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 MR. DIPOMPEO: Anyway, that's all I meant to say. 4 Just one very final point. We said this in our reply brief 5 at the end. You know, we're also very concerned about what 6 litigation in 200 separate state courts will look like and 7 so --8 THE COURT: Well, it isn't 200 state courts. As I 9 -- you'll correct me. I'm not on top of this. I thought 10 there was only one judge in Nassau County who has all of the 11 sex abuse cases. You know, I don't know what the plan is, 12 whether that judge is only going to handle them through 13 pretrial and then they're going to be farmed out to 14 different trial judges, but there are not going to be 200 15 trials in any time --16 MR. DIPOMPEO: No time soon. It is true that this 17 goes to one judge. Ninety percent of the cases go to one 18 judge. There's 10 percent I think go to New York but it's -19 - you're exactly right. In any event, we mentioned this in 20 our reply, but we think some period of time to allow the District Court to consider one 57(b)(5) motion, should we 21 22 make it, could also be justified. But the ultimate point

23 which I'll leave with is that we just think we're at a

24 critical time. The case should -- realizing I forgot to

give you the percentages of the insurance, as I'm talking,

25

Pg 158 of 529

1 so I will do that -- but my final point before going into 2 that is that we just think we're at a critical time 3 particularly in the next 45 to 60 days.

So Your Honor asked yesterday about yesterday 4 5 about percentage of insurance premiums billed. We've done 6 some work. These are -- there are some caveats to this, but 7 this is the best we could do. We -- the estimate for 2023. So again, this is under the Ecclesia program. We don't know 8 9 what the historical would be, is 83 percent is paid by 10 parishes, 16 percent is paid by affiliates, 1 percent is 11 paid by the DRVC. In 2015, the amount billed was 85 percent 12 parishes, 14 percent affiliates, 1 percent DRVC.

A couple of caveats. That's the amounts that are billed. I don't think every amount that billed is ultimately collected. I think we're around 90 percent collections. Again, these are Ecclesia numbers. We don't actually know what the amounts were for the Royal or London, so the legacy years.

We think premiums in 2023 were about \$16 million. So the DRVC is probably paying roughly \$160,000. The average participant is probably paying about 80, so the diocese probably pays about two times what the average participant would be. There's just a lot more non-diocesan participants who pay.

25

THE COURT: It would be helpful to me, because

Page 62

Pg 159 of 529

Page 63

	raye 05
1	obviously this is an issue I previewed an interest in, is if
2	it's possible I don't know whether the Committee has
3	taken any discovery or gotten the information on who pays
4	the who's paid the premiums. It would be helpful if
5	you're all able to agree on a stipulated exhibit, even if
6	it's not for you know, even if it's approximate for the
7	years that are involved in the abuse claims that have been
8	asserted against the diocese.
9	Because I mean, the look, it should be obvious
10	why I asked the question. It was not addressed in any of
11	the briefs. You're arguing that an injunction should be
12	issued because the proceeds of the insurance are jeopardized
13	by ongoing state court litigation and, you know, none of the
14	in the my experience as a litigator before I became a
15	bankruptcy judge, and in the cases I've had since, it's
16	usually been D&O, E&O claims, all of the premiums were paid
17	by the Debtor. Here, that's not true.
18	Here, the overwhelmingly large percentage of the
19	premiums for this insurance are paid by the parishes and
20	other affiliates and the you know, you all can address
21	this in your closing arguments. The notion that the
22	parishes should be prevented from if the litigation goes

23 forward, should be prevented from recovering defense --

24 because of defense costs or judgments or settlements, the

25 parishes who pay the overwhelming amount of the premiums

	Page 64
1	shouldn't be permitted to recover because the diocese has an
2	interest in yeah, you have an interest in the policies.
3	That's why I asked the question. It would be
4	helpful to me if I had an exhibit, if it can't be agreed
5	upon, if you have a witness who can testify or put in the
6	it's not in the next two days, something, you know. A
7	declaration that supports the work that you've done. I'm
8	surprised that you've come here not having precise figures
9	for who paid for what. That's why I asked the question.
10	MR. DIPOMPEO: We appreciate it. We will
11	certainly work to put that together.
12	MR. BROWN: Your Honor, if I Ken Brown again.
13	I completely understand your concerns. I just, since we
14	have not, this has not been an issue for which there's been
15	any discovery, I have a little bit of indigestion
16	stipulating. Certainly we're not going to object to the
17	admission of a declaration that says what it says
18	THE COURT: Or the stipulation can say exactly
19	what you just said so far. Just so that you see if you
20	can work it out. Otherwise, the Debtor can put forward an
21	exhibit and we'll see how we deal with it. You can put all
22	the caveats you want about it and
23	MR. BROWN: Well
24	THE COURT: You haven't had discovery, and
25	therefore subject to dispute. But at least what I've heard

Pg 161 of 529

Page 65 1 so far is an acknowledgement by the Debtor that a very, very 2 large percentage, varying by policy year or insurer, were 3 paid by the parishes or affiliates and not from the Debtor, 4 so okay. But (indiscernible). 5 MR. DIPOMPEO: That's all I have. Thank you, Your 6 Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks very much. Mr. Brown, 8 are you going to do an opening? 9 MR. BROWN: I am going to do an opening. 10 THE COURT: Go ahead. It's 10:20. 11 MR. BROWN: You want to take a break or --12 THE COURT: I'm ready to go, but if you want a 13 break, I'm happy to do it. 14 MR. BROWN: You know, I wouldn't mind a five-15 minute bathroom break. 16 THE COURT: There's never been a five-minute break 17 in the history of this courtroom, so we're taking a ten-18 minute break. 19 MR. BROWN: Takes five minutes to walk --20 THE COURT: Yeah, it does. 21 (Recess) 22 THE COURT: All right. Court's back in session. 23 Mr. Brown, are you going to give an opening? 24 MR. BROWN: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Let's wait a minute. Let's --

Page 66 1 MR. BROWN: I will --2 THE COURT: It's hard in a 10-minute recess to be able to do it. That's why I said -- I can remember saying 3 we're going to have a five-minute recess and --4 5 MR. BROWN: Right. 6 THE COURT: -- it's just not possible. Even 10 7 minutes is stretching it. All right. Go ahead, Mr. Brown. 8 MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor, and good 9 And thank you for being here today and hearing us morning. 10 all out on this. I'm not going to put up any demonstratives 11 and I'm not going to impose upon you the burden of -- the mind-numbing burden of going through each of these 12 13 complaints and answers and counterclaims and the State Court 14 actions that were filed pre-petition and those that are 15 post-petition. And hopefully, I can convince you that 16 that's -- they don't matter. I mean, and here's why. 17 Those complaints and the answers, they say what 18 they say. And the complaints that were filed post-petition 19 don't name the Diocese. And the complaints that were filed 20 pre-petition do, and we've got in evidence, you know, a 21 bunch of charts that split that up for you. 22 The issue that the Diocese is focusing on, and I 23 think it comes under the prong of, oh, we're going to -- we will suffer irreparable harm if you don't enter this 24

injunction today because collateral estoppel, res judicata,

25

Page 67

1	inconsistent judgments, indemnity contribution.
2	Putting aside whether those are actual risks, and
3	I think there is beyond substantial doubt about that,
4	whatever risks there are not needed and they are not
5	something that they are going that this injunction that
6	they're seeking, whether it's 45 days or whether it's 120
7	days is going to prevent.
8	And it's the standard in this District for an
9	injunction in a bankruptcy case, and as set forth in the
10	Calpine decision cited in our briefs, 365 B.R. 401, 410, the
11	threat to the reorganization process has to be imminent and
12	substantial. And imminence is what's critical here.
13	And Judge Lafferty went through this in detail in
14	a very recent decision he issued in the Northern District in
15	the Mariner case, which is also cited in our briefs. And he
16	talked a great deal about imminence. And not all the courts
17	in the Northern District or in the Ninth Circuit are kooks.
18	They really aren't. And it's a very
19	THE COURT: I happen to know Judge Lafferty very
20	well
21	MR. BROWN: He's a very smart guy
22	THE COURT: and I have great respect for him.
23	MR. BROWN: Sits on the bat, and pardon me?
24	THE COURT: I have great respect for Judge
25	Lafferty.

-9			

	Page 68
1	MR. BROWN: As do I. And I think his decision
2	talking about the concept of imminent harm is applicable
3	here, because he specifically relates it to that what
4	were really were issues of preclusion in that case and says,
5	and says, you know what, litigation takes a long time. It
6	moves at a glacial pace we all know about.
7	And there just aren't going to be any judgements
8	in these State Court cases this is what Judge Lafferty
9	says in these State Court in the State Court
10	litigation that are going to be protected by the injunction
11	I'm being asked to issue.
12	And the same is true here. Whether it's 45 days -
13	- which I think some people were bandying about which was
14	being bandied about, is maybe we don't need 120 days; we
15	just need to get past this next mediation, or whether it's
16	120 days I think that's out through August some time
17	that's being asked for, that's not going to give any
18	protection against the harm of res judicata, collateral
19	estoppel, and form of preclusion, indemnity contribution,
20	none of that.
21	I mean, so what's the purpose? It's purely
22	leverage shifting because it's not to protect against any
23	harm that they've identified. It's purely to just say, let
24	us keep this
25	THE COURT: I mean, with all due respect, this

Pg 165 of 529

1	whole well, I want to be fair. You're each trying to
2	gain leverage over the other, but
3	MR. BROWN: Well, I mean, I would say that I'm

not going to disagree with that. This is about where the 4 5 lever is in negotiations. But they're the ones who have the 6 burden. They're the ones who've got to make the case. 7 They're the ones who have to prove imminent irreparable harm. Otherwise, they are not entitled to the leverage 8 9 they're asking for.

10 And by coming here to you and asking for it 11 without any particularized proof of imminent harm, let alone burden, I mean, I think it's notable, Your honor, that there 12 13 is not a single person in this courtroom here, not a single 14 one, nor is there any direct testimony offered from any 15 diocesan personnel on burden on how they're going to be 16 distracted by State Court litigation in cases with -- in 17 which they are not named.

18 How is that going to distract them from the 19 reorganization effort? How much time is it going to require 20 from them? How much time is it going to take away from 21 their reorganization duties? Where is that? They won't put 22 them in front of you to be cross-examined on that point. 23 They won't put them in front of you to be cross-examined on the issue of, even, impairment. Is it going to in any way 24 25 impair or preclude the reorganization efforts?

> Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

Page 69

Page 70

1	All you get is you're going to you know, you
2	can see from direct testimony is Mr. Stevens saying, well, I
3	worked on pre-petition, these cases pre-petition, which were
4	against the Diocese, by the way, and Mr. Moore as well, who
5	will say, yes, and I worked on pre-petition cases which were
6	against the Diocese. And based on my experience in those
7	cases, yes, there were diocesan personnel who had to be
8	involved and had to do work in connection with those with
9	that litigation against the Diocese.
10	THE COURT: But is I had this issue in the SVB
11	Financial Group preliminary injunction hearing. The two
12	FINRA arbitrations are against the non-debtor SVB
13	Securities, an indirectly wholly owned subsidiary of the
14	Debtor.
15	And essentially, the argument which I accepted at
16	the early stage of that case was that the general counsel of
17	the parent company was going to have to be personally
18	involved in the imminent arbitrations. They were scheduled
19	for next month.
20	And I agreed, essentially, that they had made
21	it was also the arguments, ultimately, about that they
22	agreed to indemnify the non-debtors against liability. So
23	it would have an impact.
24	But you know, the fact that Mr. Renker would have
25	to if those State Court actions go forward would, and
	Varitavt Lagal Solutions

	Page 71
1	maybe others in the Diocese would be personally involved in
2	it, I accept that as true.
3	MR. BROWN: So what
4	THE COURT: But what does that get me?
5	MR. BROWN: Exactly.
6	THE COURT: Well, they say it would get me to the
7	point where I should grant the preliminary injunction. So,
8	I don't I accept that the Diocese the evidence in good
9	faith shows that the Diocese would of necessity be involved
10	in the State Court litigation against the parishes if it
11	goes forward. The question is, okay
12	MR. BROWN: To the extent
13	THE COURT: What's the conclusion
14	MR. BROWN: irreparable
15	THE COURT: What's the legal conclusion that comes
16	from those facts?
17	MR. BROWN: And they yes, it would have to
18	cause imminent and irreparable and substantial harm. And
19	that is not there's no evidence of the Court that the
20	harm would have to be to the reorganization effort. There
21	is simply no particularized evidence before this court that
22	that's the case. When does it follow from the other. I
23	mean, you know, there's not even testimony that says by
24	Mr. Renker or Dudin or, you know, any of those guys that
25	"Well, yeah, we might have to get up earlier and go to bed

Г

Pg 168 of 529

1 late if we have to do both." They don't even say that. 2 THE COURT: I think you're being unfair in that characterization. I don't doubt that Mr. Renker and 3 4 probably others from the Diocese would be heavily involved 5 if one of those cases goes to trial. But again, I'm not 6 sure where that gets --

7 MR. BROWN: But what I'm -- the key here, though, 8 is the linkage between whatever they're going to have to do 9 and what it takes away from whatever the near-term 10 reorganization efforts are, and that linkage is not made by 11 any evidence before this court. So, again, I would say that 12 when you talk about -- when you look at this from the 13 standpoint of eminent harm that would be remedied by a 45-14 day or a 120-day injunction, there simply is no risk of 15 collateral estoppel res judicata, inconsistent judgements. 16 During the span, the timeframe of the injunction aside --17 THE COURT: No, I understand. Let me ask you 18 this. You don't have to answer it now; you can confer with 19 your colleagues about it. Do you object to continuing a 20 preliminary injunction until June 1? Because subject to 21 possible extension beyond -- I mean, you've just gotten a 22 judicial co-mediator. Magistrate Judge Sarah Cave is on board at least until May 31, subject to her concluding that, 23 24 you know, progress is being made, whatever. You don't have

25

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

to answer me now if you don't want to, I mean, but I --

Page 72

Page 73

	raye 75
1	that's one question I have. The result it could be that
2	I grant the debtor's request for preliminary injunction and
3	it's longer than you want, but I asked the question before
4	about, you know, the result might be that I deny the
5	preliminary injunction, except keep it in place until June
6	1, so that you all can focus on what needs to be focused on,
7	finding a resolution to this case.
8	MR. BROWN: Your Honor, obviously, I'm not the guy
9	that's going to decide that, but the only thing I
10	THE COURT: Oh, why not? I'm teasing.
11	MR. BROWN: But everybody heard you on Zoom, the
12	deciders. The only thing I would say is that's another
13	thing that's not linked here by any evidence, and that is
14	that these state court actions, which are nowhere right now
15	I mean, there's no discovery. Answers haven't even been
16	filed. Nothing has been done. They have complaints have
17	been filed. Nada else has been done.
18	THE COURT: I
19	MR. BROWN: So, there is no linkage between the
20	notion that, okay, the State if you took the State away
21	today, it would have no impact. Or certainly this well.
22	Both logic and common sense say, and the absence of evidence
23	to the contrary say that that doesn't - it's not going to
24	impact the mediation
25	THE COURT: Mr. Brown, I remember doing a lot of

	Page 74
1	work as a practicing lawyer about figuring out what was
2	going to go into the answer, what defenses they're going to
3	serve. It's not like you just file you know, somebody
4	scribbles on a piece of paper and files an answer and you
5	just think about the next steps. I would accept I don't
6	need proof on this point. I litigated for 34 years. It
7	just if the stay were lifted today, there would be a lot
8	of work that's required.
9	MR. BROWN: But by the Parish's lawyers.
10	THE COURT: Well, and I'm prepared to accept that
11	it would be that the Diocese lawyers would be involved as
12	well, but I'm not sure whether that didn't get me to the
13	well, I don't know where it gets me. We'll see at the
14	end of this.
15	MR. BROWN: I just want to point out that we just
16	saw a bunch of charts and there's a bunch of evidence
17	already before the Court with respect to the prepetition
18	answers complaints and answers, and they're all they
19	say the same thing. These are they are largely
20	standardized.
21	THE COURT: Look, I
22	MR. BROWN: So, anyway, I will move on. I think -
23	- you said in your comments, I think, with respect to Mr
24	I'm sorry.
25	MR. DIPOMPEO: DiPompeo.

212-267-6868

Page 75 1 MR. BROWN: DiPompeo's opening that you thought 2 the application of the automatic stay was a stretch. THE COURT: 3 I do. MR. BROWN: And I think that's true and I think 4 5 you're being kind, but I just don't think there's a 6 conceivable way you get there to say these State Court 7 actions that don't name the Diocese are subject to the 8 automatic --THE COURT: Well, I think even in the ones that do 9 10 name the Diocese, you know, there's some briefing on this 11 issue. Are they necessary parties? I'm not going to 12 comment on what I think the answer to that is, but that's 13 been addressed. Even if they -- the Diocese has been named, 14 I have on multiple occasions over the years as a bankruptcy 15 judge faced the issue whether an action in state or federal 16 District Court should go forward against the non-debtors, 17 and the answer generally has been yes, more than is required 18 than just having a debtor named as a defendant. It may -- I 19 mean, there is briefing on this issue. Are they a necessary 20 party, and there's a state statute on this that suggests 21 they're not, but I'm not deciding the issue today. 22 MR. BROWN: So, I -- should I -- I'm happy to say 23 a couple comments on why the State --24 THE COURT: You'll get a chance to argue the law 25 in closing, so --

Page 76

	Page 76
1	MR. BROWN: Okay. I'm going to spare everyone,
2	then, at this point. I think just a couple of brief words
3	about putting aside the eminence issue, the issue of "Is
4	there even a risk?", a measurable or I think it has to be
5	a substantial risk of preclusion. And we all know Diocese
6	isn't a party to these lawsuits, so I think the presumption
7	is
8	THE COURT: Well, let me ask you so, assume
9	that comparative fault applies, whether there's an argument
10	it does or doesn't. Just assume for the purposes of my
11	question comparative fault applies. The jury determines in
12	one of the cases damages of \$4 million; the Parish is 25
13	percent at fault. Is the 75 percent there were only two
14	defendant if there were only two, obviously the Diocese
15	is not a defendant is there a conclusive effect of a jury
16	determination that
17	MR. BROWN: No.
18	THE COURT: the Parish is only 25 percent at
19	fault?
20	MR. BROWN: I have an my unequivocal answer is
21	no, and I will first I'll first
22	THE COURT: You'll get a chance to argue further
23	on the law when we do closing, but I'll let you briefly talk
24	about it.
25	MR. BROWN: So, there on the issue of

Pg 173 of 529

Page 77 1 comparative fault, I quess first principles would be, how is 2 it that a State Court, to which -- in an action to which the 3 Diocese is not a party, could impose liability or a finding or a ruling on the Diocese that would be binding --4 5 THE COURT: The jury has said --6 MR. BROWN: Where the stay is in place? 7 THE COURT: The jury has said that this abuse 8 survivor's damages are \$4 million, and it concludes that the 9 Parish is 25 percent at fault. That's the state of the 10 findings. The trial court enters judgement against the 11 Parish for a million dollars. MR. BROWN: And it doesn't matter whether the 12 13 judge is the finder of fact or the jury is. I mean, I don't 14 think that -- that doesn't impact the determination of 15 whether a finding or a determination by the finder of fact 16 is preclusive. I mean, if you've got the automatic stay in 17 place and you've got an entity that's not a party, somebody, 18 whether it's the Parish, has got to come to into this court 19 on their proof of claim --20 THE COURT: Let me just say -- if this bankruptcy 21 case goes forward --22 Well, that's --MR. BROWN: 23 THE COURT: Wait, stop. Let me ask my question. 24 MR. BROWN: Sorry. I assume that this bankruptcy case is 25 THE COURT:

45-mg	DUC 2875		74 of 529	Main Document
				Page 78
1	not dismis	sed. It goes	s forward.	

2 MR. BROWN: Yes. THE COURT: It hasn't been resolved with a 3 4 confirmed plan. A jury returns a verdict -- a \$4 million verdict for Survivor No. 1 and determines that the Parish is 5 6 25 percent at fault. You agree that in the claims 7 resolution process in this court that the Diocese is not 8 bound by the trial court verdict on comparative fault. The 9 Diocese is not bound by what may seem implicit that there was \$3 million attributable to the Diocese. You agree 10 11 they're not bound by that. 12 MR. BROWN: I believe that to be the case, Your 13 Honor. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. BROWN: Yes, and --16 THE COURT: So -- more than you believe it, you 17 agree that the committee will not argue that the jury 18 determination on this comparative fault finding has any 19 preclusive effect in the claims allowance process in this 20 court. Correct? 21 MR. BROWN: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Okay, go ahead. 23 Somebody may get very angry at me for MR. BROWN: 24 saying that, but that's what I believe.

Okay. Well, it's not just what you

THE COURT:

25

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 175 of 529 Page 79 1 You agree on behalf of the committee -believe. 2 MR. BROWN: Yes. THE COURT: That the committee will not assert in 3 this court --4 MR. BROWN: 5 Yes. 6 THE COURT: That the Diocese -- that that jury 7 verdict has any preclusive effect on the Diocese's defenses 8 with claim resolution --9 MR. BROWN: We can't have it both ways, Your 10 Honor. We can't --11 I'm just -- I'll only get -- you're THE COURT: 12 the committee's representative who's arguing, and you agree 13 that the committee will not assert that there's preclusive 14 effect from that jury determination on comparative fault. 15 MR. BROWN: Yes. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. BROWN: And you know, the other part of that 18 that I want to emphasize at the risk of repeating myself, 19 but this is in a different context. When you're talking 20 about indemnity and contribution, and I think you alluded to 21 this in terms of, you know, if the bankruptcy case is still 22 pending -- so, keep in mind all the Parish and affiliated entity claims for indemnity and contribution have been 23 24 disallowed by Your Honor as contingent claims. They are 25 subject to revival if and when they become non-contingent.

	Page 80
1	THE COURT: You stipulated to that, I think.
2	MR. BROWN: Well, it's a stipulated order.
3	THE COURT: Yeah.
4	MR. BROWN: Yeah. And so, let's unpack for a
5	moment what that means under the eminence heading, right?
6	Which really in this case means that "if ever" heading,
7	because right now, the claims are disallowed, so there would
8	have to be a judgement in the State Court actions. I mean,
9	you could quibble about whether that's
10	THE COURT: Well, it I mean, the real issue is,
11	what happens when there's a settlement?
12	MR. BROWN: Well, there is no determination,
13	though, in a settlement on comparative fault. Nothing is
14	binding then. You have no issues with indemnity
15	contribution or inconsistent judgements or collateral
16	estoppel. It's only that's the issue here. It's only a
17	risk way off in the future with who you is it a year?
18	It's more than a year, but who knows when? Two years? I
19	don't know, but it's a long way off, certainly way outside
20	the 120 days.
21	THE COURT: That's why everyone in your
22	constituency should be focused on coming up with a
23	consensual plan, because the result I don't want to sound
24	like a broken record
25	MR. BROWN: From your lips to God's ears, Your

Pg 177 of 529

Page 81

1 Honor. Right? I mean, yeah, if we can get there. 2 THE COURT: Let's not invoke the name of God in 3 this proceeding, okay?

MR. BROWN: Pardon me. But let me -- let me just 4 5 finish this thought, though, which is, so what has to happen 6 for there to be a contribution or indemnity risk? You've 7 got to have a judgement, right, whenever that happens, 8 outside the 45 or 120-day period. Then, that judgement has 9 to happen, assuming this case is still pending, before --10 before there is a plan of confirmation and a discharge for 11 the debtor. If the judgement doesn't occur before that, the 12 debt is discharged, because right now all those claims are 13 disallowed. So, I think I'm analyzing that correctly. And 14 if that is so, not only don't we have eminence -- imminence 15 in terms of the risks here, but we don't really even have a 16 -- the most likely scenario is we're never going to get 17 there. If there is a plan and the debtor gets a discharge, 18 that stuff is never going to come back to this court for a 19 determination on the Diocese contribution indemnity claims. 20 Same with any, you know, inconsistent judgements. 21 So, I guess the point I want to make on that is 22 that, well, yes, you know, I'm not challenging Your Honor's ability to keep a stay in place for a period of time to 23

allow the mediation to take place, but I would question 24

25 whether that should be done, certainly if you are going to

Page 82

	Tage 02
1	go through a traditional factor analysis here, which is, do
2	you have an eminent and substantial harm here by allowing
3	these things to go forward in terms of how that might affect
4	the mediation? I would argue you don't, that that prong
5	doesn't exist, and you know, I think we've well briefed and
6	you made earlier comments about the harm to the survivors
7	here of preventing them now for you know, we're going to
8	get three years in, and they're dying and the ones that
9	aren't dying are getting sick and old. So, I would just
10	question whether you should do it, if outside of a
11	stipulation and outside of the committee and the survivor
12	constituencies saying here, you know, affirmatively, "Yeah,
13	we think"
14	THE COURT: Are you challenging my jurisdiction to
15	do that? I'm not saying that as a provocative question,
16	because you've addressed jurisdiction.
17	MR. BROWN: I've addressed subject matter
18	jurisdiction, and I mean, I think so, here's let's
19	turn to that just momentarily.
20	THE COURT: Because I thought that I'm not
21	ruling on it, but I thought that you got the real stretch on
22	this issue about subject matter jurisdiction.
23	MR. BROWN: I took it up. I did, and I think
24	certainly I'll be the first one to acknowledge the issue of
25	"Can you?". I think subject matter jurisdiction is "Can

Page 83 1 vou?" 2 THE COURT: Yes. "Can you enjoin?" That's a much 3 MR. BROWN: easier question and a much lower bar than "Should you?" 4 The "Should you?" is -- are the factors there, and that's where 5 6 the eminence comes in. 7 THE COURT: I agree with that. 8 MR. BROWN: Can you? Well, I don't think a case -9 - I don't think there's -- I don't think the Diocese has met 10 their burden on each of these cases. 11 THE COURT: I mean, I have to decide subject 12 matter jurisdiction whether you -- whether they raise it, 13 you raise it or not, I've got to conclude that I have 14 subject matter jurisdiction. It's been briefed by both 15 sides. I'm not deciding the issue. I think the Diocese has 16 a much stronger argument on subject matter jurisdiction. Ι 17 think the battleground is the exercise of discretion on 18 those factors that should be applied. 19 MR. BROWN: So, I don't disagree with a single 20 thing you just said. I think it is a much easier question 21 to answer, but I don't think it's easy and I don't think it 22 should be assumed, and let me just briefly comment on that. 23 Okay, so the standard is we're -- there's no dispute that we're not talking about arising in or arising under. You 24 25 have to have related to jurisdiction over each case that

212-267-6868

Page 84

1	you're going to enjoin. That has not been seriously
2	contested. And so, the question is, does each and every one
3	of these 230 223 cases that are issued today will they
4	have a conceivable impact on the distributions that are
5	going to be made, on how much the debtor distributes in this
6	case? And I think that there are arguments, there are
7	serious arguments with respect to the Royal and the London
8	arguments, debtor arguments with cases covered under the
9	Royal policies that they don't. Because just again, keep
10	in mind here, too, we've offered up. What we're seeking
11	here today is just permission to go forward or to have the
12	stay lifted to proceed to judgement, not to execute on
13	judgement, right? That's all we're talking about.
14	The preceding to judgement all that's at issue
15	is defense costs. Under the Royal policies, they're not
16	wasting, so the exhaustion of defense costs doesn't have an
17	impact on the estate. It's not estate-depleting. It
18	doesn't impact the debtor's insurance rights. We already
19	know that there are no written indemnity agreements, right?
20	We're also saying that we're not going to execute on any
21	judgements, so the policy or the actual coverage portion of
22	the policy is not at stake. So, again, we'd have to go and
23	look closely at, is there really a risk
24	THE COURT: That's not the issue the issue is
25	different as to Arrowood, though, right?

Page 85

	Page 85
1	MR. BROWN: Pardon me?
2	THE COURT: The issues would be different as to
3	Arrowwood because of its precarious financial
4	MR. BROWN: Well, I mean, I think that you'd have
5	to consider whether or not that is really has it been
6	proved that they're going to run out of money such that
7	there isn't going to be enough for them to pay whatever
8	their obligations are? And I don't think there's proof of
9	that. So, the question on the Royal policies is, where is
10	the conceivable impact on the estate? And you know, so if
11	it's not the insurance, then I think everybody's on real
12	thin ice on conceivable impact, because then you have to
13	say, "Well, there's real res judicata collateral estoppel
14	risk." I could explain to you why there isn't if you're
15	interested, but the one case they they're not parties so
16	they have to show privity. The Diocese and the Parishes
17	would have to be in privity. One case cited in all the
18	papers that have been submitted on privity, and you know,
19	that's the (indiscernible) case. I anyway, it's a case I
20	the bottom line, it's a case where three-lawyer law
21	firm. One lawyer departs and then gets in a kerfuffle with
22	an ex-client about some of his rights under an agreement,
23	and he sues the ex-clients or actually, the ex-clients
24	sue him and they say, "We don't owe you the money because
25	the agreement's an ethical violation." They then seek to

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 182 of 529

Page 86

1 bring in the other two lawyers, and they contest that and 2 say, "We don't want to be part of the lawsuit," and they win the motion to not be part of the lawsuit because it's late 3 in the game. 4

5 And they're on notice; they know everything that's 6 happening, but -- and then the clients actually sue the 7 other two lawyers under the same agreement and say, "Yeah, 8 same with you. This agreement is void. It violates ethical 9 standards under New York law, so we don't owe you the money 10 under it," and they -- the two lawyers say, "Well, let's 11 stay that until there is a determination made in the first 12 action with our ex-partner." And everybody agrees to that. 13 Well, the ex-partner loses, right? Loses at trial, loses on 14 appeal, and then the two lawyers who tried to get out of the 15 first litigation, to which they were originally parties --16 THE COURT: They're going to say, "We're not bound 17 by what happened in the first one." MR. BROWN: Said, "We're not bound." 18 That's the 19 lawsuit that they rely on for privity. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Let's relay the legal arguments 21 for closing. 22 I mean, I just wanted -- the MR. BROWN: Okay. point is there is no risk of collateral estoppel or res 23 judicata because the Diocese is not a party and it's not in 24 privity, and there is nothing --25

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 183 of 529

Page 87 1 THE COURT: Let me just be clear. You agree that 2 the committee will not argue at any point in this Chapter 11 3 case that the Parishes are in privity with the Diocese. 4 MR. BROWN: Okay, so is anybody hollering that I 5 shouldn't agree? 6 MR. NASATIR: Yeah, that's -- we're hollering. 7 Don't agree. 8 MR. BROWN: Don't agree? 9 THE COURT: Yeah, that's what -- that's exactly 10 what I thought. You know, the committee may well argue in 11 response to claim objections, in response to allowance or 12 disallowance of claims, that the Parishes and the Diocese 13 are in privity. And your colleague has said, "No, don't 14 agree." 15 MR. BROWN: Okay. Well, then, I won't. 16 THE COURT: And now I got the other side mad that 17 I asked the question and let you off the hook. I want to be 18 fair to both sides about it. 19 MR. BROWN: So, there are those -- the issue was 20 raised for the first time in the reply brief, which is 21 "Don't do anything until we have a chance ... - I think the 22 way they characterized it was "We the Diocese need a chance. 23 Keep the objection in place to allow us to move the District Court to transfer all these cases ... " 24 25 They want to remove all of the actions THE COURT:

Page 88 1 _ _ 2 MR. BROWN: Out of State Court and into the 3 District Court. I mean, maybe I'm missing something, but I just --4 5 THE COURT: No, I mean, this --6 MR. BROWN: I'm perplexed. I don't know why. 7 THE COURT: 8 MR. BROWN: You don't know why? 9 THE COURT: I don't know why. I mean, they've 10 asked for the -- they've raised the issue. I didn't go back 11 to look whether there'd been stipulations along the way 12 extending their time to remove. I assume -- maybe somebody from the debtor's side can tell me. Have there been 13 14 stipulated orders extending the debtor's time to remove 15 actions from State Court? 16 MR. DIPOMPEO: There have been, and in fact, the 17 debtors are not parties in some of these cases, but the 18 preliminary injunction order was... 19 MR. BROWN: Let's make sure we understand. 20 THE COURT: Because under the rules, there's a 21 deadline for removing actions and it can be extended and 22 usually is. 23 MR. BROWN: Okay. So, I'm going to unpack this a 24 little more for you, Your Honor. We're not talking about 25 removal.

	Page 89
1	THE COURT: Again, the legal arguments say for
2	I understand they I'm sure you will strenuously if
3	they if we get to this point and they want to remove the
4	actions in which they're named as a were named as a
5	defendant, you'll oppose it, they'll support it, and we'll
6	deal with it then.
7	MR. BROWN: Okay. Iain, did you have any
8	THE COURT: Go ahead.
9	MR. BROWN: Iain is going to deal with the
10	insurance issues. Was there anything you wanted to say with
11	respect to insurance that was covered in the other?
12	MR. NASATIR: Yes, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Just identify your name again.
14	MR. NASATIR: Yes. Iain Nasatir, Pachulski Stang.
15	THE COURT: Yes.
16	MR. NASATIR: I have one answer to your many
17	hypotheticals that I want I think I can clear up one
18	point, at least. So, your example where Parish is 50-50
19	with the Diocese and with the finding by State Court, and
20	then you have concern that the Parish would take 100 percent
21	because they were joint and severally liable, and then go
22	back again the Parish and there would be no insurance
23	THE COURT: Go back against the Diocese.
24	MR. NASATIR: Diocese, excuse me. Yes, sir. So,
25	my answer to you is that in the Royal policies Royal and

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 186 of 529

Page 90 1 Arrowwood are the same, just so we're clear, right? Just 2 Arrowwood took on the obligation. So, in those policies and 3 in the London policies, there are provisions, as there 4 commonly are in these CGL policies, that the subrogation 5 rights of the assured -- that's what they call it in 6 England, anyway -- the assured are assigned to the insurer 7 after they pay. So, there is not -- the hypothetical won't work, because the Parishes won't have any rights to go back 8 9 after the Diocese. 10 THE COURT: No, it'll be the insurers that --11 MR. NASATIR: It will be the insurers if they do 12 it. 13 THE COURT: Yes, I know. I fully understand that. 14 MR. NASATIR: Okay. Okay, I was going to say --15 THE COURT: The point is that somebody is going to 16 come after the Diocese for some amount. It's either the 17 Parish or it's the insurer. MR. NASATIR: Well, I'm not sure the insurer could 18 19 come after them for something that they covered them for. 20 THE COURT: I know. 21 MR. NASATIR: It would be something that was -- it 22 would be the accusation that --THE COURT: It's not an insurable risk. 23 MR. NASATIR: Precisely. It's not an insured 24 25 risk, so they have to consider making a case for non-

Page 91 1 coverage. 2 THE COURT: But the claims against the Diocese are negligence, negligent hiring, negligent supervision. Those 3 claims are not intentional torts --4 5 MR. NASATIR: No, they're not, so they wouldn't be 6 covered. 7 THE COURT: -- for which coverage, if there were 8 determination of an intentional fault, it wouldn't be -- you 9 know, it's a public policy violation. You can't insure 10 intentional fraud. 11 MR. NASATIR: Right, so the circumstance would 12 have to be that the insurer would pay the 100 percent of the 13 Parish's liability because it was jointly and severally 14 liable. Turns around and says, "The Diocese's actions here 15 were uninsurable. I'm going after them." That's the only 16 context in which that would come up. I just wanted to 17 clarify. 18 THE COURT: All right, thank you. 19 MR. NASATIR: And I can cite you to the --20 THE COURT: No, it's okay. 21 MR. NASATIR: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Thank you. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, there was one other thing. 23 24 I think you asked me a question as I was trying to address 25 your initial question about subject matter jurisdiction

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 188 of 529

Page 92

	5
1	related to subject matter jurisdiction. I covered why I
2	think there are some challenges in your analysis with
3	respect to the cases covered by the Royal policies. I think
4	there are also challenges on the London policies that have
5	the extraordinarily high per-occurrence limits, because
6	again, we're talking the world of conceivable, and what does
7	conceivable mean where you have an aggregate limit of \$100
8	million? Is there a conceivable way that litigation against
9	the Parishes would ever impact the Diocese coverage when you
10	have that kind of that level of coverage?
11	THE COURT: I understand your argument.
12	MR. BROWN: Yeah. So, \$100 million there's not
13	I mean, anything is possible, but in real world, no,
14	that's not conceivable.
15	THE COURT: All right. You're done?
16	MR. BROWN: Pardon?
17	THE COURT: You're done?
18	MR. BROWN: Reserving everything for closing.
19	THE COURT: Yes, yes, yes. Let's call the first
20	witness.
21	MR. DIPOMPEO: Thank you, Your Honor. We do. So,
22	I thought I would move the three directs into evidence, and
23	then the Committee can (indiscernible) can cross whichever
24	witnesses it chooses?
25	THE COURT: I don't know whether you've discussed

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 189 of 529

1 this. I mean, ordinarily what I do in this circumstance is 2 you call the witness. The witness is sworn. You offer the 3 written direct as the witness' direct testimony. If there 4 are some brief background questions you want to ask that 5 aren't covered, I let you do that. And then you tender the 6 witness for cross-examination and do a redirect. 7 MR. DIPOMPEO: I see. 8 THE COURT: I would prefer we do it unless you 9 worked this out with Mr. Brown ahead of time. 10 MR. BROWN: Absolutely not, Your Honor. My 11 assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two 12 separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in 13 written and that we would have a right to cross. 14 THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that 15 were 16 MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think 17 that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we 18 fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's 19 what's 20 THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. 21 He'll be sworn. Again, if you		Page 93
written direct as the witness' direct testimony. If there are some brief background questions you want to ask that aren't covered, I let you do that. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination and do a redirect. MR. DIPOMPEO: I see. THE COURT: I would prefer we do it unless you worked this out with Mr. Brown ahead of time. MR. BROWN: Absolutely not, Your Honor. My assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in written and that we would have a right to cross. THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that were MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's what's THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination. MR. DIFOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	1	this. I mean, ordinarily what I do in this circumstance is
 are some brief background questions you want to ask that aren't covered, I let you do that. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination and do a redirect. MR. DIFOMPEO: I see. THE COURT: I would prefer we do it unless you worked this out with Mr. Brown ahead of time. MR. BROWN: Absolutely not, Your Honor. My assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in written and that we would have a right to cross. THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that were MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's what's THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination. MR. DIFOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to 	2	you call the witness. The witness is sworn. You offer the
 aren't covered, I let you do that. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination and do a redirect. MR. DIPOMPEO: I see. THE COURT: I would prefer we do it unless you worked this out with Mr. Brown ahead of time. MR. BROWN: Absolutely not, Your Honor. My assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in written and that we would have a right to cross. THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that were MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's what's THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination. MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to 	3	written direct as the witness' direct testimony. If there
 witness for cross-examination and do a redirect. MR. DIPOMPEO: I see. THE COURT: I would prefer we do it unless you worked this out with Mr. Brown ahead of time. MR. BROWN: Absolutely not, Your Honor. My assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in written and that we would have a right to cross. THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that were MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's what's THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination. MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to 	4	are some brief background questions you want to ask that
7 MR. DIPOMPEO: I see. 8 THE COURT: I would prefer we do it unless you 9 worked this out with Mr. Brown ahead of time. 10 MR. BROWN: Absolutely not, Your Honor. My 11 assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two 12 separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in 13 written and that we would have a right to cross. 14 THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that 15 were 16 MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think 17 that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we 18 fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's 19 what's 20 THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. 21 He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short 22 background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you 23 tender the witness for cross-examination. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	5	aren't covered, I let you do that. And then you tender the
8 THE COURT: I would prefer we do it unless you 9 worked this out with Mr. Brown ahead of time. 10 MR. BROWN: Absolutely not, Your Honor. My 11 assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two 12 separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in 13 written and that we would have a right to cross. 14 THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that 15 were 16 MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think 17 that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we 18 fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's 19 what's 20 THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. 21 He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short 22 background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you 23 tender the witness for cross-examination. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	6	witness for cross-examination and do a redirect.
 worked this out with Mr. Brown ahead of time. MR. BROWN: Absolutely not, Your Honor. My assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in written and that we would have a right to cross. THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that were MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's what's THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination. MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to 	7	MR. DIPOMPEO: I see.
10MR. BROWN: Absolutely not, Your Honor. My11assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two12separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in13written and that we would have a right to cross.14THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that15were16MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think17that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we18fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's19what's20THE COURT: Let's just call your witness.21He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short22background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you23tender the witness for cross-examination.24MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	8	THE COURT: I would prefer we do it unless you
11 assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two 12 separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in 13 written and that we would have a right to cross. 14 THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that 15 were 16 MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think 17 that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we 18 fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's 19 what's 20 THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. 21 He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short 22 background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you 23 tender the witness for cross-examination. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	9	worked this out with Mr. Brown ahead of time.
 separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in written and that we would have a right to cross. THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that were MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's what's THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination. MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to 	10	MR. BROWN: Absolutely not, Your Honor. My
 written and that we would have a right to cross. THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that were MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's what's THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination. MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to 	11	assumption was that and I think we've agreed upon in two
14THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that15were16MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think17that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we18fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's19what's20THE COURT: Let's just call your witness.21He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short22background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you23tender the witness for cross-examination.24MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	12	separate orders that the direct testimony was coming in
15 were 16 MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think 17 that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we 18 fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's 19 what's 20 THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. 21 He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short 22 background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you 23 tender the witness for cross-examination. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	13	written and that we would have a right to cross.
 MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's what's THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination. MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to 	14	THE COURT: Well, then you had objections that
17 that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we 18 fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's 19 what's 20 THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. 21 He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short 22 background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you 23 tender the witness for cross-examination. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	15	were
<pre>18 fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's 19 what's 20 THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. 21 He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short 22 background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you 23 tender the witness for cross-examination. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to</pre>	16	MR. BROWN: So I object to the proposal. I think
<pre>19 what's 20 THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. 21 He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short 22 background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you 23 tender the witness for cross-examination. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to</pre>	17	that what you are saying is your normal practice is what we
20 THE COURT: Let's just call your witness. 21 He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short 22 background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you 23 tender the witness for cross-examination. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	18	fully expected. I think it's what we agree to and it's
He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you tender the witness for cross-examination. MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	19	what's
22 background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you 23 tender the witness for cross-examination. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	20	THE COURT: Let's just call your witness.
 23 tender the witness for cross-examination. 24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to 	21	He'll be sworn. Again, if you have some just some short
24 MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to	22	background that you want to do, that's fine. And then you
-	23	tender the witness for cross-examination.
25 Ms. Del Medico.	24	MR. DIPOMPEO: Allow me to turn the podium over to
	25	Ms. Del Medico.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 190 of 529		
	Page 94	
1	THE COURT: Okay.	
2	MR. DEL MEDICO: Your Honor, the Diocese would	
3	like	
4	THE COURT: Just identify your	
5	MS. DEL MEDICO: My name sorry. Jennifer Del	
6	Medico for the Debtor, Your Honor. The Diocese calls	
7	Kenneth Porter to the stand, please.	
8	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Porter, come on up. If you	
9	would raise your right hand, you'll be sworn.	
10	CLERK: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the	
11	testimony you are about to give this Court will be the	
12	truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?	
13	MR. PORTER: I do.	
14	THE COURT: All right. Please have a seat.	
15	MR. PORTER: Thank you, Your Honor.	
16	THE COURT: And there should be water in the	
17	pitcher and there are cups there. You can take one	
18	MR. PORTER: Super.	
19	THE COURT: if you want.	
20	MR. PORTER: Thank you very much.	
21	THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Del Medico.	
22	MS. DEL MEDICO: Thank you.	
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF KENNETH F. PORTER	
24	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:	
25	Q Good morning, Mr. Porter. Mr. Porter, could you tell -	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 191 of 529

	Pg 191 of 529	
	Page	95
1	- are you employed?	
2	A Yes.	
3	Q And could you tell us who are you employed by?	
4	A Heffernan Insurance Brokers.	
5	Q Okay. And could you describe what is your title	
6	there?	
7	A Vice President.	
8	Q And have you can tell us a little bit about your	
9	experience with respect to working with the Diocese?	
10	A Specifically Rockville Centre?	
11	Q Yes, please.	
12	A Okay, sure. I've been engaged by the Diocese since	
13	2006 to assist them with the design and implementation of	
14	their insurance program.	
15	Q And what responsibilities have you had in connection	
16	with that work?	
17	A All matters of consulting and advisory services rang	ing
18	from the structure that the program would take. The limi	ts
19	of coverage that would be provided. The self-insured	
20	retentions that would be retained. The breadth of covera	ge,
21	the coverage forms themselves, placement of insurance and	
22	excess insurance and reinsurance. Assisting them with	to
23	a lesser degree, assisting them with claims administration	n.
24	Q You mentioned that you began your work for the Dioce	se
25	of Rockville Centre in 2006. There were policies in plac	e

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 192 of 529

1	1 9 132 01 323
	Page 96
1	before that time, insurance policies that that the Diocese
2	had. Correct?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And do you have any personal knowledge about those
5	policies that predated your involvement with the Diocese?
6	A Any knowledge from my review of those policies.
7	Q Okay.
8	MS. DEL MEDICO: Your Honor, we'd like to move the
9	direct written testimony of Mr. Porter into evidence.
10	THE COURT: Any objections?
11	MR. BROWN: No, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: All right. The direct testimony
13	MR. BROWN: Oh, hold on. We did have some
14	objections that we filed, which we are reserving. And we
15	have there has been objections and then there was omnibus
16	response. So we
17	THE COURT: So, what
18	MR. BROWN: It's not that we don't have no
19	objections but will deal with the issues of foundation and
20	hearsay and expert testimony during the cross-examination.
21	THE COURT: So, the Court's ruling and I'm
22	aware, I've read the objections. The objections are
23	overruled without prejudice. I want to hear the cross-
24	examination and any redirect examination. Otherwise, I'll
25	give the direct testimony such weight as I believe it is

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 193 of 529

Page 97 1 entitled to receive. 2 Obviously, there's no jury. Hearsay objections 3 always raise the issues about for what purpose is the 4 testimony being offered. There may be -- assuming there 5 might be a valid hearsay objection that may be non-hearsay 6 purposes that wind up being relevant. So I'm overruling 7 without prejudice admitting in evidence the direct testimony 8 of Mr. Porter. It's not going to preclude you from arguing 9 _ _ 10 MR. BROWN: That's all I was --11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 MR. BROWN: That's what I was going to suggest --13 THE COURT: Absolutely. 14 MR. BROWN: -- was that we wait and see --15 THE COURT: That's fine. 16 MR. BROWN: -- what comes out in cross and then 17 you can address hearsay --18 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Go ahead. Well, 19 you're tendering the witness for cross-examination? 20 MS. DEL MEDICO: Yes. Tendering witness for 21 cross-examination. 22 THE COURT: All right. Before you start, just 23 give me a second to get my computer open here. What is the 24 ECF docket number of Mr. Porter's testimony? 25 MR. NASATIR: 181.

20-12345-m	g Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 194 of 529
	Page 98
1	THE COURT: It's going to take me another minute.
2	MR. NASATIR: That's fine.
3	THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry for the delay. Go
4	ahead.
5	MR. NASATIR: No problem. Thank you, Your Honor.
6	Iain Nasatir, Pachulski Stang.
7	CROSS-EXAMINATION OF KENNETH F. PORTER
8	BY MR. NASATIR:
9	Q Good morning, Mr. Porter.
10	A Good morning.
11	Q Do you have a witness binder up there in front of you?
12	A I do not.
13	Q Okay.
14	MR. NASATIR: To the extent we need it, if I can
15	approach the witness and provide him with
16	THE COURT: Sure. Do you want to give it to him
17	now, or not?
18	MR. NASATIR: I'm not sure I'm going to need it.
19	THE COURT: Go ahead.
20	MR. NASATIR: Just a piece of paper with
21	THE COURT: Go ahead.
22	MR. NASATIR: Thank you.
23	THE COURT: And I operate on the principle that
24	you're all experienced lawyers. You do not have to ask for
25	permission each time you want to approach the witness to

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 195 of 529

	Page 99
1	show him something. If opposing counsel wants to come up
2	because the questions are you know, they can come up as
3	well if need be. So you don't need to ask permission each
4	time you need to approach a witness. Okay?
5	MR. NASATIR: Thank you, Your Honor. Appreciate
6	the courtesy. Otherwise, I would have
7	THE COURT: All right.
8	MR. NASATIR: been asking.
9	BY MR. NASATIR:
10	Q Okay. Mr. Porter, do you recall you were deposed on
11	March 9th of this year?
12	A Yes.
13	Q And one of the subjects of that examination was your
14	declaration that you had submitted prior to the declaration
15	you submitted in direct testimony, right?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Okay. And that prior declaration was drafted with your
18	assistance and review, correct?
19	A Correct.
20	Q Okay. And you were assisted in that by counsel, right?
21	A I was.
22	Q Now, your latest declaration, the subject of your
23	direct testimony, that's almost identical as to your prior
24	declaration, right?
25	A It is.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 196 of 529 Page 100 1 Okay. And the same drafting process as the prior 0 2 declaration? In what manner? 3 Α 4 Again, it was prepared with your assistance and the Q 5 counsel assisted you with it? 6 Α Yes. 7 Was there any -- did you rely on any new information in 0 that -- in your -- to create your correct testimony? 8 9 Α No. 10 And in your preparation for today, did you learn any 0 11 new information? 12 No. Α 13 Now, one of the services that your company provides is 0 claim advocacy. Is that right? 14 15 Α Yes. 16 And that -- you described that as assisting clients Q 17 with perfecting their claims submissions with insurance

- 18 companies?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q And if a claim is denied, you evaluate the basis and
- 21 consider counter arguments for coverage?
- 22 A Correct.
- 23 Q Do you understand if there are any coverage denials in
- 24 this case?
- 25 A I don't know.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 197 of 529 Page 101 1 Q So you didn't engage in any such evaluations today?

- 2 A Not in this case, no.
- 3 Q You have three insurance institute designations, right?
- 4 A I do.
- 5 Q But none of them are associated with claims or claims 6 management?
- 7 A Not specifically.
- 8 Q And so you did not conduct -- you are not qualified to
 9 conduct an analysis of where the CDA claims fell in
- 10 coverage? You couldn't evaluate where the CDA plans fell in
- 11 coverage, could you?
- 12 A I could, I think.
- 13 Q Did you?
- 14 A No.
- Q And did you evaluate how much insurance was available
 to satisfy any of the CDA -- each CDA claim?
- 17 A No.

18 Now, Paragraph 4 of your direct testimony declaration Q 19 you said, "Although there are differences between the policy 20 programs which I outline below, as a general matter, there 21 is a risk that every dollar out of the insurance proceeds 22 that goes to defense costs is a dollar that cannot be awarded to victims of abuse." Do you recall saying that? 23 Was it defense costs specifically? 24 Α 25 Q Yes.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 198 of 529

Page 102 1 Α Okay. 2 When you say there is a risk --0 3 THE COURT: Does he have a copy of his direct 4 testimony? I think if you're going to ask him about things 5 that are in his direct testimony --6 MR. NASATIR: That's fair enough. 7 THE COURT: -- I want to be sure that the witness 8 has a copy of it in front of him. 9 MR. NASATIR: I will... 10 THE WITNESS: Thank you. Great. 11 THE COURT: And your last question was about 12 Paragraph 4, which is --13 MR. NASATIR: Paragraph 4, correct? 14 THE COURT: -- on page 4 of 14. 15 BY MR. NASATIR: 16 So this risk that every dollar for defense costs is a 0 17 dollar that could have been given to award -- excuse me -to victims of abuse, did you quantify that percentage of 18 19 risk? 20 Α No. 21 So you don't -- you don't have an opinion on whether Q 22 it's really small or really big? 23 Α I do not. 24 So, now I'd like you to look at the coverage chart. It Q 25 is attached as Exhibit A, the last page of Exhibit A to the

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 199 of 529

Page 103 1 stipulated coverage chart. 2 MR. NASATIR: And I don't know if we can put that 3 up on the screen? If it's any assistance, Your Honor, it looks like that. 4 5 THE COURT: Maybe... Was this in your opening 6 slide deck? 7 MR. NASATIR: I think it was in their opening --8 THE COURT: Yeah. 9 MR. NASATIR: This page was not though. It should 10 be PX-1, I think. 11 BY MR. NASATIR: 12 Have you seen this before? 0 13 THE COURT: It's in DX-1? Excuse me. 14 MR. BROWN: It looks like it's Exhibit A. 15 THE COURT: Exhibit A of DX-1. 16 MR. BROWN: I think that's committee. It is DX-1 17 open in front of me. MR. NASATIR: It's also Committee Exhibit A. 18 THE COURT: Okay. You agree it's attached to DX-19 20 1? 21 MR. NASATIR: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Just so -- that's what I have 23 open in front me I'm looking at. 24 MR. NASATIR: And this may be a pointless 25 exercise, unless the witness says he's seen it before.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 200 of 529

Page 104 1 BY MR. NASATIR: 2 Sir, have you seen this before? 0 3 Α I have not. 4 MR. NASATIR: And then I'm going to ask if we 5 could put up the coverage chart that you had admitted into 6 evidence in the -- Yeah, the bar chart, yeah. This chart 7 that we're going to put up here is actually an exhibit to 8 Mr. Porter's first day declaration. And it was -- the 9 exhibits were moved into evidence the beginning of today by 10 the Diocese. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 MR. NASATIR: And if you're looking for -- it kind 13 of looks like that. I apologize, Your Honor. I was not 14 expecting that this Court had not received what we -- was 15 agreed upon, the summary of our coverage. So I'm going back 16 to what he attached to his declaration in the first days. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 MR. NASATIR: I know you don't. 19 THE COURT: Just so long as we have a clear record 20 of what it that you're -- by exhibit number or ECF number. 21 So, as I understand it, this is ECF 169-1. You're supposed 22 to put up on the screen is... 23 MR. NASATIR: Well, no. What I'm talking about, Your Honor, which -- and I don't know if it has a different 24 25 number --

20-12345-mg	g Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 201 of 529
	Page 105
1	THE COURT: Look at the screen over there. Is
2	that what you're showing?
3	MR. NASATIR: No. I'm looking because the
4	witness has not seen that before
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	MR. NASATIR: I'm looking for a copy of
7	something he has seen before.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	MS. DEL MEDICO: (indiscernible).
10	MR. NASATIR: Yeah, that's (indiscernible).
11	MS. DEL MEDICO: It's also Debtors' Exhibit 12.
12	MR. NASATIR: Yeah, let's just see if it's
13	yes, it is. Right there. It's right there. It's Debtors'
14	Exhibit U, Your Honor, we put up. It's possible that it's
15	not got the colors.
16	MS. DEL MEDICO: It's Debtors' 12 over here.
17	MR. NASATIR: It's also Debtors' 12.
18	THE COURT: Debtors' Exhibit 12?
19	MS. DEL MEDICO: Well, I'm just saying, if we're
20	looking.
21	MR. NASATIR: Yes.
22	THE COURT: Okay. I don't think so.
23	MS. DEL MEDICO: It's attached at the back.
24	THE COURT: Debtors' Exhibit 12 is giant
25	MR. BROWN: It's at the beginning of the

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 202 of 529 Page 106 1 declaration, of course, right, from --2 MS. DEL MEDICO: From October 1st --3 THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: Docket 6 -- it's right at the 4 5 beginning of Docket 6. The Porter declaration filed early 6 on. 7 THE COURT: In this adversary proceeding? 8 MR. BROWN: In the ADV, yes. 9 THE COURT: You mean --10 MR. BROWN: Docket 6 of the ADV. We're 11 unfortunately crashing on the computer pulling it up. 12 MR. NASATIR: So, Your Honor has this in front of 13 him? 14 THE COURT: Just a second. Yes, I do. 15 MR. NASATIR: Okay. I'm going to --16 THE COURT: Yes, go ahead. 17 MR. NASATIR: -- give this to the witness? 18 THE COURT: All right. 19 MR. NASATIR: He --20 THE COURT: So that we're clear --21 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 22 THE COURT: -- the witness is being shown --23 MR. NASATIR: The witness is being --24 THE COURT: -- is Docket Number 6-1, Page --25 insurance coverage chart. It's Exhibit A, the insurance

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 203 of 529

Page 107 1 coverage chart, Page 2 of 2. You hear? 2 MS. DEL MEDICO: Right. But Your Honor, that's 3 part of a larger document. It's an attachment to the declaration. 4 5 THE COURT: That one I opened. 6 MR. NASATIR: I think our exhibit we eliminated. 7 THE COURT: This is -- it's Part 2 of ECF 6, which 8 is Mr. Porter's declaration in support of the preliminary 9 injunction. On ECF it shows up as Exhibit A, Insurance 10 Coverage Chart, which is Exhibit A. That's the second page 11 of that. 12 MR. NASATIR: You are correct. 13 THE COURT: Go ahead. I just want to make sure we 14 have a clear record about what is being shown. 15 MR. NASATIR: Sure. 16 THE COURT: Okay, go ahead. 17 MR. NASATIR: And again, I apologize, Your Honor. 18 I had not anticipated --19 THE COURT: It's -- go ahead. Go ahead. 20 BY MR. NASATIR: 21 So, is a chart that you're familiar with, right, Mr. Q 22 Porter? Α 23 It is. 24 Okay. And what does the blue signify? Q 25 Α Royal policies.

20-12345-r	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 204 of 529
	Page 108
1	Q And for our purposes, can we agree that Arrowwood and
2	Royal are to be used interchangeably in terms of coverage of
3	policies issued here that are in blue?
4	A Yes.
5	Q Now, I think this came out of your post-direct direct,
6	but you didn't place the Arrowwood policies, right?
7	A I did not.
8	Q And your firm didn't, either.
9	A No.
10	Q But you are familiar with the policies.
11	A Iam.
12	Q And they cover 1956 through 1976, correct?
13	A Correct.
14	THE COURT: Just so we're clear for the record,
15	this chart is now being displayed on the screens in the
16	courtroom, on the large screens in the courtroom as well.
17	MR. NASATIR: Thank you. I didn't hadn't
18	noticed that.
19	BY MR. NASATIR:
20	Q And so, the blue chart looking at the blue chart
21	only right now, the bottom layer of it those are the
22	primary policies that Royal issued to the Diocese, right?
23	A Correct.
24	Q And where there are there's blue above that line.
25	These are the unbuelle policies wight?

25 Those are the umbrella policies, right?

	Pg 205 of 529
	Page 109
1	A Correct.
2	Q And would you agree with me that each of those
3	Arrowwood policies have limits that are not affected by the
4	payment defense costs?
5	A I would agree.
6	Q So, every dollar that Arrowwood pays out in defense
7	costs could never be a dollar that would go into the
8	(indiscernible) award for survivors of abuse.
9	A True, subject to their financial ability to pay.
10	Q We'll come to their financial ability, but excluding
11	their financial ability, that defense cost payment could
12	never have gone under the policy to an award for the
13	survivors.
14	A That's correct.
15	Q So, when you say there is a risk of every dollar out of
16	the insurance proceeds that goes to defense costs is a
17	dollar that cannot be awarded to the victims of abuse,
18	that's not true of the Arrowwood policies, is it?
19	A It is not.
20	Q And you say in that same sentence, you say as a
21	general matter would you agree with me that there is far
22	more blue Arrowwood policies in this coverage chart than
23	there are other codes, at least at the primary level?
24	A There are more bars, yes.
25	Q So as a general matter, defense costs are not going to

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 206 of 529

Page 110 1 be part of any award for survivors, right? 2 It would depend on the actual -- it's a state court Α 3 matter. 4 THE COURT: (indiscernible) what you've just said 5 -- the Arrowwood policies, Royal/Arrowwood policies, covered 6 policy years from the end of 1956 through 1976. Is that 7 correct? 8 MR. PORTER: It is. 9 THE COURT: Go ahead (indiscernible) 10 BY MR. NASATIR: 11 Okay. So, you suggested that -- or I think the Diocese 0 12 has suggested that you support the concept that Arrowwood 13 has limited funds available to pay claims or defense costs. 14 That's correct. Α 15 Q And you said in your deposition that Arrowwood is in 16 receivership. Do you recall that? 17 In receivership or under some sort of financial Α 18 oversight, yes. 19 You did say "Or has been taken over by a special Q 20 purpose company with limited resources." 21 Α Yes. 22 (indiscernible) and Arrowwood, right? Q 23 That's right. Α 24 So, I'd like to bring up the Arrowwood 2022 annual Q 25 statement.

20-12345-n	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 207 of 529
	Page 111
1	THE COURT: What exhibit?
2	MR. NASATIR: (indiscernible) Exhibit E, Your
3	Honor.
4	THE COURT: Do you have the exhibit on your
5	screen?
6	MR. PORTER: I think it's coming up.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MR. PORTER: It's coming up, I think. Thank you.
9	THE COURT: I have Exhibit (indiscernible)
10	MR. NASATIR: You have it?
11	THE COURT: I do.
12	BY MR. NASATIR:
13	Q My first question is, Mr. Porter, are you familiar with
14	the 2022 annual report that Arrowwood filed?
15	A Not specifically, no.
16	Q I'm going to read you the statement found on Page 14.1
17	and 2, (indiscernible) statement.
18	THE COURT: Wait. If you want to ask him a
19	question about the exhibit, you need to put the exhibit in
20	front of him, and he needs to you know, if he wants to
21	look at something other than the specific paragraph that
22	you're referring him to, he needs to be able to do that. So
23	
24	MR. NASATIR: I will show him
25	THE COURT: Where you you know, on the screen
l	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 208 of 529

Page 112 1 you've got a portion of a larger document. I just want to 2 be sure that the witness has the full exhibit in front of 3 him. 4 MR. NASATIR: If we could get a clipboard, it'll 5 be easier for us to work with (indiscernible) 6 UNKNOWN: Is that 101 pages? 7 THE COURT: I don't have a lot of clips, but 8 here's a clip. 9 MR. NASATIR: Sorry, but thank you. 10 THE COURT: You may deplete my supply up here, but 11 here's a clip that'll fit on that. 12 MR. NASATIR: You are welcome to look at the 13 entire exhibit --14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 MR. NASATIR: (indiscernible) 16 THE COURT: Tell me what page you're going to 17 (indiscernible) 18 MR. NASATIR: 14.1, which is after Page 11. 19 THE COURT: Okay. It's "Notes to Financial 20 Statement". 21 MR. NASATIR: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Page 14.1. MR. NASATIR: Right. I'm going to read the 23 24 paragraph about going concern. 25 THE COURT: Are you familiar with this document,

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 209 of 529

Page 113 1 Mr. Porter? 2 MR. PORTER: I've -- this is the second time I've 3 seen it, yes. THE COURT: 4 Okay. 5 MR. PORTER: Thank you. 6 THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. NASATIR: Thank you, Your Honor. 7 8 BY MR. NASATIR: 9 So, what Arrowwood says about its financial situation 10 is as follows under Going Concern: "Based on the company's 11 evaluation, the company has sufficient liquidity to continue as a going return -- going concern, as defined in SSAP No. 12 13 1, Disclosures of accounting policies, risks, and other 14 uncertainties and other disclosures. However, as of 15 December 31, 2022, the company's risk case capital, RBC 16 ratio, which is the ratio of the company's total adjusted 17 capital to authorize control level capital, has fallen below 18 its RBC-mandatory level. As the mandatory control level, 19 the Delaware Department of Insurance, DOI, is mandated to 20 place the company under its control except where, as is the 21 case with the company, such company is a property and 22 casualty insurance company that is no longer writing new 23 business and is running off existing liabilities. 24 Under these circumstances, the Commissioner has 25 the discretion to continue to allow the runoff of the

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 210 of 529

	Page 114
1	company; nevertheless, the DOI could seek to place the
2	company in a formal proceeding, i.e., rehabilitation or
3	liquidation, at any time based on the company's financial
4	condition." Have I read that accurately?
5	THE COURT: Well, you actually got one thing
6	wrong, but he's got it in front of him. I think you
7	inverted the order of two words. It's not going to make a
8	difference. Go ahead. You asked if you read it accurately;
9	I don't think so, but
10	BY MR. NASATIR:
11	Q Does this refresh your recollection in any way as to
12	whether or change your view as to whether Arrowwood is in
13	receivership?
14	A My comment about receivership was about financial
15	impairment. I don't know that I
16	Q You didn't mean it as a technical term.
17	A Not as a technical term.
18	THE COURT: Can I ask you this question? Is it
19	is Royal/Arrowwood continuing is it writing new business?
20	MR. PORTER: It is not, no.
21	MR. NASATIR: That is the nature of a runoff
22	company.
23	THE COURT: I understand that.
24	BY MR. NASATIR:
25	Q Are you familiar with the firm ACIC?

Pa	21:	1 of	529

	Page 115
1	A No.
2	Q Do you disagree that this statement in the annual
3	report indicates that Arrowwood can meet its financial
4	obligations for at least the next twelve months?
5	A That's what the report would suggest, yes.
6	Q And do you have any understanding as to whether the
7	company has \$768 million in cash and invested assets?
8	A Are you asking the question whether I know that?
9	Q Yes, whether you know.
10	A Is it in the report?
11	Q Yes.
12	A Where in the report is that?
13	Q I'm just asking if you know. I don't
14	A Oh, okay. No. Not offhand, no.
15	Q So, if the preliminary injunction is not granted and
16	cases went along and defense costs were incurred, wouldn't
17	that be a good thing because Arrowwood currently has the
18	funds to pay those defense costs?
19	THE COURT: How many other cases anywhere in the
20	country involving Dioceses are going forward that for
21	which Arrowwood's reserves can be called on? Is Arrowwood -
22	_
23	MR. NASATIR: I can tell you
24	THE COURT: I thought that Arrowwood not only
25	insured this Diocese but many Diocese.
I	

Page 116

MR. NASATIR: Your Honor, I can tell you that (indiscernible) to the Archdiocese of Santa Fe that they have confirmed the plan about -- I don't know, a couple months ago, and that plan had a settlement with Arrowwood in which they contributed millions of dollars to the settlement (indiscernible)

7 THE COURT: Yeah, but I -- there are -- I don't 8 know whether Arrowwood wrote insurance for other than 9 Catholic Diocese. I don't know what its book of business 10 consisted of. You put up a report that says how much their 11 cash reserves were at a date, but how is this witness 12 supposed to know what all of the insured's claims, other 13 than this Diocese or parishes that are covered by it, and 14 what's -- how many hands are pulling on that pot of money? 15 Do you know? I mean, is it in the document? 16 MR. NASATIR: Well, I would submit, Your Honor, 17 that the document says that it's a going concern for the 18 next twelve months. 19 THE COURT: Yes, but --20 MR. NASATIR: And Mr. Porter -- Mr. Porter is --21 THE COURT: Mr. Porter, do you know how many

22 claims have been made against Arrowwood not involving the

23 Diocese of Rockville Centre or parishes within it?

24 MR. PORTER: I don't know.

MR. NASATIR: The people who do the financial

25

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 213 of 529

	Page 117
1	accounting, the actuaries and those people, have to assess
2	whether they can pay the claims going forward. I'm not
3	asking Mr. Porter to adopt the idea that the company is
4	solid beyond a year
5	THE COURT: Okay, you're using this document
6	what's the
7	MR. NASATIR: The purpose of my use the use of
8	this document, Your Honor, is to rebut Mr. Porter's view
9	that there is a practical and the Diocese view that this is
10	a practical aggregate.
11	THE COURT: Okay, go ahead. Just go ahead, then.
12	BY MR. NASATIR:
13	A I don't know what went into the analysis of their
14	liabilities, but if they were estimated on the basis of the
15	stay of the state court actions, bringing those forward
16	could potentially change the analysis.
17	Q (indiscernible) reserve for a the insurance company
18	reserves claims it's aware of, right?
19	A They do, but the idea of liquidity and the next the
20	obligations that'll be payable for the next twelve months
21	if they're estimating those on the basis of current claims,
22	active claims, that's one number. If it's current claims,
23	active claims, plus now new claims, that could put a greater
24	stress would put a greater stress on their cash
25	obligations over the next twelve months.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 214 of 529 Page 118 1 You don't know whether this report takes that into 0 2 account or not. 3 I don't know. Α 4 One last point. In your declaration at Footnote 4, you Q 5 note that Arrowwood -- you note that some insurance company 6 has denied claims. 7 Α Yes. 8 THE COURT: I don't understand your question. 9 MR. NASATIR: Part of the direct testimony of Mr. 10 Porter is that a company has denied claims to date based on 11 the policy arguments. 12 MS. DEL MEDICO: Can you direct us to where you're 13 14 MR. NASATIR: Footnote 4. 15 MS. DEL MEDICO: Okay. Page 3? 16 MR. NASATIR: Footnote 4. 17 BY MR. NASATIR: 18 And do you recall that, sir? Footnote 4. Q 19 Α I see that, yes. 20 Q Do you know whether that refers to Arrowwood? 21 Α I believe it -- I believe it did, yes. 22 So, to the extent that Arrowwood is denying claims Q 23 based on the coverage defense it has, there are no defense 24 dollars coming out of Arrowwood anyway which would not --25 which could go to anywhere else, right? At least for those

Г

	Page 119
1	claims.
2	THE COURT: Just so we have a clear record, when
3	you refer to Footnote 4, you're talking about Footnote 4 on
4	Page 4 of Mr. Porter's direct testimony?
5	MR. NASATIR: Yes, that's it, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Okay, that's fine. I just wanted
7	again, I just want to make sure we have a clear record of
8	what
9	MR. NASATIR: Thank you.
10	THE COURT: Okay, go ahead.
11	BY MR. NASATIR:
12	Q Going back to Exhibit U, Your Honor. That's it. Now,
13	we're still talking about your testimony that there is a
14	risk that every dollar out of the insurance proceeds is
15	that goes towards defense costs is a dollar that cannot be
16	awarded to victims of abuse. Let's turn to what I've heard
17	described as "the Bishop's program". Are you familiar with
18	that phrase?
19	A Iam, yes.
20	Q What is the Bishop's program?
21	A It's a proprietary liability program created by Arthur
22	J. Gallagher called the Bishop's program for churches.
23	Q And looking at the first green line above the white
24	line, what is that specific excess program?
25	THE COURT: Let me just the charts on the

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 216 of 529

Page 120 1 screen are in color. The charts in the exhibit binders are 2 not. 3 MR. NASATIR: Okay. I was using it for ease of --THE COURT: I understand. Again, I'm looking for 4 5 clarity of record, because the exhibit binders don't have 6 the color chart. They have a black and white chart, so I 7 want to be sure that they're -- I see them on the screen; I 8 understand that. 9 MR. NASATIR: I will read what's in the black and 10 white chart so that we identify --11 THE COURT: Fine. Go ahead. That's fine. BY MR. NASATIR: 12 13 So, if you can follow -- in the color chart, it's 0 14 green. If it's not colored, it's the "specific excess 15 program". And my question is, what carrier is in the 16 specific excess program? 17 It's a mix of insurers. Ά 18 Q I'm sorry? It's a mix. Mix of insurers. 19 Α 20 Q But those insurers, all of them -- they have no duty to 21 defend, correct? 22 Α Correct. 23 And they just reimburse defense costs, right? Q 24 Α And damages. 25 Q And damages.

	Pg 217 of 529
	Page 121
1	A Yes.
2	Q And you said and (indiscernible) in your
3	declaration, at Paragraph 16, Docket 181, you said, "Under
4	the London policies, defense costs are generally considered
5	part of the ultimate net loss. That means incurring
6	reimbursable defense costs depletes available policy
7	proceeds." Did I read that correctly?
8	A I don't have that in front of me, but it sounds right.
9	Q It sounds right to you.
10	A It does. Yeah.
11	MS. DEL MEDICO: Where are you reading?
12	THE COURT: This is from his direct testimony.
13	MS. DEL MEDICO: Okay, you said 16?
14	THE COURT: Paragraph 16. It was a verbatim read
15	of what's in Paragraph 16.
16	MS. DEL MEDICO: Do you have it?
17	MR. PORTER: I don't have that in front of me.
18	THE COURT: I thought somebody put his direct
19	MR. NASATIR: I gave you your declaration
20	(indiscernible)
21	THE COURT: It's in your declaration, which was
22	given to you.
23	MR. PORTER: Okay.
24	THE COURT: It's Paragraph 16, which is which
25	is Page 7

20-12345-m	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 218 of 529
	Page 122
1	MR. PORTER: Okay, thank you.
2	THE COURT: of your direct testimony.
3	MR. PORTER: Okay. Okay, my document is not
4	reading the same, I don't think.
5	MR. NASATIR: I'm sorry, would you repeat
6	yourself?
7	MR. PORTER: I my document's not reading the
8	same, I don't think. What I have here is a looks like my
9	direct testimony. Okay.
10	MR. NASATIR: That's what I'm talking about.
11	MR. PORTER: Yeah. And you're saying
12	MR. NASATIR: Paragraph 16.
13	MR. PORTER: Okay. Okay. Thank you.
14	BY MR. NASATIR:
15	Q So, it is your testimony that the insurers will not
16	wait to be presented with the (indiscernible) net loss but
17	will reimburse defense costs over the course of the claim.
18	Is that right?
19	A They can, yes, if they're willing.
20	Q Well, are you aware that the London insurers have said
21	that they will not pay until they're presented with an
22	alternate loss in their litigation?
23	A I don't know.
24	MS. DEL MEDICO: Objection.
25	THE COURT: Overruled. He's answered.

Page 123 1 MR. NASATIR: I didn't hear the answer. 2 BY MR. NASATIR: I don't know. 3 Α You don't. Would you agree with me that the policy 4 Q language does not provide for payment during the course of 5 6 the claim of defense costs? 7 Α I don't know. I don't know whether there's language to 8 that effect or not. 9 You said that it's custom and practice for the insurer 0 10 to pay defense costs over the course of the claim in these 11 policies. Yes, I did. 12 Α Yeah. 13 Is that based on your personal knowledge of this Okay. 0 program? 14 15 Α Personal knowledge of the Bishop's program, yes. 16 So in other words, this is -- this course of conduct Q 17 that you're testifying to happened after you came on board in 2007. 18 19 With respect -- yes, but with respect to -- I don't Α 20 know -- not with respect to Rockville Centre particularly, 21 but my experience with Diocesan organizations and that 22 program generally. All right. So, I'm strictly talking about Rockville 23 Q 24 Centre. 25 Α Okay.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 220 of 529 Page 124 1 All right. So, you haven't seen that happen in the 0 2 Rockville Centre CDA cases, right? 3 Α I have not. 4 THE COURT: Do you know one way or the other 5 whether it's happened in the Rockville Centre cases where 6 the -- this is the London insurers -- whether they're 7 responding to pay defense costs during the course of the 8 case. 9 MR. PORTER: They are not. I don't believe they 10 are. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 MR. PORTER: No. 13 MR. NASATIR: Thank you. And Your Honor, to the extent that Mr. Porter is relying on the experience of other 14 15 programs, I think that I would object to that testimony. 16 THE COURT: Overruled. You can ask him 17 specifically, "Are they paying the defense costs in the Rockville Centre case?" 18 19 MR. NASATIR: Yeah, I asked him that. He said he 20 didn't know. 21 THE COURT: And the answer is you don't know? 22 Were they --23 MR. PORTER: I don't know. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. PORTER: I don't know.

Page 125

	Page 125
1	BY MR. NASATIR:
2	Q You would agree with me that if the London insurers had
3	taken the position that they're not going to pay defense
4	costs over the course of the claim that there is no defense
5	dollars going into anyone's pocket that could have gone into
6	awards for the survivors, right?
7	THE COURT: I don't understand that question.
8	BY MR. NASATIR:
9	Q Mr. Porter, you would agree if LMI is if the London
10	insurers are not paying defense costs, there's no question
11	that any defense costs can't have gone to the survivors
12	instead if they're not paying.
13	THE COURT: I'm sorry, but that doesn't make any
14	sense to me.
15	MR. NASATIR: I'm going to his statement that
16	Mr. Porter's statement that every dollar in defense costs is
17	a dollar that could have gone to the survivors. And I'm
18	saying in this instance if London Market Insurers aren't
19	paying, there's nothing that could have gone to the
20	survivors.
21	THE COURT: Is there to your knowledge, is
22	there a priority payments provision in the policy as to
23	whether defense costs are satisfied before liability to
24	abusers abused you know, those who have been abused?
25	MR. PORTER: In my experience, dollars are paid

Pg 222 of 529

Page 126 1 accrued as they become -- as they're presented, sort of in 2 time order. So, the defense expenses that are being 3 incurred are being accrued as a liability payable in the future. 4 5 THE COURT: To your knowledge, in any of the 6 Diocese cases --7 MR. PORTER: Yeah. 8 THE COURT: Because you're involved in not only 9 Rockville Centre. 10 MR. PORTER: Others as well. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 MR. PORTER: Yeah. 13 THE COURT: Has this issue of coverage amounts being exhausted arose where some of it is defense costs and 14 15 some of it is the liability to abuse survivors? 16 MR. PORTER: It is a practical matter that defense 17 costs precede the settlement amounts --18 THE COURT: They're not being paid; I don't know. I mean, is there something -- what are you relying on as to 19 20 the order in which they're -- if the insurers aren't paying 21 the defense costs and you get -- there's a judgment. 22 MR. PORTER: Right. 23 THE COURT: And the amount of the judgment and 24 defense costs exceed the policy limits --25 MR. PORTER: Yes.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 223 of 529 Page 127 1 THE COURT: Do you know of cases in which insurers 2 have resolved which to pay first? I'm asking for your 3 experience. 4 Yeah. My experience is that they're MR. PORTER: 5 going to pay in the order in which those costs were 6 incurred. 7 THE COURT: Do you know that that has actually 8 happened, where the policy limits have been exhausted for 9 both defense and settlements or judgements and they've made 10 a decision in which the order -- which they'll pay, because 11 they haven't paid during the course of the case. 12 MR. PORTER: Right, and --13 THE COURT: And you know that that has happened? 14 MR. PORTER: I believe that to be my experience, 15 that they're paying --16 THE COURT: Give me the specific of a case where 17 that's happened. MR. PORTER: Well, let me clear on what I'm 18 19 saying. So, as the expenses -- as defense expenses are 20 incurred, Day One, Day Two, Day Three, those amounts 21 accumulate. 22 THE COURT: But are not paid.

MR. PORTER: Not paid, but accumulate as a
liability payable to the insured. Let's just say they wait
until the very end, right? The bucket has been filled up

Pg 224 of 529

Page 128 1 with defense expense amounts, and at the point where -- to 2 say the limits are exhausted, it would be at that point the 3 reimbursement would be payable, would be due. 4 THE COURT: They pay at the point when it's been 5 exhausted even if the underlying -- if there's no judgement? 6 If the costs are fully -- policy amounts are used. They've 7 accrued defense costs up to the policy amounts. 8 MR. PORTER: Right. 9 THE COURT: They pay then whether there's any 10 finality or not? 11 MR. PORTER: If it's a covered claim, yes. 12 They'll pay. 13 THE COURT: And you know that that's happened? 14 MR. PORTER: I --15 THE COURT: Do you? 16 MR. PORTER: I believe that --17 THE COURT: Not "maybe". I'm asking specifics. 18 MR. PORTER: I --19 THE COURT: Because you're going to tell me which 20 case. MR. PORTER: Yeah. It's just the mechanics of the 21 22 policy. 23 THE COURT: I'm asking you a specific question. 24 MR. PORTER: Yes. 25 THE COURT: You said that's how it works, and I

Pg 225 of 529

Page 129 1 want you to tell me, when has that happened? I don't want 2 to know "Maybe. That's how they might treat it." 3 MR. PORTER: Right. THE COURT: Do you know that that's actually 4 5 happened in fact, and if so, tell me the case. 6 MR. PORTER: I can't --7 THE COURT: Who was the insured --8 MR. PORTER: Right. I don't have those particular 9 10 THE COURT: Okay, so you don't know. 11 MR. PORTER: I believe I know, but I don't have 12 the specifics of any case to provide you, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: You can't tell me the case. You think it's happened, but you don't know when, who, any of that. 14 15 Or you're not prepared to tell me? 16 MR. PORTER: I'm relying on the language of the 17 policy (indiscernible) 18 THE COURT: I want -- that's not my question. I 19 see the language of policies. 20 MR. PORTER: Okay. 21 THE COURT: You said that when the defense costs 22 have been -- when the policy amounts have been exhausted, 23 they pay, even if the case -- underlying case isn't done. 24 MR. PORTER: Okay. 25 I asked, when did that happen? THE COURT:

Page 130 1 MR. PORTER: I don't have that. 2 THE COURT: You don't know. 3 MR. PORTER: I don't know. THE COURT: I asked if there's a judgement and 4 5 defense costs that exceed the amounts of the policy limits -6 - I asked you how it would be allocated or in what order it 7 would be paid. You don't -- you can't tell me a specific 8 case where that's happened. Am I correct? 9 MR. PORTER: That's correct. 10 THE COURT: Go ahead. Don't fence with me. 11 MR. NASATIR: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm going to 12 move to a slightly different topic --13 THE COURT: Go ahead. 14 BY MR. NASATIR: 15 0 Which is the limits on the London program. Would you 16 agree to me that -- with me that from 1980 to 1985, there's 17 an average of \$50 million in limits? 18 Yes, that's what the chart suggests. Α 19 Q And you --20 THE COURT: That's for primary and excess. 21 MR. NASATIR: Primary and excess, yes. 22 BY MR. NASATIR: 23 So, if you -- 5 million -- sorry, 50 million for five Q 24 years is 2.5 billion, right? By my math --25 Α If that's the math, yes.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 227 of 529		
	Page 131	
1	Q And the and this is on a per-claim basis, right?	
2	A Per-occurrence basis.	
3	Q Occurrence, excuse me.	
4	A Yeah.	
5	Q Thank you. Now, there's something called a "self-	
6	insured retention aggregate limit". Are you familiar with	
7	that?	
8	A Iam.	
9	Q This aggregate limit is not about the aggregating the	
10	limits of liability; it's about aggregating the obligation	
11	to pay the self-insured retention. Is that right?	
12	A That's right.	
13	Q There are two different uses of the word "aggregate".	
14	A Yes.	
15	Q And with respect to the SIR aggregate and the specific	
16	excess program, is it correct to say initially without	
17	putting numbers on it the Diocese has to pay the self-	
18	insured retention and when it caps out at a certain point,	
19	it becomes the London Insurers obligation, and when that	
20	caps out it goes back to the Diocese. Is that right?	
21	A Generally, that would be true, yes.	
22	THE COURT: But self-insured retention under these	
23	policies	
24	MR. PORTER: Yes.	
25	THE COURT: Is the Diocese or the parish or both -	

	Page 132
1	- at the start today, we heard that a large percentage of
2	the premiums were paid by the parishes, and I'm asking that
3	with respect how does it work with respect to the self-
4	insured retention?
5	MR. PORTER: I don't know for sure. I can speak
6	generally, but not for sure.
7	BY MR. NASATIR:
8	Q But for the insurer's responsibility for the self-
9	insured retentions, they would be paying out the defense
10	costs. Do you understand that that amount is roughly
11	\$500,000 a year for the first seven years of the Bishop's
12	program?
13	A I do not I was not aware of that, no.
14	Q So, you're generally not aware at what point the self-
15	insured retention kicks in as an obligation of the insurer
16	and when it reverts back to the Diocese.
17	A That's right.
18	Q But in order to understand the impact of any claim
19	going forward and whether the London Insurer was responsible
20	for it, you would have to know exactly where in that SIR
21	aggregate risk program you were to know whose obligation it
22	was going to be.
23	A That's right.
24	Q And you've not done any of that type of analysis,
25	right?

Page 133

1	A I have not.
2	MR. NASATIR: Your Honor, the next topic I'm going
3	to cover is concerning the shared insurance and the first-
4	come-first-served topic. I just want to make the point that
5	currently we are asking for permission we're asking for
6	the stay not to be imposed or the injunction not to be
7	placed upon us to allow the state court cases to go forward
8	to collect and that defense costs be paid. The issue of
9	income the issue of shared insurance only comes up upon
10	execution on a judgement or settlement. I don't I'm
11	prepared to go forward with my examination with Mr. Porter
12	on that, but it is depending on how Your Honor
13	THE COURT: I don't know what relief I'll grant.
14	Just go for it.
15	MR. NASATIR: Okay, thank you.
16	THE COURT: Ask the question.
17	MR. NASATIR: Thank you.
18	BY MR. NASATIR:
19	Q Now, you raised some concerns in your direct
20	examination declaration about shared insurance, right?
21	A Yes.
22	Q Okay. And is it fair to say that your concern is that
23	insurance will be paid out in a first-come-first-served
24	basis?
25	A Yes.

	1920001020
	Page 134
1	Q Well, let's let me ask you this. You would agree
2	with me that was a concern that is not a concern where
3	the carriers denied coverage, right?
4	A Correct.
5	Q Do you know how many coverage actions are currently
6	going on which involve the Diocese insurance policies?
7	A Only from what I've heard today.
8	Q Only from what you heard today?
9	A Yeah.
10	Q To the extent any carrier is engaged in a coverage
11	declaratory relief coverage action, in order for first-come-
12	first-served to be an issue, they would have to drop all
13	their coverage defenses, right?
14	A Had they denied outright, or they'd reserved their
15	rights?
16	Q Either way, before they pay, they're going to have to
17	agree to pay.
18	A Agreed. Yes.
19	Q Now, have you ever witnessed a situation where an
20	insurer of the Diocese and/or the parishes settled with one
21	of those two, but not the other?
22	THE COURT: I don't ask it again, please. I
23	just I had trouble following.
24	BY MR. NASATIR:
25	Q Have you witnessed a situation where both the Diocese

Pg 231 of 529	
---------------	--

Γ

	Page 135
1	and a parish are codefendants and the matter has been
2	resolved by the insurer by getting a release for one
3	defendant but not for the other?
4	A I have not experienced that.
5	Q So, as a practical matter, most typically you've
6	observed the insurer when it settles gets releases from all
7	its assureds, right?
8	A I don't I suppose it's one or the other. I don't
9	know.
10	Q You would agree with me that if the insurer does get
11	releases from both from all its for all its assureds
12	that there is no issue of first-come-first-served.
13	A If the I would agree on that particular example,
14	yes.
15	Q Now, you nonetheless believe that Arrowwood would pay
16	on a first-come-first-served basis, assuming it isn't
17	denying the claim and it is paying.
18	A Absolutely.
19	Q Now, would you agree with me that there is no policy
20	provision in the Arrowwood policies that require the carrier
21	to pay on a first-come-first-served basis?
22	A Arrowwood has a duty to defend, and therefore must meet
23	those policy obligations as the obligations become due.
24	Q Right, but if you have let me ask it a different
25	way. There is no provision in the policy that says "We have

	Pg 232 of 529
	Page 136
1	to pay the first person that tenders a settlement or a
2	judgement."
3	A There's nothing in the policy that says that.
4	Q And have you ever seen an application strike that.
5	You're not aware of any case law, insurance case law in New
6	York, that creates a first-come-first-served rule, are you?
7	MS. DEL MEDICO: Objection.
8	THE COURT: Sustained.
9	BY MR. NASATIR:
10	Q You would agree with me that if a survivor asserts
11	they've been abused by a priest or a perpetrator over
12	multiple years, there would be multiple per-occurrence
13	limits available in coverage, right?
14	A Yes.
15	Q So, we're not just talking about one tower. We're
16	talking, depending on the claim, about several towers,
17	right?
18	A Right.
19	Q Can you look at Paragraph 22 of your direct testimony?
20	Let me know when you're there.
21	A I'm there, thank you.
22	Q Now, you say you're saying here that if a parish and
23	a CVA plaintiff have settled for \$200,000 during the
24	THE COURT: Which paragraph are you looking at?
25	MR. NASATIR: Twenty-two.

20-12345-m	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 233 of 529
	Page 137
1	THE COURT: I'm looking at Paragraph 22. It just
2	says "Attached hereto as Exhibit B."
3	MR. NASATIR: Is this are you looking at 181?
4	THE COURT: I'm looking at 180 ECF Docket No.
5	181.
6	MR. NASATIR: (indiscernible) 181. Yes.
7	THE COURT: All right, I've got it now. Go ahead.
8	I have it opened up. Go ahead. I had the wrong docket.
9	BY MR. NASATIR:
10	Q So, I'm going to start with the hypothetical that you
11	testified to here again. You're saying that if a parish and
12	a CVA plaintiff settle for \$200,000 during the London
13	Insurer years and the London Insurer did not get a release
14	from the CVA plaintiff, that the Diocese would have no
15	insurance proceeds available. Is that right? That's what
16	you said.
17	MS. DEL MEDICO: I don't see objection. I
18	don't see those words.
19	THE COURT: I don't either. Sustained.
20	MR. NASATIR: I will read it. I was paraphrasing
21	it.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MS. DEL MEDICO: (indiscernible)
24	MR. NASATIR: I can't see that.
25	BY MR. NASATIR:

Page 138

1	Q Starting at Paragraph 22, "Thus, even while the
2	automatic stay bars litigation against the DRVC, if a CVA
3	plaintiff succeeded in establishing liability against a
4	parish for sexual abuse occurring during the London program
5	policy periods, the parish would be able to draw insurance
6	policy proceeds to cover the loss." Okay? And now I'm
7	going to read your the hypothetical you provided here.
8	"If, for example, the parish"
9	THE COURT: "For example, if." You didn't read it
10	correctly.
11	BY MR. NASATIR:
12	Q I guess I'm getting dyslexia in my later years. Let me
13	try this again. "For example, if the parish's liability for
14	the claim was \$200,000, the parish would be responsible for
15	a \$100,000 self-insured retention (SIR) but may be entitled
16	to have some or all of the SIR reimbursed from the proceeds
17	the insurance proceeds of that year's aggregate
18	agreement. The parish would also be entitled to
19	indemnification of the \$100,000 under the specific excess
20	agreement for the amount exceeding the SIR. Importantly,
21	once the insured once the insurance company has paid its
22	share of the covered loss to the parish, it will have no
23	further obligation regarding that occurrence and as a
24	result, if the DRVC later attempts to settle with that CVA
25	plaintiff in its Chapter 11 case, no insurance policy

212-267-6868

	Page 139
1	proceeds would be available under the aggregate agreement
2	and the proceeds paid to the parish under the specific
3	excess agreement would also not be available to the DRVC."
4	I hope I read that correctly. My question, sir, is if
5	somebody did come after the Diocese in that hypothetical,
6	there would be the remaining amounts of insurance available
7	to pay that claim, right? On the occurrence basis.
8	A Are we speaking about the specific
9	Q Yes.
10	A aggregate, or the
11	Q No, we're not talking about the aggregate. I'm just
12	saying, one I'm asking you, isn't it true that the upper
13	towers of insurance would be available to the Diocese in the
14	event that there was a settlement with the parish that
15	exhausted the first layer of insurance?
16	MS. DEL MEDICO: Objection.
17	THE COURT: Overruled.
18	BY MR. NASATIR:
19	A I would have to look at the policies again, but I'm
20	just not recalling what the excess would do over top of
21	those primary layers. Would they would a gap emerge?
22	THE COURT: I don't understand what you mean by
23	I understand "gap" because I've had to litigate this before,
24	but there's primary; there's excess. There are multiple
25	insured parties.

Page 140 1 MR. PORTER: Yes. 2 THE COURT: If the primary is exhausted with a judgement against one of the co-insureds, I think really the 3 4 question goes to whether the excess is available to the 5 second insured. That's essentially what you're asking. 6 MR. NASATIR: Exactly. MR. PORTER: And it's the question also, does it 7 8 drop down to be immediately over the SIR, or is this 9 additional gap -- SIR gap --10 THE COURT: Assuming --11 MR. NASATIR: (indiscernible) 12 THE COURT: The self-insured retention is 13 exhausted. The primary is exhausted. Does the second 14 insured have a claim against -- to recover against the 15 excess? That's what we're really trying to find out. 16 MR. NASATIR: Exactly. Thank you. 17 MR. PORTER: Presumably in excess of the SIR and 18 potentially in excess of the exhausted primary limit. 19 THE COURT: Yes, the second of the co-insureds can 20 claim against the excess insurance. 21 MR. PORTER: Yes. 22 BY MR. NASATIR: And in the event that happened, that scenario occurred, 23 Q 24 there would be no SIR for the second insured to pay, right? 25 I don't -- well, it depends on whether it's the same Α

Page 141 1 occurrence, treated as the same occurrence or not. 2 Well, if -- in the example, there's one occurrence and 0 3 that's -- it's not a new occurrence. We only get to the 4 question of excess if it's the same occurrence, right? 5 THE COURT: If it's a different occurrence, then 6 the policy limit -- that policy --MR. NASATIR: The new policy limit. It all starts 7 8 over again. 9 THE COURT: The policy limit starts all over 10 again. 11 MR. PORTER: Right. 12 THE COURT: This is an issue if it's the same 13 occurrence --14 MR. PORTER: Yeah. 15 THE COURT: And the primary and the self-insured 16 retention is exhausted by one of the co-insureds --17 MR. PORTER: Yeah. 18 THE COURT: Does the other co-insured then able to 19 claim against the excess? That's the issue, right? 20 MR. PORTER: Right. 21 MR. NASATIR: That's the exact issue. 22 MR. PORTER: Right. 23 THE COURT: And your answer is yes, they can. 24 MR. PORTER: They can. 25 BY MR. NASATIR:

- 3 insured retention?
- 4 A If treated as the same occurrence, yes.
- 5 Q And we've established that the self-insured retention,
- 6 to the extent it's the insurer's responsibility, was -- for
- 7 several years was an aggregate of \$500,000.
- 8 A Right.
- 9 Q Just to finish up here, Mr. Porter, your firm
- 10 represents the Philadelphia Archdiocese?
- 11 A It does.
- 12 Q Baltimore?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q Newark?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q Manchester?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q Richmond?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q Camden?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q Metuchen?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q Virgin Islands?
- 25 A Yes.

	Pg 239 of 529
	Page 143
1	Q And then, Rockville Centre.
2	A And
3	Q By my math, that's ten diocese representations. Have I
4	left anyone out?
5	A There are others, but those are the ones I'm directly
6	involved in.
7	Q And of those ten, at least five of them are facing CVA
8	claims under New York or New Jersey, right?
9	A New York or New Jersey, yeah.
10	Q And are the insurance programs in those five similar in
11	nature? Let me rephrase that. Do they have Bishop's
12	programs?
13	A Many of them do, yes.
14	Q So, your testimony here could be applicable
15	THE COURT: Let's leave the testimony just to this
16	case. He's not testifying about other cases.
17	MR. NASATIR: That's fine, Your Honor. I have no
18	further questions.
19	THE COURT: Thank you very much. Redirect?
20	MS. DEL MEDICO: No redirect, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Thank you. You're excused. Thank you
22	very much.
23	MR. PORTER: Thank you.
24	THE COURT: All right, it's 21 minutes after
25	12:00. Let's take our lunch recess now. Who is the next
	Varitavt Lagal Solutions

Page 144 1 witness? 2 MR. GEREMIA: The next witness is Charles Moore, Your Honor. 3 4 MR. NASATIR: Excuse me, Your Honor. Just --5 could we get Exhibit U admitted into evidence if there's no 6 objection? 7 MR. BROWN: I think (indiscernible) everything's 8 going to come in at the --9 MR. NASATIR: At the end? 10 MR. BROWN: We'll do a stipulation at the end. 11 MR. NASATIR: Okay. 12 MR. BROWN: There's not --13 THE COURT: Well, let's deal with it now, okay? Make a specific offer of -- by letters, maybe. If it's a 14 15 range, fine. Let's get -- I like -- you know, if there's 16 agreement in particular, let's have the record clear now 17 about which exhibits are in evidence for each side, okay? 18 MS. GREENWOOD: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Gail 19 Greenwood for Pachulski Stang. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MS. GREENWOOD: We move to have Exhibits A through 22 Q admitted into evidence as well as U, Y, and Z. And I 23 believe that -- setting aside U for the moment, Exhibits A 24 through Q, Y, and Z have been -- the parties have admitted 25 that they are admissible (indiscernible) pretrial

Page 145

	rage 145
1	stipulations provided to Your Honor, and
2	THE COURT: The parties have consented to
3	admitting A through Q, Y, and Z in the pretrial stipulation.
4	MS. GREENWOOD: Much better said, thank you.
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	MR. BROWN: And the only thing we're withdrawing,
7	Your Honor, from what's on the stipulation Exhibit R was
8	the joinders, which were objected to. That's the joinders
9	and the motion to dismiss. They were objected to as
10	hearsay. We are taking them out of the mix.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	MS. GREENWOOD: And Your Honor, I believe that we
13	provided the Court with electronic copies of these that are
14	in color, but to the extent that exhibits have been provided
15	that are black and white, we'll switch out any that are
16	necessary
17	THE COURT: That's fine. If they're if I have
18	them electronically, that's fine for this purpose, okay? I
19	just I want to be sure that when, you know, there's
20	witness testimony I'm looking at binders (indiscernible) I'm
21	looking at screen with color, but so it's clear, okay?
22	What about Exhibit U?
23	MS. GREENWOOD: Do you want to address Exhibit U?
24	We would move to
25	MR. NASATIR: Yes.

Page 146 1 MS. GREENWOOD: To admit Exhibit U pursuant to the 2 -- pursuant to the testimony by Mr. Porter this afternoon 3 and the questioning by Mr. Nasatir. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 MS. GREENWOOD: In particular --6 THE COURT: Hold on. Are there any objections to 7 the Court admitting in evidence Exhibit -- Defendant's 8 Exhibit -- yeah, Defendant's Exhibit U? 9 MR. DIPOMPEO: Christopher DiPompeo of the debtor, 10 Your Honor. No objections. 11 THE COURT: All right. So, Exhibit U is in as 12 well, okay. So, A through Q, U, Y, and Z have been offered. 13 There's been no objection as to any of them. They're all in 14 evidence. 15 MS. GREENWOOD: Yes, and we reserve for additional 16 rebuttal exhibits to the extent necessary --17 THE COURT: Okay, and -- and we covered all of 18 your exhibits? 19 MR. DIPOMPEO: Yes, Your Honor. I believe all of 20 our exhibits have been admitted. 21 THE COURT: Okay. So, we're good, then. Let's 22 take our lunch break. I don't know how long you want for lunch. I mean, we can go 1:30 or 2 o'clock. Tell me what 23 24 you want. 25 MR. GEREMIA: 1:30's good.

1 Is that okay? 1:30? We'll resume at THE COURT: 2 1:30. Let's just talk about -- are you going to finish the 3 evidence today? 4 MR. GEREMIA: I believe we can, yes. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Here's -- we can go no later 6 than 5:25, okay? Assuming we finish the evidence, my 7 thought is tomorrow we'll have closing arguments. Okay? Is there any disagreement with that plan? 8 9 MR. GEREMIA: No. No, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's try and see if we 11 can accomplish that. Hopefully, we can finish the evidence 12 today and you can all think about -- even if we finish the 13 evidence early, we'd still do closings tomorrow so you can 14 organize your thoughts and stuff like that. Okay? 15 MR. GEREMIA: May I clarify one thing, Your Honor? 16 THE COURT: Yeah, sure. 17 MR. GEREMIA: You asked me before about the IRCP. THE COURT: Yes. 18 19 MR. GEREMIA: And whether in connection with that 20 process notice was addressed. 21 THE COURT: Yes. 22 MR. GEREMIA: I just wanted to make sure that I clarified. The notice defense, in the sense that we've 23 24 spoken about it with the objections; that is, did the 25 Diocese know beforehand that this abuser was -- person was

Pg 244 of 529 Page 148 1 likely to abuse? That was not adjudicated or addressed by 2 the IRCP. Your Honor may be familiar with the IRCP protocol. One of the several factors that the 3 administrators looked at was whether after the abuse, did 4 5 the person contemporaneously notify somebody? So, there was 6 that --7 THE COURT: Yes. 8 MR. GEREMIA: That different --9 THE COURT: No, I just -- what I was trying -- I 10 thought that it was the case that the ICRP did not reject 11 claims because the Diocese or parishes did not have notice 12 of a -- you know, the alleged abuser's propensity or prior 13 bad acts. And you're saying --14 MR. GEREMIA: That's correct. 15 THE COURT: -- that that's true. The issue of 16 whether -- and it's in the form itself. "Did you tell

17 anybody about it?"

18 MR. GEREMIA: Yes.

19 THE COURT: Was something that was considered by the IRCP. 20 21 MR. GEREMIA: Right. 22 THE COURT: Okay, fair. All right, see you this afternoon. See you at 1:30. Thanks very much. Again --23 24 (Recess) 25 THE COURT: All right. Thanks very much. We're

Page 149 1 back after our short lunch break. We're ready to go forward 2 with the second witness. MR. GEREMIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Todd 3 Geremia for the Diocese. The Diocese calls as its next 4 5 witness Charles Moore. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Moore? 7 CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to 8 give this Court will be the truth, the whole truth, and 9 10 nothing but the truth? 11 MR. MOORE: I do. 12 THE COURT: Please have a seat. And there's water 13 there if you need water. 14 MR. MOORE: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Geremia? 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION OF CHARLES MOORE 17 BY MR. GEREMIA: 18 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Moore. 19 Good afternoon. Α 20 Q Could you please tell the Court your name and position? 21 Charles Moore. I am a managing director with Alvarez & Α 22 Marsal. 23 Has Alvarez & Marsal been engaged by the Diocese of Q Rockville Centre? 24 25 Α Yes.

	Pg 246 of 529
	Page 150
1	Q Since approximately when?
2	A We began work in January of 2019.
3	Q Have you personally worked with the Diocese since
4	January of 2019?
5	A Yes, I have.
6	Q And to do what?
7	A We were initially engaged by the Diocese to do a couple
8	of items. The first was to assist the Diocese with
9	improving its financial operations, but then also to assist
10	with evaluation of strategic alternatives, especially as it
11	relates to passage of the Child Victims Act.
12	Q Is it fair to say that you are the principal
13	restructuring advisor for the Diocese?
14	A Yes. I lead the team for Alvarez & Marsal.
15	Q Can you describe generally what work you personally did
16	for the Diocese before the Diocese filed the Chapter 11
17	cases?
18	A I've worked very closely with the Diocese since I got
19	involved. Specifically I interact with Tom Doodian, who is
20	the chief financial officer for the Diocese and his team,
21	along with Mr. Tom Renker, who is the chief operating
22	officer, and general counsel, Bill Chapin, for insurance,
23	Father Eric Fasano, who is the Vicar General, the Bishop,
24	and a variety of other people in essentially going back to
25	the original items. Initially it was to get our arms around

	Page 151
1	the operations of the Diocese. The Diocese was facing a
2	number of issues that was causing its financial performance
3	to deteriorate. So figuring out ways to improve that and
4	then also working with that team that I indicated,
5	especially as lawsuits started to be passed under the CVA,
6	or filed I should say, under the CVA to address and evaluate
7	different scenarios.
8	Q Did your duties shift after the Diocese filed the
9	Chapter 11 petition in this case?
10	A Yes. Once the Diocese filed on October 1st of 2020, we
11	moved into a role of supporting the Chapter 11 process.
12	That includes all of the bankruptcy administrative items,
13	but also working with the Unsecured Creditors' Committee on
14	diligence-related items and then also throughout the process
15	assisting with different items that the Diocese was
16	pursuing. Sale of assets as an example.
17	THE COURT: Could you estimate what percentage of
18	your professional time is taken up on representing the
19	Diocese?
20	THE WITNESS: Your Honor, that has varied. Around
21	the time of the filing, it would have been probably as high
22	as 25 hours a week. Once the case stabilized, and
23	especially after a lot of the diligence was completed, my
24	time definitely went down. So in the last I would say 15
25	months or so, it's been much less. There are some weeks,

212-267-6868

Page 152 1 recently as an example, where it would be much higher. 2 THE COURT: Me too. THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm sure. Other than those 3 select weeks, I would say it's maybe five to ten hours a 4 5 week. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks very much. Go ahead. 7 BY MR. GEREMIA: 8 Mr. Moore did you execute a declaration in the Diocese Q 9 Chapter 11 case on the first day of filing, October 1, 2020? 10 Α Yes. That's referred to as the first day declaration. 11 Yes. 12 And did you also execute two declarations in connection 0 13 with this motion for a preliminary injunction in the 14 adversary proceeding? 15 Α Yes. 16 0 And did you execute a written direct testimony on April 17 6th, 2023? 18 In this matter, yes. Α I'm going to hand that to you now, Mr. Moore. 19 Q 20 Α Thank you. 21 THE COURT: And I have that on the screen. 22 BY MR. GEREMIA: 23 Is that a copy of your written direct testimony dated Q April 6th, 2023? 24 It is. 25 Α

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 249 of 529		
	Page 153	
1	Q And you signed that testimony, correct?	
2	A I did.	
3	MR. GEREMIA: I tender the witness for cross-	
4	examination, Judge.	
5	THE COURT: You are offering that in evidence. Is	
6	it already admitted?	
7	MR. GEREMIA: I'm sorry. Yeah. We are yes, we	
8	move the direct testimony of Mr. Moore into evidence.	
9	THE COURT: Any objection?	
10	MR. BROWN: There's not any objections. We've	
11	already stated on the same terms as we did with	
12	(indiscernible).	
13	THE COURT: It's admitted in evidence and subject	
14	to I'll give it what weight it's deserved or consider	
15	your objections from here on. Okay? Good. All right.	
16	Cross-examination.	
17	CROSS-EXAMINATION OF CHARLES MOORE	
18	BY MR. BROWN:	
19	Q Good afternoon, Mr. Moore.	
20	A Hello, Mr. Brown.	
21	Q How are you?	
22	A I am well, thank you.	
23	THE COURT: He said who you are, but you didn't.	
24	MR. BROWN: I think I'm batting a thousand on that	
25	today.	

Page 154 1 THE COURT: You could do it now. 2 BY MR. BROWN: 3 Ken Brown for the Committee. Mr. Moore, I'm going to Q ask you some questions about the direct testimony that I 4 5 think you've been given a copy of. 6 How did you prepare that testimony? 7 Α An initial draft was prepared by Jones Day. I went through that draft, made edits, and then I signed it. 8 9 Since you went through that exercise and executed your 0 10 direct testimony, have you learned anything further that's 11 relevant to that direct testimony that's not contained 12 within it? 13 As part of preparation of the expert report that I Α 14 submitted in motion to dismiss on Monday, I spent a little 15 bit more time on the cases themselves. Other than that, no. 16 So I would like to focus your attention on Paragraph 3 0 17 of your direct testimony. And just so we're all kind of 18 level setting, you stated historically any claims alleging 19 liability for sexual abuse or related misconduct against the 20 DVRC, alleged perpetrators, the individual defendants in the parishes that effectuate the DVRC's mission or the various 21

22 affiliated organizations of the DVRC have, with very limited 23 exception, been litigated and administered by the DVRC in

24 close connection with the DVRC parties, this approach is due

25 to the relationship between the DVRC and the DVRC-related

	Page 155
1	parties, and the fact that many of the key allegations made
2	by the Claimants in such cases are substantially directed at
3	DVRC. I'm not asking you a question, I just wanted to
4	refresh you that that was your testimony.
5	And when I as we did in your deposition, Mr. Moore,
6	I'm going to refer to the cases that are the subject of
7	today's motion and hearing as the state court actions, or
8	the SCAs. And you'll understand what I'm referring to?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Okay. So you haven't reviewed any of the pleadings
11	filed in the state court actions against the Diocese, have
12	you?
13	A Correct, I have not.
14	Q And that includes you have not reviewed any of the
15	complaints, answers, cross-complaints, any of that stuff,
16	have you?
17	A Correct, I have not.
18	Q And you don't know how many of the state court actions
19	name the Diocese versus how many don't name the Diocese, do
20	you?
21	A That's an area based on my expert report reviewing case
22	listings. I am more familiar with the number that have
23	named the Diocese and that have not named the Diocese.
24	Q But at the time you submitted this direct testimony and
25	the time I took your deposition, you didn't know that

212-267-6868

-545-1	Pg 252 of 529
	Page 156
1	information, correct?
2	A That is correct.
3	Q And you're not familiar with any of the claims the
4	Plaintiffs have alleged against the non-debtors in the cases
5	where the Diocese is not party to the litigation, are you?
6	A Correct.
7	Q And your knowledge overall of the state court actions
8	and the role that diocesan personnel have played in those
9	state court actions is limited to the activities you
10	observed during the year and a half prior to the time the
11	bankruptcy petition was filed, correct?
12	A That's correct.
13	Q So you don't have any experience in terms of your own
14	observation of the work that is required of diocesan
15	personnel in connection with state court actions to which it
16	is not a party, do you?
17	A There haven't been any activities, correct.
18	Q The answer to my question is you don't have any
19	knowledge of that, correct?
20	A That's correct.
21	Q And just generally, is it correct to say that the
22	lawsuits that were filed prepetition named the Diocese and
23	the parishes and other DRVC-related parties and the lawsuits
24	that were filed post-petition did not name the Diocese.
25	A That's generally true.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 253 of 529

Page 157 1 And all of your work is in observing the work that was 0 2 required of diocesan personnel was from the pre-petition 3 period. 4 Yes. Α 5 Okay. So the activities -- all the activities you 0 6 observed were in cases that had been filed against the 7 Diocese, correct? 8 Α Yes. 9 0 And you don't have any direct knowledge, do you, of the 10 extent to which diocesan personnel would be required to 11 administer cases to which the Diocese is not a party, do 12 you? 13 I don't think anyone knows that. I don't know that. Α And in the cases where the Diocese is not a defendant, 14 0 15 you don't know what allegations have been directed against 16 the Diocese, do you? 17 Α I don't. 18 THE COURT: Have you reviewed proofs of claim that 19 have been filed in the bankruptcy case? 20 THE WITNESS: Not detailed proofs of claim, Your 21 Honor. I have reviewed the claims register and I have 22 reviewed the detail that makes up what are referred to as 23 the tort claims in the claims register. 24 THE COURT: Many of the proofs of claim attach 25 state court pleadings to them. Have you reviewed those?

	3 • • • • • • • • • •
	Page 158
1	THE WITNESS: I have not.
2	THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Brown.
3	BY MR. BROWN:
4	Q Now, turning to Paragraph 4 of your direct testimony,
5	you testify, "My personal experience is consistent with this
6	historical practice. I've been working with the DVRC since
7	early 2019. As a result, there were over a year-and-a-half
8	where I was active with the DVRC prior to the bankruptcy
9	filing and observed firsthand some of the activities that
10	were involved in responding to the state court actions,
11	especially as Child Victims Act cases started to be filed in
12	August of 2019. As a result, I had visibility on a
13	prepetition basis to the amount of time and attention key
14	DRVC personnel, including legal, financial, and risk
15	management departments devoted to matters related to the
16	state court actions."
17	And again, just emphasizing that the visibility you had

18 max again, just emphabiling endered visibility journad 18 was to only cases where DVRC was a defendant, correct? 19 A Yes. Mr. Brown, just to clarify, you continue to say 20 DVRC. I know you're referring to DRVC. Just to clarify. 21 Thank you. 22 Q DRVC. And you don't know how time was delegated among 23 the employees within each of those departments, legal,

24 financial, risk management, who was carrying out the various

25 tasks, do you?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

	ing Do	0 2010	P	g 255 of 5		02,2	, TU.C	0.10	Ivitan	1 Dood	
				-						Page	3
1	A	Could	you just	clarify	when	you	say	how	time	was	
2	allo	ocated?	Amongst	what?							

Yes. So when -- your testimony was that I had 0 visibility on a prepetition basis to the amount of time and 4 attention key DVRC personnel, including legal, financial, 5

6 and risk management --

THE COURT: DRVC, but that's okay.

MR. BROWN: Pardon?

THE COURT: DRVC.

10 MR. BROWN: Did I say it right that time?

11 BY MR. BROWN:

3

7

8

9

"I had visibility on a prepetition basis to the amount 12 0 13 of time and attention key DRVC personnel, including legal, 14 financial, and risk management departments devoted to matters related to the state court actions." So my question 15 16 is, do you know how time was delegated among personnel in 17 each of those three departments?

I'm not sure that I still follow the question, but I 18 Ά 19 had visibility to how much the legal department was 20 spending. I had visibility to how much time financial 21 people were spending, and then also insurance or risk. 22 Did you have visibility into how the tasks were Q allocated among employees in each department? 23 24 Well, it was fairly logical in terms of the legal Α

25 department were dealing with legal items in terms of filings

159

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 256 of 529

Page 160

1	and responses. Insurance was dealing with giving
2	notification to carriers, and then the financial side was
3	dealing with some responses to discovery.
4	THE COURT: How large were these departments?
5	THE WITNESS: Your Honor, there's actually a
6	little bit of an explanation on that. During our work, we
7	did a number of head count reductions. And so the legal
8	department as an example experienced some head count
9	reduction. I believe right now the legal department is
10	three people. The financial department has experienced some
11	reductions as well. Those were voluntary. That department,
12	five people or so. Five to six. And insurance or risk is
13	one person.
14	THE COURT: What do the risk management people do?
15	THE WITNESS: There are two aspects. There is the
16	current coverage. And when we talk about coverage, that
17	covers not only the Diocese, but the parishes and other
18	entities. So they are arranging coverage, renewing
19	policies, and maintaining insurance. But then there is also
20	the aspect related to the historical aspect for these cases.
21	And that involves, number one, ensuring that proper
22	notification has been given. But also there is litigation
23	that was initiated against the insurers. And they're very
24	heavily or the person is very heavily involved in that as
25	well.

Page 161

	Page 161
1	THE COURT: Thank you. Go ahead.
2	BY MR. BROWN:
3	Q So what I'm trying to get at and I want to refresh
4	your recollection from reading from your deposition
5	transcript. Your answer was to a question about how tasks
6	were allocated within a department. And I'm reading from
7	Page 120 of your deposition transcript. And here is your
8	answer. "When I say personnel at a minimum, I am referring
9	to Mr. Renker and Mr. Doodian and Mr. Chapin when I talk
10	about these three departments. But I do try to make clear
11	here that I don't have visibility to how they delegate some
12	of their responsibilities. I do know that there are people
13	in their departments that were working on these activities
14	as well, but I don't interact with those people directly."
15	MR. GEREMIA: Your Honor, could I ask that Mr.
16	Brown provide a copy of the deposition transcript?
17	MR. BROWN: Certainly.
18	THE COURT: Yes.
19	MR. BROWN: This is a binder of your deposition
20	with respect to (indiscernible).
21	THE COURT: And we're looking at Page 120.
22	MR. BROWN: We're looking at Page 120 of your
23	deposition.
24	THE COURT: And for context, you should feel free
25	to flip back a couple of pages and forward a couple of pages

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

	Pg 258 of 529
	Page 162
1	so you can see the context (indiscernible).
2	BY MR. BROWN:
3	Q Okay. So I was reading from your answer at the top of
4	Page 120.
5	A Yes.
6	Q Does that refresh your recollection about what
7	visibility you had into the individuals within each
8	department?
9	A It actually helps clarify the question that you were
10	asking. I wasn't sure if you were asking it sounded like
11	you were asking about how tasks were allocated between
12	finance, legal, and risk. Now I understand you are asking
13	about within the finance department. And that is correct,
14	as I stated within my deposition how as an example Tom
15	Doodian allocated activities within his department for
16	people to fulfill tasks, I don't have visibility to that.
17	Q Okay. And that would be true with Mr. Doodian and Mr.
18	Chapin as well, correct, in their departments.
19	A I just referred to Mr. Doodian. But it would be
20	consistent with Mr. Renker and Mr. Chapin if he was using
21	someone as well.
22	Q So you don't have an understanding of the extent to
23	which they may be able to get help from other people within
24	their departments to fulfill whatever duties they may have
25	in connection with the state court actions, do you?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 259 of 529		
	Page 163	
1	A Could you restate that question, please?	
2	THE COURT: You've lost me.	
3	MR. BROWN: I'm sorry.	
4	BY MR. BROWN:	
5	Q You don't have any information you don't have any	
6	knowledge concerning the extent to which, for example, Mr.	
7	Doodian has the ability to get assistance from people within	
8	his department to deal with whatever obligations he may have	
9	in the state court actions, do you?	
10	A I do have visibility to it because I see him do it.	
11	How he decides how to allocate tasks, I don't know on what	
12	basis he allocates tasks.	
13	Q And you don't know how Mr. Renker would allocate tasks	
14	relating to the state court actions within his department	
15	either, do you?	
16	A Correct.	
17	Q And you don't know how Mr. Chapin would even be?	
18	A That's correct.	
19	Q Okay. Turning to Paragraph 5. "Consistent with past	
20	practice and my experience, if the Court were to allow	
21	Plaintiffs to proceed with the state court actions, the DRVC	
22	will need to play multiple roles in these cases, including	
23	providing information and records that the DRVC maintains.	
24	Further, because my understanding is that the DRVC believes	
25	there may be insurance, res judicata, or other consequences	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 260 of 529

Page 164

1	to the DRVC of the cases proceeding, the DRVC would need to
2	be very actively involved in the litigation from at least
3	the monitoring standpoint."
4	With respect to that testimony, Mr. Moore, do you

5 you don't have any information as to what documents the 6 Diocese would have to produce in discovery, in connection 7 with discovery, in actions which it's not named, do you? 8 Well, under the shared services agreements that exist Α 9 with about half the parishes, the Diocese maintains all of 10 the parishes' financial information. So if anything 11 financial is required to be produced, the Diocese would have 12 to produce that on behalf of the parish.

13 Do you have any understanding of the extent to which 0 14 the Diocese has already collected all the documents relevant 15 to the state court actions?

16 There is very limited information that has been Α 17 produced during the Chapter 11 proceeding regarding parish financial information. So that would have to be compiled 18 19 anew.

20 0 Did you have -- do you have an understanding that all 21 of the documents related to the state court actions have 22 already been collected by the Diocese and produced to the 23 Committee?

I don't have visibility to everything that was required 24 Α 25 to be produced under the state court actions. I do have

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 261 of 529

	Page 165
1	visibility to a subset of that information that relates to
2	financial information that was provided on a prepetition
3	basis. I do have visibility to a slightly larger population
4	of information that was produced to the Committee during the
5	Chapter 11 proceeding, but not everything that was produced
6	to the Committee.
7	Q Do you have any information that would well, okay,
8	understood.
9	You're not familiar with what documents have already
10	been produced in connection with the state court actions,
11	are you?
12	A Not a hundred percent. But the financial-oriented
13	documents, yes, I am familiar with that.
14	Q Beyond the financial organization documents, you don't
15	have knowledge with respect to the documents that have
16	already been collected and produced related to the state
17	court actions, do you?
18	A That's correct.
19	THE COURT: Let me ask you this. You say in that
20	paragraph five that because my understanding of this is that
21	the DRVC believes there may be insurance res judicata or
22	other consequences to the DRVC of the cases preceding.
23	What's the basis of your understanding and what are you
24	referring to when you're talking about other consequences?
25	THE WITNESS: Your Honor, as it relates to my

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 262 of 529 Page 166 1 understanding that the DRVC believes these issues, they are 2 based specifically on conversations with Mr. Renker as well 3 as Mr. Chapin. 4 THE COURT: And what are these other consequences 5 unnamed that you refer to? 6 THE WITNESS: There are a few different legal 7 items. And I'm not an attorney and I'm not taking a 8 position --9 THE COURT: But you say you have an understanding 10 about the consequences. 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. 12 THE COURT: And somebody has told you something. 13 THE WITNESS: Yeah. The four --THE COURT: And you opened the door to what that 14 15 is.

16 THE WITNESS: Yes. The four items that are 17 commonly cited in -- well, res judicata, collateral estoppel 18 --

19 THE COURT: I didn't ask about those. But I
20 understand. Other consequences isn't defined.
21 THE WITNESS: I was referring to the other legal
22 issues. Indemnification, contribution. Yeah.
23 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Brown.
24 MR. BROWN: I'm going to follow up on that in a
25 moment, Your Honor. But I had questions --

1	THE COURT: You can or not. I just had a
2	question, and I asked it.
3	BY MR. BROWN:
4	Q You don't know if the Diocese has any additional
5	documents that it would be required to collect and produce
6	if the state court actions to which it is not a party are
7	allowed to proceed, do you?
8	A It would be highly unlikely
9	Q I just asked you if you have personal knowledge one way
10	or the other. Not what you think a likelihood is.
11	A Could you restate your question, please?
12	Q You don't know if the Diocese has any additional
13	documents that it would be required to collect and produce
14	if the state court actions to which the Diocese is not a
15	party are allowed to proceed, do you?
16	A If you are asking me to speculate on what the discovery
17	requirements may be, you are correct. I don't know.
18	Because I don't know what the discovery would be.
19	Q And you can't testify whether the diocese is in
20	possession of responsive documents to any state court action
21	to which it is not a party, can you?
22	A As I indicated, the Diocese maintains the books and
23	records for about half the parishes.
24	Q Now, do you remember in your deposition when I asked
25	you the nature when I asked you how you had an

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 264 of 529

	Pg 264 of 529
	Page 168
1	understanding regarding the risks of res judicata,
2	collateral estoppel, indemnification, and contribution,
3	where that understanding came from?
4	A Yes. I believe I responded from counsel.
5	Q Yes. And did you just tell Judge Glenn that they came
6	from conversations with Mr. Doodian and Renker?
7	A No, from Mr. Renker and Mr. Chapin.
8	Q Mr. Renker and Mr. Chapin, okay.
9	A Mr. Renker is the general counsel of the diocese.
10	Q Okay.
11	A What I did not say to Your Honor is also conversations
12	with Jones Day as counsel as well.
13	Q Okay. And do you remember in your deposition when I
14	asked you about your understanding of the risks of Res
15	Judicata, collateral estoppel, indemnification, and
16	contribution, when I asked you about your understanding as
17	it was attained from counsel, you were instructed not to
18	answer any questions about your conversations with counsel.
19	A I recall that, yes.
20	Q And you recall you followed those instructions and
21	wouldn't answer any of the questions I had about that?
22	A Yes.
23	Q So is it true that isn't it true that you have no
24	independent understanding of the risks of res judicata,
25	collateral estoppel, indemnification, and contribution other
l	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 265 of 529

Γ

	Page 169
1	than what you know from what your lawyers have from what
2	the diocese lawyers have told you?
3	A Correct. I have no personal view on those items.
4	Q Okay. Turning to Paragraph 7 of your direct testimony,
5	Mr. Moore. "Litigating state court actions during the
6	pendency of this Chapter 11 case, even if they only proceed
7	against other defendants, such as the DRVC related parties,
8	who are the individual defendants, will be extremely
9	burdensome on the DRVC, disrupt the administration and
10	expeditious reorganization of the DRVC, and reduce the
11	estate's assets to the detriment of all creditors."
12	So just to confirm, your understanding of the basis for
13	your belief that the litigation of actions that do not name
14	the diocese would be extremely burdensome on the DVRC.
15	That's from the experience you had and your involvement in
16	the litigation of the state court actions where the Diocese
17	was named as a party, correct?
18	A As well as the diligence activities of the Committee
19	during the Chapter 11 case.
20	Q Did the diligence and activity of the Committee during
21	the Chapter 11 case have anything to do with the prosecution
22	of state court actions in the post-petition period?
23	A Many of the items that the Committee sought during the
24	Chapter 11 case related to financial information. And that
25	would highly likely be part of any discovery in state court
1	

212-267-6868

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 266 of 529

I	Pg 266 of 529
	Page 170
1	actions as well. That's why I referred to that
2	Q that information has already been collected and
3	produced, correct?
4	A That information has been collected and produced
5	related to the Diocese. It has not been collected and
6	produced related to the parishes.
7	Q Okay.
8	THE COURT: Were you involved in collecting and
9	producing any of the financial information relating to the
10	parishes that has been provided in connection with the
11	mediations?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes, I was. The information I'm
13	just a little unclear, Your Honor, as it relates to
14	mediation, confidentiality.
15	THE COURT: I'm not asking about who said what to
16	whom in the mediation, but what's been the information
17	that's been provided to me is that in connection with the
18	mediations that the Diocese and parishes produced financial
19	information. And that's not a secret from me. That's been
20	stated on the record. And so that's my question to you.
21	THE WITNESS: I was involved in that. The level
22	of information produced related to the parish financials was
23	significantly less information than what the Diocese has
24	produced related to its financials as part of the Chapter
25	11. That's the distinction I was making.

Page 171

1 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Brown. 2 BY MR. BROWN: 3 Paragraph 8, again. I'm going to read it so we have a Q level set on it. "Although I was not involved with the 4 5 litigation of individual cases before the petition date, I 6 observed the total amount of activity that went into 7 managing the litigation of the approximately 200 prepetition 8 cases and the overall activity level was significant. For 9 example, in connection with the prepetition state court 10 actions, the DRVC's general counsel and chief operating 11 officer, Thomas Renker, was required to review, analyze, and 12 approve settlement strategies and expenses. And the DRVC's 13 director of insurance and risk management, William Chapin, 14 devoted substantial amounts of time to insurance, noticing, 15 and coverage matters related to the prepetition state court 16 actions." 17 So, again, I just want to confirm, all of those 18 observations you make in Paragraph 8 related only to 19 prepetition cases where the Diocese was not a party, 20 correct? 21 Α Yes. 22 And you don't have any knowledge of whether the claims Q noticing work that Mr. Chapin has or doesn't have to do has 23 already been completed, do you? 24 25 I don't. Α

Page 3	172
--------	-----

1	Q And you don't have any knowledge as to whether or not
2	any diocesan personnel would be required to be involved in
3	the approval of settlements in actions to which they are not
4	a party, do you?
5	A I don't.
6	Q And you're not aware either, are you, that any diocesan
7	personnel would be involved in the parish's litigation or
8	defense strategy with respect to actions to which the
9	Diocese is not a party, are you?
10	A I'm not aware of how that would work.
11	Q Okay. Turning to Paragraph 10 or your written
12	testimony, Mr. Moore. "If the state court actions are
13	allowed to resume, however, these individuals would be
14	forced to reallocate time away from the Chapter 11 process.
15	Mr. Renker would need to closely monitor these cases and
16	coordinate with the defendants as it relates to litigation
17	strategies at a minimum. To the extent any litigation
18	decisions or settlements affecting the DRVC were proposed,
19	it would be Mr. Renker who would need to review, analyze,
20	and make those decisions. Similarly, Mr. Chapin would be
21	required to coordinate insurance matters based on the shared
22	programs with the parish schools and the DRVC affiliates.
23	This would be an important and complicated undertaking. Mr.
24	Chapin would have to closely monitor the claims being made
25	on these 200-plus state court actions, the amounts left on

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 269 of 529

Γ

	Page 173
1	the various claims, self-insured retentions, and help to
2	resolve any coverage issues that may arise."
3	So you don't have any knowledge one way or the other
4	about whether Mr. Renker could handle what his duties are
5	that you say they are in connection with the state court
6	action as well as his duties in connection with the
7	restructuring, do you?
8	A I am quite confident that he can handle the
9	responsibilities. I'm concerned about the time commitment.
10	Q And do you have any information that would indicate
11	that he couldn't handle both?
12	A Yes, because of how hard he's working right now. And
13	that's while no state court actions are proceeding. So to
14	the extent based on his belief that he needs to monitor
15	these items, that's going to be an added activity.
16	Q And you don't know whether or not Mr. Renker has other
17	people though that can help him fulfill whatever obligations
18	he may have in connection with the state court actions, do
19	you?
20	A As I indicated, I know his department is very lean.
21	Q You didn't answer my question, Mr. Moore.
22	A Could you restate the question, please?
23	Q I asked you whether or not there was whether you had
24	any knowledge about whether Mr. Renker had anybody else he
25	could delegate duties in connection with the state court

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 270 of 529

Γ

		.00.10
g 270	0 of 529	
•		

	Page 174
1	actions, do you?
2	A Correct, I do not.
3	Q Okay. Now, when I asked you just a moment ago about
4	whether or not either one way or the other whether Mr.
5	Renker could handle both his obligations with respect to the
6	state court actions and the restructuring. You said you
7	believe that he might not be able to, correct?
8	A He may not have the time to do both, yes.
9	Q I would like you to turn to Page 105 of your
10	deposition, please. And if you could look down to about the
11	middle of the page to the question that starts at Line 9.
12	Question, okay I think I threw in an extra okay there.
13	The question is, "Do you have any knowledge one way or the
14	other whether Mr. Renker has the capacity to fulfill his
15	obligations and duties with respect to the restructuring and
16	to complete whatever tasks he's responsible for in
17	connection with the state court actions?"
18	Your answer, "No."
19	So you testified to me differently in your deposition
20	than you're testifying here to me today, would you agree?
21	A No. Because the word capacity could mean a couple of
22	different things. What I've indicated here is that I have
23	no concerns at all that Mr. Renker would not be able to
24	carry out both the activities. He is a very capable
25	individual. What I am concerned about is his time capacity.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Р	g	21	1	OŤ	529	

1	And that is something that I've indicated here as well as
2	what I indicated here.

3	Q I'm not I'm sorry, I'm not understanding the
4	distinction. Does he have the capacity to do both? Do you
5	have any knowledge one way or the other whether he has the
6	capacity to do both fulfill his duties with respect to the
7	state court actions to which the Diocese is not a party and
8	to fulfill his obligations with the restructuring? In his
9	deposition, you said no, you had no information one way or
10	the other on that. Is your answer any different here today?
11	A Mr. Brown, I just want to clarify. When you used the
12	word capacity in the deposition, it was fairly clear that
13	you were referring to time capacity. The way that you asked
14	a question here, I believe you may have used the word
15	capable of doing that. And that's where I distinguish.
16	Q Well, let me ask it another way. I just read your
17	testimony, your no answer to my question in your deposition.
18	Are you still is that still your answer or do you want to
19	change the answer you gave in the deposition?
20	A I think I've answered the same in both places, here and
21	in the deposition, that I don't have visibility to whether
22	he has other people that he can delegate to that would
23	address the time concern.
24	THE COURT: Does visibility mean the same thing as
25	

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

Page 175

Page 176 1 MR. BROWN: Do you know one way or the other -- go 2 ahead. 3 THE COURT: Does visibility that you've used now have the same meaning as knowledge in Line 9? 4 5 THE WITNESS: It does, Your Honor. 6 BY MR. BROWN: 7 0 It does? 8 Α Yes. 9 So isn't it true, Mr. Moore, that you have no knowledge 0 10 one way or the other whether Mr. Renker has the capacity to 11 fulfill his obligations and duties with respect to the 12 restructuring and to complete whatever tasks he is 13 responsible for in connection with the state court actions? 14 Α It is true. 15 0 Thank you. And isn't it true, Mr. Renker, that you 16 don't know whether --17 THE COURT: It's not Mr. Renker. Could you -- you 18 said isn't it true, Mr. Renker. 19 BY MR. BROWN: 20 0 Excuse me. Isn't it true, Mr. Moore, that you don't 21 know whether there are other individuals at the Diocese who 22 can perform the tasks that have been allocated to Mr. Renker 23 in connection with the restructuring? 24 Α I don't know. 25 And isn't it true that you don't know whether there are Q

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 273 of 529

	F Y 273 01 323
	Page 177
1	other individuals at the Diocese who can perform the tasks
2	that may have been allocated to Mr. Renker in connection
3	with the state court actions?
4	A I don't know.
5	Q And isn't it true that you don't know whether Mr.
6	Chapin can fulfill both his obligations in connection with
7	the state court actions and the restructuring?
8	A That's true.
9	Q And isn't it true that to your knowledge, Mr. Chapin
10	doesn't devote all his time to the restructuring?
11	A That's correct.
12	Q And isn't it true that you don't know what actual
13	diocesan personnel would be required to deal with the state
14	court actions to which it is not a party if it was allowed
15	to proceed?
16	A Well, I know that the individuals we've been talking
17	about will have to be involved given their roles. Whether
18	they could delegate some activities to someone else in their
19	departments, that's what we've been talking about here and
20	in my deposition. And I don't have knowledge of that.
21	Q Now, I may have garbled the question I meant to ask.
22	You don't know what diocesan personnel would actually be
23	required to do, what tasks they would actually be required
24	to do if state court actions were allowed to proceed, do
25	you?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 274 of 529

1	A I don't know what each diocesan employee would have to
2	do what, correct.

3 Turning to Paragraph 12 of your written testimony. Q "Finally, if the state court actions are allowed to resume, 4 Mr. Renker, Mr. Chapin, Mr. Doodian, and other key DRVC 5 6 personnel may be called to testify as witnesses or be 7 required to sign off on written discovery requests, document 8 requests, or other discovery matters directed to the DRVC. 9 This would necessarily distract these individuals from their 10 primary focus of running the day-to-day for the DRVC and 11 helping manage the Chapter 11 process."

Now, isn't it true that your understanding of witnesses who may be called to trial in the state court actions is based on your discussions with counsel?

15 A Yes, along with my general knowledge of litigation.

16 Q Do you recall in your deposition when I asked about 17 your understanding of the witnesses who might be called in 18 the state court actions you told me that it was based on

19 your conversations with counsel?

A I do. I'm just distinguishing, as I just indicated, I
have general knowledge of litigation and witness -- types of
witnesses that might be called.

Q But you do have -- to the extent you have knowledge of who will be called as a witness in the state court action, you got that information from counsel, correct?

Page 178

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 275 of 529

I	Pg 275 of 529
	Page 179
1	A Yes.
2	Q And do you recall that when I asked you what those
3	conversations were, you were instructed not to answer those
4	questions?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And do you recall following those instructions?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And isn't it true that you have no knowledge of when
9	any diocesan personnel might be called as witnesses in state
10	court actions to which it is not a party?
11	A That's correct.
12	Q And you have no knowledge of what if any future
13	discovery requests will be made that will require their
14	attention, do you?
15	A Correct.
16	Q And at this point in time well, strike that. You
17	don't have any knowledge, do you, whether or not Mr. Doodian
18	can handle both his anticipated duties associated with the
19	state court actions if they are allowed to proceed and his
20	duties in connection with the restructuring, do you?
21	A Only based on the concern that I cited before. Same as
22	Mr. Renker and Chapin.
23	Q And you don't know whether or not there are other
24	individuals who could take on some of the responsibilities
25	of Mr. Renker, Chapin, or Doodian in connection with the
l	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 276 of 529

	Pg 276 of 529
	Page 180
1	state court actions, do you?
2	A Correct.
3	Q And you don't know how Mr. Renker, Chapin, or Doodian
4	delegate their responsibilities within their departments, do
5	you?
6	A Correct.
7	Q Turning to Paragraph 15, Mr. Moore. "Accordingly, the
8	success of the DRVC's reorganization efforts will in part be
9	dependent on the time and efforts that its key personnel are
10	able to extent for its ensuring a successful reorganization.
11	The DRVC's continued ability to focus its efforts on the
12	reorganization process will maximize the value of the DRVC's
13	estate to the benefit of all creditors. On the other hand,
14	the DRVC's reorganization efforts and its estate will suffer
15	real and substantial harm to the detriment of all creditors
16	if the DRVC's key personnel are required to actively
17	participate in the state court actions instead of
18	concentrating their efforts on the bankruptcy case."
19	It's true, isn't it, that you do not have full
20	visibility into how these key personnel allocate their time
21	on restructuring efforts, do you?
22	A I have pretty good visibility to how much time we're
23	spending on the reorganization.
24	Q But you can't state what they would be required to do
25	if the state court actions go forward, can you?

Page 181

1	A	Correct.

 written testimony. "Finally, should the state court actions be allowed to continue even only as against other defendants such as the DRVC-related parties and the individual defendants, my understanding is that the DRVC believes and its estate could face potential contribution, indemnification, collateral estoppel, and/or res judicata effectively compel the DRVC-related parties, which would effectively compel the DRVC to monitor and participate in the numerous trials of the state court actions. Relatedly, if the DRVC faces potential contribution and indemnification obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC- related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state court action, such events will consume assets of the estate to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 reorganization." So again, I think we went through this in connection with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But your understanding, again, of these potential risks of 	2	Q Finally, I'm turning now to Paragraph 16 of your
 such as the DRVC-related parties and the individual defendants, my understanding is that the DRVC believes and its estate could face potential contribution, indemnification, collateral estoppel, and/or res judicata issues with respect to the DRVC-related parties, which would effectively compel the DRVC to monitor and participate in the numerous trials of the state court actions. Relatedly, if the DRVC faces potential contribution and indemnification obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC- related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state court action, such events will consume assets of the estate to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 reorganization." 	3	written testimony. "Finally, should the state court actions
 defendants, my understanding is that the DRVC believes and its estate could face potential contribution, indemnification, collateral estoppel, and/or res judicata issues with respect to the DRVC-related parties, which would effectively compel the DRVC to monitor and participate in the numerous trials of the state court actions. Relatedly, if the DRVC faces potential contribution and indemnification obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC- related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state court action, such events will consume assets of the estate to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 reorganization." 	4	be allowed to continue even only as against other defendants
7 its estate could face potential contribution, 8 indemnification, collateral estoppel, and/or res judicata 9 issues with respect to the DRVC-related parties, which would 10 effectively compel the DRVC to monitor and participate in 11 the numerous trials of the state court actions. Relatedly, 12 if the DRVC faces potential contribution and indemnification 13 obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC- 14 related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any 15 monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court 16 actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from 17 limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state 18 court action, such events will consume assets of the estate 19 to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 20 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	5	such as the DRVC-related parties and the individual
 indemnification, collateral estoppel, and/or res judicata issues with respect to the DRVC-related parties, which would effectively compel the DRVC to monitor and participate in the numerous trials of the state court actions. Relatedly, if the DRVC faces potential contribution and indemnification obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC- related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state court action, such events will consume assets of the estate to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 reorganization." So again, I think we went through this in connection with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But 	6	defendants, my understanding is that the DRVC believes and
9 issues with respect to the DRVC-related parties, which would effectively compel the DRVC to monitor and participate in 11 the numerous trials of the state court actions. Relatedly, 12 if the DRVC faces potential contribution and indemnification 13 obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC- 14 related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any 15 monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court 16 actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from 17 limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state 18 court action, such events will consume assets of the estate 19 to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 20 reorganization." 21 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	7	its estate could face potential contribution,
effectively compel the DRVC to monitor and participate in the numerous trials of the state court actions. Relatedly, if the DRVC faces potential contribution and indemnification obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC- related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state court action, such events will consume assets of the estate to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 zo reorganization." So again, I think we went through this in connection with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	8	indemnification, collateral estoppel, and/or res judicata
11 the numerous trials of the state court actions. Relatedly, 12 if the DRVC faces potential contribution and indemnification 13 obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC- 14 related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any 15 monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court 16 actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from 17 limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state 18 court action, such events will consume assets of the estate 19 to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 20 reorganization." 21 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	9	issues with respect to the DRVC-related parties, which would
12 if the DRVC faces potential contribution and indemnification 13 obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC- 14 related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any 15 monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court 16 actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from 17 limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state 18 court action, such events will consume assets of the estate 19 to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 20 reorganization." 21 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	10	effectively compel the DRVC to monitor and participate in
 obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC- related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state court action, such events will consume assets of the estate to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 reorganization." So again, I think we went through this in connection with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But 	11	the numerous trials of the state court actions. Relatedly,
14 related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any 15 monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court 16 actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from 17 limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state 18 court action, such events will consume assets of the estate 19 to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 20 reorganization." 21 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	12	if the DRVC faces potential contribution and indemnification
15 monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state court action, such events will consume assets of the estate to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 reorganization." 21 So again, I think we went through this in connection with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	13	obligations from the DRVC-related parties or the DRVC-
16 actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from 17 limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state 18 court action, such events will consume assets of the estate 19 to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 20 reorganization." 21 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	14	related parties use limited insurance proceeds, pay any
17 limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state 18 court action, such events will consume assets of the estate 19 to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 20 reorganization." 21 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	15	monetary awards to the plaintiffs in the state court
18 court action, such events will consume assets of the estate 19 to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 20 reorganization." 21 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	16	actions, or if any defense costs are incurred and paid from
19 to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11 20 reorganization." 21 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	17	limited insurance proceeds in connection with the state
20 reorganization." 21 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	18	court action, such events will consume assets of the estate
21 So again, I think we went through this in connection 22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	19	to the detriment of other creditors in the Chapter 11
22 with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But	20	reorganization."
	21	So again, I think we went through this in connection
23 your understanding, again, of these potential risks of	22	with other testimony earlier in your written direct. But
	23	your understanding, again, of these potential risks of
24 contribution comes from conversations with your attorneys,	24	contribution comes from conversations with your attorneys,
25 correct?	25	correct?

212-267-6868

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 278 of 529

	Pg 278 of 529
	Page 182
1	A Yes.
2	Q Your understanding of the potential risks from
3	indemnity comes from your attorneys, right? Or from the
4	Diocese's attorneys, right?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Same thing for collateral estoppel?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And same thing for res judicata, correct?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Independently of what your lawyers told you, you have
11	no understanding of any of those risks, do you?
12	A Correct. I am not taking a position on any of the
13	risks of those items.
14	Q And when I asked you about the nature of those
15	conversations where you were apprised of those risks by the
16	Diocese attorneys, do you remember that you were instructed
17	not to answer any of those questions?
18	A In my deposition, correct.
19	Q Correct, yeah. And do you remember that you followed
20	those instructions?
21	A Yes.
22	Q And it's true also isn't it, Mr. Moore, that you have
23	no understanding what if any insurance proceeds will be
24	exhausted if the state court actions are allowed to proceed,
25	do you?
l	

Page 183

1	A	Correct.

-	
2	Q And you don't know whether a monetary award against a
3	DRVC-related party could have any effect on the Diocese if
4	the award is not collected from shared insurance, do you?
5	A Could you state that question again, please?
6	Q If they strike that. I am withdrawing the question.
7	At the present time, Mr. Moore, you don't have any knowledge
8	of the extent of diocesan involvement in cases where its
9	named as a defendant versus cases where it's not, do you?
10	A There hasn't been any activity in cases where the
11	Diocese is not named.
12	Q So the answer to my question is you don't have any
13	knowledge on that, do you?
14	A I know that there's been no activity.
15	Q Well, I want you to answer my question. And my
16	question was you don't have any knowledge, do you, to the
17	extent to which diocesan involvement you don't have any
18	knowledge
19	THE COURT: Strike that. Start your question
20	again.
21	BY MR. BROWN:
22	Q Mr. Moore, isn't it true that you don't know the extent
23	of diocesan involvement in cases where it is a named
24	defendant versus cases where it is not?
25	A Are you talking at the present time, Mr. Brown, or in
l	Veriterat Legel Celetions

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 280 of 529

г	Pg 280 of 529
	Page 184
1	the future?
2	Q I'm talking as you sit here today.
3	A I know that I do have knowledge. I know that
4	there's no activity that has gone on because the cases have
5	been subject to the stay.
6	Q So you don't have any knowledge of the extent of
7	diocesan of the extent of diocesan involvement that would
8	be required in state court actions to which it is not a
9	party, correct?
10	A Correct, as it relates to the future.
11	Q And that's all there is, right, as to those actions?
12	Because there hasn't been activity to date, correct?
13	A Correct. And that's why I was distinguishing in my
14	answer.
15	THE COURT: Ask your next question.
16	MR. BROWN: No further questions.
17	THE COURT: Thank you very much. Redirect?
18	REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF CHARLES MOORE
19	BY MR. GEREMIA:
20	Q Mr. Moore, do you
21	THE COURT: You have to identify yourself.
22	MR. GEREMIA: Sorry. Todd Geremia for the
23	Diocese.
24	BY MR. GEREMIA:
25	Q Do you know the types of administrative tasks that the
L	Varitavt Lagal Solutions

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 281 of 529

	Page 185
1	Diocese management team would be undertaking in connection
2	with state court actions where the Diocese is not a named
3	defendant if those cases were to proceed?
4	A I would expect because of the administrative services
5	agreements that are in place, that the Diocese would have to
6	undertake a significant amount of activity as it relates to
7	financial and related information because the Diocese
8	maintains that information for about half of the parishes,
9	about 66 parishes.
10	In addition to that, the Diocese does posses parish
11	financial information for all parishes. And so I would
12	expect that there would be activities related to that
13	information as well, that plaintiffs would seek that
14	information.
15	And then as it relates to non-financial information,
16	whether that's insurance or personnel files, I don't have
17	visibility to any of that aspect. But I know that that has
18	been an activity.
19	THE COURT: What do you mean, you know it's been
20	an activity?
21	THE WITNESS: I know that as part of the Chapter
22	11 process, especially part of this preliminary injunction,
23	that a significant amount of personnel files were provided
24	to the Committee. I would expect similar activities would
25	occur under the state court actions even if the Diocese is

212-267-6868

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 282 of 529

	r g 202 01 323
	Page 186
1	not named.
2	THE COURT: Personnel files of whom?
3	THE WITNESS: Priests and other alleged abusers.
4	BY MR. GEREMIA:
5	Q You've also testified, Mr. Moore, in your written
6	direct and in cross-examination about the roles that the
7	Diocese management undertake in connection with its
8	restructuring efforts. Do you recall that?
9	A Yes.
10	Q And do you have firsthand familiarity with what the
11	diocese management does in connection with its restructuring
12	efforts?
13	A I do.
14	Q Does it make it more difficult in your view for the
15	diocese management to attend to tasks in connection with
16	restructuring when the diocese management team would also
17	have to attend to state court actions if those were to
18	proceed?
19	A Yes. As I've said a couple of times, the Diocese is a
20	very lean organization. Any additional activity, I would be
21	concerned about. Because they all work very hard as it is.
22	I am especially concerned about it because of where we stand
23	in the case right now. I think that we are in a very
24	critical time period.
25	THE COURT: Why is that?

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 283 of 529

Page 187 1 THE WITNESS: With the renewed efforts as it 2 relates to the mediation as well as the need --3 THE COURT: The mediation has been going on for 4 quite a lengthy period of time, correct? 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. I am hopeful that with the 6 addition of the judicial, co-judicial mediator, that all 7 parties are going to engage vigorously over the next six 8 weeks. And so I do believe --9 THE COURT: But you don't have any projection 10 beyond the end of May, correct? 11 THE WITNESS: Correct. 12 THE COURT: Go ahead. 13 BY MR. GEREMIA: 14 You testified -- could you turn with me to Page 104 of 0 15 your deposition? Could you put Page 104 up on the screen as 16 well? 17 And you corrected Mr. Brown that in that line of 18 questioning, you were talking about the time commitment for 19 Mr. Renker. Do you recall that? 20 THE COURT: I'm sorry, you've lost me --21 MR. BROWN: Objection to this line of questioning. 22 THE COURT: Well, I don't know about -- I didn't 23 understand the question. So let's get a question that I understand and then we'll see where --24 25 MR. BROWN: Where --

Page 188 1 THE COURT: Stop. 2 BY MR. GEREMIA: 3 Do you recall that Mr. Brown was asking you about Mr. Q Renker's capacity to attend to the state court actions and 4 5 the restructuring? 6 MR. BROWN: Objection, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Overruled. 8 BY MR. GEREMIA: 9 I do recall this questioning that begins on -- or the Α 10 end of Page 103 to the beginning of Page 104. 11 I was actually orienting to the cross-examination line 0 12 of questioning. Mr. Brown was asking you about Mr. Renker's 13 capacity to handle the state court actions and the 14 restructuring efforts. And you drew a distinction between a 15 capacity with respect to his time and his ability to handle 16 those tasks. Do you recall that? 17 Α Yes. And in your deposition, were you addressing your 18 Q 19 knowledge of Mr. Renker's ability to handle as a matter of 20 time restructuring efforts and the state court actions? 21 Α Time, yes. 22 And on Page 104, if you review that colloquy, the Q questions there all concern allocations of time with respect 23 to various members of the Diocese management. Is that 24 25 correct?

Pg 285 of 529		
-		
I	?age	189

1	A Yes.
2	Q And you said that you are concerned with respect to Mr.
3	Renker's ability to handle administration of the state court
4	actions and the restructuring efforts. Do you recall that?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Can you elaborate on your concerns?
7	A I know Mr. Renker works very hard right now, as I
8	indicated. He is heavily involved in all aspects of the
9	Chapter 11 process. I expect that that is going to
10	increase. I hope actually that's going to increase.
11	THE COURT: I do, too.
12	BY MR. GEREMIA:
13	A Because of that, I am concerned already about that
14	increased Chapter 11 reorganization time if there was
15	additional time that was added on top of that, especially in
16	this critical time period as it relates to state court
17	actions. I have concerns over how he would get all of that
18	done.
19	A Do you similarly have concerns about Mr. Doodian, the
20	chief financial officer, whether he can handle duties with
21	respect to administration of the state court actions and
22	also the restructuring effort?
23	Q Yes.
24	A And can you elaborate on those concerns for the judge?
25	Q Mr. Doodian has actually lost two key individuals in

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 286 of 529

Γ

	Page 190
1	the last few months from his department. His department is
2	stretched very thin. I see this on a day-to-day basis.
3	Given what we and when I say we, Alvarez and Marsal, in
4	addition to Mr. Doodian's department went through in terms
5	of diligence through the Chapter 11 process. If something
6	like that were to occur as it relates to the state court
7	actions, it would be very difficult to see how he could or
8	his department could accomplish all of that.
9	Q I think you testified on cross-examination that Mr.
10	Doodian recently lost two individuals within his department.
11	A Yes.
12	Q Does that add to your concern?
13	A Yes.
14	THE COURT: Were they laid off or did they
15	voluntarily depart?
16	THE WITNESS: They voluntarily departed. And my
17	understanding is with both of them, it was because of
18	workload.
19	THE COURT: Are they seeking to hire replacements?
20	THE WITNESS: Yes. Unfortunately, with these two
21	individuals, they had a lot of institutional knowledge that
22	allowed them to be very efficient in their activities. And
23	we just haven't seen the efficiency gains yet with
24	replacements.
25	THE COURT: People have been hired to replace the

Page 191 1 two who left? 2 THE WITNESS: At least one. And then there's been 3 a shuffling of some responsibilities. But there's no doubt 4 that the department has been impacted. 5 BY MR. GEREMIA: 6 Mr. Brown was also asking you some questions about Mr. 0 7 Chapin's department. What's your understanding of Mr. 8 Chapin's department? Who is in it? 9 Α I don't have visibility to whether there is anyone that 10 assists Mr. Chapin. He has always been really a one man 11 show from my standpoint. So if he has people behind the 12 scenes that he uses within the Diocese, I'm not aware of 13 them. 14 So in your view, is Mr. Chapin's department already as Q 15 lean as it can be? 16 Α Yes. 17 And do you have concerns about Mr. Chapin's ability to Q 18 handle administrative tasks connected to the restructuring 19 efforts if the state court actions were to proceed? 20 Α Yes. 21 MR. GEREMIA: I have no further questions, Your 22 Honor. 23 THE COURT: Thank you very much. Any further 24 cross? RECROSS-EXAMINATION OF CHARLES MOORE 25

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 288 of 529

	Pg 288 0f 529
	Page 192
1	BY MR. BROWN:
2	Q Mr. Moore, some parishes maintain their own financial
3	information, do they not?
4	A That's correct.
5	Q And you don't have any idea how many actually do and
6	how many actually don't, do you?
7	A I do know that now, yes.
8	Q You didn't know at the time of your deposition, but you
9	do know now. And what is it?
10	A Approximately 66 parishes have administrative services
11	agreements in place that allow the Diocese to maintain the
12	books and records for those parishes.
13	THE COURT: Allow or require? I mean
14	THE WITNESS: They contract with the Diocese to
15	perform those services.
16	BY MR. BROWN:
17	Q And do you know whether or not those administrative
18	services agreements are terminable at the option of the
19	Diocese?
20	A That is a legal determination that I can't make.
21	Q You are not familiar with the termination provisions
22	and you don't have those services agreements aren't in
23	evidence, are they?
24	MR. GEREMIA: Your Honor, objection. This is
25	beyond the scope of the redirect.

	Page 193
1	THE COURT: Overruled.
2	BY MR. BROWN:
3	A I don't have the full listing of what is in evidence.
4	Q And you can't testify that those administrative
5	services agreements are not terminable by the Diocese at
6	will, can you?
7	A I can't testify to that.
8	Q And you don't know if those administrative services
9	agreements are going to be assumed in this case, do you?
10	A I can't say that as we sit here today.
11	Q But in any event, about 40 or some 66 percent of the
12	parishes you say rely on the diocese pursuant to these
13	services agreements. The remainder do not. They would
14	maintain their own insurance. They have own financial
15	records, correct?
16	A To clarify, it's actually 66 parishes, not 66 percent.
17	Q I'm sorry, 66 parishes rely. Out of how many?
18	A 135.
19	Q Okay. So the remainder
20	A About half.
21	Q The remainder maintain their own financial information,
22	correct?
23	A That's right. The diocese, as I did indicate, the
24	diocese possesses financial information for all parish
25	though.
I	

Γ

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 290 of 529

	Page 194
1	Q And beyond your view that the administrative services
2	agreements require the Diocese to maintain certain financial
3	records for the parishes, are there any other things in
4	those agreements that you understand would require the
5	Diocese to participate in parish discovery?
6	A I do recall there is a specific paragraph in the
7	administrative services agreement that relates to release of
8	information, but that's related to confidentiality. I don't
9	I am not aware of any other provisions in the contract
10	that relate to that.
11	MR. BROWN: I don't have any further questions.
12	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
13	MR. GEREMIA: Just one brief follow-up, Your
14	Honor.
15	THE COURT: Just identify yourself again.
16	MR. GEREMIA: Todd Geremia for the Debtor.
17	FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF CHARLES MOORE
18	BY MR. GEREMIA:
19	Q Is it your understanding, Mr. Moore, that even with
20	respect to those parishes that the Diocese does not have a
21	bookkeeping and records arrangement, that the Diocese
22	maintains financial records for the parishes?
23	A It possesses financial information for all parishes,
24	yes.
25	Q And in your experience, would you expect that if
	Varitart Lagal Calutions

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 291 of 529

	1925101525
	Page 195
1	litigation were to proceed as against the parishes, that
2	there would be discovery requests on the Diocese for that
3	information?
4	A I would expect that.
5	MR. GEREMIA: Nothing further.
6	THE COURT: All right. You are excused. Thank
7	you very much for your testimony.
8	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: All right. So one more witness?
10	MR. GEREMIA: Yes we do, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Let's take a ten-minute recess now and
12	then we'll go to the last witness. Okay?
13	MR. GEREMIA: Thank you.
14	(Recess)
15	THE COURT: All right. Court is back in session.
16	Would you like to call your next witness?
17	MS. DEL MEDICO: Jennifer Del Medico for the
18	Debtor. The Debtor calls Eric Stephens to the stand.
19	CLERK: Raise your right hand. Do you solemnly
20	swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give
21	this Court will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing
22	but the truth?
23	MR. STEPHENS: I do.
24	THE COURT: Please have a seat. And there is
25	water there if you need it.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 292 of 529		
	Page 196	
1	MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Your Honor.	
2	MS. DEL MEDICO: I am going to hand Mr. Stephens a	
3	copy of his direct.	
4	THE COURT: Please. Thank you.	
5	MS. DEL MEDICO: And it's at 180 in the binder.	
6	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	
7	MS. DEL MEDICO: You're welcome.	
8	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF ERIC STEPHENS	
9	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:	
10	Q Good afternoon, Mr. Stephens.	
11	A Good afternoon.	
12	Q Mr. Stephens, how long have you been acting as counsel	
13	for the Debtor?	
14	A Since either January or February of 2019.	
15	Q And my question was imprecise. How long have you been	
16	representing the Diocese?	
17	A Yes. So my involvement with the Diocese began in	
18	January or February of 2019, right around the time that the	
19	Child Victims Act was being signed into law.	
20	Q And what type of work did you do for the Diocese during	
21	that time, January 2019 up until the time of this	
22	bankruptcy?	
23	A So I helped assemble and lead the state court	
24	litigation team that was responsible for appearing in and	
25	defending on behalf of the Diocese all of the Child Victims	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 293 of 529

	1 9 233 01 323
	Page 197
1	Act complaints that were filed against the Diocese across
2	the state.
3	Q And these were complaints where the Diocese was a named
4	defendant, is that right?
5	A That's correct.
6	Q And could you tell a little bit describe a little
7	bit more of the tasks that you did with respect to discovery
8	in those actions.
9	A Sure. So just for the Court's reference, roughly 90
10	percent of the cases against the Diocese were filed in
11	Nassau and Suffolk counties. The rubric that the State has
12	put in place for the CVA actions is to appoint regional
13	parts for the CVA actions. And so the cases in Nassau and
14	Suffolk have been appointed to a single regional part that
15	was originally presided over by Justice Jaeger, now being
16	presided over by Justice Steinman. That was where the bulk
17	of the diocesan cases were.
18	And so among the first tasks we undertook as litigation

19 counsel was to make an effort to impose some order and some 20 structure. And we filed motions seeking to consolidate and 21 coordinate cases against the Diocese in Judge Jaeger's part. 22 That motion was denied in part and granted in part. 23 And so the individual cases did not end up coordinated or 24 consolidated. There was no coordinated or consolidated 25 docket. But the court did approve some uniform discovery

Page 198

requests that were proposed by a liaison counsel of
 plaintiffs as well as a liaison counsel of defendants who
 were in those cases.

My memory is that around about 50 or 60 prepetition 4 5 cases got to the point where those uniform discovery 6 requests were exchanged and responded to. The Diocese had 7 begun making document productions in response to those 8 uniform requests, but some significant discovery disputes arose, particularly around the scope of discovery and the 9 10 permissible scope of discovery. And those issues were being 11 briefed not in any formal, consolidated way, but in a 12 loosely-coordinated way at the time of the bankruptcy.

13 Also pre-bankruptcy in those cases -- again, and I'm 14 talking about the 9th and 10th regional district. The Diocese had filed motions to dismiss in a similar number of 15 16 cases. Again, those motions were all individually-briefed, 17 individually decided. The Diocese I believe had received decisions in about 40 of those cases, some of which then 18 19 resulted in appeals to the Second Department, one of which 20 resulted in a complete dismissal, but largely paired the 21 claims back to the types of negligence claims that Mr. 22 DiPompeo and Mr. Brown addressed in their opening. 23 And then just so I don't leave it out, the other ten percent of the -- roughly ten percent of the cases were 24 25 assigned or filed in the New York City regional part. Those

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 295 of 529

	rage 199
1	have not made any material progress because the city
2	there was a regional part for all five boroughs.
3	Prepetition, they had taken longer, frankly, to come up with
4	liaison counsel, pattern discovery requests, and a form
5	protective order. And so by the time of the diocesan
6	bankruptcies, I don't believe there was even final approval
7	in the city cases. And so those cases had not even
8	progressed to the extent that the Nassau and Suffolk cases
9	had progressed.
10	THE COURT: During the opening statements this
11	morning, I asked questions about discovery on the notice
12	issue, which is not directly involved here. But can you
13	tell me what documents or information the Diocese produced
14	before the bankruptcy with respect to notice issues?
15	THE WITNESS: Sure. So in the in response to
16	the pattern of discovery requests that I referenced and in
17	those roughly 50 or 60 cases, the Diocese provided
18	interrogatory responses in response to interrogatories
19	directed at that specific abuser. In response to those
20	interrogatories, the Diocese provided information about that
21	individual's assignment history, including other individuals
22	who the Diocese was able to determine from personnel records
23	worked alongside. So other potential witnesses, for
24	example.
25	The diocese then also produced the underlying
l	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 296 of 529

Page 200

1	documents. So there were what our client would refer to as
2	priest cards, which then list the assignment history for
3	that individual priest. The diocese also produced parish
4	cards, which is sort of the inverse of a priest card, which
5	is a list of assignment history within the parish. But the
6	diocese had not begun its production of personnel files. So
7	it was my recollection on the evidence or the documents
8	that would have been produced on the notice-type issue would
9	have been those interrogatory responses and then the
10	underlying priest and parish cards.
11	THE COURT: And then after the Chapter 11 case was
12	filed, did the diocese produce to the Committee further
13	information regarding I'll broadly categorize it as the
14	notice issue?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, yes. And so in connection with
16	the stipulation that was discussed earlier this morning, the
17	Diocese, in connection with the Chapter 11, has produced to
18	the Committee the complete personnel file of every
19	individual who has been accused of abuse by either a CVA
20	plaintiff or a claimant with a POC to the extent that those
21	are different. There were, however, a number of individual
22	accused for whom the Diocese did not have a file.
23	THE COURT: I referenced and I didn't bring a
24	copy of the document out, but in the grand jury report that
25	was done, there were references I don't know whether it

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 297 of 529

Page 201 1 used the term secret files. I think it did. Was an effort 2 made to determine whether the Diocese had any files other 3 than these cards, other than personnel files that related to 4 issues of alleged abuse by priests or other employees of 5 parishes or the Diocese? 6 THE WITNESS: Sure. So if you'll allow me, I'll 7 give you a two-part answer. 8 THE COURT: Please. 9 THE WITNESS: Our client doesn't use the term 10 secret files. That's not our nomenclature --11 THE COURT: And I don't mean --12 THE WITNESS: No, no. And -- no, but I also want 13 to make sure that I'm clearly addressing the Court's 14 question. 15 However, it is correct that personnel files are 16 divided into parts. And there is what our client would 17 refer to as a confidential portion of the personnel files 18 that would include the type of notice evidence that Your 19 Honor has asked about. And those -- the complete personnel 20 file, including those portions, have bene produced in 21 connection with the Chapter 11. 22 With respect to your question about other types of 23 files, the Diocese production in this matter also includes files from the Office of Child Protection. So that includes 24 policies, procedures, those sorts of records as well. 25

	Page 202
1	THE COURT: Okay. Thanks very much. Go ahead
2	with your question.
3	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
4	Q Mr. Stephens, how you mentioned the documents that
5	were produced in this bankruptcy. Over what period of time
6	were those documents produced?
7	A I believe we sent a letter to the Committee talking
8	about substantial completion in July of 2022. So roughly 18
9	months. Well, excuse me. It took us some time to get a
10	protective order in place. So 18 months is probably the
11	right ball park, but
12	Q And you are you familiar with the state court
13	litigations in which the Diocese is not named as a
14	defendant?
15	A I am familiar with the complaints that have been filed
16	in those cases.
17	Q And was there any activity with respect to discovery in
18	any of those cases prior to the bankruptcy?
19	A No, no. And those cases had not been filed. And then
20	once they were filed, they were immediately stayed.
21	Q Okay. Mr. Stephens, if the Diocese isn't a defendant
22	in those cases, why would there be any burden on the Diocese
23	in connection with those cases?
24	A To the extent that those cases go forward, the Diocese
25	is in possession of the documents that I've just described

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 299 of 529

Page 203

1	for Your Honor. And this was an issue prepetition as well.
2	Based on the contentions in the state court, it's my
3	understanding that the Diocese is largely, at least as the
4	parishes would argue, the exclusive source, for example,
5	personnel files and the like. And so my understanding is
6	there will be a tremendous third-party discovery burden just
7	to gather the basic evidence. My understanding from my
8	review of the complaints in the post-petition cases is those
9	allegations cannot be adjudicated in any meaningful way
10	without the records of the Diocese.
11	THE COURT: Was there a document depository,
12	physical and electronic, that was created with respect to
13	the documents that were gathered?
14	THE WITNESS: So all of the documents that we have
15	produced to the Committee we have provided electronically.
16	Our collection efforts included physical files which were
17	then digitized.
18	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
19	Q Couldn't you just give all those documents to the state
20	court claimants?
21	A No, no. In my view, no. And this was among the
22	discovery issues that was teed up before the bankruptcy on
23	the scope of discovery. And I apologize. There are a
24	number of points I would like to make. I think there's a
25	confidentiality concern, and then I think there's also a

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 300 of 529

Page 204

1 practical concern. So certainly from a confidentiality 2 perspective, in this case there was a court order redaction 3 protocol that was in place to protect survivors based on a concern that the records would reflect the names of 4 5 survivors who are claimants in these matters and in the CVA 6 and also those who are not. And so there was a concern 7 about outing people who weren't even involved in this 8 process. So we agreed to a redaction protocol which we then 9 modified for mediation. 10 In order to produce these records in state courts, one, 11 there are no -- there's no agreed redaction protocol in 12 state court and there's no protective orders in place in any 13 of those cases. And so those issues will have to be sorted 14 out. But even then, it will need to be a case-by-case, 15 plaintiff-by-plaintiff redaction effort so that we are not outing one survivor to another. So there is a threshold --16 17 THE COURT: You haven't reviewed documents related 18 to 226 cases, the number. Is that an insurmountable task? 19 I mean, this is not thousands of cases. This is not 30,000 20 asbestos cases. This is hundreds. THE WITNESS: So certainly, Your Honor, it's not 21 22 an insurmountable task. It's been done. It will have to be 23 redone at the expense and at the time and individually 24 certainty. And that's just from a survivor perspective. 25 And then there would also be the additional burden --

Page 205 1 If a protective order of the same THE COURT: 2 basic terms was agreed to in state court as what was put in 3 place here, why would that additional -- including 4 redactions and all that. I mean, all of the secret cases, 5 the names are redacted. 6 THE WITNESS: That's right. That's right. But in 7 these cases, in order, for example, to litigate the notice 8 issues -- let's say you have the Smith case. 9 THE COURT: Sure. I understand. If there was 10 alleged abuse before, there was the name of somebody who was 11 allegedly abused. 12 THE WITNESS: Precisely. So I guess the Smith 13 case would require different redactions than the Robinson 14 case would require different, than the Stephens case I think 15 is the --16 THE COURT: But we're talking about 226 cases or 17 thereabouts. Right? We're not talking about thousands. 18 We're talking about a finite number of -- what's the volume 19 of documents? 20 THE WITNESS: So the total volume of documents 21 produced in a Chapter 11 to date is about 3 million pages. 22 THE COURT: No, just -- there's a lot of financial information. And I want to drill down to abuse claims. 23 24 THE WITNESS: I would want to look that number up 25 so I could answer the Court with precision. But I agree

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 302 of 529

Page 206 1 that overall number includes a lot of financial information 2 in this case. 3 THE COURT: Overwhelmingly. Overwhelmingly. THE WITNESS: So it's some subset of that. 4 5 THE COURT: How big is a typical personnel file? 6 How many pages? 7 THE WITNESS: I couldn't give a rule of thumb. 8 Some are very thin and some are more substantial. 9 THE COURT: Go ahead. 10 BY MS. DEL MEDICO: 11 And, Mr. Stephens, during your work as a lawyer for the 0 12 Diocese, are there individuals at the Diocese who you have 13 worked with on a consistent basis? 14 Yes, yes. So certainly from taking direction from the Α 15 Diocese in the state court litigations, that comes from the 16 chief counsel and operating officer, Mr. Renker. Certainly 17 on the risk and claim type issues I've worked very closely 18 with Bill Chapin. On the financial issues, I've worked very 19 closely with Tom Doodian and his staff. And then on the 20 document issues, I've also -- on the collection and 21 digitization efforts, I've worked very closely with the 22 chancellor of the Diocese, Sister Maryanne Fitzgerald. The 23 Diocese also has an archivist by the name of Krista Ammirati 24 who has worked very closely with us. And then as the 25 allegations and discovery on child protection have come in,

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 303 of 529

Page 207 1 I've also worked very closely with the head of child 2 protection, Mary McMahon. 3 MS. DEL MEDICO: Your Honor, we would like to introduce into evidence or submit into evidence the direct 4 5 testimony of Mr. Stephens. 6 THE COURT: All right. Does it have any docket 7 number? 8 MS. DEL MEDICO: 180. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Any objection? 10 MR. BROWN: Same as the other two, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. It's admitted into 12 evidence subject to any later objections that the Court has 13 to address. 14 MS. DEL MEDICO: And we would like to tender the 15 witness over to -- for cross-examination. 16 THE COURT: Great. Thank you. Cross-examination. 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION OF ERIC STEPHENS BY MR. BROWN: 18 19 Good morning, Mr. Stephens -- or afternoon, Mr. Q 20 Stephens. Afternoon. Okay. 21 So Diocese has produced and collected millions of pages 22 of information to the Committee during the bankruptcy, 23 right? 24 Α Yes. 25 And those productions included all documents that would Q

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 304 of 529

	Pg 304 01 529
	Page 208
1	otherwise be produced to the plaintiffs in the underlying
2	CVA actions, correct?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And in your view, did anything other than privileged
5	documents get withheld?
6	A No, I'm not aware of anything that was withheld other
7	than on the grounds of privilege.
8	Q And the documents included insurance policies,
9	financial information, and financial statements?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And the Diocese produced the files of all the alleged
12	abusers' disciplinary records, laicization documents, and
13	confidential
14	THE COURT: What's that?
15	MR. BROWN: Pardon me?
16	THE COURT: What is that?
17	BY MR. BROWN:
18	Q What are laicization documents?
19	A My understanding is documents related to laicization,
20	rejoining the laypeople, so leaving the religious life. But
21	to answer the broader question, yes, all of those records
22	were collected and produced.
23	Q Confidential or secret files consisting of portions of
24	the personnel files that were maintained by the bishop,
25	those were also produced, correct?

	Page 209
1	A The confidential portions of the personnel files were
2	collected and produced. That's correct.
3	Q And if there was a file for an alleged abuser, it was
4	produced, correct?
5	A That's correct.
6	Q And the Diocese also produced very detailed financial
7	information, including the financial information of certain
8	of its affiliates and parishes, correct?
9	A Correct.
10	A The in the adversarial with Arrow Wood, special
11	insurance counsel is leading that effort. I have certainly
12	assisted them in their discovery efforts. I'm not sure I
13	would I certainly didn't have the same leadership role
14	that I have had
15	Q Okay.
16	A in the Chapter 11 or the state board actions.
17	Q Is it correct to say that if the I think we're now
18	at 223 if I'm of the 223 state court actions to which the
19	Diocese is not a party, if those actions are allowed to
20	proceed, there are no other categories of documents that
21	you're aware of that remain to be collected in connection
22	with those actions?
23	A That's correct. I'm not aware of additional documents
24	that would need to be collected.
25	Q Okay. Mr. Moore testified that if the state court

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 306 of 529

Page 210 1 actions go forward, that the Diocese would be required to 2 collect additional financial information regarding the 3 parishes. Do you recall that testimony? 4 I heard that testimony. Α 5 0 Okay. In connection with the stipulation to extend the 6 injunction, I think it's Exhibit P, and it's a -- I think 7 you testified to it, and at Paragraph 10 of your direct 8 testimony you reference the exhibit which -- it's 9 Plaintiff's Exhibit P for today and also Docket 59 in the 10 adversary proceeding. And your testimony is in return for 11 the Committee's agreement to extend the preliminary 12 injunction, the Diocese agreed to produce documents that 13 would otherwise be produced to the Plaintiffs in the 14 underlying CDA actions. Non-controversial, right? I just 15 -- everything was produced. 16 THE COURT: You have to answer audibly. 17 THE WITNESS: I wasn't sure I had the question 18 yet, but --19 BY MR. BROWN: 20 Q No, no. You know, I'm just getting -- staying 21 background for --22 THE COURT: Well, it sounded like a question. And 23 if it's a question, it needs an audible answer. 24 MR. BROWN: Okay. 25 THE COURT: If it's not a question --

20-12345-r	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 307 of 529
	Page 211
1	MR. BROWN: Not a question yet.
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	MR. BROWN: Okay?
4	BY MR. BROWN:
5	A Good. I didn't think there was one. I was nodding
6	along with you.
7	Q Okay.
8	A I was reading along with you.
9	Q So the parish was the parish financial information
10	produced in connection with the stipulation?
11	A My recollection of the parish productions in this case
12	is that they were made in connection with the mediation, and
13	then also in response to various discovery disputes about
14	parish information that came up along the way that are
15	reflected on the docket. My I would put financial
16	information largely to the side given my understanding, for
17	example, of the limitations on the financial discovery
18	that's available in state court prior to a judgment.
19	Q Right. That's what I'm getting at. Do you recall that
20	there were significant limitations on the production of
21	financial information regarding the parishes at the
22	insistence of the parishes because of their position that
23	there were limitations on the production of financial
24	information prejudgment in state court litigation?
25	A Yes, I remember that issue coming up

	Py 506 01 529
	Page 212
1	Q Okay.
2	A in this case a number of times.
3	Q So it's correct that the parishes have previously taken
4	the position that you don't get our financial information en
5	masse prejudgment.
6	A I think that's a fair description of the
7	Q Okay.
8	A early 2004 discovery disputes.
9	Q Okay.
10	A Or at least of the issue. The issue.
11	Q So it's your understanding of the parish's position
12	that the parish financial information doesn't need to be
13	produced until and unless there's a judgment.
14	A I can't speak for the parishes. I can only, you know,
15	speak to their positions as reflected in those discovery
16	disputes.
17	Q And that is the position that they took in the
18	discovery disputes, correct?
19	A I'd have to go back to their pleadings, but among the
20	basis for their objections to that discovery, I do believe
21	that was one.
22	Q Okay. Thank you. So looking at Paragraph 34 of your
23	written testimony, Mr. Stephens, you testify pursuant to an
24	order of the Regional CDA Part for the Ninth and Tenth
25	Judicial Districts Nassau and Suffolk Counties, the Diocese
l	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 309 of 529

	Pg 309 of 529
	Page 213
1	and its co-Defendants were subject to standardized discovery
2	requests in connection with the pre-petition state court
3	actions
4	A I see that testimony.
5	Q pending in those judicial districts. Okay. So
6	you're referring to a case management order entered by Judge
7	Jager in November of 2019, are you?
8	A It was certainly a Judge Jager order. That timing
9	sounds roughly correct.
10	MR. BROWN: Could we put up Plaintiff's Rebuttal
11	Exhibit AA?
12	BY MR. BROWN:
13	Q And if I could approach you, Mr. Stephens.
14	A Thank you.
15	Q I believe this is the case management order. Oh, yeah.
16	Mr. Stephens, can I ask is this the order that you're
17	referring to in Paragraph 34?
18	A Yes, and it's also the order that I was describing to
19	His Honor earlier today.
20	Q Okay. And this, we'll call it the Case Management
21	Order for purposes of this testimony, it was entered to
22	achieve coordination of the state court actions and to avoid
23	undue burdens of the litigation. I think that's what the
24	language of the order says.
25	A I'm I see words to that effect under Heading 2,

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 310 of 529

	Pg 310 of 529
	Page 214
1	Objectives of
2	Q Yeah.
3	A This Order.
4	Q Yeah. And did the Diocese seek and obtain this order
5	in the state court actions?
6	A Yes. This order was entered in response to a motion
7	that was brought by the Diocese.
8	Q Okay. And this order only applies to cases to which
9	the Diocese is a party, correct?
10	A Yes. Yeah. By its terms at the top there, it is only
11	applicable where the Diocese of Rockville Center
12	Q Okay.
13	A is a named party Defendant. I would also add it's
14	only applicable in this regional part.
15	Q Okay.
16	A So for example, it does not apply in the New York City
17	Regional Part that I described earlier.
18	Q And no such order has been entered with respect to any
19	of the 223 cases to which the Diocese is not a party because
20	those cases have been stayed, correct?
21	A That's my understanding. That's correct.
22	Q Okay, but you're not aware of any reason why a similar
23	order couldn't be issued with respect to those cases in the
24	courts in which they're pending, are you?
25	A Well, this order came about on the motion of the

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 311 of 529

Page 215

1	Diocese and was granted over the objection of a number of
2	Plaintiff's counsel. So I don't know in the 220 cases
3	where the Diocese is not a party, I don't know that there's
4	a Defendant with the will, the resources, or the motivation
5	to try to bring about a similar order. And our experience,
6	at least with this order, was that the Plaintiff's counsel
7	resisted it. So if you're asking do I you know, what do
8	I know about the likelihood of an order like this in the 228
9	or the 223, I don't expect a similar order. This was
10	something that my client had to fight for in order to get
11	entered.
12	Q Okay. Okay. So you've also stated that the Diocese
13	was the repository for the overwhelming majority of
14	documents relevant to the state court actions.
15	A Yes.
16	Q And that includes the personnel files, the assignment
17	cards for the abusers, which were produced to the Committee
18	during the bankruptcy, correct?
19	A Yes, those are among the categories of documents.
20	Q And the Diocese maintains centralized files for all
21	abusers, right?
22	A The Diocese has personnel files, but there are a number
23	of accused, for example, who are not diocesan. So no, I
24	would not agree that the Diocese maintains centralized
25	abuser files. That
1	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 312 of 529

	Page 216
1	Q That maintain centralized abuse files for all the
2	documents that it has regarding the Diocese, correct?
3	A No, the sorry, your use of the frame abuse files,
4	there are personnel files. There are personnel files.
5	There are policies and there are procedures. I'm not aware
6	sort of as of abuse as a category of document.
7	Q Okay. Okay.
8	THE COURT: Did the Diocese collect personnel
9	files for religious order priests who are accused of being
10	abusers in cases or on claims where the Diocese is also?
11	THE WITNESS: So generally speaking, the Diocese
12	does not have order priest files, personnel files since they
13	were not diocesan personnel.
14	THE COURT: Before or after the petition date, the
15	Diocese, your understanding is, didn't maintain personnel
16	files on religious order priests.
17	THE WITNESS: That's right, and we didn't and
18	there's been no effort go and collect personnel files from
19	third parties. But to the extent that the name of the
20	accused showed up in the diocesan personnel files, it was
21	produced.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	BY MR. BROWN:
24	Q I think you testified in your preliminary testimony
25	here today in response to questions of your counsel that

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

20	131	L3	OŤ	529	•

г	Pg 313 of 529
	Page 217
1	there was standardized discovery that was propounded in the
2	state court actions pre-petition. Is that correct?
3	A That's right pursuant to the order that I believe
4	you've marked as Rebuttal Exhibit AA.
5	Q Exhibit AA, yes.
6	A That's correct.
7	Q And you supervised the team that handled the Diocese
8	responses to those standardized discovery requests, didn't
9	you?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And do you recall in those discovery requests that the
12	Diocese stated that it didn't control parish priests and
13	other perpetrators of childhood sex abuse?
14	A I do recall interrogatory responses with similar
15	language.
16	Q And I'd like to hand you a copy of Exhibit N, which is
17	a collection of some of those discovery responses, and I'd
18	just like to walk through them. And if we could put Exhibit
19	N up on the screen.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And I have my copy of Exhibit N
21	in front of me as well, but you can put it up on the screen.
22	MR. BROWN: You do have a copy?
23	THE COURT: I do. I do, but you can put it up on
24	the screen.
25	BY MR. BROWN:
L	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 314 of 529

Page 218 1 Thank you. Α 2 You're welcome. Okay. So if you could flip to -- at 0 3 the page number at the bottom --4 THE COURT: The actual page of the document. 5 MR. BROWN: It's the page number at the bottom of 6 the document, 10430.3. 7 THE COURT: The Bates number. 8 MR. BROWN: Pardon me? 9 The Bates numbers --THE COURT: 10 MR. BROWN: Yeah, the Bates number. 11 THE COURT: -- as opposed to the page. Give me --12 which one is it again? Bates --13 MR. BROWN: It's Interrogatory Number 1. 14 THE COURT: Give me the Bates page again. 15 MR. BROWN: 10430.3. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 BY MR. BROWN: 18 And this interrogatory just -- you know, it asks for Q 19 the Diocese to describe the employment and business 20 relationship between it and the individual listed below. 21 Here it's Father Charles Ribatu (ph). And it says the --22 see subject to objections, the Diocese states that Charles 23 Ribatu was a priest at the Diocese who served at a parish 24 from specified dates. Agree? 25 I see that language, and that language is highlighted Α

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 315 of 529

Page 219

1	on	my	сору
---	----	----	------

2 Is highlighted, yes. And again, if we could flip to 0 10430.10, which is Interrogatory Number 10, please describe 3 the relationship between you and any other named Defendant 4 regarding each individuals listed below who are identified 5 6 in the Plaintiff's complaint, including legal relationship, 7 financial relationship, and your relationship with regard to 8 supervising and controlling the individual. General 9 objection's stated, and then if you flip the page, the 10 response, which again is highlighted at 104.3011, subject to 11 and without waiving those objections, the Diocese states 12 that holy family diocesan and high school is separately 13 incorporated from the Diocese and under New York State 14 Religious Corporation Law. The Diocese Corporation, a 15 Special Act Corporation under New York law, does not and did 16 not have the ability to control Father Ribatu. You see 17 that? 18 Α I see that. Is there any reason you have to believe that the answer 19 0 20 to that interrogatory is not correct? 21 Α No. I believe the answer is correct. 22 And again at 10435, another set of Q Okay. interrogatories -- standardized interrogatories relating to 23 another priest and another Defendant -- set of Defendants. 24 25 Same Interrogatory Number 1, this relates to a priest by the

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 316 of 529

Page 220

1	name of Father John P. Halprin. That's at 10435.3. And
2	then if you flip to 10435.10, Diocese response to the same
3	standard interrogatory is subject to and without waiving
4	objections, the Diocese states that the Church of St.
5	Rosalee, a parish of the Diocese, is separately
6	incorporated. And any compensation of parish priests is the
7	responsibility of the parishes and the Diocese as a special
8	act corporation under New York law does not and did not have
9	the ability to control Father Halprin. Anything incorrect
10	about that?
11	A Not to my knowledge.
12	THE COURT: Were you involved in the drafting of
13	the answers to this (indiscernible)?
14	THE WITNESS: I certainly supervised the team.
15	Whether I put fingers to keys on these specific responses, I
16	couldn't say, but my recollection was in looking at these
17	responses they were individualized. There was an effort
18	made to, as I described, you know, provide earlier
19	provide the information in one about who worked. And then
20	as I reviewed these responses, even the relationship to the
21	individual was investigated individually. And the Diocese
22	provided what information it could. And so for example, I'm
23	looking at Page 10350.10 where, again, we describe the
24	relationship, and also individuals at the Diocese to whom
25	this person reported. So my recollection is there was an

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 317 of 529

Page 221

1 individualized investigation to respond to each of these. I supervised that effort. I couldn't describe in any detail 2 sort of the drafting that I either did or didn't do. 3 THE COURT: So what -- in the response to 4 5 Interrogatory Number 10 with respect to Father John Halprin, 6 in the highlighted portion of the answer where it says the 7 Diocese Corporation Special Act Corporation of New York Law 8 does not and did not have the ability to control Father 9 Halprin, explain what the meaning of control is as used in 10 that response. Maybe I should say that in the opinion I 11 issued this morning I found that the use of the word control 12 is a conclusory statement. And so I'm trying to understand, 13 and that's with respect to claims that were filed. And now 14 the word here is used in an interrogatory answer, and I'm 15 trying to understand what -- and you said you worked on 16 these, what was your understanding of the meaning of the 17 word control? What did that mean? THE WITNESS: I apologize, Your Honor. 18 I wish I 19 had a better answer from three years ago. In terms of the 20 specific facts and, you know, how we determined or chose to 21 use the word control in these responses, I -- sitting here 22 today, I apologize, I just don't know. 23 THE COURT: So I think this is obviously a term, the word control appears in multiple answers as to different 24 25 Did you and your colleagues, in deciding to use priests.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 318 of 529

	Page 222
1	the word control, have the general understanding or intent
2	as to what was what did you intend to communicate in
3	saying that the Diocese did not have the ability to control
4	Father Halprin or another priest?
5	THE WITNESS: I have no independent memory. All I
6	can talk to is the words on the page. And I do see, for
7	example, in the response that you have raised, clearly we
8	tried to delineate, for example, who compensation was paid
9	by. In subsequent responses, we also talk about reporting
10	relationships. But sitting here today, sort of the type of
11	control or the nature of the control that we had in mind
12	while we were compiling these, I don't have a memory. I'm
13	sorry, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Go ahead.
15	MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm and
16	bear with me for a few more minutes.
17	THE COURT: Sure.
18	MR. BROWN: There's a couple more of these.
19	THE COURT: Yeah.
20	MR. BROWN: Because some of them relate the
21	ones I've asked about so far relate to the parish priests,
22	but there are others that relate to certain other diocesan
23	personnel but are higher up in the structure where the
24	Diocese took the same position. And I just want to make
25	sure those get your attention as well. So, in John Hagan's
L	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 319 of 529

Page 223 1 complaint, the interrogatories relating to his complaint 2 against the Diocese and --3 THE COURT: Is there a page I'm supposed to look at? 4 5 MR. BROWN: We're looking now at 10350.1. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MR. BROWN: So again, if you now turn to 10350.3, we get response to Interrogatory Number 1 where the Diocese 8 9 describes the relationship. And it says -- and who the guy 10 is, the perpetrator. And this is Monsignor Edward Melton. 11 I don't know a whole about the diocesan --12 THE COURT: I always pronounced it monsignor, but 13 that's --14 MR. BROWN: Pardon me? 15 THE COURT: -- you know --16 MR. BROWN: Pardon? I don't know a lot about the 17 diocesan structure, but I think a monsignor is higher up 18 than a priest. 19 THE COURT: Monsignors, yes. 20 MR. BROWN: And so we're talking about a monsignor 21 now. And then if we flip to the answer to Interrogatory 22 Number 10, which is 10350.1, the Diocese states that 23 Monsignor Melton was papal chamberlain from 1959 to 1965. 24 The Diocese does not and did not have the ability to control 25 Monsignor Melton. However, he did at times -- this one we

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 320 of 529

Page 224 1 get a little bit different language. He did at times report 2 to the Diocese, but no control. 3 THE COURT: Let's leave the chart as out, but I'd 4 like, you know, (indiscernible). Go ahead. BY MR. BROWN: 5 6 So Mr. Stephens, what did you mean here when you said 0 7 that although the monsignor did report to the Diocese, the 8 Diocese didn't control the monsignor? 9 I didn't get -- I'd echo the comments that I made to Α His Honor that, you know, as I look at these and it appears 10 11 to me to be an individualized response --12 Mm-hmm. 0 13 -- talking about issues of compensation reporting Α 14 lines, and then the use of that word control. And in terms 15 of whether we were using control based on allegations in the 16 complaint that used the same word, as I said, I don't have a 17 specific recollection of --18 Q Okay. 19 -- of what that --Α 20 Q Okay. 21 THE COURT: I was wondering --22 BY MR. BROWN: 23 -- what generated that. Α THE COURT: -- is it fair for me to criticize 24 25 claims that use the word control when the Diocese responded

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 321 of 529

	Pg 321 of 529
	Page 225
1	to discovery by using the term control? But that's a
2	question to myself. Go ahead.
3	MR. BROWN: I don't think it was directed at me.
4	THE COURT: No, it wasn't. It was
5	MR. BROWN: I'm not going to go there.
6	THE COURT: No. Let's move
7	MR. BROWN: I do point out, Your Honor, I mean
8	that the interrogatories didn't ask specifically
9	THE COURT: I know what they ask. Go ahead.
10	MR. BROWN: for control.
11	THE COURT: Go ahead.
12	MR. BROWN: All right.
13	BY MR. BROWN:
14	A Sorry, Ken. As I read the interrogatory, Part 3 of
15	that interrogatory, your relationship with regard to
16	supervising and controlling. So I think the interrogatory
17	does use the word.
18	Q Did they did it mention control?
19	THE COURT: It does. It says supervising and
20	control.
21	MR. BROWN: Well, okay. I apologize.
22	THE COURT: And of course, the objection starts by
23	saying it improperly calls for a legal conclusion.
24	BY MR. BROWN:
25	Q If we turn to the next set, which is for Richard
L.	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 322 of 529

Page 2	26
--------	----

1	Toldner, who is the Plaintiff, Interrogatory Number 1 is at
2	10377.3, and this relates to a perpetrator by the name of
3	Monsignor Alan Placa. And again flipping to the response to
4	Interrogatory Number 10 at 10377.11, subject to objections,
5	the Diocese states that Monsignor Alan Placa was faculty
6	with the residents at St. Pius from January '74 to July '78.
7	The Diocese Corporation Special Act Corporation under New
8	York law does not and did not have the ability to control
9	Monsignor Placa. However, he did at times report to the
10	diocesan bishop. And we get the same pattern with respect
11	to one I think there's only one more here, but I do
12	stress these are standardized interrogatories, which were
13	propounded and responded to in hundreds of cases.
14	A I don't think the I think that's I'm sorry, Ken.
15	Q Oh, okay.
16	A On the numbers, I don't think that's right.
17	Q How many cases?
18	A My recollection it was sort of 50 to 60.
19	Q 50 to 60. Okay. So this is a 10 percent sampling. If
20	the next set is a Doe Plaintiff starting at 10452. And
21	this again this one relates to a perpetrator who was a
22	deacon, Deacon William Mahoney. And that's at 104.52.3, and
23	then the interrogatory response to Number 10 is at 104.52.10
24	where the Diocese says again Deacon Williams was not a
25	compensated employee for his work as a deacon, and the

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 323 of 529

Diocese did not control or have the ability to control And again, did you have do you have any understandin with respect to either Mr. Placa or Mr. Deacon what the Diocese meant when it said it didn't control them?	g
3 with respect to either Mr. Placa or Mr. Deacon what the	-
4 Diocese meant when it said it didn't control them?	
5 A I don't have a specific recollection of what that	term
6 was meant to convey.	
7 Q Okay.	
8 A Clearly, control is an issue that's going to be	
9 litigated in every one of these cases.	
10 Q Okay. Paragraph 38, you testified in your direct	
11 testimony, and we're, by the way done with you can t	oss
12 Exhibit M. You testified Paragraph 38, Mr. Stevens, th	at
13 although the Diocese has gone to great lengths during t	he
14 Chapter 11 case to produce all of the relevant discover	γ.
15 With respect to the CDA claims, that discovery was made	more
16 efficient because it was provided en masse to the Commi	ttee
17 in its capacity as an estate fiduciary.	
18 And then going onto Paragraph 39, if the Diocese w	ere
19 now required to reproduce evidence in 228 individual ca	ses
20 in the state, it would have to negotiate protective ord	ers,
21 cull through previously produced material, previously	
22 produced discovery materials, separate out documents	
23 relevant to individual cases, re-review documents to re	dact
24 personally identifying information of non-parties, and	
25 produce targeted re-redacted subsets of documents in ea	ch

Page 228 1 specific case. And again, you did testify to this to some 2 extent in your preliminary testimony here today, live 3 testimony. 4 MR. BROWN: And Your Honor, I've explored some of 5 this, and I appreciate that. And I'm going to try not to be 6 duplicative, but I did want to do some follow-up on some of 7 the questions and concerns that you had. 8 THE COURT: At 10 minutes to 4 we're going to take 9 a short recess to switch ECRO operators. 10 MR. BROWN: Sure thing. 11 THE COURT: But let's continue --12 MR. BROWN: If I don't notice, just somebody 13 holler at me. 14 THE COURT: I -- somebody will holler at you. 15 BY MR. BROWN: 16 I recall that. I recall those exchanges. Α 17 Yeah. Okay. So obviously the Diocese isn't a party to Q 18 any of these state court actions that are at issue today, 19 the 223. So is your concern that it would be a party to 20 third-party discovery? Like be subpoenaed? 21 Α Yes. Yes. I believe that's the case. I don't believe 22 that those cases will be able to be adjudicated without --23 Uh-huh. Q -- the evidence that the Diocese is -- has. 24 Α 25 And is -- again, the -- there's a large volume, in fact Q

	Page 229
1	the great majority of the documents, certainly the financial
2	documents for example and insurance information, that would
3	be able to be produced en masse, wouldn't it? I mean, let
4	me ask it another way. Why couldn't a data room just be set
5	up for some of that for the Diocese and financial
6	information, any parish information the Diocese has, any
7	parish financial information, any insurance information.
8	That could be done, right?
9	A Well, in effect pre-petition that was done, and the
10	motion the discovery motion practice that I described to
11	you earlier included Plaintiff's objection to the mass
12	production of insurance information. And they came back
13	seeking to compel the Diocese to identify the specific
14	policies within the production that were applicable to the
15	claims alleged in the complaint. So my understanding is
16	that that is not acceptable to state court counsel.
17	Q I don't mean to be facetious
18	THE COURT: Let me ask you this. The I don't
19	want to get in I'm not intending to get into what has
20	gone on in mediations, but the Diocese excuse me, that
21	the parishes have had counsel appear before me, one of them
22	represents 98 parishes. You know, there are a handful.
23	Have the documents relating to parishes been made available
24	to the counsel who are representing the parishes in
25	connection with mediations for who would appear before me?

Page 230 1 THE WITNESS: To the extent that the Debtor has 2 provided documents in connection with the mediation, 3 including the parish financial information, that has been shared with the counsel for the -- the restructuring counsel 4 5 for the parishes. 6 THE COURT: Have these personnel files for alleged 7 abusers within a parish been provided to counsel representing the parishes? 8 9 THE WITNESS: No. 10 THE COURT: Go ahead. 11 BY MR. BROWN: 12 And there's no reason, is there, that, for example 0 13 child protection information that has been produced to the 14 Committee could also not be produce en masse in the state 15 court litigation, is there? 16 I do -- yeah, I would include -- yes. I think Α 17 financial insurance and policies and procedures, there are categories of general information that would be appropriate 18 to produce in bulk. 19 20 Q And --21 Α Whether or not that would be acceptable to the state 22 court parties, I can't say. 23 You don't know. Q 24 But that would certainly be the approach I would Α 25 recommend to my client to try and manage cost.

	Pg 327 of 529 Page 231
1	Q And all the
2	A And time.
3	Q document productions to the Committee in this case
4	of the massive document productions that have taken place in
5	this bankruptcy case to the Committee, that's all been done
6	electronically, right?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And with respect to the documents that have been
9	produced to the Committee, everything relevant to the CDA
10	actions, there have been privileged reviews and documents
11	that have been withheld from the Committee on the grounds of
12	<pre>privilege, correct?</pre>
13	A That's correct.
14	Q And Jones Day has already prepared all the privilege
15	logs relating to that, has it not?
16	A The privilege logs have been prepared in connection
17	with those productions. That's correct.
18	Q And is are the documents that have been produced to
19	date to the Committee, which is all the CDA related
20	documents that the Diocese has, they're maintained in an
21	electronic database, correct?
22	A Yes.
23	Q And does Jones Day oversee this database?
24	A It's at an outside vendor, but certainly we have access
25	and then, you know, we make productions to the Committee out

Pg 328 of 529

Page 232 1 of the database. We also provide information to the 2 insurers through the database. But in terms of -- it 3 resides at a vendor, but we direct, you know, the vendor. 4 Fair enough. Q THE COURT: Well, let me ask you. So most 5 6 insurance policies require cooperation with the insurers, 7 and they frequently do ask for underlying documents that 8 they've produced subject to the confidentiality stipulation. 9 What has been provided to the insurers with respect to 10 personnel, anything related to the abusers? 11 THE WITNESS: In connection with the mediation, 12 and this goes back to the discussion I had earlier about the 13 revised protective order, for example, in connection with 14 the mediation, the Committee -- or I should say counsel for 15 the Committee, counsel for the Debtor, and counsel for the 16 insurers are working from the same pool. So the same 17 documents with the same Bates numbers on the abuse issues. 18 THE COURT: There are four coverage actions 19 pending in the Southern District in the District Court. In 20 connection with those actions, has the Diocese produced 21 documents to the insurers in those four cases? And if so, 22 in what format? When I say in what format, electronically? Policies have a duty to cooperate, and they usually want to 23 24 see whatever you've got. 25 THE WITNESS: And to date, what I'm aware of being

Pg 329 of 529

Page 233 1 -- what I am aware of what's being shared is that the --2 what we would call the merits production that has been made to the Committee has been shared with counsel for all of the 3 insureds. 4 5 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, is it the witching out 6 yet? 7 THE COURT: Well, it's almost, so let's -- we'll 8 break it until 4:00. 9 MR. BROWN: Okay. 10 THE COURT: We'll just have the switchover of 11 ECROs --12 MR. BROWN: Okay. Fair enough. THE COURT: -- now. We'll take -- this will be 13 our last break. Do you have an estimate? I'm not --14 15 MR. BROWN: Yeah, I can give --16 THE COURT: -- holding you. Do you have an 17 establish how much longer you're going to be? MR. BROWN: I think I should be able to finish in 18 19 an hour. 20 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Okay. Then we're 21 in recess until 4:00. 22 (Recess) 23 AUTOMATED VOICE: Recording in progress. 24 THE COURT: Don't run. Don't run. All right. The court is back in session. Before we continue, I have a 25

	Page 234
1	question for Committee counsel. The testimony has been that
2	all of the personnel files, including the confidential
3	personnel files for all of the alleged abusers have been
4	produced to the Committee. Do you agree with that?
5	MR. BROWN: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Okay. And can you tell me whether
7	personnel files for alleged abusers have been provided
8	whether the Committee has provided those documents to the
9	state court counsel representing alleged victim for the
10	abusers that were involved in that?
11	MR. BROWN: I cannot, but I can get you an answer.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	MR. BROWN: Or we
14	MS. GREENWOOD: I believe the answer is no,
15	they've only been available to Committee under
16	confidentiality restrictions, and Karen would know.
17	MR. BROWN: Karen Dine would know probably
18	THE COURT: Ms. Dine stepped out.
19	MR. BROWN: but
20	THE COURT: Okay.
21	MR. BROWN: And certainly, I can get you an answer
22	more definitively, but I don't know personally.
23	THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Do any of the
24	Debtors' counsel have a different response to that question?
25	Do you have Charlie, do you what that do you

Pg 331 of 529

Page 235 1 understand the question I was --2 MR. ADAMS: I do, and I unfortunately don't know 3 the answer to that question either. Mr. Stephens --THE COURT: Well, I was going to ask Mr. 4 5 (Indiscernible) who has been preparing all the --6 MAN 2: Yeah, I --7 THE COURT: -- claim objections, including arguing 8 the notice one. 9 MAN 2: I think the person who knows who knows 10 best is on the witness stand. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Stephens, do you know 12 whether the personnel files for the alleged abusers that 13 have been produced to the Committee, both the confidential 14 personnel files and the non-confidential personnel files, 15 whether those documents have been provided to the state 16 court counsel with respect to the -- whichever alleged 17 abuser, if it's not generally, but at least that with the 18 respective abuser? 19 THE WITNESS: Yeah. With apologies, I don't know. 20 I know we've made the productions, but ultimately --21 THE COURT: Do you know whether the protective 22 order that restricted the Committee from providing those documents to anyone else, such as the state court counsel? 23 24 THE WITNESS: My understanding of the protective 25 order and the designations on those documents is that they

	Page 236
1	would be allowed to be shared with state court counsel to
2	Committee members. I don't believe the I do not believe
3	that it would be a I believe the restriction would not
4	extend to all state court counsel to all Claimants.
5	THE COURT: I don't well, let's see whether Ms.
6	Dine has a different
7	MAN 3: Are we live on Zoom?
8	THE COURT: We are.
9	MAN 3: Because somebody on the Zoom call may well
10	know.
11	MS. GREENWOOD: Well, that was the response that
12	Eric just gave is consistent with the response that I
13	received, which is it's available to counsel for
14	MR. BROWN: For Committee members.
15	MS. GREENWOOD: Committee members, but not a
16	broader audience.
17	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Go ahead with your
18	questioning.
19	MR. BROWN: And as a
20	MS. MICHAEL: Your Honor?
21	MR. BROWN: Sorry. As a factual matter whether
22	that's happened or not, I don't know.
23	THE COURT: All right. Somebody on Zoom wanted to
24	speak?
25	MS. MICHAEL: Yes. Apologies, Your Honor. This

Page 237 1 is Brittany Michael from Pachulski Strang Ziehl Jones on 2 behalf of the Committee. THE COURT: Yes. 3 4 MS. MICHAEL: One clarification in response to 5 your question directly. What Ms. Greenwood said is correct, 6 but it is also my understanding you asked if the personnel 7 files for the abusers at issue in the objections have been 8 shared. 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 MS. MICHAEL: And it is my understanding that for 11 some of the objections there were no files that were 12 produced to the Committee regarding the noted at issue 13 abuser. 14 THE COURT: And for some there were, and for some 15 there weren't. 16 MS. MICHAEL: Right, but what Ms. Greenwood said 17 is correct in terms of the Committee's ability to -- or 18 inability to share those beyond the confidentiality 19 agreement. 20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Thank you very 21 much. Mr. Brown? 22 MR. BROWN: May I proceed? 23 THE COURT: Yes, please. 24 MR. BROWN: Okay. 25 BY MR. BROWN:

Page 238

1	Q Mr. Stephens, I'm going to ask some questions of you
2	regarding your testimony at Paragraph 41 of your written
3	direct, which states based on the Diocese heavy involvement
4	in the litigation of all pre-petition state court actions,
5	its key personnel would remain busy with case management and
6	supervision in any resumed state court actions despite the
7	fact that the document collection process is over. That
8	would be true even if only the cases that do not name the
9	Diocese as a Defendant were to move forward. While as a
10	general proposition, fewer cases take less time to manage.
11	Based on my experience and the fact that the Diocese key
12	personnel are in senior management positions, the amount of
13	time they would spend on oversight on a subset of state
14	court actions would not be reduced on a one-to-one basis.
15	By key personnel, who are you referring to in that
16	paragraph?
17	A The individuals that immediately come to mind are the
18	Diocese general counsel and Chief Operating Officer Tom
19	Renker, the Diocese Director of Insurance and Risk
20	Management William or Bill Chapin, and the Diocese Chief
21	Financial Officer Tom Dutian.
22	Q Tom Duty. Okay. Renker, Dutian so it's Renker,
23	Dutian, and Chapin? Yeah?
24	A Yes. Yes. And in my written direct, I provide some
25	further detail
1	

DUC 2015		LIIIEIEU 02/02/24 17.39.13	Main Document
	Pg 33	35 of 529	
			Page 239
			Fage 259

	Page 239
1	Q Okay.
2	A in Paragraphs 42, 43, and 44.
3	Q Okay. So from your personal observations of these
4	individuals, it's true that you don't know what actual tasks
5	any of them engaged in with respect to the state court
6	actions pre-petition, do you?
7	A On a task-by-task basis, that's correct. I mean, it's
8	clear to me from minor actions with them that they have been
9	doing the work to achieve the goals, but how they organize
10	themselves in their pursuit of those, that's right.
11	Q And for example, you never observed Mr. Renker in the
12	performance of his day-to-day duties in connection with the
13	state court actions pre-petition, did you?
14	A No, that's right. I do not sit with Tom Renker as he
15	does his job, but from his direction of me, it's clear to me
16	that he's done it.
17	Q And all of your observational knowledge of what those
18	individuals were doing in the state court litigation was
19	based on pre-petition work they did in cases that included
20	the Diocese as a party, correct?
21	A I would make I would offer just a few
22	clarifications. I would say that that's largely true.
23	However, for example, I do know that Mr. Chapin, for
24	example, continued to send notices with respect to post-
25	petition complaints. And so I observed him in carrying out

	Page 240
1	that piece of his duties. And similarly, I know that, you
2	know, Mr. Renker was aware of the filing of the complaints
3	often because he was the individual who received the
4	complaints. So there were responsibilities that they had in
5	connection with post-petition complaints that I'm aware of,
6	but
7	THE COURT: Yeah, you've noticed of the insurers
8	for one.
9	THE WITNESS: Precisely. And that's work that I
10	observed being done, but the bulk if my experience and the
11	thrust I agree. You know, the foundation for my expectation
12	is pre-petition activity, but there is there has been
13	post-petition activity that I have observed.
14	BY MR. BROWN:
15	Q And that's true for all this, the key personnel that
16	you're referring to, correct?
17	A Yes.
18	Q Okay. With respect to time spent by diocesan personnel
19	collecting and producing documents during the bankruptcy
20	proceedings, you don't have any knowledge whether their time
21	spent on those tasks impaired their ability to perform their
22	other duties in connection with the reorganization, do you?
23	A No. No, that's right. Beyond, you know, what they
24	spent time on, one thing they did not spend on another, I
25	don't have any details on that.

Γ

Pg 337 of 529

Page 241

1	Q With respect to Paragraph 42 of your written testimony,
2	you are talking are you well, specifically the Diocese
3	general counsel and Chief Operating Officer Tom Renker will
4	have to direct and supervise the Diocese responses to
5	request for documents, written discovery, and deposition
6	notices. He will have to review filings in order to monitor
7	and manage the risk of prejudice to the Debtor posed by the
8	state court actions.

9 In my role as outside counsel of the Diocese in the 10 state court actions, I know that Mr. Renker performed these 11 duties in connection with pre-petition state court actions, 12 and he will be responsible for those duties in connection 13 with any resumed state court actions. You can't identify 14 any state court actions to which the Diocese is not a party 15 that would require Mr. Renker to review all the filings and 16 legal documentation, could you?

17 Since those cases are on pause, that's correct. If 223 Α 18 cases resume, in my mind it is a certainty that there will I don't think it's -- I don't think it should be 19 be cases. 20 controversial that flicking the on-switch back on, on 223 21 state court cases will result in additional work by the 22 general counsel of the Diocese.

23 THE COURT: Well, let me ask you what documents relating to state court actions in which the Diocese is not 24 25 named, what documents relating to the alleged abuse or other

Pg 338 of 529

Page 242 1 information that's in the possession of the Diocese and not 2 in the possession of the parish? 3 THE WITNESS: So the largest category that I'm 4 aware of, Your Honor, is the personnel files. So the 5 personnel files are aware to the extent that allegations or 6 complaints have been made or noted in the file or the 7 correspondence underlying those complaints. And so it's my 8 understanding that to the extent the Diocese has a file for 9 an alleged abuser in any one of those cases, those files 10 will have to be -- those files will be sought and have to be 11 produced --12 THE COURT: Are you talking --THE WITNESS: -- in the state court actions. 13 THE COURT: -- about parishes that don't have 14 15 copies of the personnel files to -- for priests who were 16 working in a particular parish? 17 THE WITNESS: That is my understanding, and that 18 is among the issues that was teed up in the state court 19 motion to compel that I described earlier that was then 20 placed on pause due to the filing of the bankruptcy. 21 BY MR. BROWN: 22 So those personnel files are all collected and Q 23 presumably in one place, correct? 24 Α As I described to His Honor earlier, that's correct. 25 They've all been collected. And I realized that I only gave

Pg 339 of 529

Page	243
raue	243

	Page 243
1	I promised His Honor a two-part answer to the question
2	of, you know, couldn't we just turn those over. And I said
3	and I gave him the first half, which was the third
4	action, the privacy issues. There's also the logistical
5	issue of determining because there are no you know, as
6	we discussed earlier in my testimony, because there is no
7	pattern discovery in these cases that would come off pause,
8	there will also be an individualized effort in each case
9	that the Diocese received third-party discovery, and those
10	requests would have to be reviewed.
11	The documents within the production that admittedly
12	have been collected, those that are responsive to those
13	specific requests in the 228 will have to be identified as
14	responsive to the specific requests that were served in that
15	case. Then you have the redaction issue. And so I think I
16	recall from a prior appearance that His Honor shares an
17	engineering background with me. And so while I don't think
18	it's an exponential issue, I do think it's geometric. I
19	think it is you know, the complexity is multiplied by the
20	specific documents, the specific cases, the specific

21 requests, and then the confidentiality in each case.

22 So I'm not here testifying that there are -- in every case there's going to be 223 different sets of redactions on 23 each document, but there are going to be documents that have 24 25 to be determined to be responsive in some cases, not others.

	Page 244
1	There will be some documents that are responsive in multiple
2	cases. Each situation is going to have to be addressed
3	individually and will place an enormous burden on the Debtor
4	to respond to that volume of third-party discovery.
5	THE COURT: I'm clearly not trying to give an
6	answer to the question, but I it may be, I'm not making
7	any rulings, that if for example, if the injunction were
8	not continued against the parishes, that doesn't mean that
9	the automatic stay does not apply to discovery from the
10	Diocese, nor does it mean that the stay wouldn't be modified
11	to permit discovery subject to various time limitations.
12	MR. BROWN: I think another way of saying that,
13	Your Honor, is certainly within your the scope of what
14	you could do is say I'm lifting the I'm not going to
15	continue the injunction, but I'm going to be a gatekeeper of
16	discovery against the Diocese.
17	THE COURT: I that's not an issue for today. I
18	have at least one opinion in the case of FHFA, Federal
19	Housing Finance Authority, v it came up in the
20	Residential Capital case, which I presided over. FHFA, a
21	government-sponsored enterprise, had an action pending in
22	the Southern District Court against a group of Defendants,
23	including investment banks, the parent of ResCap Allied
24	Financial and others, and sought discovery from ResCap.
25	And I started the opinion by saying a very old

Page 245

1	statement in an old Supreme Court case. The public has a
2	right to every man's evidence, but that doesn't mean that
3	there's unconstrained discovery from the Debtor. And I
4	won't go into the parameters of it, but you should it
5	so the fact that the Diocese might have to provide discovery
6	to state court counsel proceeding against parishes doesn't
7	mean that the Court would not regulate the time, place,
8	circumstances, and even who pays. All of those were issues
9	addressed in the FHA FHFA opinion that I authored. I'd
10	leave it at that for now. So but on this point though, I
11	mean, it cuts both ways for
12	MR. BROWN: Understood, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: you.
14	MR. BROWN: Understood. And not a thing you said
15	do I take issue with.
16	THE COURT: Okay. But go ahead with your
17	questioning.
18	BY MR. BROWN:
19	Q Mr. Stephens, in your testimony, I it's a little bit
20	stale now. My memory doesn't last very long, but I think
21	you said since there isn't any kind of coordination order in
22	the state court litigation state court actions in which
23	the Diocese is not a party, that a number of things will
24	follow. But I just want to make sure we all understand.
25	You testified earlier you don't think, based on your prior

Pg 342 of 529

Page 246 1 experience in getting the order in the cases where the 2 Diocese was a party, you don't think or you think it might 3 be difficult to get a coordination order, but you don't 4 really know, do you? 5 You're speculating that the parishes and state court 6 counsel and the presiding courts in those actions will not 7 ultimately come up with some type of consolidation order and to streamline discovery and manage things. You don't know. 8 9 That's speculation, isn't it, Mr. Stephens? 10 Well, what I know is that the same state court counsel Α 11 who filed the complaints and then objected to the Diocese efforts to consolidate and coordinate are the same state 12 13 court counsel who continue to file complaints. And so I'm 14 not aware of any facts that would suggest to me that they 15 would take a different approach. Those are the facts. I′m 16 also not aware of any individual or even a group of parishes 17 making that sort of motion. 18 Q Well, the --19 So those are the facts --Α 20 Q The --21 -- the facts that I have are that the only two people Α 22 that are left if the Diocese is out of this, one didn't make 23 the motion. The other opposed. So the only thing I conclude from the facts that I have is that that seems very 24 25 unlikely.

Page 247 To all of you, you should not assume THE COURT: that it means that it's open season on discovery from the Diocese if the state court actions are permitted to go forward against non-debtors. MR. BROWN: I'll leave it at that. I think that will suffice for me. BY MR. BROWN: With respect to Paragraph 43 of your testimony, Q similarly the Diocese Director of Insurance and Risk Management William Chapin will have to direct and supervise insurance noticing and coverage matters relating to any resumed state court actions involving co-insureds under the diocesan shared insurance program. They've already given notices of the THE COURT: cases, right? MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. What did you say, Your

17 Honor?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

25

18 THE COURT: You already gave notice to the 19 insurers.

20 MR. BROWN: That's what -- exactly.
21 THE WITNESS: That's my understanding.
22 MR. BROWN: All notice has been given, hasn't it?
23 THE COURT: Yes. He just said that's his
24 understanding.

MR. BROWN: Yeah. Okay.

Pg 344 of 529

Page 248

1	BY	MR.	BROWN:
---	----	-----	--------

2 So nothing remains to be done in that context, does it? 0 3 Well, the Diocese administers the insurance program and Α 4 the insurers, in my involvement in the cases, is they expect 5 updates. They expect to receive pleadings. They need to be 6 addressed if there are settlement discussions to be had. So 7 while the -- you know, my understanding is that there -- my expectation is there would be ongoing work there. 8 9 0 But all the claims with respect to the SC, the state 10 court actions, have been tendered to the insurers already,

11 correct?

12 My understanding is those notices have gone out. Α

13 And you don't know whether or not there any continuing 0 reporting obligations to insurers once a claim is tendered, 14 15 do you?

I'm not an insurance coverage lawyer, so I don't know 16 Α 17 one way or the other.

18 And you're not aware of any additional insurance Q 19 documentation that would need to be collected if the state 20 court actions were permitted to proceed, are you?

21 Α That's correct.

22 And you don't know -- you don't have any knowledge as Q to whether or not Mr. Dutian would be required to prepare 23 24 any additional financial information if the state court actions are allowed to proceed, do you? 25

Pg 345 of 529

1 To the extent that there were requests for financial Α 2 information, it's Mr. Dutian and his team that would be 3 responsible for leading the response. 4 THE COURT: Do the parishes compensate the Diocese 5 where there is a services agreement to the financial and 6 accounting services? 7 THE WITNESS: My understanding is that there is a 8 fee associated with the services, and that the services are 9 selected from a menu. But as to the precise details or the 10 -- even the magnitude of the fee, I don't know, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: But your understanding is that where 12 there is a services agreement pursuant to a schedule, the 13 parish is to compensate the Diocese for performing those 14 services. 15 THE WITNESS: That's my understanding. 16 BY MR. BROWN: 17 Okay. So Mr. Stephens, I want to ask you about Q 18 Exhibits A and Exhibit B to your written direct testimony. 19 MR. BROWN: And is it possible to put up Exhibit A 20 to Mr. Stephens' testimony first? And then we'll go to 21 Exhibit B. Okay. So --22 BY MR. BROWN: I see it on the screen, and I have it in the book in 23 Α front of me. 24 25 Q Okay.

Page 249

20-12345-r	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 346 of 529
	Page 250
1	MR. BROWN: Your Honor, do you have
2	THE COURT: I have it on
3	MR. BROWN: Great.
4	THE COURT: I have it on my screen.
5	BY MR. BROWN:
6	Q Okay. So Exhibit A summarizing your testimony is a
7	summary of specified paragraphs from complaints in the 220
8	some state court actions to which the Diocese is not a party
9	that you contend state some type of diocesan involvement
10	notwithstanding the fact that it's not named a party. Is
11	that in sum and substance what Exhibit A is?
12	A Yes. The right-most column of this chart is meant to
13	reflect just the text of allegations involving allegations
14	of what we phrased as diocesan involvement
15	Q Okay.
16	A within the complaint.
17	THE COURT: When did you prepare Exhibit A? I
18	assume you had others who did it.
19	THE WITNESS: Sure. So there was a team of
20	associates that were working under my direction and
21	supervision. I'm sure it will not surprise the Court to
22	know that we had existing work product on this issue prior
23	to my written direct. However, in the course of preparing
24	for my deposition and then recognizing Your Honor's rules
25	about written direct, we then formalized this.
	Veritext Legal Solutions

Page 251

	- 5
1	And I believe we've done this correctly. The
2	order in which these cases are presented, this should be the
3	same order in our stipulated chart of 228. So the first
4	line in this chart should be the same in order to allow, you
5	know, the reader, whether it's the Court or anybody here, to
6	identify what we believe are the relevant allegations of
7	diocesan involvement and then tie that to the parties'
8	THE COURT: And it appears
9	THE WITNESS: stipulated chart.
10	THE COURT: It appears to be an index number order
11	to (indiscernible). I'm glancing through the first bunch of
12	them.
13	THE WITNESS: That was certainly the intent. I
14	don't know that our software on the original chart did a
15	perfect sorting job. So this is meant to reflect what's I
16	believe at Docket 169. But yes, it's also roughly index
17	order but only by first number, not chronologically.
18	MR. BROWN: Okay.
19	THE COURT: More than the first number.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes. No, what I meant what I was
21	referring to there was the New York index numbers end with a
22	slash and then the year.
23	THE COURT: Yes.
24	THE WITNESS: And so a pure sort of numerical
25	index number REPORTER: rt is not necessarily a chronological
	Veritext Legal Solutions

Page 252 1 sort. That's all. 2 BY MR. BROWN: 3 Okay. Now, Exhibit B of your written testimony --Q 4 MR. BROWN: And if we could put that up on the 5 screen. 6 BY MR. BROWN: 7 0 Exhibit B relates to a whole different subset of complaints, does it not? 8 9 Α Exhibit B summarizes pre-petition answers. That's 10 right. 11 Q Okay. 12 And so these are answers to complaints that involve the Α 13 Diocese. And so they are not the complaints. They are not answers, you know, to the 228 or the 223 complaints --14 15 Q Yeah, so there's not a single --16 Α -- that we've been discussing. 17 -- complaint listed on Exhibit B that is one of the 223 Q 18 cases that are at issue today, correct? 19 Well, there are no complaints on Exhibit B that are Α 20 answers, but those answers --21 I'm sorry. There's not a single pleading, whether it's Q 22 an answer or a counterclaim, listed on Exhibit B that 23 relates to a complaint filed in any of the 223 cases that 24 are at issue today, correct? 25 Α That's right. There are no answers in those cases to

	Pc	<u> 349</u>	9 of	529)
--	----	-------------	------	-----	---

	Page 253
1	summarize would be another way to say that.
2	Q So these are summaries of both answers and
3	counterclaims that were filed by certain of the non-Debtor
4	Defendants, correct?
5	A That's right. In
6	Q In pre-petition actions that name the Diocese.
7	A That was exactly the clarification I was going to add.
8	Q Okay. So do you know can you make a distinction
9	between which of these line items are from answers and which
10	of these line items are from actual counterclaims?
11	A So they what we set out to do was refer the reader
12	to the specific paragraph or heading where these could be
13	found. So if you look at the if you look at Line 1, for
14	example, on my Exhibit B, Docket number 180-2, we indicate
15	the heading that the language comes from is under the
16	heading of an affirmative defense.
17	Q I got it.
18	A If you look at the next line, you'll see it's in the
19	answer, and then we cite the paragraph. And so that was
20	meant to be the roadmap from the section of the pleading
21	where that language was quoted.
22	Q Okay. So let me just see if I But I guess the
23	question is some of these pleadings are answers and
24	counterclaims, right? And if it was an answer this
25	doesn't make any distinction. For example, Line Item 1. If

Page 254

 Line Item 1 was an answer and a counterclaim, the description would just say answer, correct? A That's right. To the that's right. To the extent that the answering party styled it an answer or an answer in counterclaims or an answer in affirmative defense, that information is not reflected here. Q Okay. So we can't tell from looking at this chart the extent to which any of these allegations by the non-Debtor Defendants were actually made in an answer versus made in a counterclaim, correct? A I'm not aware of separate pleadings in any of these cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been within a heading within the pleading. Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say answers, and they so these would be set forth in
 A That's right. To the that's right. To the extent that the answering party styled it an answer or an answer in counterclaims or an answer in affirmative defense, that information is not reflected here. Q Okay. So we can't tell from looking at this chart the extent to which any of these allegations by the non-Debtor Defendants were actually made in an answer versus made in a counterclaim, correct? A I'm not aware of separate pleadings in any of these cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been within a heading within the pleading. Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
 4 that the answering party styled it an answer or an answer in 5 counterclaims or an answer in affirmative defense, that 6 information is not reflected here. 7 Q Okay. So we can't tell from looking at this chart the 8 extent to which any of these allegations by the non-Debtor 9 Defendants were actually made in an answer versus made in a 10 counterclaim, correct? 11 A I'm not aware of separate pleadings in any of these 12 cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that 13 distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been 14 within a heading within the pleading. 15 Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
 counterclaims or an answer in affirmative defense, that information is not reflected here. Q Okay. So we can't tell from looking at this chart the extent to which any of these allegations by the non-Debtor Defendants were actually made in an answer versus made in a counterclaim, correct? A I'm not aware of separate pleadings in any of these cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been within a heading within the pleading. Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
 information is not reflected here. Q Okay. So we can't tell from looking at this chart the extent to which any of these allegations by the non-Debtor Defendants were actually made in an answer versus made in a counterclaim, correct? A I'm not aware of separate pleadings in any of these cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been within a heading within the pleading. Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
Q Okay. So we can't tell from looking at this chart the extent to which any of these allegations by the non-Debtor Defendants were actually made in an answer versus made in a counterclaim, correct? A I'm not aware of separate pleadings in any of these cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been within a heading within the pleading. Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
 8 extent to which any of these allegations by the non-Debtor 9 Defendants were actually made in an answer versus made in a 10 counterclaim, correct? 11 A I'm not aware of separate pleadings in any of these 12 cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that 13 distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been 14 within a heading within the pleading. 15 Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
 9 Defendants were actually made in an answer versus made in a 10 counterclaim, correct? 11 A I'm not aware of separate pleadings in any of these 12 cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that 13 distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been 14 within a heading within the pleading. 15 Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
 10 counterclaim, correct? 11 A I'm not aware of separate pleadings in any of these 12 cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that 13 distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been 14 within a heading within the pleading. 15 Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
11 A I'm not aware of separate pleadings in any of these 12 cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that 13 distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been 14 within a heading within the pleading. 15 Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
12 cases for answers and counterclaims. To the extent that 13 distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been 14 within a heading within the pleading. 15 Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
13 distinction was made that I'm aware of, it would've been 14 within a heading within the pleading. 15 Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
14 within a heading within the pleading. 15 Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
15 Q It would've been the name of the document. Some say
16 answers, and they so these would be set forth in
17 affirmative defenses for example? Some of them?
18 A Certainly Line 1. That's right. That one
19 Q Yeah.
20 A just from the chart appears to have been styled as
21 an affirmative defense. You know, with Number with Line
22 2 here, whether the answer that's reflected here in Line 2
23 at Paragraphs 28 and 29, you know, 28 refers to the
24 collateral source rule as reflected in CPLR 4545. And then
25 our Paragraph 29 talks about the allocation and

Γ

	Page 255
1	apportionment rules under CPLR Article 16. You know,
2	whether that pleading styled those as affirmative defenses
3	or crossclaims or both, that I can't tell from this chart.
4	Q So we'd have to go in and look to the actually
5	underlying documents if we wanted to know that.
6	A To the extent that that was a distinction that someone
7	was interested in
8	Q Wanted to make, right. Okay.
9	A they would go to the underlying pleading. That's
10	correct.
11	Q And then turning the Paragraph 52
12	A So are we going to Line 52 in Exhibit B
13	Q I'm sorry. We're
14	A or are we going back to the written
15	Q moving to Paragraph 52 of your
16	THE COURT: Of the direct testimony.
17	BY MR. BROWN:
18	Q direct testimony, and we are departing from Exhibit
19	В.
20	A Thank you.
21	Q Too much information. And I think this is just a typo,
22	but I want to make sure. Based on my review of the
23	complaints, all but six of the 228 state court actions
24	contested by the Committee were filed before the petition
25	date. You meant to say after, correct?

20-12345-r	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 352 of 529
	Page 256
1	A Reading that, yes. That
2	Q Okay.
3	A that is that has to be a typo. That's correct.
4	Q Okay.
5	MR. BROWN: Okay, Your Honor. I don't have
6	further questions
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MR. BROWN: on this cross-examination.
9	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
10	MR. BROWN: Reserve my rights on recross.
11	THE COURT: Redirect. I'm just making sure you
12	introduce yourself again
13	MS. DEL MEDICO: I'm going to.
14	THE COURT: for the record.
15	MS. DEL MEDICO: Jennifer Del Medico, Jones Day
16	for the Debtor.
17	CROSS-EXAMINATION OF ERIC STEPHENS
18	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
19	Q Mr. Stephens, you were asked some questions about
20	Paragraph 43 of your direct testimony about the duties of
21	the Diocese Director of Insurance and Risk Management
22	William Chapin. Do you see that?
23	A I do, and I recall that
24	Q Do you recall that?
25	A exchange.

	Pg 353 of 529
	Page 257
1	Q Sorry. And do you recall your testimony that Mr.
2	Chapin had that the insurers had already been noticed
3	regarding state court actions? Do you recall that?
4	A Yes.
5	Q And with respect to any state court actions, Mr. Chapin
6	would also have other responsibilities, correct?
7	A Correct.
8	Q And what would those responsibilities be?
9	A As the risk manager, he would certainly he is likely
10	a source of third-party discovery to the extent that that is
11	allowed. He would then also have the monitoring and
12	reporting obligations that I described.
13	Q Would he have monitoring obligations regarding with
14	respect to the SIRs with respect to insurance?
15	A Yes, that would be part of his administration of the
16	overall insurance program.
17	Q Would he be responsible for fielding questions about
18	PSIP or the other PSIP?
19	THE COURT: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear your
20	question completed.
21	MS. DEL MEDICO: Sorry. Let me restate that.
22	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
23	Q Would he have responsibility for fielding any questions
24	about, for example, about PSIP or
25	A Sure.

Γ

	Page 258
1	Q other insurance (indiscernible)?
2	A Sure. So you know, PSIP is the when I talk about
3	the administering the program, I apologize. I should
4	break down administering the program, but yes. So for
5	example, you know, as Mr. Porter and Mr. Moore described,
6	you know, making sure that the insurance was in place,
7	monitoring the SIRs to the extent that proceeds are coming
8	in and being disbursed, all of that falls under his
9	responsibility for the entire program and all of the co-
10	insureds.
11	Q Mr. Stephens, do you have Exhibit the Committee's
12	Exhibit R? Do you have that available to you up there?
13	A I don't. And my recollection was the Committee Exhibit
14	
15	Q The in the binders.
16	A Committee Exhibit R was the joinders?
17	Q Yeah. Do you have that?
18	A I don't know that anybody has shown it to me yet.
19	Q Okay.
20	A Give me one sec. I have a big stack here. Hang on.
21	MS. DEL MEDICO: Okay. Okay. And
22	THE COURT: Well, let him if you want him to
23	look for it, he'll look for it. Don't ask another question
24	until he finds it, okay?
25	MS. DEL MEDICO: Makes sense.

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 355 of 529	
	Page 259
1	MAN 4: Yeah, let us locate it as well.
2	MR. BROWN: Okay. Hang on.
3	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
4	A Yes, okay. Among the binders here I have the Committee
5	Exhibit Binder. I have located Exhibit R.
6	MS. DEL MEDICO: Have you all located it? Okay.
7	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
8	Q Mr. Stephens, I'd like you unfortunately, the
9	exhibit doesn't have consecutive page numbers on it, but I'd
10	like you to start from the back of the exhibit and go to
11	Page
12	THE COURT: Use the ECF docket number and
13	MS. DEL MEDICO: Oh, yes. Okay.
14	THE COURT: then page of
15	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
16	Q I would like you to go to ECF Page
17	THE COURT: First the docket number and then
18	because here are multiple ECF
19	MS. DEL MEDICO: I see. 1975.
20	MR. BROWN: Your Honor, just
21	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
22	A Okay. I'm I have that document.
23	MR. BROWN: I have an objection to the extent that
24	I didn't this isn't part of his direct. It's not part of
25	my cross.

	Page 260
1	THE COURT: Overruled.
2	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
3	Q Okay. Mr. Stephens, do you see a signature block on
4	that on this document on Page 3?
5	A I see the signature block of the if I'm looking in
6	the right place, of the Merson firm.
7	Q Okay. And do you know who Jordan Merson is?
8	A I do.
9	Q And who is Mr. Merson?
10	A He's one of the state court counsel that we were
11	litigating with pre-petition. And I understand that he is
12	now counsel to a number of individual Claimants in this
13	bankruptcy action.
14	Q Okay. And do you see on the page before that that the
15	title of this
16	THE COURT: Page 2 of 3.
17	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
18	Q Page 2 of 3, the title is Joinder and Motion of the
19	Official Committee of Unsecured
20	THE COURT: Page 1 of 3 is the joinder
21	MS. DEL MEDICO: 1 of 3.
22	THE COURT: is the title.
23	BY MS. DEL MEDICO:
24	Q the title Joinder and Motion of the Official
25	Committee of Unsecured Creditors to Dismiss Chapter 11 Case.

Γ

_0.0.	Pg 357 of 529
	Page 261
1	Do you see that?
2	A I do.
3	Q Okay. And do you see if you sorry to make you
4	turn the page again, but if you turn the page again to the
5	page where the signature block is, do you know Mr. Merson
6	do you know about how many cases he has in the state court
7	cases that we're talking about today?
8	A My recollection is it was on the order of 10 to 20.
9	Q Okay. And I'd like to direct your attention to the
10	second to last paragraph above the signature block there.
11	And it says once the bankruptcy is dismissed, the courts on
12	Long Island have had similar cases trial-ready in as little
13	as 90 days. Do you see that?
14	A I do.
15	Q And do you have any reason to believe sitting here
16	today that Mr. Merson wouldn't try to get one of his cases
17	trial ready in 90 days?
18	A No, I don't have any facts about what he will and won't
19	do.
20	Q And if a case is trial ready in 90 days, would that be
21	a significant burden on the Diocese?
22	A To try and respond in order to allow the parties to get
23	one of these cases ready in 90 days would be a significant
24	burden.

- 24 burden.
- 25 Q And if other Plaintiff's counsel also took the same

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 358 of 529 Page 262 1 approach and tried to get a case trial-ready in 90 days, 2 would that be an additional burden on the Diocese? 3 THE COURT: How many judges are trying cases in 4 Long Island in Nassau County? One. 5 MS. DEL MEDICO: But there's --6 THE COURT: You expect the judge to try 10 cases 7 in one week? 8 MS. DEL MEDICO: Mr. -- may I --9 THE COURT: No, I'm serious about this. 10 MS. DEL MEDICO: I'm serious too, but may I ask a 11 question? 12 THE COURT: I'll sustain my own objection to this 13 question. 14 MS. DEL MEDICO: Okay. 15 BY MS. DEL MEDICO: 16 There's -- is there work, Mr. Stephens, that goes into Q 17 getting a case trial-ready --18 Yes. Α 19 -- before it goes to trial? Q 20 Α Yes. 21 Q And would doing that work in 90 days be a significant 22 burden on the Diocese? 23 THE COURT: Well, he may dream of --BY MS. DEL MEDICO: 24 25 Α Yes.

Page 263 1 THE COURT: -- getting his case to trial in 90 2 days, but the state court judge may have something to say about that. And there are a whole line of cases behind it. 3 MS. DEL MEDICO: Understood. 4 5 THE COURT: Move on. 6 MS. DEL MEDICO: Okay. That's all we have, Your 7 Honor. 8 Thank you very much. Any cross? THE COURT: She exceeded the scope of direct and 9 MR. BROWN: 10 cross, but so be it. Thank you, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Okay. It's 4:42 according to my 12 watch. Are there any housekeeping details we should take 13 care of? 14 MR. BROWN: I'm going to -- there may be something 15 that somebody on the Zoom call from the Pachulski firm wants 16 to deal with or possibly Jones Day, but not from me. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 WOMAN 1: I'd just like to make certain that we 19 have Exhibit AA in --THE COURT: Oh. 20 21 WOMAN 1: -- admitted, that that was one that 22 presented at the meeting. 23 MR. BROWN: Exhibit AA was the case management order. We introduced it as a rebuttal exhibit. Any 24 25 objections?

Page 264 1 MR. DIPOMPEO: No objections, Your Honor.. 2 THE COURT: All right. It's admitted. (Rebuttal Exhibit AA admitted into evidence) 3 MR. BROWN: Oh. 4 5 THE COURT: Go ahead. 6 MR. BROWN: And you know there was another exhibit 7 that I think we wanted to have introduced as a rebuttal 8 exhibit, but not for purposes of any examination for 9 purposes of (indiscernible). 10 THE COURT: I should have said this. Does the 11 Plaintiff rest? It's not a trick question. 12 MR. DIPOMPEO: Yes, I'm sorry, Your Honor. Yes. 13 The Debtor rests. Christopher Dipompeo --14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. DIPOMPEO: -- Jones Day. 16 THE COURT: Does the Defendant rest? 17 MR. BROWN: Except for offering in evidence the disclosure statement as Exhibit BB. 18 19 WOMAN 3: That would be the Debtor's disclosure 20 statement. 21 MR. BROWN: The Debtor's disclosure statement as 22 Exhibit BB. THE COURT: What's the relevance of the disclosure 23 24 statement? 25 The relevance is rebuttal to the MR. BROWN:

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 361 of 529

	Page 265
1	burden issue. Because
2	THE COURT: I don't follow.
3	MR. BROWN: There is a recitation in it about the
4	four law firms and four other professional firms that the
5	Debtor has retained to assist it in its restructuring
6	efforts, and it mitigates burden. Because they've got a lot
7	of people. They got an army of highly paid professionals
8	THE COURT: Are there any objections to
9	MR. BROWN: working on the (indiscernible).
10	THE COURT: offer of Exhibit BB?
11	MR. DIPOMPEO: No objections, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Then it's admitted.
13	(Rebuttal Exhibit BB admitted into evidence)
14	MR. BROWN: For what it's worth.
15	THE COURT: For what it's worth. Okay. So both
16	sides have rested. The exhibits are in evidence. Certainly
17	can make your argument about whether any portions of the
18	direct testimony should be stricken. Those rights are
19	reserved. More may go to the weight of what should be given
20	to it. How long do each of you believe you want for closing
21	arguments? So really we start it's Plaintiff, Defendant,
22	reply. So give me the aggregate time, and then I'll let you
23	reserve a portion of that total time for your rebuttal.
24	MR. DIPOMPEO: Sure. So I think as an estimate,
25	Your Honor Christopher Dipompeo for the Debtor. I would

Page 266 think an hour --1 2 Okay. THE COURT: 3 MR. DIPOMPEO: -- would be sufficient. THE COURT: Total? 4 5 MR. DIPOMPEO: Total. 6 THE COURT: Okay. And you would reserve how much 7 of that for --MR. DIPOMPEO: Ten minutes, Your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 10 MR. BROWN: We'll go with that. 11 THE COURT: Total of an hour. Okay. 12 MR. BROWN: Hour. 13 THE COURT: With those estimates, I know I 14 scheduled the trial for 9 a.m., but if you're both willing 15 to -- now I ask questions, so I -- you know, that may 16 stretch it out a little bit. We could -- if you wanted, we 17 could either start at 9 or at 10. I schedule trials for 9 18 because I want to make sure, if need be, we have a full 19 trial day. It would be my expectation to finish by lunch. 20 MR. BROWN: I think 10 would be my preference, 21 Your Honor. 22 MR. NASATIR: Your Honor, Ian Nasatir. The West 23 Coast people would be probably grateful if you made it at 24 10. 25 THE COURT: I love the fact that you have West

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 363 of 529

Page 267 1 Coast people, but that's not guiding me. 2 MR. DIPOMPEO: We have no objection to that, Your 3 Honor. All right. So we'll start at 10. 4 THE COURT: 5 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, and the one hour, is that 6 with or without time --7 THE COURT: Well, we'll see. 8 -- for your questions. MR. BROWN: 9 THE COURT: We'll see. We'll see. 10 MR. GEREMIA: One housekeeping issue, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Identify yourself for the record. 12 MR. GEREMIA: Todd Geremia for Jones Day for the 13 I don't know whether Your Honor's aware, but Debtor. 14 Magistrate Judge Cave has set a scheduling call on Friday, 15 which we will all attend. Yesterday Mr. Cornfeld -- we hard 16 Your Honor's encouragement at the last proceeding, called my 17 partner Eric Stephens. And the Committee has agreed to 18 adjourn the motion to dismiss, and we have agreed to discuss 19 any future scheduling --20 THE COURT: Okay. MR. GEREMIA: -- at a later date for the date of 21 22 the hearing. 23 THE COURT: I'm glad to hear that. Obviously I 24 wasn't ordering it. I wanted you to discuss it. I'm glad 25 that you agreed on that. I would -- you know, I've had one

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 364 of 529

Page 268

1	telephone conversation with Magistrate Judge Cave. We have
2	not discussed the merits of the action in any way. Just so
3	it's clear, I do not get involved in I don't want to know
4	what goes on in mediation, and we just had a very pleasant
5	conversation. I was glad she was onboard.
6	I entered that notice of you know, judicial
7	notice document that kept going in the record. That was
8	really the most of what was discussed. And so if she has
9	questions, Your Honor, wanting access to documents or
10	something, she can talk to one of my law clerks and get
11	those documents, but that's (indiscernible).
12	MR. GEREMIA: And we thank Your Honor for all the
13	work behind the scenes and phone calls. We also understand
14	that the work that's at issue with the objections.
15	THE COURT: Could you get serious about this
16	MR. GEREMIA: Thank you.
17	THE COURT: mediation and get this case solved?
18	MR. GEREMIA: We will.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	MR. GEREMIA: We are.
21	THE COURT: I'll see you tomorrow morning at
22	10:00.
23	MR. GEREMIA: Thank you, Judge.
24	THE COURT: Thank you for
25	MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

	Page 269
1	MS. DINE: Your Honor, just one note?
2	THE COURT: I'm sorry. Go ahead.
3	MS. DINE: Your Honor
4	THE COURT: Excuse me for standing. It's because
5	my back's bothering me.
6	MS. DINE: No, no, no. Karen Dine from Pachulski
7	Stang Ziehl and Jones on behalf of the Committee. I rise in
8	the Committee's capacity as a coordinator of the claims
9	objection issues. And we noted that today there were many
10	questions, and there was some testimony that went to issues
11	of notice and all. And we would just respectfully request
12	on behalf of the state court lawyers representing Claimants
13	that to the extent that such testimony is influencing Your
14	Honor's decisions on those objections, particularly in a way
15	that may be negative to the Claimants, that those state
16	court counsel be offered an opportunity to respond.
17	THE COURT: I understand your position. Obviously
18	maybe my question had something to do with some of the
19	pending claim objections. Maybe not. Ms. Dine, the last I
20	heard on the subject of notice, potentially would bear on
21	notice is that the personnel files, which have been produced
22	to the Committee, have not been produced to the state court
23	counsel. Is that correct?
24	MS. DINE: That is correct, but the only counsel
25	that would've had access to those files would be state court

20-12345-m	g Doc 2875	Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 366 of 529
		Page 270
1	counsel.	But the clients on the
2		THE COURT: Who represent Committee members.
3		MS. DINE: Committee members but not otherwise
4	generally	available.
5		THE COURT: Okay.
6		MS. DINE: Thank you, Your Honor.
7		THE COURT: It's a little more clearer. Thank you
8	very much	. I'll see you all tomorrow morning.
9		MR. BROWN: Thank you, Judge.
10		(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at
11	4:49 PM)	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
		Veritext Legal Solutions

20-12345-m	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 367 of 529
	Page 271
1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing
4	transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.
5	
6	Soneya M. destande Hyd
7	
8	Sonya Ledanski Hyde
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Veritext Legal Solutions
21	330 Old Country Road
22	Suite 300
23	Mineola, NY 11501
24	
25	Date: April 21, 2023
L	Veritext Legal Solutions

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 368 of 529

[& - 179]

			
&	10004 1:21	10:20 65:10	13 57:17
& 2:5 4:10	10017 4:13	10th 198:14	135 3:6 193:18
149:21,23	1006 17:16	11 12:21 21:22	137 43:22
150:14	57:18	27:19 28:6,8	13th 13:18
0	101 112:6	28:12,20 29:10	14 20:4 57:17
	103 188:10	29:25 87:2	62:12 102:14
05 3:5	1031 38:2	112:18 138:25	14.1 111:16
1	56:17 58:14	150:16 151:9	112:18
1 15:22 17:16	10350.1 223:22	151:11 152:9	14.1. 112:22
41:11 42:23	10350.1. 223:5	164:17 165:5	147 3:6
47:16 48:8	10350.10	169:6,19,21,24	148 3:6
62:10,12 72:20	220:23	170:25 172:14	149 7:5
73:6 78:5	10350.3 223:7	178:11 181:19	15 151:24
103:10,13,15	10377.11 226:4	185:22 189:9	180:7
103:16,20	10377.3 226:2	189:14 190:5	150 49:15
113:13 152:9	104 187:14,15	200:11,17	150,000 47:11
218:13 219:25	188:10,22	201:21 205:21	153 7:5
223:8 226:1	104.3011	209:16 227:14	157 3:6
253:13,25	219:10	260:25	158 3:6
254:1,18	104.52.10	11501 271:23	16 46:23 62:10
260:20,21	226:23	12 15:8,17	62:19 121:3,13
263:18,21	104.52.3	52:20,25	121:14,15,24
10 7:9 19:12,24	226:22	105:11,16,17	122:12 181:2
23:8 61:18	10430.10 219:3	105:18,24	255:1
66:2,6 172:11	10430.3. 218:6	178:3	160,000 62:20
210:7 219:3	218:15	120 38:13	161 3:6
221:5 223:22	10435 219:22	58:12 67:6	168 3:6
226:4,19,23	10435.10 220:2	68:14,16 72:14	169 17:15
228:8 261:8	10435.3. 220:1	80:20 81:8	251:16
262:6 266:17	10452 226:20	161:7,21,22	169-1 104:21
266:20,24	105 8:20 37:8	162:4	16th 41:17
267:4	37:14 38:3	12151 271:6	60:15
100 34:1,19	43:2 56:4,15	121st 38:17	17 15:5
89:20 91:12	56:22 59:5	39:4,5	173 21:15 53:6
92:7,12	174:9	126 3:6	177 3:7
100,000 138:15	10:00 268:22	12:00 143:25	179 3:7
138:19			

[18 - 4]

Page 2

18 202:8,10	254:22,22	137:1 138:1	3
180 137:4	260:16,18	220 215:2	3 42:23 48:16
196:5 207:8	2.5 130:24	250:7	48:17 49:2
180-2 253:14	20 3:9 261:8	223 15:18	50:7,16 78:10
181 97:25	20-01226 1:4	16:11 17:2	118:15 154:16
121:3 137:3,5	3:1	18:14 21:16	205:21 225:14
137:6	20-12345 1:3	22:10 26:20	236:7,9 260:4
184 7:5	200 11:13	32:3 42:15	260:16,18,20
19 1:23 3:8	40:12 50:12,13	43:22 84:3	260:21 264:19
191 7:5	61:6,8,14	209:18,18	30,000 204:19
192 3:7	171:7 172:25	214:19 215:9	300 49:15,17
1950 51:6	200,000 136:23	228:19 241:17	271:22
1956 108:12	137:12 138:14	241:20 243:23	300,000 49:13
110:6	20001 4:6	252:14,17,23	49:23,24 50:17
1957 51:17	2004 212:8	226 204:18	31 60:23 72:23
1959 223:23	2006 95:13,25	205:16	113:15
196 7:6	2007 123:18	228 14:17 15:5	31st 13:25
1965 223:23	2015 62:11	21:16 215:8	39:15,19,21
1970 51:17	2019 150:2,4	227:19 243:13	40:8 60:5
52:17	158:7,12	251:3 252:14	320 1:15 3:2
1975 259:19	196:14,18,21	255:23	330 271:21
1976 52:17	213:7	22nd 13:4	34 74:6 212:22
54:5 108:12	2020 18:10	23 17:2	213:17
110:6	151:10 152:9	230 84:3	34th 4:12
1980 130:16	2021 13:4	25 47:2,17,22	362 3:5 8:20
1985 130:16	2022 110:24	48:19,25 49:18	42:23
1986 16:2	111:14 113:15	50:5 76:12,18	365 67:10
52:19 54:5	202:8	77:9 78:6	37 31:15,16
1:30 146:23	2023 1:23 3:9	151:22	38 227:10,12
147:1,2 148:23	3:10 62:7,19	26 21:4	39 227:18
1:30's 146:25	152:17,24	264 7:10	
1st 41:19 106:2	271:25	265 7:11	4
151:10	207/256 7:6	28 254:23,23	4 47:1,7,17
2	21 3:9 143:24	29 54:14	48:7 49:17
	271:25	254:23,25	50:4 52:20,25
2 107:1,1,7	22 26:17,21		76:12 77:8
111:17 146:23	31:14 136:19		78:4 101:18
213:25 235:6,9			

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com 20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 370 of 529

[4 - abuse]

Page 3

102:12,13,14	51 4:5	9	able 10:12
118:4,14,16,18	52 255:11,12	9 19:9,10 53:13	14:10 15:7
119:3,3,4	255:15	174:11 176:4	22:16 24:12
158:4 228:8	57 61:21	266:14,17,17	27:18 48:22
259:1	59 13:6 30:5	90 38:5,5,7,9	49:23 60:11
40 193:11	210:9	58:14 62:15	63:5 66:3
198:18	5:25 147:6	197:9 261:13	111:22 138:5
400094/2021	6	261:17,20,23	141:18 162:23
26:5	6 18:25 19:1	262:1,21 263:1	174:7,23
401 67:10	26:10 106:4,5	900148/2021	180:10 199:22
41 238:2	106:10 107:7	22:10	228:22 229:3
410 67:10	6-1 106:24	9058 18:10	233:18
42 239:2 241:1	60 62:3 198:4	9038 18.10 94 7:4	above 45:12
43 21:8 239:2	199:17 226:18	98 7:4 229:22	108:24 119:23
247:8 256:20		98 7.4 229.22 99 43:23 54:13	261:10
44 239:2	226:19 64 51:24	9:00 1:24 3:10	absence 47:19
45 40:7 47:11		9:00 1.24 5.10 9th 99:11	73:22
54:8 60:9,19	65 56:17	198:14	absolutely
60:21,24 62:3	66 185:9		38:19 50:11
67:6 68:12	192:10 193:11	a	59:10 93:10
72:13 81:8	193:16,16,17	a.m. 266:14	97:13 135:18
4545 254:24	6th 152:17,24	a.w. 4:16	abuse 16:2
490 14:14	7	aa 7:10 213:11	17:21 24:1
4:00 233:8,21	7 121:25 169:4	217:4,5 263:19	26:1 27:8
4:42 263:11	700,000 49:25	263:23 264:3	28:18,22 30:22
4:49 270:11	73 52:25 53:3	ability 35:20	30:24 32:1,5
5	75 49:19 50:6	53:11 81:23	34:1 44:4
	76:13	109:9,10,11	45:10 58:19,25
5 22:2,20,21,23	768 115:7	163:7 180:11	59:7 61:11
54:8 61:21	780 4:12	188:15,19	63:7 77:7
130:23 163:19 50 24:5 120:17	8	189:3 191:17	101:23 102:18
50 34:5 130:17	8 19:2,2 23:2	219:16 220:9	109:8,17
130:23 198:4	171:3,18	221:8 222:3	119:16 126:15
199:17 226:18	80 62:21	223:24 226:8	138:4 148:1,4
226:19	83 62:9	227:1 237:17	154:19 200:19
50-50 89:18	85 62:11	240:21	201:4 205:10
500,000 132:11	00 02.11		205:23 216:1,3
142:7			

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 371 of 529

[abuse - activity]

			e	
216:6 217:13	accrued 126:1	244:21 260:13	185:25 186:17	
232:17 241:25	126:3 128:7	268:2	188:4,13,20	
abused 125:24	accumulate	actions 11:13	189:4,17,21	
125:24 136:11	127:21,23	11:20 12:16	190:7 191:19	
205:11	accurate 271:4	13:4 14:13,15	197:8,12,13	
abuser 24:1	accurately	14:17,17 15:19	208:2 209:16	
27:8 35:16	114:4,8	17:11 22:2	209:18,19,22	
147:25 199:19	accusation	27:6 28:10	210:1,14 213:3	
209:3 215:25	25:25 90:22	30:8 42:15	213:22 214:5	
235:17,18	accused 28:23	53:21 66:14	215:14 217:2	
237:13 242:9	200:19,22	70:25 73:14	228:18 231:10	
abuser's	215:23 216:9	75:7 80:8	232:18,20	
148:12	216:20	87:25 88:15,21	238:4,6,14	
abusers 28:23	achelais 6:25	89:4 91:14	239:6,8,13	
125:24 186:3	achieve 213:22	117:15 134:5	241:8,10,11,13	
215:17,21	239:9	155:7,11,18	241:14,24	
216:10 230:7	acic 114:25	156:7,9,15	242:13 245:22	
232:10 234:3,7	acknowledge	158:10,16	246:6 247:3,12	
234:10 235:12	82:24	159:15 162:25	248:10,20,25	
237:7	acknowledged	163:9,14,21	250:8 253:6	
abusers'	59:1	164:7,15,21,25	255:23 257:3,5	
208:12	acknowledge	165:10,17	active 12:5	
abusive 26:23	65:1	167:6,14 169:5	117:22,23	
accept 71:2,8	act 8:23 150:11	169:13,16,22	158:8	
74:5,10	158:11 196:19	170:1 171:10	actively 164:2	
acceptable	197:1 219:15	171:16 172:3,8	180:16	
229:16 230:21	220:8 221:7	172:12,25	activities 19:5	
accepted 70:15	226:7	173:13,18	156:9,17 157:5	
access 50:17	acting 196:12	174:1,6,17	157:5 158:9	
231:24 268:9	action 17:20	175:7 176:13	161:13 162:15	
269:25	24:7 27:2	177:3,7,14,24	169:18 174:24	
accomplish	31:19,20 46:6	178:4,13,18	177:18 185:12	
147:11 190:8	50:9 75:15	179:10,19	185:24 190:22	
account 118:2	77:2 86:12	180:1,17,25	activity 169:20	
accounting	134:11 167:20	181:3,11,16	171:6,8 173:15	
113:13 117:1	173:6 178:24	182:24 184:8	183:10,14	
249:6	181:18 243:4	184:11 185:2	184:4,12 185:6	
	i la		1	1

[activity - afternoon]

LV	1		0
185:18,20	addition	administered	adv 1:4 106:8
186:20 202:17	185:10 187:6	154:23	106:10
240:12,13	190:4	administering	advance 10:24
acts 148:13	additional 15:3	258:3,4	11:1
actual 18:9	140:9 146:15	administers	adversarial
20:21 21:18	167:4,12	248:3	209:10
67:2 84:21	186:20 189:15	administration	adversary 3:1
110:2 177:12	204:25 205:3	95:23 169:9	13:6 106:7
218:4 239:4	209:23 210:2	189:3,21	152:14 210:10
253:10	241:21 248:18	257:15	advisor 150:13
actually 14:20	248:24 262:2	administrative	advisory 95:17
16:7 18:9	additive 29:6	151:12 184:25	advocacy
19:10 20:15,24	address 28:2	185:4 191:18	100:14
21:19 22:20	42:7 56:11,13	192:10,17	affect 82:3
24:19 26:5,17	56:20 59:11	193:4,8 194:1	affected 109:3
29:2 31:10	63:20 91:24	194:7	affecting
44:11 49:10	97:17 145:23	administrators	172:18
50:25 52:16	151:6 175:23	148:4	affiliated 79:22
53:11 57:8	207:13	admissible	154:22
58:1 62:17	addressed	144:25	affiliates 11:17
85:23 86:6	25:10,15,21	admission	22:25 26:15
104:7 114:5	44:17 63:10	64:17	62:10,12 63:20
127:7 129:4	75:13 82:16,17	admit 146:1	65:3 172:22
160:5 162:9	147:20 148:1	admitted 10:4	209:8
177:22,23	198:22 244:2	10:11 104:5	affirm 94:10
188:11 189:10	245:9 248:6	144:5,22,24	149:8 195:20
189:25 192:5,6	addressing	146:20 153:6	affirmative
193:16 254:9	188:18 201:13	153:13 207:11	253:16 254:5
255:4	adjourn	263:21 264:2,3	254:17,21
actuaries 117:1	267:18	265:12,13	255:2
adams 4:20	adjudicated	admittedly	affirmatively
235:2	148:1 203:9	243:11	82:12
add 190:12	228:22	admitting 10:2	afternoon
214:13 253:7	adjusted	97:7 145:3	144:18 146:2
added 173:15	113:16	146:7	148:23 149:3
189:15	administer	adopt 117:3	149:18,19
	157:11		153:19 196:10

[afternoon - allow]

196:11 207:19	agreed 13:2,17	106:16 107:13	19:13 23:10
207:20	58:15 59:23	107:16,19,19	24:1,4 26:1
aggregate	64:4 70:20,22	110:9 113:6	27:8 28:17,22
44:20,21,24	93:11 104:15	114:8 117:11	30:24 32:1,5
51:5,17 52:15	134:18 204:8	117:11 119:10	44:4 148:12
52:16,17,18,19	204:11 205:2	120:11 130:10	154:20 156:4
52:25 53:21	210:12 267:17	130:13 137:7,8	186:3 201:4
54:7,15 55:21	267:18,25	152:6 158:2	205:10 208:11
55:22 92:7	agreement	161:1 166:23	209:3 229:15
117:10 131:6,9	30:12 37:20	171:1 176:2	230:6 234:3,7
131:13,15	85:22 86:7,8	187:12 202:1	234:9 235:12
132:21 138:17	138:18,20	206:9 222:14	235:16 241:25
139:1,10,11	139:1,3 144:16	224:4 225:2,9	242:9
142:7 265:22	194:7 210:11	225:11 230:10	allegedly
aggregating	237:19 249:5	236:17 245:16	205:11
131:9,10	249:12	264:5 269:2	alleges 19:24
ago 28:15	agreement's	al 1:15 3:3	alleging 154:18
46:14 116:4	85:25	alan 226:3,5	allen 6:7
174:3 221:19	agreements	allegation 23:3	allied 244:23
agree 27:20	84:19 164:8	26:14,19,21	allocate 163:11
0	0		
39:13 40:7	185:5 192:11	31:22	163:13 180:20
39:13 40:7 46:1,6 55:20			
	185:5 192:11	31:22	163:13 180:20
46:1,6 55:20	185:5 192:11 192:18,22	31:22 allegations	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19 108:1 109:2,5	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17 8:17 10:15	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3 155:1 157:15	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14 163:12
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19 108:1 109:2,5 109:21 123:4	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17 8:17 10:15 29:9 31:4,7,13	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3 155:1 157:15 203:9 206:25	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14 163:12 allocation 14:4
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19 108:1 109:2,5 109:21 123:4 125:2,9 130:16	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17 8:17 10:15 29:9 31:4,7,13 37:5 41:21	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3 155:1 157:15 203:9 206:25 224:15 242:5	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14 163:12 allocation 14:4 254:25
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19 108:1 109:2,5 109:21 123:4 125:2,9 130:16 134:1,17	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17 8:17 10:15 29:9 31:4,7,13 37:5 41:21 42:8 43:8,16	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3 155:1 157:15 203:9 206:25 224:15 242:5 250:13,13	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14 163:12 allocation 14:4 254:25 allocations
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19 108:1 109:2,5 109:21 123:4 125:2,9 130:16 134:1,17 135:10,13,19	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17 8:17 10:15 29:9 31:4,7,13 37:5 41:21 42:8 43:8,16 48:14 50:22	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3 155:1 157:15 203:9 206:25 224:15 242:5 250:13,13 251:6 254:8	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14 163:12 allocation 14:4 254:25 allocations 188:23
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19 108:1 109:2,5 109:21 123:4 125:2,9 130:16 134:1,17 135:10,13,19 136:10 174:20	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17 8:17 10:15 29:9 31:4,7,13 37:5 41:21 42:8 43:8,16 48:14 50:22 51:13,13 65:10	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3 155:1 157:15 203:9 206:25 224:15 242:5 250:13,13 251:6 254:8 allege 11:24	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14 163:12 allocation 14:4 254:25 allocations 188:23 allow 22:4
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19 108:1 109:2,5 109:21 123:4 125:2,9 130:16 134:1,17 135:10,13,19 136:10 174:20 205:25 215:24	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17 8:17 10:15 29:9 31:4,7,13 37:5 41:21 42:8 43:8,16 48:14 50:22 51:13,13 65:10 66:7 78:22	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3 155:1 157:15 203:9 206:25 224:15 242:5 250:13,13 251:6 254:8 allege 11:24 20:24 32:21	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14 163:12 allocation 14:4 254:25 allocations 188:23 allow 22:4 25:12 39:6
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19 108:1 109:2,5 109:21 123:4 125:2,9 130:16 134:1,17 135:10,13,19 136:10 174:20 205:25 215:24 218:24 234:4	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17 8:17 10:15 29:9 31:4,7,13 37:5 41:21 42:8 43:8,16 48:14 50:22 51:13,13 65:10 66:7 78:22 89:8 93:9	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3 155:1 157:15 203:9 206:25 224:15 242:5 250:13,13 251:6 254:8 allege 11:24 20:24 32:21 45:3	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14 163:12 allocation 14:4 254:25 allocations 188:23 allow 22:4 25:12 39:6 40:16 61:20
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19 108:1 109:2,5 109:21 123:4 125:2,9 130:16 134:1,17 135:10,13,19 136:10 174:20 205:25 215:24	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17 8:17 10:15 29:9 31:4,7,13 37:5 41:21 42:8 43:8,16 48:14 50:22 51:13,13 65:10 66:7 78:22 89:8 93:9 94:21 97:18	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3 155:1 157:15 203:9 206:25 224:15 242:5 250:13,13 251:6 254:8 allege 11:24 20:24 32:21 45:3 alleged 16:2	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14 163:12 allocation 14:4 254:25 allocations 188:23 allow 22:4 25:12 39:6 40:16 61:20 81:24 87:23
46:1,6 55:20 59:19 63:5 78:6,10,17 79:1,12 83:7 87:1,5,7,8,14 93:18 103:19 108:1 109:2,5 109:21 123:4 125:2,9 130:16 134:1,17 135:10,13,19 136:10 174:20 205:25 215:24 218:24 234:4	185:5 192:11 192:18,22 193:5,9,13 194:2,4 agrees 30:7 60:22 86:12 ahead 8:9,17 8:17 10:15 29:9 31:4,7,13 37:5 41:21 42:8 43:8,16 48:14 50:22 51:13,13 65:10 66:7 78:22 89:8 93:9	31:22 allegations 12:3 19:11 20:7,11,12 21:6 23:17,21 25:5 36:23 37:7,9 45:3 155:1 157:15 203:9 206:25 224:15 242:5 250:13,13 251:6 254:8 allege 11:24 20:24 32:21 45:3	163:13 180:20 allocated 48:25 130:6 159:2,23 161:6 162:11 162:15 176:22 177:2 allocates 47:14 163:12 allocation 14:4 254:25 allocations 188:23 allow 22:4 25:12 39:6 40:16 61:20

[allow - applicable]

133:7 163:20	159:12 171:6	141:23 156:18	anybody 87:4
192:11,13	185:6,23	161:5,8 162:3	148:17 173:24
201:6 251:4	238:12	168:18,21	251:5 258:18
261:22	amounts 53:2	173:21 174:18	anymore 18:4
allowance	62:13,17	175:10,17,18	18:5
37:10 78:19	126:13,17	175:19 179:3	anyone's 125:5
87:11	127:20 128:1,6	182:17 183:12	anyway 25:2
allowed 22:2	128:7 129:22	183:15 184:14	42:24 61:3
33:21 34:4	130:5 139:6	201:7 205:25	74:22 85:19
50:16 167:7,15	171:14 172:25	208:21 210:16	90:6 118:24
172:13 177:14	analysis 82:1	210:23 219:19	apologies
177:24 178:4	92:2 101:9	219:21 221:6	235:19 236:25
179:19 181:4	117:13,16	221:14,19	apologize 11:8
182:24 190:22	132:24	223:21 234:11	42:4 104:13
209:19 236:1	analyze 171:11	234:14,21	107:17 203:23
248:25 257:11	172:19	235:3 243:1	221:18,22
allowing 32:9	analyzing 43:5	244:6 252:22	225:21 258:3
82:2	81:13	253:19,24	appeal 86:14
allows 12:23	anderson 4:22	254:1,2,4,4,5,9	appeals 198:19
alluded 79:20	22:15,15 26:13	254:22	appear 3:13
alongside	andrew 5:2,22	answered	229:21,25
199:23	anew 164:19	122:25 175:20	appearance
alternate	angela 6:10	answering	243:16
122:22	angry 78:23	254:4	appearing
alternatives	ann 5:11	answers 24:23	196:24
150:10	annual 110:24	57:20 66:13,17	appears 221:24
alvarez 149:21	111:14 115:2	73:15 74:18,18	224:10 251:8
149:23 150:14	answer 12:19	155:15 220:13	251:10 254:20
190:3	17:1 24:21	221:24 252:9	appendix 30:6
amala 4:21	27:10,18 28:24	252:12,14,20	apples 22:16
ammirati	31:6 41:21	252:20,25	22:16
206:23	42:8,12 46:20	253:2,9,23	applicable
amount 48:22	55:17 72:18,25	254:12,16	23:22 37:15,17
62:11,14 63:25	74:2,4 75:12	anticipate 3:7	43:21 68:2
90:16 126:23	75:17 76:20	anticipated	143:14 214:11
132:10 138:20	83:21 89:16,25	107:18 179:18	214:14 229:14
158:13 159:4	123:1 124:21		

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 375 of 529

[application - asking]

approve	83:16 92:11	135:15,20,22
171:12 197:25	265:17	arrowwood's
approved	arguments	115:21
39:15 58:7	41:8 57:3 59:3	arthur 119:21
approximate	63:21 70:21	article 46:23
63:6	84:6,7,8,8	255:1
approximately	86:20 89:1	asbestos
150:1 171:7	100:21 118:11	204:20
192:10	147:7 265:21	asia 5:3
april 1:23 3:8,9	arielle 6:24	aside 67:2
3:9 152:16,24	arising 21:2	72:16 76:3
271:25	23:15 83:24,24	144:23
arbitrations	ark 1:15 3:2	asked 34:16
70:12,18	arms 150:25	45:8 46:3,13
archdiocese	army 265:7	46:19 62:4
116:2 142:10	arose 126:14	63:10 64:3,9
archivist	198:9	68:11,17 73:3
206:23	arrangement	87:17 88:10
area 155:21	194:21	91:24 114:8
aren't 67:18	arranging	124:19 129:25
82:9 125:18		130:4,6 147:17
		167:2,9,24,25
		168:14,16
U	53:17 84:25	173:23 174:3
	arrowood's	175:13 178:16
		179:2 182:14
		199:11 201:19
0	,	222:21 237:6
0 0		256:19
		asking 30:18
		31:2 39:2,23
0	, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	52:22 60:13
		69:9,10 99:8
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	115:8,13 117:3
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		127:2 128:17
		128:23 132:2
70:15 76:9	118:5,20,22,24	133:5,5 139:12
	171:12 197:25 approved 39:15 58:7 approximate 63:6 approximately 150:1 171:7 192:10 april 1:23 3:8,9 3:9 152:16,24 271:25 arbitrations 70:12,18 archdiocese 116:2 142:10 archivist 206:23 area 155:21 aren't 67:18	17171:12 197:25265:17approvedarguments39:15 58:741:8 57:3 59:3approximate63:21 70:2163:684:6,7,8,8approximately86:20 89:1150:1 171:7100:21 118:11192:10147:7 265:21april1:23 3:8,93:9 152:16,24arising 21:2271:2523:15 83:24,24arbitrationsark 1:15 3:270:12,18arms 150:25archdiocesearmy 265:7116:2 142:10arose 126:14archivist198:9206:23arrangementarea 155:21194:21aren't 67:18arranging82:9 125:18160:18126:20 192:22arrow 209:10arguably 26:16arrowood 52:5203:4arrowood's32:4 87:2,1053:12 55:25203:4arrowood'sarguing 55:1390:1,2 108:1,663:11 79:12109:3,6,18,2297:8 235:7110:22,2411:7 23:22111:14 113:936:7,12 42:21114:12,1943:4,7 44:11115:3,17,21,2445:22 58:6116:4,8,22

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 376 of 529

[asking - aware]

140:5 155:3	assisted 99:20	attempt 40:18	244:9	
162:10,10,11	100:5 209:12	attempts	automatically	
162:12 167:16	assisting 95:22	138:24	42:24	
170:15 188:3	95:23 100:16	attend 186:15	available 45:7	
188:12 191:6	151:15	186:17 188:4	53:3 54:12	
215:7	assists 191:10	267:15	101:15 110:13	
asks 218:18	associated	attention 40:14	121:6 136:13	
aspect 160:20	101:5 179:18	154:16 158:13	137:15 139:1,3	
160:20 185:17	249:8	159:5,13	139:6,13 140:4	
aspects 160:15	associates	179:14 222:25	211:18 229:23	
189:8	250:20	261:9	234:15 236:13	
assemble	assume 33:17	attorney 166:7	258:12 270:4	
196:23	47:6,12,25	attorneys 4:4	avenue 4:5,12	
assert 35:20	76:8,10 77:25	4:11 181:24	average 62:21	
46:8 48:18	88:12 247:1	182:3,4,16	62:22 130:17	
79:3,13	250:18	attractions	avoid 213:22	
asserted 35:10	assumed 83:22	16:1	award 102:17	
36:17 44:25	193:9	attributable	109:8,12 110:1	
63:8	assuming 34:3	78:10	183:2,4	
asserts 33:20	81:9 97:4	audible 210:23	awarded	
35:17 136:10	135:16 140:10	audibly 210:16	101:23 109:17	
assess 117:1	147:6	audience	119:16	
assets 33:22,23	assumption	236:16	awards 125:6	
45:21 48:17	29:25 93:11	august 68:16	181:15	
115:7 151:16	assured 90:5,6	158:12	aware 96:22	
169:11 181:18	assureds 135:7	authored 245:9	117:18 122:20	
assigned 24:16	135:11	authority	132:13,14	
90:6 198:25	attach 157:24	19:25 23:5,12	136:5 172:6,10	
assignment	attached 10:1	244:19	191:12 194:9	
12:1 199:21	57:15 102:25	authorize	208:6 209:21	
200:2,5 215:16	103:19 104:16	113:17	209:23 214:22	
assist 95:13	105:23 137:2	automated	216:5 232:25	
150:8,9 265:5	attachment	233:23	233:1 240:2,5	
assistance	107:3	automatic	242:4,5 246:14	
99:18 100:4	attained	21:25 53:5	246:16 248:18	
103:3 163:7	168:17	59:3 75:2,8	254:11,13	
		77:16 138:2	267:13	

[b - believer]

			0
b	bandied 68:14	203:2 204:3	106:5 188:10
b 2:1 5:7 6:22	bandying	224:15 238:3	begins 188:9
21:15 53:7	68:13	238:11 239:19	begun 198:7
57:15 61:21	bank 38:12	245:25 255:22	200:6
137:2 249:18	bankruptcies	basic 11:3	behalf 79:1
249:21 252:3,7	199:6	203:7 205:2	164:12 196:25
252:9,17,19,22	bankruptcy	basis 39:3 58:6	237:2 269:7,12
252:9,17,19,22	1:1,19 2:3 3:5	100:20 117:14	belabor 11:11
255:14 255.12	8:21 12:11	117:21 131:1,2	belief 169:13
b.r. 67:10	17:14 33:24	133:24 135:16	173:14
back 18:9,18	35:18 42:23	135:21 139:7	believe 12:18
18:20 30:9	44:22 47:19	158:13 159:4	14:1,21 16:22
38:17 39:4	63:15 67:9	159:12 163:12	22:16 27:13
51:15 56:5,16	75:14 77:20,25	165:3,23	29:21,22 31:11
65:22 81:18	79:21 151:12	169:12 190:2	51:25 52:4,5,6
88:10 89:22,23	156:11 157:19	206:13 212:20	52:10 53:6
90:8 104:15	158:8 180:18	238:14 239:7	78:12,16,24
105:23 119:12	196:22 198:12	bat 67:23	79:1 96:25
131:20 132:16	198:13 199:14	bates 218:7,9	118:21,21
149:1 150:24	202:5,18	218:10,12,14	124:9 127:14
	203:22 207:22	232:17	128:16 129:11
161:25 195:15	215:18 231:5	bathroom	135:15 144:23
198:21 212:19 229:12 232:12	240:19 242:20	65:15	145:12 146:19
	260:13 261:11	batting 153:24	147:4 160:9
233:25 241:20	banks 244:23	battleground	168:4 174:7
255:14 259:10	bar 83:4 104:6	83:17	175:14 187:8
background	bars 109:24	bb 7:11 264:18	198:17 199:6
93:4,22 210:21 243:17	138:2	264:22 265:10	202:7 212:20
back's 269:5	based 11:25	265:13	213:15 217:3
bad 148:13	35:10 49:4	bear 222:16	219:19,21
	53:15 70:6	269:20	228:21,21
bair 4:23	113:10 114:3	bed 71:25	234:14 236:2,2
balance 47:21	118:10,23	befall 53:15	236:3 251:1,6
ball 4:24	123:13 155:21	began 95:24	251:16 261:15
202:11	166:2 172:21	150:2 196:17	265:20
baltimore	173:14 178:14	beginning	believer 11:21
142:12	178:18 179:21	104:9 105:25	

[believes - brown]

[]			8
believes 35:13	bishop 20:1	bound 32:15	236:16
163:24 165:21	150:23 208:24	78:8,9,11	broadly 200:13
166:1 181:6	226:10	86:16,18	broken 80:24
bene 201:20	bishop's	bowling 1:20	brokers 95:4
benefit 180:13	119:17,20,22	boy 44:21,23	brought 214:7
benjanmin	123:15 132:11	45:1	brown 4:15,25
5:21	143:11	breadth 95:20	9:10,13,13,15
best 62:7	bit 11:23 14:13	break 49:6	9:16 16:22,25
235:10	64:15 95:8	65:11,13,15,16	16:25 17:7,8
better 145:4	154:15 160:6	65:18 146:22	29:4,5,10,10
221:19	197:6,7 224:1	149:1 233:8,14	30:4,6 31:3,4,5
beyond 39:19	245:19 266:16	258:4	36:7,10,11
39:21 40:24	black 120:6,9	brian 6:5	41:22,23,24,25
67:3 72:21	145:15	brief 61:4 76:2	42:1,2,4,4
117:4 165:14	block 260:3,5	87:20 93:4	64:12,12,23
187:10 192:25	261:5,10	194:13	65:7,9,11,14
194:1 237:18	blue 107:24	briefed 82:5	65:19,23,24
240:23	108:3,20,20,24	83:14 198:11	66:1,5,7,8
big 102:22	109:22	198:16	67:21,23 68:1
206:5 258:20	board 72:23	briefing 75:10	69:3 71:3,5,12
bigger 22:8	123:17 209:16	75:19	71:14,17 72:7
bill 150:22	book 116:9	briefly 76:23	73:8,11,19,25
206:18 238:20	249:23	83:22	74:9,15,22
billed 62:5,11	bookkeeping	briefs 11:15	75:1,4,22 76:1
62:14,14	194:21	35:14 56:19	76:17,20,25
billion 130:24	books 167:22	63:11 67:10,15	77:6,12,22,24
binder 18:6,10	192:12	brigid 23:4	78:2,12,15,21
18:17,18 22:12	borne 59:14	bring 86:1	78:23 79:2,5,9
98:11 161:19	boroughs	110:24 200:23	79:15,17 80:2
196:5 259:5	199:2	215:5	80:4,12,25
binders 10:16	bothering	bringing	81:4 82:17,23
10:18 120:1,5	58:23 59:9	117:15	83:3,8,19 85:1
145:20 258:15	269:5	brittany 6:17	85:4 86:18,22
259:4	bottom 56:23	237:1	87:4,8,15,19
binding 77:4	85:20 108:21	broad 29:20	88:2,6,8,19,23
80:14	218:3,5	broader 31:18	89:7,9 91:23
		37:25 208:21	92:12,16,18

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 379 of 529

[brown - carrying]

Page 12

			C
93:9,10,16	225:7,10,12,13	bunch 18:20	225:23 268:13
96:11,13,18	225:21,24	42:10 66:21	calpine 67:10
97:10,12,14,16	228:4,10,12,15	74:16,16	camden 142:20
103:14,16	230:11 233:5,9	251:11	canty 5:3
105:25 106:4,8	233:12,15,18	burden 57:25	can't 167:19
106:10 144:7	234:5,11,13,17	59:14 66:11,12	180:24 192:20
144:10,12	234:19,21	69:6,12,15	193:4,7,10
145:6 153:10	236:14,19,21	83:10 202:22	212:14 230:22
153:18,20,24	237:21,22,24	203:6 204:25	241:13 254:7
154:2,3 158:2	237:25 240:14	244:3 261:21	255:3
158:3,19 159:8	242:21 244:12	261:24 262:2	capable 174:24
159:10,11	245:12,14,18	262:22 265:1,6	175:15
161:2,16,17,19	247:5,7,16,20	burdens	capacity
161:22 162:2	247:22,25	213:23	174:14,21,25
163:3,4 166:23	248:1 249:16	burdensome	175:4,6,12,13
166:24 167:3	249:19,22	169:9,14	176:10 188:4
171:1,2 175:11	250:1,3,5	business	188:13,15
176:1,6,19	251:18 252:2,4	113:23 114:19	227:17 269:8
183:21,25	252:6 255:17	116:9 218:19	capital 53:15
184:16 187:17	256:5,8,10	busy 238:5	113:15,17,17
187:21,25	259:2,20,23	butler 5:2	244:20
188:3,6,12	263:9,14,23	с	caps 131:18,20
191:6 192:1,16	264:4,6,17,21	c 4:1 6:7,15 8:1	card 200:4
193:2 194:11	264:25 265:3,9	26:6 271:1,1	cards 200:2,4
198:22 207:10	265:14 266:10	calhoun 6:8	200:10 201:3
207:18 208:15	266:12,20	call 11:15 90:5	215:17
208:17 210:19	267:5,8 268:25	92:19 93:2,20	care 21:3 23:16
210:24 211:1,3	270:9	195:16 213:20	24:13 263:13
211:4 213:10	bucheit 5:1	233:2 236:9	carle 23:11
213:12 216:23	bucket 51:6,24	263:15 267:14	carrier 120:15
217:22,25	52:14,18 53:1	called 44:7	134:10 135:20
218:5,8,10,13	54:13 127:25	115:21 119:22	carriers 134:3
218:15,17	buckets 43:17	131:5 178:6,13	160:2
222:15,18,20	43:22	178:17,22,24	carry 174:24
223:5,7,14,16	bulk 197:16	179:9 267:16	carrying
223:20 224:5	230:19 240:10	calls 94:6	158:24 239:25
224:22 225:3,5		149:4 195:18	

516-608-2400

[case - cda]

Page 13

			-
case 1:3,4	180:18 186:23	69:16 70:3,5,7	243:25 244:2
11:12 13:11,11	193:9 200:11	72:5 76:12	246:1 247:15
16:7,8 18:2,9	204:2,14,14	83:10 84:3,8	248:4 251:2
18:12,14,25	205:8,13,14,14	87:24 88:17	252:18,23,25
22:9,17 23:3	206:2 211:11	92:3 115:16,19	254:12 261:6,7
24:23 26:7,9	212:2 213:6,15	124:2,5 126:6	261:12,16,23
26:13 27:4	213:20 227:14	127:1 133:7	262:3,6 263:3
28:6,8,12,20	228:1,21 231:3	143:16 150:17	cash 115:7
29:10,25 31:21	231:5 238:5	154:15 155:2,6	116:11 117:24
35:11,18 36:20	243:8,15,21,23	156:4 157:6,11	casualty
38:2,10 40:4	244:18,20	157:14 158:11	113:22
41:20 44:13	245:1 260:25	158:18 160:20	catalina 6:3
48:3 49:10,11	261:20 262:1	163:22 164:1	cate 6:23
55:11,18 58:9	262:17 263:1	165:22 171:5,8	categories
58:11,17 59:6	263:23 268:17	171:19 172:15	209:20 215:19
60:8,18 61:24	caselaw 35:19	183:8,9,10,23	230:18
67:9,15 68:4	35:25,25 36:5	183:24 184:4	categorize
69:6 70:16	44:13 59:5	185:3 197:10	200:13
71:22 73:7	cases 11:23	197:13,17,21	category 216:6
77:21,25 78:12	12:6,12 14:7	197:23 198:3,5	242:3
79:21 80:6	14:21 15:5,8	198:13,16,18	catholic 1:8,12
81:9 83:8,25	15:18 16:4,5	198:24 199:7,7	3:2 20:6 31:16
84:6 85:15,17	16:10 17:13	199:8,17	116:9
85:19,19,20	18:14 19:21	202:16,18,19	cause 24:7
87:3 90:25	20:20,24 21:16	202:22,23,24	31:20 71:18
100:24 101:2	21:18,19,19,20	203:8 204:13	causes 17:19
113:15,21	22:4,10 24:10	204:18,19,20	31:19
124:8,18	24:18 27:12	205:4,7,16	causing 151:2
127:11,16	32:4,25 37:19	214:8,19,20,23	cave 13:24
128:20 129:5	40:13 42:24,25	215:2 216:10	39:10,18 40:25
129:12,13,23	43:22,23,23	226:13,17	60:22 72:22
129:23 130:8	44:18 50:12	227:9,19,23	267:14 268:1
136:5,5 138:25	51:24 53:1,2,3	228:22 232:21	caveats 62:6,13
143:16 148:10	53:5 54:13,23	238:8,10	64:22
151:9,22 152:9	55:7,23 56:9	239:19 241:17	cda 101:9,10
155:21 157:19	57:23 61:11,17	241:18,19,21	101:16,16
169:6,19,21,24	63:15 68:8	242:9 243:7,20	124:2 210:14

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

[cda - christopher]

			C
212:24 227:15	certainty	chapter 12:21	103:1 104:5,6
231:9,19	204:24 241:18	21:22 27:19	104:6 106:25
center 23:6	certified 271:3	28:6,8,12,20	107:1,10,21
214:11	cetera 23:24	29:10,25 87:2	108:15,20,20
central 24:10	cgl 90:4	138:25 150:16	109:22 120:6,6
centralized	chain 36:15	151:9,11 152:9	120:10,13
215:20,24	challenges 92:2	164:17 165:5	130:18 224:3
216:1	92:4	169:6,19,21,24	250:12 251:3,4
centre 1:8,12	challenging	170:24 172:14	251:9,14 254:7
3:2 95:10,25	14:16 81:22	178:11 181:19	254:20 255:3
116:23 123:20	82:14	185:21 189:9	charts 22:8
123:24 124:2,5	chamberlain	189:14 190:5	51:9,10 57:12
124:18 126:9	223:23	200:11,17	57:15 66:21
143:1 149:24	chance 75:24	201:21 205:21	74:16 119:25
cents 34:1	76:22 87:21,22	209:16 227:14	120:1
certain 11:14	chancellor	260:25	check 52:5
131:18 194:2	206:22	characterizat	chelsie 6:20
209:7 222:22	change 114:12	72:3	chief 150:20,21
253:3 263:18	117:16 175:19	characterized	171:10 189:20
certainly 28:11	chapel 23:11	87:22	206:16 238:18
28:14 30:16	chapin 150:22	charitable	238:20 241:3
36:8,13 37:11	161:9 162:18	12:24	child 8:23
37:13 39:24	162:20 163:17	charles 4:20	150:11 158:11
46:12 56:11	166:3 168:7,8	5:16 7:5 144:2	196:19,25
59:11 64:11,16	171:13,23	149:5,16,21	201:24 206:25
73:21 80:19	172:20,24	153:17 184:18	207:1 230:13
81:25 82:24	177:6,9 178:5	191:25 194:17	childhood
161:17 204:1	179:22,25	218:21,22	217:13
204:21 206:14	180:3 191:10	charlie 6:22	children 19:4,6
206:16 209:11	206:18 238:20	234:25	19:8
209:13 213:8	238:23 239:23	charlotte 6:25	chooses 92:24
220:14 229:1	247:10 256:22	charlton 6:9	chose 221:20
230:24 231:24	257:2,5	chart 18:3	chris 4:8
234:21 244:13	chapin's 191:7	20:23 22:8,9	christopher
251:13 254:18	191:8,14,17	24:19,23 50:25	5:6 6:4 8:10
257:9 265:16	chapman 13:5	53:6 54:9	146:9 264:13
		57:13 102:24	265:25
		1	

[chronological - closing]

chronological	77:19 79:8	118:6,10,22	239:8,15 268:3	
251:25	87:11 100:14	119:1 143:8	clearer 270:7	
chronologica	100:20 101:16	148:11 154:18	clearly 56:9	
251:17	122:17 123:6	156:3 157:21	201:13 222:7	
church 31:17	123:10 125:4	157:23,23	227:8 244:5	
220:4	128:11 131:1	171:22 172:24	cleric 20:6	
churches	132:18 135:17	173:1 198:21	clerics 26:23	
119:22	136:16 138:14	198:21 205:23	clerk 94:10	
cipolla 6:10	139:7 140:14	216:10 221:13	149:7 195:19	
circuit 67:17	140:20 141:19	224:25 227:15	clerks 43:5	
circuit's 56:8	157:18,20,24	229:15 248:9	268:10	
circumstance	206:17 235:7	269:8	client 85:22	
91:11 93:1	248:14 269:19	clarification	200:1 201:9,16	
circumstances	claimant	237:4 253:7	215:10 230:25	
113:24 245:8	200:20	clarifications	clients 85:23	
cite 91:19	claimants	239:22	85:23 86:6	
253:19	155:2 203:20	clarified	100:16 270:1	
cited 67:10,15	204:5 236:4	147:23	clip 112:8,11	
85:17 166:17	260:12 269:12	clarify 22:13	clipboard	
179:21	269:15	29:7 91:17	112:4	
city 198:25	claims 12:22	147:15 158:19	clips 112:7	
199:1,7 214:16	17:3 18:2	158:20 159:1	clock 60:22	
claim 15:6,7,9	20:10,11,17,19	162:9 175:11	close 154:24	
15:10,10,17	20:21 27:8	193:16	closely 24:3	
16:5,8,9,12	32:6,7 33:23	clarity 120:5	84:23 150:18	
17:9,19 21:25	34:7 44:3	class 33:25	172:15,24	
22:22 24:1	58:21,22,25	34:7	206:17,19,21	
30:22 31:25	59:8 63:7,16	clear 16:23	206:24 207:1	
33:13,20,21	78:6,19 79:23	19:14 34:12	closer 15:19	
34:2,3,20,21	79:24 80:7	38:9 48:21	closing 43:7	
35:3,4,15,16	81:12,19 87:12	56:7 87:1	44:11 56:5,11	
35:17 36:17,19	91:2,4 95:23	89:17 90:1	56:13,16 57:6	
37:10,18 42:16	100:17 101:5,5	104:19 106:20	63:21 75:25	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
44:21,21 45:11	101:9 110:13	107:14 108:14	76:23 86:21	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	101:9 110:13 116:12,22	107:14 108:14 119:2,7 127:18	76:23 86:21 92:18 147:7	
44:21,21 45:11 45:17 48:19 49:9 50:2,3,13				
44:21,21 45:11 45:17 48:19	116:12,22	119:2,7 127:18	92:18 147:7	

[closings - company]

	• •		e
closings 147:13	collecting	206:15 253:15	185:24 200:12
coast 266:23	170:8 240:19	coming 16:1	200:18 202:7
267:1	collection	27:16 58:11	203:15 207:22
codd 6:11	203:16 206:20	69:10 80:22	215:17 227:16
code 3:5 8:21	217:17 238:7	93:12 111:6,8	230:14 231:3,5
42:24	collections	118:24 211:25	231:9,11,19,25
codefendants	62:16	258:7	232:14,15
135:1	collects 47:4	commenced	233:3 234:1,4
codes 109:23	colloquy 39:24	22:3	234:8,15
coincidence	188:22	comment	235:13,22
17:10	color 120:1,6	75:12 83:22	236:2,14,15
coinsureds	120:13 145:14	114:14	237:2,12
11:16	145:21	comments	255:24 258:13
collateral 46:8	colored 120:14	74:23 75:23	258:16 259:4
57:22 66:25	colors 105:15	82:6 224:9	260:19,25
68:18 72:15	column 250:12	commissioner	267:17 269:7
80:15 85:13	come 12:21,21	113:24	269:22 270:2,3
86:23 166:17	28:1 30:9	commitment	committee's
168:2,15,25	38:17 39:4	173:9 187:18	26:6 79:12
181:8 182:6	45:23 51:15	committed	committee's
254:24	56:5,16 57:12	39:18 58:18	210:11 237:17
colleague	57:25 64:8	committee	258:11 269:8
25:11,12 87:13	77:18 81:18	4:11 9:6 13:1,9	common 37:21
colleagues	90:16,19 91:16	13:19 14:16,22	73:22
58:18 72:19	94:8 99:1,2	17:1,24 21:15	commonly
221:25	109:10 133:4	21:16 26:7	90:4 166:17
collect 50:7	133:23 134:11	27:21 29:13	communicate
133:8 167:5,13	135:12,16,21	30:2 31:5	222:2
210:2 216:8,18	136:6 139:5	39:11 53:7	communicati
collected 62:15	144:8 199:3	59:18 63:2	39:11
164:14,22	206:25 238:17	78:17 79:1,3	companies
165:16 170:2,4	243:7 246:7	79:13 82:11	100:18
170:5 183:4	comes 45:14	87:2,10 92:23	company 49:22
207:21 208:22	49:6 66:23	103:16,18	52:5 70:17
209:2,21,24	71:15 83:6	151:13 154:3	100:13 110:20
242:22,25	97:16 133:9	164:23 165:4,6	113:11,20,21
243:12 248:19	181:24 182:3	169:18,20,23	113:21,22

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 384 of 529

[company - connected]

	1		e
114:1,2,22	36:23 57:18	concentrating	conclusory
115:7 117:3,17	66:13,17,18,19	180:18	221:12
118:5,10	73:16 74:18	concept 68:2	condition
138:21	155:15,15	110:12	27:19 29:15
company's	197:1,3 202:15	concern 89:20	30:6 114:4
113:10,15,16	203:8 239:25	112:24 113:10	conduct 32:16
114:3	240:2,4,5	113:12 116:17	42:15 101:8,9
comparative	242:6,7 246:11	133:22 134:2,2	123:16
76:9,11 77:1	246:13 250:7	175:23 179:21	conducted 3:12
78:8,18 79:14	252:8,12,13,14	188:23 190:12	confer 72:18
80:13	252:19 255:23	203:25 204:1,4	conference
compare 22:16	complete 19:5	204:6 228:19	13:16
compel 181:10	58:11,21	concerned	conferred
229:13 242:19	174:16 176:12	40:11 50:20	14:22
compensate	198:20 200:18	61:5 173:9	conferring
249:4,13	201:19	174:25 186:21	18:11
compensated	completed	186:22 189:2	confident
58:20 226:25	151:23 171:24	189:13	173:8
compensating	257:20	concerning	confidential
58:19	completely	133:3 163:6	201:17 208:13
compensation	38:20 40:7	concerns 64:13	208:23 209:1
220:6 222:8	64:13	133:19 174:23	234:2 235:13
224:13	completion	189:6,17,19,24	235:14
compiled	202:8	191:17 228:7	confidentiality
164:18	complexity	conclude 15:2	170:14 194:8
compiling	243:19	83:13 246:24	203:25 204:1
222:12	complicated	concluded 15:9	232:8 234:16
complaint	172:23	270:10	237:18 243:21
22:19,20 23:7	complicating	concludes 77:8	confirm 169:12
23:17,20 24:21	34:10	concluding	171:17
26:4,19 219:6	complied 29:21	72:23	confirmation
223:1,1 224:16	computer	conclusion	39:7 40:18
229:15 250:16	97:23 106:11	71:13,15	81:10
252:17,23	conceivable	225:23	confirmed 9:6
complaints	75:6 84:4	conclusive	78:4 116:3
11:24 17:17	85:10,12 92:6	76:15	connected
18:24 32:21	92:7,8,14		191:18
	1	1	

[connection - conversations]

L	L		U
connection	165:24 166:4	contend 250:9	contribution
70:8 95:15	166:10,20	contentions	33:13,20 34:2
147:19 152:12	consider 56:17	203:2	34:12,21 35:17
154:24 156:15	61:21 85:5	contest 37:3	36:17 37:18,22
162:25 164:6	90:25 100:21	86:1	48:19 67:1
165:10 170:10	153:14	contested	68:19 79:20,23
170:17 171:9	considered	13:14 15:19	80:15 81:6,19
173:5,6,18,25	121:4 148:19	16:10 21:18	166:22 168:2
174:17 176:13	consisted	22:11 43:25	168:16,25
176:23 177:2,6	116:10	84:2 255:24	181:7,12,24
179:20,25	consistent	context 79:19	control 19:5,25
181:17,21	158:5 162:20	91:16 161:24	20:3 21:11
185:1 186:7,11	163:19 206:13	162:1 248:2	23:4,5,12
186:15 200:15	236:12	contingent	36:23 113:17
200:17 201:21	consisting	79:24,25	113:18,20
202:23 209:21	208:23	continue 12:12	217:12 219:16
210:5 211:10	consolidate	12:23 59:24	220:9 221:8,9
211:12 213:2	197:20 246:12	113:11,25	221:11,17,21
229:25 230:2	consolidated	158:19 181:4	221:24 222:1,3
231:16 232:11	197:24,24	228:11 233:25	222:11,11
232:13,20	198:11	244:15 246:13	223:24 224:2,8
239:12 240:5	consolidation	continued	224:14,15,25
240:22 241:11	246:7	13:10 14:16	225:1,10,18,20
241:12	constituencies	29:14 60:3	226:8 227:1,1
consecutive	82:12	180:11 239:24	227:4,8
259:9	constituency	244:8	controlling
consensual	80:22	continues	219:8 225:16
12:21 13:17	consulting	19:24 26:24	controversial
27:20 59:15	95:17	continuing	210:14 241:20
80:23	consume	72:19 114:19	conversation
consensually	181:18	248:13	268:1,5
13:3 38:7,22	contain 23:20	contract	conversations
58:14 59:23	contained	192:14 194:9	166:2 168:6,11
consented	154:11	contrary 73:23	168:18 178:19
145:2	contains 17:17	contributed	179:3 181:24
consequences	contemporan	116:5	182:15
163:25 165:22	148:5		

[convey - counsel]

227.(27.2 1 (212.19.212.0	110.12 115.16
convey 227:6	correct 27:3,16	212:18 213:9	110:13 115:16
convince 66:15	32:23 33:4,5	214:9,20,21	115:18 119:15
convinces	34:8 37:23	215:18 216:2	120:23 121:4,6
35:14	61:9 78:20	217:2,6 219:20	122:17 123:6
cooperate	96:2 99:18,19	219:21 231:12	123:10 124:7
232:23	100:8,22	231:13,17,21	124:17 125:4
cooperation	102:13 107:12	237:5,17 239:7	125:10,11,16
232:6	108:12,13,23	239:20 240:16	125:23 126:14
coordinate	109:1,14 110:7	241:17 242:23	126:17,21,24
12:20 40:19	110:14 120:21	242:24 248:11	127:5 128:6,7
172:16,21	120:22 130:8,9	248:21 252:18	129:21 130:5
197:21 246:12	131:16 134:4	252:24 253:4	132:10 133:8
coordinated	148:14 153:1	254:2,10	181:16
197:23,24	155:13,17	255:10,25	couldn't
198:12	156:1,2,6,11	256:3 257:6,7	173:11 203:19
coordination	156:12,17,19	269:23,24	206:7 214:23
213:22 245:21	156:20,21	corrected	220:16 221:2
246:3	157:7 158:18	187:17	229:4 243:2
coordinator	162:13,18	correctly 81:13	257:19
269:8	163:16,18	121:7 138:10	counsel 18:11
copies 145:13	165:18 167:17	139:4 251:1	22:13,14,18
242:15	169:3,17 170:3	corresponde	26:11,12 30:11
copy 15:14	171:20 174:2,7	242:7	30:19 39:12,24
102:3,8 105:6	177:11 178:2	corresponding	70:16 99:1,20
152:23 154:5	178:25 179:11	15:6	100:5 150:22
161:16 196:3	179:15 180:2,6	cost 109:11	168:4,9,12,17
200:24 217:16	181:1,25 182:8	230:25	168:18 171:10
217:20,22	182:12,18,19	costs 51:22	178:14,19,25
219:1	183:1 184:9,10	52:3,6 53:10	196:12 197:19
corinna 4:24	184:12,13	53:12,20,22	198:1,2 199:4
cornfeld	187:4,10,11	54:10,11,18,20	206:16 209:11
267:15	188:25 192:4	54:20 55:1,2,5	215:2,6 216:25
corporation	193:15,22	55:9,12,23	229:16,21,24
219:14,14,15	197:5 201:15	63:24 84:15,16	230:4,4,7
220:8 221:7,7	208:2,25 209:2	101:22,24	232:14,15,15
226:7,7	209:4,5,8,9,17	102:16 109:4,7	233:3 234:1,9
	209:23 212:3	109:16,25	234:24 235:16

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 387 of 529

[counsel - court]

Page 20

-			C	
235:23 236:1,4	124:7 125:4	42:10,15 43:3	80:1,3,8,10,21	
236:13 238:18	127:11 225:22	43:13 44:3,6,9	81:2,18 82:14	
241:3,9,22	250:23	44:17,19,22	82:20 83:2,7	
245:6 246:6,10	court 1:1,19	45:8 46:4,5,12	83:11 84:24	
246:13 260:10	3:11 8:2,7,9,12	47:6,12 48:3,6	85:2 86:16,20	
260:12 261:25	8:15,17,21 9:9	48:14,23 50:8	87:1,9,16,24	
269:16,23,24	9:11,15,17,20	50:12,22 51:2	87:25 88:2,3,5	
270:1	9:23 10:4,8,14	51:7,13 52:1,9	88:7,9,15,20	
count 20:22	10:18,21,23	52:10,21 53:21	89:1,8,13,15	
21:4,4 23:13	11:2,6,13	53:25 54:17,22	89:19,23 90:10	
23:14 25:3,3,5	12:10,16 13:14	54:23 55:6,8	90:13,15,20,23	
160:7,8	14:1,11,13,14	55:15,19 56:12	91:2,7,18,20	
counter 100:21	14:17,25 15:2	56:16,22 57:2	91:22 92:11,15	
counterclaim	15:14,15,19,21	57:5,14,19	92:17,19,25	
252:22 254:1	15:24 16:11,16	58:5 59:17	93:8,14,20	
254:10	16:23 17:6,24	60:14,21,25	94:1,4,8,11,14	
counterclaims	17:25 18:4,7	61:2,8,21	94:16,19,21	
66:13 253:3,10	18:15,17,19	62:25 63:13	96:10,12,17,21	
253:24 254:5	19:14,19,22	64:18,24 65:7	97:11,13,15,18	
254:12	20:14,16 21:21	65:10,12,16,20	97:22 98:1,3	
counties	22:5,14 23:20	65:22,25 66:2	98:16,19,21,23	
197:11 212:25	24:6,6,21,25	66:6,13 67:19	99:7 102:3,7	
country 54:2	25:7,13,16,19	67:22,24 68:8	102:11,14	
115:20 271:21	25:23 26:2	68:9,9,25	103:5,8,13,15	
county 61:10	27:1,2,5,6,22	69:16 70:10,25	103:19,22	
262:4	28:7,10 29:2,7	71:4,6,10,13	104:11,14,17	
couple 56:15	29:9 30:3,9	71:15,19,21	104:19 105:1,5	
58:9 59:23	31:4,7,13,24	72:2,11,17	105:8,18,22,24	
62:13 75:23	32:20,24 33:8	73:10,14,18,25	106:3,7,9,14	
76:2 116:3	33:14 34:15	74:10,17,21	106:16,18,20	
150:7 161:25	35:6,12,24	75:3,6,9,16,24	106:22,24	
161:25 174:21	36:10,16,19	76:8,18,22	107:5,7,13,16	
186:19 222:18	37:3,5,9,12,15	77:2,5,7,10,18	107:19 108:14	
course 28:20	38:4 39:8,10	77:20,23,25	110:2,4,9	
29:25 46:8	39:17 40:13,19	78:3,7,8,14,16	111:1,4,7,9,11	
106:1 122:17	40:20 41:4,23	78:20,22,25	111:18,25	
123:5,10,16	41:25 42:3,8	79:3,4,6,11,16	112:7,10,14,16	

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

212-267-6868

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 388 of 529

Page 21

112:19,22,25	144:20 145:2,5	179:10,19	218:4,7,9,11
113:4,6 114:5	145:11,13,17	180:1,17,25	218:14,16
114:18,23	146:4,6,7,11	181:3,11,15,18	220:12 221:4
115:19,24	146:17,21	182:24 183:19	221:23 222:14
116:7,19,21	147:1,5,10,16	184:8,15,17,21	222:17,19
117:5,11,15	147:18,21	185:2,19,25	223:3,6,12,15
118:8 119:2,6	148:7,9,15,19	186:2,17,25	223:19 224:3
119:10,25	148:22,25	187:3,9,12,20	224:21,24
120:4,11	149:6,9,12,15	187:22 188:1,4	225:4,6,9,11
121:12,14,18	149:20 151:17	188:7,13,20	225:19,22
121:21,24	152:2,6,21	189:3,11,16,21	228:8,11,14,18
122:2,25 124:4	153:5,9,13,23	190:6,14,19,25	229:16,18
124:11,16,21	154:1 155:7,11	191:19,23	230:6,10,15,22
124:24 125:7	155:18 156:7,9	192:13 193:1	232:5,18,19
125:13,21	156:15 157:18	194:12,15	233:7,10,13,16
126:5,8,11,13	157:24,25	195:6,9,11,15	233:20,24,25
126:18,23	158:2,10,16	195:15,21,24	234:6,9,12,18
127:1,7,13,16	159:7,9,15	196:4,23	234:20,23
127:22 128:4,9	160:4,14 161:1	197:25 199:10	235:4,7,11,16
128:13,15,17	161:18,21,24	200:11,23	235:21,23
128:19,23,25	162:25 163:2,9	201:8,11 202:1	236:1,4,5,8,17
129:4,7,10,13	163:14,20,21	202:12 203:2	236:23 237:3,9
129:18,21,25	164:15,21,25	203:11,20	237:14,20,23
130:2,4,10,13	165:10,17,19	204:2,12,17	238:4,6,14
130:20 131:22	166:4,9,12,14	205:1,2,9,16	239:5,13,18
131:25 133:7	166:19,23	205:22,25	240:7 241:8,10
133:13,16	167:1,6,14,20	206:3,5,9,15	241:11,13,14
134:22 136:8	169:5,16,22,25	207:6,9,11,12	241:21,23,24
136:24 137:1,4	170:8,15 171:1	207:16 208:14	242:12,13,14
137:7,19,22	171:9,15	208:16 209:18	242:18 244:5
138:9 139:17	172:12,25	209:25 210:16	244:17,22
139:22 140:2	173:5,13,18,25	210:22,25	245:1,6,7,13
140:10,12,19	174:6,17 175:7	211:2,18,24	245:16,22,22
141:5,9,12,15	175:24 176:3	213:2,22 214:5	246:5,10,13
141:18,23	176:13,17	215:14 216:8	247:1,3,12,14
143:15,19,21	177:3,7,14,24	216:14,22	247:18,23
143:24 144:13	178:4,13,18,24	217:2,20,23	248:10,20,24

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

[court - court]

[court - database]

			C
249:4,11 250:2	261:11	crashing	cull 227:21
250:4,8,17,21	court's 197:9	106:11	cups 94:17
251:5,8,10,19	201:13	create 100:8	curious 25:7
251:23 255:16	cover 15:23	created 119:21	current 26:24
255:23 256:7,9	51:7 108:12	203:12	117:21,22
256:11,14	133:3 138:6	creates 136:6	160:16
257:3,5,19	coverage 14:19	credibility	currently
258:22 259:12	43:21 51:18,22	25:25	14:15 115:17
259:14,17	54:5,23 55:7	crediting 54:19	133:5 134:5
260:1,10,16,20	56:24 84:21	creditors 4:11	custom 123:9
260:22 261:6	91:1,7 92:9,10	33:25 34:3	cuts 245:11
262:3,6,9,12	95:19,20,21	169:11 180:13	cva 11:20 13:4
262:23 263:1,2	100:21,23	180:15 181:19	13:9 17:11,13
263:5,8,11,17	101:10,11	260:25	17:16,18 18:10
263:20 264:2,5	102:24 103:1	creditors'	22:2 26:4
264:10,14,16	104:5,15	151:13	29:20 30:1,8
264:23 265:2,8	106:25 107:1	critical 13:12	136:23 137:12
265:10,12,15	107:10 108:2	40:9 60:7,20	137:14 138:2
266:2,4,6,9,11	109:22 118:23	61:24 62:2	138:24 143:7
266:13,25	126:13 134:3,5	67:12 186:24	151:5,6 197:12
267:4,7,9,11	134:10,11,13	189:16	197:13 200:19
267:20,23	136:13 160:16	criticize 224:24	204:5 208:2
268:15,17,19	160:16,18	cross 7:3 69:22	d
268:21,24	171:15 173:2	69:23 92:23	d 8:1,16 23:5
269:2,4,12,16	232:18 247:11	93:6,13,23	d 8.1,10 25.5 d&o 44:17,21
269:17,22,25	248:16	96:20,23 97:16	63:16
270:2,5,7	covered 11:18	97:19,21 98:7	d'estries 6:22
court's 51:11	48:10 84:8	153:3,16,17	d cstrics 0.22 daly 5:4
65:22 96:21	89:11 90:19	155:15 186:6	damage 52:13
courtesy 99:6	91:6 92:1,3	188:11 190:9	damage 52.13 damages 46:2
courtroom	93:5 110:5	191:24 207:15	46:7,17,18
65:17 69:13	116:13 128:11	207:16,17	47:1 76:12
108:16,16	138:22 146:17	256:8,17	77:8 120:24,25
courts 12:12	covers 33:18	259:25 263:8	data 229:4
44:1 61:6,8	34:22 160:17	263:10	database
67:16 204:10	cplr 46:23	crossclaims	231:21,23
214:24 246:6	254:24 255:1	255:3	231:21,23
			232.1,2

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 390 of 529

[date - defendants]

-	-		C
date 11:19 12:8	261:17,20,23	267:13	99:24 100:2
22:3 39:14	262:1,21 263:2	debtor's 12:7	101:18 104:8
40:23 41:10	dc 4:6	56:24 73:2	104:16 106:1,5
116:11 118:10	deacon 226:22	84:18 88:13,14	107:4,8 118:4
171:5 184:12	226:22,24,25	264:19,21	121:3,19,21
205:21 216:14	227:3	debtors 8:19	133:20 152:8
231:19 232:25	deadline 88:21	9:3 19:15	152:10
255:25 267:21	deal 9:25 43:13	39:12 43:18	declarations
267:21 271:25	48:12 64:21	47:22 58:25	9:5 152:12
dated 152:23	67:16 89:6,9	70:22 75:16	declaratory
dates 17:20	96:19 144:13	88:17 105:11	134:11
218:24	163:8 177:13	105:13,16,17	defend 40:12
davey 6:5	263:16	105:18,24	55:2 120:21
day 3:9,11 4:3	dealing 44:20	156:4 247:4	135:22
8:11 11:12	159:25 160:1,3	debtors'	defendant 16:4
25:17 26:25	debt 81:12	234:24	17:14 19:1,10
34:17 38:5,7,9	debtor 1:10 4:4	december	20:1,2 21:3
38:13,18 39:4	8:11,22 11:14	113:15	22:24 23:3,4,9
39:5 58:12,14	12:5,11,13,23	decide 39:20	23:19 26:15
72:14,14 81:8	14:18 22:1	41:9 73:9	31:22 42:14,19
104:8 127:20	25:18 29:13,21	83:11	75:18 76:14,15
127:20,20	33:16 44:25	decided 41:7	89:5 135:3
152:9,10 154:7	45:7 48:24	198:17	157:14 158:18
168:12 178:10	51:18,18 54:6	deciders 73:12	183:9,24 185:3
178:10 190:2,2	63:17 64:20	decides 163:11	197:4 202:14
231:14,23	65:1,3 70:12	deciding 75:21	202:21 214:13
239:12,12	70:14 75:18	83:15 221:25	215:4 219:4,24
256:15 263:16	81:11,17 84:5	decision 38:1	238:9 264:16
264:15 266:19	84:8 94:6	44:22 67:10,14	265:21
267:12	146:9 194:16	68:1 127:10	defendant's
days 3:8 38:5	195:18,18	decisions	21:10 22:25
40:8 46:14	196:13 230:1	172:18,20	146:7,8
60:10,20,21	232:15 241:7	198:18 269:14	defendants
61:1 62:3 64:6	244:3 245:3	deck 103:6	1:16 11:21
67:6,7 68:12	253:3 254:8	declaration 9:7	21:1,1,7,10
68:14,16 80:20	256:16 264:13	10:1 64:7,17	23:15,15 33:3
104:16 261:13	265:5,25	99:14,14,17,22	43:1 154:20

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 391 of 529

[defendants - deposition]

	-		-
169:7,8 172:16	74:2 79:7	delay 98:3	198:19
181:4,6 198:2	134:13 254:17	delegate	departments
213:1 219:24	255:2	161:11 173:25	158:15,23
244:22 253:4	defined 113:12	175:22 177:18	159:14,17
254:9	166:20	180:4	160:4 161:10
defending	definitely	delegated	161:13 162:18
196:25	151:24	158:22 159:16	162:24 177:19
defense 24:11	definitively	delete 54:10	180:4
32:19 42:19	234:22	delineate 222:8	departs 85:21
51:22 52:3,6	degree 95:23	demonstrative	depend 110:2
53:10,11,20,22	del 5:5 93:25	11:6	dependent
54:10,11,18,19	94:2,5,5,21,22	demonstratives	180:9
54:20 55:1,2,5	94:24 96:8	66:10	depending
55:9,12,23	97:20 105:9,11	denials 100:23	52:2 54:9
63:23,24 84:15	105:16,19,23	denied 55:17	133:12 136:16
84:16 101:22	106:2 107:2	100:20 118:6	depends
101:24 102:16	118:12,15	118:10 134:3	140:25
109:4,6,11,16	121:11,13,16	134:14 197:22	deplete 51:24
109:25 110:13	122:24 136:7	deny 73:4	52:24 53:3
115:16,18	137:17,23	denying 118:22	55:23,24
118:23,23	139:16 143:20	135:17	112:10
119:15 120:23	195:17,17	deo 1:15	depleted 45:6
121:4,6 122:17	196:2,5,7,9	depart 190:15	depletes 54:11
123:6,10 124:7	202:3 203:18	departed	121:6
124:17 125:3,4	206:10 207:3,8	190:16	depleting
125:10,11,16	207:14 256:13	departing	84:17
125:23 126:2	256:15,15,18	255:18	deposed 99:10
126:14,16,21	257:21,22	department	deposition
126:24 127:9	258:21,25	53:14,17	110:15 155:5
127:19 128:1,7	259:3,6,7,13	113:19 159:19	155:25 161:4,7
129:21 130:5	259:15,19,21	159:23,25	161:16,19,23
132:9 133:8	260:2,17,21,23	160:8,9,10,11	162:14 167:24
147:23 172:8	262:5,8,10,14	161:6 162:8,13	168:13 174:10
181:16 253:16	262:15,24	162:15 163:8	174:19 175:9
254:5,21	263:4,6	163:14 173:20	175:12,17,19
defenses 35:10	delaware 53:13	190:1,1,4,8,10	175:21 177:20
35:13,21,21,22	113:19	191:4,7,8,14	178:16 182:18

[deposition - diocese]

187:15 188:18	determination	difference	269:1,3,6,6,19	
192:8 241:5	76:16 77:14,15	23:18 49:3,10	269:24 270:3,6	
250:24	78:18 79:14	114:8	diocesan 62:23	
depository	80:12 81:19	differences	69:15 70:7	
203:11	86:11 91:8	32:16 101:19	123:21 156:8	
describe 95:5	192:20	different 10:19	156:14 157:2	
150:15 197:6	determine	26:11 39:25	157:10 172:2,6	
218:19 219:3	199:22 201:2	43:14 46:15	177:13,22	
220:23 221:2	determined	47:9 54:4 60:8	178:1 179:9	
described	47:1,22 48:4	61:14 79:19	183:8,17,23	
100:16 119:17	221:20 243:25	84:25 85:2	184:7,7 197:17	
202:25 214:17	determines	104:24 130:12	199:5 215:23	
220:18 229:10	3:11 76:11	131:13 135:24	216:13,20	
242:19,24	78:5	141:5 148:8	219:12 222:22	
257:12 258:5	determining	151:7,15 166:6	223:11,17	
describes	243:5	174:22 175:10	226:10 240:18	
223:9	detriment	200:21 205:13	247:13 250:9	
describing	169:11 180:15	205:14 221:24	250:14 251:7	
213:18	181:19	224:1 234:24	diocese 1:8,12	
description	developed 59:5	236:6 243:23	3:2 8:23 11:17	
212:6 254:2	devote 177:10	246:15 252:7	11:20,22,25	
deserved	devoted 158:15	differently	13:8 16:4	
153:14	159:14 171:14	174:19	17:13,14 18:13	
design 95:13	didn't 74:12	difficult 186:14	18:24 19:1,2,4	
designations	88:10 108:6,8	190:7 246:3	19:6,8,12,15	
101:3 235:25	108:17 114:16	digging 36:4	19:17,23 20:1	
despite 238:6	123:1 124:20	digitization	20:1,2,6,8,13	
detail 67:13	138:9 153:23	206:21	20:19,25 21:19	
157:22 221:2	155:25 166:19	digitized	22:22 23:2,6,6	
238:25	173:21 187:22	203:17	23:12,18,25	
detailed 157:20	192:8 200:23	diligence	24:14 26:16,20	
209:6	209:13 211:5	151:14,23	26:24 27:7,15	
details 240:25	216:15,17	169:18,20	27:20 28:21	
249:9 263:12	217:8,12 221:3	190:5	29:16,19 30:7	
deteriorate	224:8,9 225:8	diligent 30:14	30:15,19,23	
151:3	227:4 246:22	dine 5:7 234:17	31:15,18,21,25	
	259:24	234:18 236:6	32:8,14,19	
	1	1		1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 393 of 529

[diocese - dipompeo]

Page 26

33:21,22 34:13	149:4,4,23	202:21,22,24	262:2,22
34:23,24 35:2	150:3,7,8,13	202:21,22,24	diocese's 13:21
35:9,13,20	150:16,16,18	206:12,12,15	58:4 79:7
36:3,17,21,25	150:20 151:1,1	206:22,23	91:14
37:1 42:14,18	151:8,10,15,19	200:22,23	dioceses
45:12,19,24	152:8 155:11	209:6,19 210:1	115:20
46:16 47:15	155:19,19,23	210:12 212:25	diocese's 182:4
48:19,22 49:2	155:23 156:5	210:12 212:23	dipompeo 4:8
49:8 50:5,7,10	156:22,24	214:19 215:1,3	5:6 8:6,8,10,10
50:16,17 54:1	157:7,11,14,16	215:12,20,22	8:14,16,16,18
55:11 58:18	160:17 164:6,9	215:24 216:2,8	10:7,12,16,20
59:1 62:22	164:11,14,22	216:10,11,15	10:22,25 11:5
63:8 64:1	167:4,12,14,19	217:7,12	11:8 12:18
66:19,22 70:4	167:22 168:9	218:19,22,23	15:1,5,16,22
70:6,9 71:1,8,9	169:2,14,16	219:11,13,14	15:25 16:14,20
72:4 74:11	170:5,18,23	220:2,4,5,7,21	17:8 18:5,8,12
75:7,10,13	171:19 172:9	220:24 221:7	18:16,18,22
76:5,14 77:3,4	175:7 176:21	222:3,24 223:2	19:17,20,23
78:7,9,10 79:6	177:1 182:16	223:8,22,24	20:15,17 21:23
81:19 83:9,15	183:3,11	224:2,7,8,25	22:6,15 24:2,8
85:16 86:24	184:23 185:1,2	226:5,7,24	24:22 25:1,12
87:3,12,22	185:5,7,10,25	227:1,4,13,18	26:3 27:3 28:5
89:19,23,24	186:7,11,15,16	228:17,24	28:24 31:8,14
90:9,16 91:2	186:19 188:24	229:5,6,13,20	32:2,23 33:5
92:9 94:2,6	191:12 192:11	231:20 232:20	33:10 34:9,25
95:9,12,24	192:14,19	238:3,9,11,18	35:8,23 36:8
96:1,5 104:10	193:5,12,23,24	238:19,20	36:13,18,22
108:22 110:11	194:2,5,20,21	239:20 241:2,4	37:4,6,11,13
115:25,25	195:2 196:16	241:9,14,22,24	37:23 38:19
116:9,13,23	196:17,20,25	242:1,8 243:9	39:16 40:6
117:9 126:6	197:1,3,10,21	244:10,16	41:3 42:9,12
131:17,20,25	198:6,15,17	245:5,23 246:2	43:10,16 44:5
132:16 134:6	199:13,17,20	246:11,22	44:8,10,19
134:20,25	199:22,25	247:3,9 248:3	45:25 46:5,21
137:14 139:5	200:3,6,12,17	249:4,13 250:8	47:10 48:1,5
139:13 143:3	200:22 201:2,5	252:13 253:6	48:11,15 49:5
147:25 148:11	201:23 202:13	256:21 261:21	50:11,23 51:3

516-608-2400

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 394 of 529

[dipompeo - disrupt]

	-		C
51:10,15 52:4	196:3,8 207:4	discharged	241:5 243:7,9
54:3,19 55:3	210:7 227:10	81:12	244:4,9,11,16
55:20 56:14	232:3 238:3,24	disciplinary	244:24 245:3,5
57:4,7,20	241:4 247:10	208:12	246:8 247:2
59:10 60:6,19	249:18 250:23	disclose 26:22	257:10
60:24 61:1,3	250:25 255:16	disclosure	discretion
61:16 64:10	255:18 256:20	264:18,19,21	83:17 113:25
65:5 74:25,25	259:24 261:9	264:23	discuss 13:21
88:16 92:21	263:9 265:18	disclosures	267:18,24
93:7,24 146:9	directed 155:2	113:13,14	discussed
146:9,19	157:15 178:8	discoveries	92:25 200:16
198:22 264:1	199:19 225:3	13:3	243:6 268:2,8
264:12,13,15	direction	discovery	discussing
265:11,24,25	206:14 239:15	12:19 27:2,6	252:16
266:3,5,8	250:20	27:12,14,14,15	discussion
267:2	directly 25:7	27:21,23,25	232:12
dipompeo's	27:10 47:5	28:1,6,10,12	discussions
75:1	143:5 161:14	28:19 29:24	30:11 178:14
direct 7:3	199:12 237:5	63:3 64:15,24	248:6
19:25 21:10	director	73:15 160:3	dismiss 41:17
23:5,11 69:14	149:21 171:13	164:6,7 167:16	42:6 60:15
70:2 93:3,3,12	238:19 247:9	167:18 169:25	145:9 154:14
94:23 96:9,12	256:21	178:7,8 179:13	198:15 260:25
96:25 97:7	directs 92:22	194:5 195:2	267:18
99:15,23	disagree 69:4	197:7,25 198:5	dismissal
101:18 102:3,5	83:19 115:2	198:8,9,10	198:20
108:5,5 118:9	disagreement	199:4,11,16	dismissed 78:1
118:12 119:4	147:8	202:17 203:6	261:11
121:12,18	disallowance	203:22,23	displayed
122:2,9 133:19	87:12	206:25 209:12	108:15
136:19 149:16	disallowed	211:13,17	dispute 64:25
152:16,23	79:24 80:7	212:8,15,18,20	83:23
153:8 154:4,10	81:13	213:1 217:1,8	disputes 198:8
154:11,17	disbursed	217:11,17	211:13 212:8
155:24 157:9	258:8	225:1 227:14	212:16,18
158:4 169:4	discharge	227:15,22	disrupt 169:9
181:22 186:6	81:10,17	228:20 229:10	

[distinction - don't]

distinction	docket 13:6	204:17 205:19	102:17 109:6,7	
20:8 21:7	27:23 28:8,25	205:20 207:25	109:15,17	
170:25 175:4	29:3,3,11 30:5	208:5,8,12,18	119:14,15	
188:14 253:8	97:24 106:4,5	208:19 209:20	125:16,17	
253:25 254:13	106:10,24	209:23 210:12	dollars 33:24	
255:6	121:3 137:4,8	215:14,19	45:12,20 46:2	
distinguish	197:25 207:6	216:2 227:22	47:3,25 48:16	
175:15	210:9 211:15	227:23,25	49:1,20,21	
distinguishing	251:16 253:14	229:1,2,23	50:19 77:11	
178:20 184:13	259:12,17	230:2 231:8,10	116:5 118:24	
distract 69:18	document 3:6	231:18,20	125:5,25	
178:9	29:11,18 107:3	232:7,17,21	dominic 20:7	
distracted	112:1,25	234:8 235:15	dominic's 20:2	
69:16	116:15,17	235:23,25	don't 68:14	
distraction	117:5,8 122:3	240:19 241:5	72:1,3,18,24	
58:1,6,10	178:7 198:7	241:23,25	72:25 74:5,13	
distress 53:15	200:24 203:11	243:11,20,24	75:5,7 77:13	
distributes	206:20 216:6	244:1 255:5	80:19,23 81:14	
84:5	218:4,6 231:3	268:9,11	81:15 82:4	
distribution	231:4 238:7	doe 3:2 226:20	83:8,9,9,19,21	
33:24	243:24 254:15	doesn't 73:23	83:21 84:9	
distributions	259:22 260:4	76:10 77:12,14	85:8,24 86:2,9	
84:4	268:7	81:11 82:5	87:7,8,13,21	
district 1:2	document's	84:16,18	88:7,8,9	
39:10 54:23	122:7	125:13 171:23	104:18 112:7	
55:8 61:21	documentation	177:10 201:9	114:9,15	
67:8,14,17	241:16 248:19	212:12 244:8	115:13 116:3,7	
75:16 87:23	documents	245:2,6,20	116:9,24	
88:3 198:14	27:6 28:2	253:25 259:9	117:13 118:3,8	
232:19,19	29:19 30:1,8	doi 113:19	120:5 121:8,17	
244:22	30:14,20 164:5	114:1	122:4,8,23	
districts	164:14,21	doing 73:25	123:3,4,7,7,19	
212:25 213:5	165:9,13,14,15	175:15 239:9	124:9,21,23,25	
divert 40:13	167:5,13,20	239:18 262:21	125:7 126:18	
diverted 42:10	199:13 200:1,7	dollar 45:10	129:1,8,10,11	
divided 201:16	202:4,6,25	46:24 101:21	129:14 130:1,2	
	203:13,14,19	101:22 102:16	130:3,7,10	
				1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 396 of 529

[don't - early]

			0
132:5 133:10	229:17,18	62:12,20 138:2	241:12 256:20
133:13 134:22	233:24,24	138:24 139:3	duty 21:2,3
135:8,8 137:17	236:2,5 240:20	156:23 158:14	23:15,16 24:13
137:18,19	240:25 241:19	158:20,22	55:1,2 120:20
139:22 140:25	241:19 242:14	159:7,9,13	135:22 232:23
146:22 155:18	243:17 245:25	163:21,23,24	238:22
155:19 156:13	246:2,3 248:13	164:1,1 165:21	dvrc 154:20,22
156:18 157:9	248:22 256:5	165:22 166:1	154:23,24,25
157:13,13,15	258:13,23	169:7,9,10	154:25 155:3
157:17 158:22	261:18 265:2	172:18,22	158:6,8,18,20
161:11,14	268:3	178:5,8,10	159:5 169:14
162:16,22	doodian	181:5,6,9,10	dvrc's 154:21
163:5,5,11,13	150:19 161:9	181:12,13,13	dx 17:15 53:13
163:17 164:5	162:15,17,19	183:3	57:17,17
164:24 165:14	163:7 168:6	drvc's 171:10	103:13,15,16
167:4,12,17,18	178:5 179:17	171:12 180:8	103:19
171:22,25	179:25 180:3	180:11,12,14	dying 82:8,9
172:1,5 173:3	189:19,25	180:16	dyslexia
173:16 175:21	190:10 206:19	dudin 71:24	138:12
176:16,20,24	doodian's	due 68:25	e
176:25 177:4,5	190:4	128:3 135:23	e 2:1,1 4:1,1
177:12,20,22	door 166:14	154:24 242:20	6:11 8:1,1
178:1 179:17	doubt 67:3	dueling 42:17	111:2 271:1
179:23 180:3	72:3 191:3	dunk 46:13	e&o 63:16
183:2,7,12,16	draft 154:7,8	duplicative	earlier 16:6
183:17,22	drafted 99:17	228:6	22:20 41:15
184:6 185:16	drafting 100:1	dutian 238:21	71:25 82:6
187:9,22 191:9	220:12 221:3	238:22,23	181:22 200:16
192:5,6,22	draw 138:5	248:23 249:2	213:19 214:17
193:3,8 194:8	dream 262:23	duties 69:21	220:18 229:11
194:11 198:23	drew 188:14	151:8 162:24	232:12 242:19
199:6 200:25	drill 205:23	173:4,6,25	242:24 243:6
201:11 212:4	drilled 31:1,5	174:15 175:6	245:25
215:9 222:12	drop 134:12	176:11 179:18	early 70:16
224:16 225:3	140:8	179:20 189:20	106:5 147:13
226:16 227:5	drvc 11:14	239:12 240:1	158:7 212:8
228:12,21	12:4,5 62:11	240:22 241:11	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 397 of 529

[ears - especially]

Page 30

			e
ears 80:25	189:22 197:19	emerge 139:21	enormous
ease 120:3	201:1 204:15	emily 6:9	51:22 244:3
easier 50:15	209:11 216:18	eminence 76:3	ensuring
83:4,20 112:5	220:17 221:2	80:5 81:14	160:21 180:10
easily 10:12	243:8	83:6	enter 66:24
easy 35:2 83:21	efforts 58:4,9	eminent 72:13	entered 10:6
ecclesia 14:18	58:21 69:25	82:2	13:5 27:19
16:3 43:24	72:10 180:8,9	emphasis	33:12 39:9
52:19 62:8,16	180:11,14,18	31:18	213:6,21 214:6
ecf 17:15 21:15	180:21 186:8	emphasize	214:18 215:11
53:6 97:24	186:12 187:1	38:20 79:18	268:6
104:20,21	188:14,20	emphasizing	enterprise
107:7,9 137:4	189:4 191:19	158:17	244:21
259:12,16,18	203:16 206:21	employed 20:6	enters 77:10
echo 224:9	209:12 246:12	21:10 95:1,3	entire 58:10
economic 35:2	265:6	employee	112:13 258:9
ecro 2:5 228:9	either 14:18	178:1 226:25	entities 11:18
ecros 233:11	39:6 40:17	employees	160:18
edits 154:8	45:21 90:16	158:23 159:23	entitled 34:6
edward 223:10	108:8 134:16	201:4	58:19 69:8
effect 50:9	137:19 163:15	employment	97:1 138:15,18
58:24 76:15	172:6 174:4	218:19	entity 26:15
78:19 79:7,14	196:14 200:19	en 212:4	77:17 79:23
123:8 183:3	221:3 227:3	227:16 229:3	entry 17:19
213:25 229:9	235:3 266:17	230:14	equitable
effective 40:23	elaborate	encouragem	12:22
41:10	189:6,24	267:16	er 60:22
effectively	electronic	engage 101:1	eric 6:1 7:6
181:10	145:13 203:12	187:7	150:23 195:18
effectuate	231:21	engaged 95:12	196:8 207:17
154:21	electronically	134:10 149:23	236:12 256:17
efficiency	145:18 203:15	150:7 239:5	267:17
190:23	231:6 232:22	engineering	erik 5:24
efficient	eliminated	243:17	especially
190:22 227:16	107:6	england 90:6	150:10 151:5
effort 46:11	elizabeth 6:23	enjoin 8:21	151:23 158:11
69:19 71:20		83:3 84:1	185:22 186:22

516-608-2400

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 398 of 529

[especially - exchanged]

189:15	et 1:15 3:3	200:7 201:18	138:8,9,13
essentially	23:24	203:7 207:4,4	141:2 151:16
11:19 59:25	ethical 85:25	207:12 227:19	152:1 160:8
70:15,20 140:5	86:8	228:24 245:2	162:14 163:6
150:24	evaluate	264:3,17	171:9 199:24
est 3:10	100:20 101:10	265:13,16	203:4 205:7
establish	101:15 151:6	evidentiary 3:7	211:17 214:16
233:17	evaluation	3:10 10:9	215:23 220:22
established	113:11 150:10	ex 85:22,23,23	222:7,8 229:2
44:13 142:5	evaluations	86:12,13	230:12 232:13
establishing	101:1	exact 141:21	239:11,23,24
14:3,3 138:3	event 61:19	exactly 19:17	244:7 253:14
estate 15:10	139:14 140:23	22:6 24:8	253:25 254:17
16:10 44:14,16	193:11	26:12 44:19	257:24 258:5
45:5 56:3	events 181:18	59:17 61:19	exceed 33:23
84:17,17 85:10	everybody 8:3	64:18 71:5	126:24 130:5
180:13,14	53:3 73:11	87:9 132:20	exceeded 263:9
181:7,18	86:12	140:6,16	exceeding
227:17	everybody's	247:20 253:7	45:17 138:20
estate's 169:11	85:11	examination	except 73:5
estimate 51:11	everything's	93:6,23 94:23	113:20 264:17
62:7 151:17	144:7	96:20,24,24	exception 9:4
			1 = 1 = 2
233:14 265:24	evidence 9:3,7	97:19,21 98:7	154:23
233:14 265:24 estimated	evidence 9:3,7 9:24 10:5,6,11	97:19,21 98:7 99:13 133:11	154:23 excess 47:13
	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24
estimated 117:14 estimates	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13 estimating	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20 71:8,19,21	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6 188:11 190:9	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21 131:16 138:19
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13 estimating 117:21	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20 71:8,19,21 72:11 73:13,22	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6 188:11 190:9 191:25 194:17	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21 131:16 138:19 139:3,20,24
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13 estimating 117:21 estoppel 46:8	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20 71:8,19,21 72:11 73:13,22 74:16 92:22	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6 188:11 190:9 191:25 194:17 196:8 207:15	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21 131:16 138:19 139:3,20,24 140:4,15,17,18
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13 estimating 117:21 estoppel 46:8 57:22 66:25	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20 71:8,19,21 72:11 73:13,22 74:16 92:22 96:9 97:7	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6 188:11 190:9 191:25 194:17 196:8 207:15 207:16,17	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21 131:16 138:19 139:3,20,24 140:4,15,17,18 140:20 141:4
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13 estimating 117:21 estoppel 46:8 57:22 66:25 68:19 72:15	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20 71:8,19,21 72:11 73:13,22 74:16 92:22 96:9 97:7 104:6,9 144:5	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6 188:11 190:9 191:25 194:17 196:8 207:15 207:16,17 256:8,17 264:8	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21 131:16 138:19 139:3,20,24 140:4,15,17,18 140:20 141:4 141:19
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13 estimating 117:21 estoppel 46:8 57:22 66:25 68:19 72:15 80:16 85:13	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20 71:8,19,21 72:11 73:13,22 74:16 92:22 96:9 97:7 104:6,9 144:5 144:17,22	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6 188:11 190:9 191:25 194:17 196:8 207:15 207:16,17 256:8,17 264:8 examined	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21 131:16 138:19 139:3,20,24 140:4,15,17,18 140:20 141:4 141:19 exchange 13:3
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13 estimating 117:21 estoppel 46:8 57:22 66:25 68:19 72:15 80:16 85:13 86:23 166:17	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20 71:8,19,21 72:11 73:13,22 74:16 92:22 96:9 97:7 104:6,9 144:5 144:17,22 146:7,14 147:3	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6 188:11 190:9 191:25 194:17 196:8 207:15 207:16,17 256:8,17 264:8 examined 69:22,23	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21 131:16 138:19 139:3,20,24 140:4,15,17,18 140:20 141:4 141:19 exchange 13:3 256:25
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13 estimating 117:21 estoppel 46:8 57:22 66:25 68:19 72:15 80:16 85:13 86:23 166:17 168:2,15,25	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20 71:8,19,21 72:11 73:13,22 74:16 92:22 96:9 97:7 104:6,9 144:5 144:17,22 146:7,14 147:3 147:6,11,13	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6 188:11 190:9 191:25 194:17 196:8 207:15 207:16,17 256:8,17 264:8 examined 69:22,23 example 28:15	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21 131:16 138:19 139:3,20,24 140:4,15,17,18 140:20 141:4 141:19 exchange 13:3 256:25 exchanged
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13 estimating 117:21 estoppel 46:8 57:22 66:25 68:19 72:15 80:16 85:13 86:23 166:17	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20 71:8,19,21 72:11 73:13,22 74:16 92:22 96:9 97:7 104:6,9 144:5 144:17,22 146:7,14 147:3 147:6,11,13 153:5,8,13	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6 188:11 190:9 191:25 194:17 196:8 207:15 207:16,17 256:8,17 264:8 examined 69:22,23 example 28:15 30:25 49:12	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21 131:16 138:19 139:3,20,24 140:4,15,17,18 140:20 141:4 141:19 exchange 13:3 256:25
estimated 117:14 estimates 266:13 estimating 117:21 estoppel 46:8 57:22 66:25 68:19 72:15 80:16 85:13 86:23 166:17 168:2,15,25	9:24 10:5,6,11 11:7 17:16 29:12 43:21 57:14 66:20 71:8,19,21 72:11 73:13,22 74:16 92:22 96:9 97:7 104:6,9 144:5 144:17,22 146:7,14 147:3 147:6,11,13	99:13 133:11 133:20 149:16 153:4,16,17 184:18 186:6 188:11 190:9 191:25 194:17 196:8 207:15 207:16,17 256:8,17 264:8 examined 69:22,23 example 28:15	excess 47:13 95:22 119:24 120:14,16 130:20,21 131:16 138:19 139:3,20,24 140:4,15,17,18 140:20 141:4 141:19 exchange 13:3 256:25 exchanged

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 399 of 529

[exchanges - extent]

	-		· ·
exchanges	64:4,21 102:25	exist 82:5	160:8,10
228:16	102:25 103:14	164:8	expert 96:20
excluding	103:15,18	existed 25:9	154:13 155:21
109:10	104:7,20	existing 113:23	explain 85:14
exclusive 203:4	105:11,14,18	250:22	221:9
exclusively	105:24 106:25	exit 58:12	explanation
51:25 54:13	107:6,9,10	expect 185:4	160:6
excuse 45:23	111:1,2,4,9,19	185:12,24	explored 228:4
54:24 60:2	111:19 112:2	189:9 194:25	exponential
89:24 102:17	112:13 119:12	195:4 215:9	243:18
103:13 131:3	120:1,5 137:2	248:4,5 262:6	expressed
144:4 176:20	144:5 145:7,22	expectation	13:19
202:9 229:20	145:23 146:1,7	240:11 248:8	extend 13:19
269:4	146:8,8,11	266:19	39:20 40:24
excused 143:21	210:6,8,9	expected 13:25	59:19 60:23
195:6	213:11 217:4,5	93:18	210:5,11 236:4
execute 84:12	217:16,18,20	expecting	extended 13:7
84:20 152:8,12	227:12 249:18	104:14	38:8 88:21
152:16	249:19,21	expeditious	extending
executed 154:9	250:6,11,17	169:10	88:12,14
execution	252:3,7,9,17	expense 128:1	extension
133:10	252:19,22	204:23	13:18 14:5
exercise 83:17	253:14 255:12	expenses 126:2	38:6 41:11
103:25 154:9	255:18 258:11	127:19,19	72:21
exhausted	258:12,13,16	171:12	extent 9:2
126:14 127:8	259:5,5,9,10	experience	48:18 71:12
128:2,5 129:22	263:19,23,24	63:14 70:6	98:14 118:22
139:15 140:2	264:3,6,8,18	95:9 123:21	124:14 134:10
140:13,13,18	264:22 265:10	124:14 125:25	142:6 145:14
141:16 182:24	265:13	127:3,4,14	146:16 157:10
exhaustion	exhibits 7:8 9:3	156:13 158:5	162:22 163:6
84:16	9:8,24 26:6	163:20 169:15	164:13 172:17
exhibit 7:10,11	104:9 144:17	194:25 215:5	173:14 178:23
9:5 10:10	144:21,23	238:11 240:10	180:10 183:8
			I
21:15 26:5,6	145:14 146:16	246:1	183:17,22
21:15 26:5,6 30:4 53:7	145:14 146:16 146:18,20	246:1 experienced	183:17,22 184:6,7 199:8
			í í

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 400 of 529

[extent - files]

			C
216:19 228:2	facts 32:18	family 219:12	fielding 257:17
230:1 242:5,8	43:8 50:24	far 37:19 59:6	257:23
249:1 254:3,8	54:5 57:6	64:19 65:1	fifth 16:17
254:12 255:6	71:16 221:20	109:21 222:21	fight 215:10
257:10 258:7	246:14,15,19	farmed 61:13	figure 40:12
259:23 269:13	246:21,24	fasano 150:23	60:11
extra 3:9	261:18	fashion 40:19	figures 64:8
174:12	factual 32:15	father 20:5	figuring 41:19
extraordinarily	43:15 56:21	21:9 30:21	74:1 151:3
92:5	57:25 236:21	150:23 218:21	file 12:11 31:12
extremely	faculty 226:5	219:16 220:1,9	31:12 74:3
169:8,14	failing 26:22	221:5,8 222:4	200:18,22
f	fair 49:14 69:1	fault 47:23	201:20 206:5
f 2:1,5 5:19 7:4	87:18 102:6	48:4,20,25	209:3 242:6,8
94:23 98:7	133:22 148:22	49:4 50:5,6	246:13
271:1	150:12 212:6	76:9,11,13,19	filed 8:21
face 9:12 181:7	224:24 232:4	77:1,9 78:6,8	11:11 14:23
faced 32:24	233:12	78:18 79:14	16:13,19 18:13
75:15	fairly 52:20	80:13 91:8	21:16,21,23
faces 181:12	159:24 175:12	fe 116:2	22:4 60:1
facetious	faith 71:9	february	66:14,18,19
229:17	fall 42:25 43:1	196:14,18	73:16,17 96:14
facing 143:7	53:1	federal 75:15	106:5 111:14
151:1	fallen 113:17	244:18	150:16 151:6,8
fact 28:18 31:9	falls 43:22	fee 249:8,10	151:10 155:11
45:3 52:5 58:8	258:8	feel 161:24	156:11,22,24
70:24 77:13,15	familiar 23:15	feinberg 25:10	157:6,19
88:16 129:5	57:2 107:21	feldshon 6:24	158:11 197:1
155:1 228:25	108:10 111:13	fell 101:9,10	197:10,20
238:7,11 245:5	112:25 114:25	fence 130:10	198:15,25
250:10 266:25	119:17 131:6	ferguson 2:5	200:12 202:15
factor 34:10	148:2 155:22	fewer 238:10	202:19,20
82:1	156:3 165:9,13	fha 245:9	221:13 246:11
factors 56:18	192:21 202:12	fhfa 244:18,20	252:23 253:3
56:22 83:5,18	202:15	245:9	255:24
148:3	familiarity	fiduciary	files 24:15,16
	186:10	227:17	28:17 30:17

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 401 of 529

[files - focus]

Page 34

t j			8
74:4 185:16,23	85:3 109:9,10	finds 258:24	134:11,12
186:2 200:6	109:11 110:17	fine 10:2,14	135:12,12,16
201:1,2,3,10	112:19 113:9	17:6 30:9 43:9	135:16,21,21
201:15,17,23	114:3,14 115:3	44:9 93:22	136:1,6,6
201:24 203:5	116:25 150:9	97:15 98:2	139:15 150:8
203:16 208:11	150:20 151:2	119:6 120:11	152:9,10
208:23,24	158:14,24	120:11 143:17	197:18 243:3
209:1 215:16	159:5,14,20	144:15 145:17	249:20 251:3
215:20,22,25	160:2,10	145:18 234:23	251:11,17,19
216:1,3,4,4,9	164:10,11,18	finger 24:19	259:17
216:12,12,16	165:2,12,14	fingers 220:15	firsthand
216:18,20	169:24 170:9	finish 14:10	158:9 186:10
230:6 234:2,3	170:18 185:7	60:12 81:5	fit 112:11
234:7 235:12	185:11,15	142:9 147:2,6	fitzgerald
235:14,14	189:20 192:2	147:11,12	206:22
237:7,11 242:4	193:14,21,24	233:18 266:19	five 11:21
242:5,9,10,15	194:2,22,23	finished 13:8	14:21 15:3,8
242:22 269:21	205:22 206:1	finite 205:18	21:23 65:14,16
269:25	206:18 208:9,9	finra 70:12	65:19 66:4
filing 151:21	209:6,7 210:2	firm 9:14	130:23 143:7
152:9 158:9	211:9,15,17,21	22:15 26:13	143:10 152:4
240:2 242:20	211:23 212:4	85:21 108:8	160:12,12
filings 159:25	212:12 219:7	114:25 142:9	165:20 199:2
241:6,15	229:1,5,7	260:6 263:15	flicking 241:20
fill 15:18	230:3,17	firms 265:4,4	flip 161:25
filled 127:25	238:21 244:24	first 11:9,12	218:2 219:2,9
final 13:8 61:4	248:24 249:1,5	20:13,22 23:14	220:2 223:21
62:1 199:6	financials	31:19 39:16	flipping 226:3
finality 128:10	170:22,24	48:9 51:6,16	floor 4:12
finally 178:4	find 15:9 18:21	52:14 59:16,17	focus 13:13
181:2,3	29:3 140:15	76:21,21 77:1	14:1,2 22:9
finance 162:12	finder 77:13,15	82:24 86:11,15	25:24 31:15
162:13 244:19	finding 73:7	86:17 87:20	48:15 49:11
financial 27:14	77:3,15 78:18	92:19 104:8,16	58:11 73:6
27:25 38:12,12	89:19	111:13 119:23	154:16 178:10
53:12,14 55:25	findings 77:10	127:2 132:11	180:11
58:7 70:11		133:3,4,23,23	

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 402 of 529

[focused - generally]

			_
focused 28:12	forms 95:21	98:11 102:8	g
40:10 44:20	forth 67:9	103:17,23	g 6:19 8:1
58:8 73:6	254:16	106:12 111:20	gail 4:17 5:9
80:22	forward 12:24	112:2 114:6	9:21 29:16
focusing 66:22	33:3 41:10	121:8,17	144:18
folder 18:9	43:4,11 57:12	217:21 249:24	gain 69:2
follow 71:22	58:11 63:23	fulfill 162:16	gains 190:23
120:13 159:18	64:20 70:25	162:24 173:17	gallagher
166:24 194:13	71:11 75:16	174:14 175:6,8	119:22
228:6 245:24	77:21 78:1	176:11 177:6	game 86:4
265:2	82:3 84:11	full 15:20	gap 139:21,23
followed	115:20 117:2	33:19 34:22	140:9,9
168:20 182:19	117:15 132:19	35:6,16 52:13	garabedian
following	133:7,11 149:1	112:2 180:19	6:12
134:23 179:6	161:25 180:25	193:3 266:18	garbled 177:21
follows 113:10	202:24 210:1	fully 90:13	gatekeeper
footnote 118:4	238:9 247:4	93:18 128:6	244:15
118:14,16,18	found 111:16	functionally	gather 203:7
119:3,3	221:11 253:13	16:9	gathered
forced 172:14	foundation	funds 110:13	203:13
foregoing	96:19 240:11	115:18	gears 42:21
271:3	four 14:4 39:5	further 14:20	general 27:15
foreseeability	39:22 40:15	41:11 59:6	70:16 101:20
24:4 26:18	47:17 51:21	76:22 138:23	109:21,25
forever 38:24	166:13,16	143:18 154:10	150:22,23
38:24 59:2	232:18,21	163:24 184:16	168:9 171:10
60:9	265:4,4	191:21,23	178:15,21
forgot 61:24	frame 216:3	194:11,17	219:8 222:1
form 20:24	frankly 199:3	195:5 200:12	230:18 238:10
60:13 68:19	fraud 91:10	238:25 256:6	238:18 241:3
148:16 199:4	free 161:24	future 80:17	241:22
formal 114:2	freeze 58:21	126:4 179:12	generally
198:11	frequently	184:1,10	11:23 17:13
formalized	232:7	267:19	20:17 24:2
250:25	friday 267:14		25:24 28:25
format 232:22	front 15:24		43:22 44:1
232:22	23:6 69:22,23		75:17 121:4
			/3.1/121.4

[generally - going]

Page 36

			e
123:22 131:21	263:1	23:8,13 24:20	202:24 206:9
132:6,14	giant 105:24	26:10,17 29:9	210:1 212:19
150:15 156:21	give 10:10,12	31:4,7,13,15	216:18 222:14
156:25 216:11	18:19 27:11	33:3 37:5,24	224:4 225:2,5
235:17 270:4	37:9 61:25	40:1,2 41:5,21	225:9,11
generated	65:23 68:17	42:8 43:3,8,17	230:10 236:17
224:23	94:11 96:25	43:18 44:1	245:4,16 247:3
geometric	97:23 98:16	48:14 49:16,25	249:20 255:4,9
243:18	106:17 127:16	49:25 50:22	259:10,16
george 6:8	149:9 153:14	51:13,13,20	264:5 265:19
geremia 5:8	195:20 201:7	53:21 56:6,23	266:10 269:2
25:12,13,14,17	203:19 206:7	57:12,13 58:2	goal 12:20,25
25:17,20,24	218:11,14	61:17,18 65:10	goals 239:9
27:15 144:2	233:15 244:5	65:12 66:7	god 81:2
146:25 147:4,9	258:20 265:22	70:25 71:25	god's 80:25
147:15,17,19	given 12:14	74:2 75:16	goes 26:17 47:3
147:22 148:8	55:25 102:17	78:22 82:1,3	61:17 63:22
148:14,18,21	121:22 154:5	84:11,22 88:10	71:11 72:5
149:3,4,15,17	160:22 177:17	89:8,21,23	77:21 78:1
152:7,22 153:3	190:3 211:16	90:8 94:21	101:22 109:16
153:7 161:15	247:14,22	97:18 98:3,19	119:15 131:20
184:19,22,22	265:19	98:21 106:16	140:4 232:12
184:24 186:4	giving 160:1	107:13,16,19	262:16,19
187:13 188:2,8	glacial 68:6	107:19 109:7	268:4
189:12 191:5	glad 267:23,24	110:9 113:6	goffe 6:13
191:21 192:24	268:5	114:8 117:11	going 12:6,24
194:13,16,16	glancing	117:11 118:25	18:8 20:9
194:18 195:5	251:11	119:10 120:11	21:12 24:9
195:10,13	glenn 2:2 168:5	130:10,13	32:19 34:20
267:10,12,12	global 38:8	133:7,11,14	38:23 40:1
267:21 268:12	globally 12:22	137:7,8 146:23	41:10 42:6,16
268:16,18,20	go 8:9,17,17	147:5 149:1	48:8 51:7
268:23	10:15 12:16	152:6 158:2	52:24 53:2
getting 82:9	13:21 15:20,25	161:1 166:23	57:25 58:2
135:2 138:12	18:25 19:2	171:1 176:1	60:11 61:12,13
210:20 211:19	20:13,21 21:4	180:25 187:12	61:14 62:1
246:1 262:17	21:8,14 22:19	195:12 202:1	64:16 65:8,9

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

212-267-6868

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 404 of 529

[going - happening]

Page 37

	~-		-
65:23 66:4,10	235:4 238:1	207:16 227:13	164:9 167:23
66:11,12,23	243:23,24	229:1 250:3	185:8 193:20
67:5,7 68:7,10	244:2,14,15	greater 117:23	243:3
68:17 69:4,15	253:7 255:12	117:24	halprin 220:1
69:18,19,20,24	255:14 256:13	green 1:20	220:9 221:5,9
70:1,17 72:8	263:14 268:7	119:23 120:14	222:4
73:9,23 74:2,2	good 8:2 9:20	greenwood	hand 10:17
75:11 76:1	16:14 31:8	4:17 5:9 9:21	15:14 94:9
81:16,18,25	40:5 66:8 71:8	9:21 144:18,19	149:7 152:19
82:7 84:1,5,20	94:25 98:9,10	144:21 145:4	180:13 195:19
85:6,7 86:16	115:17 144:18	145:12,23	196:2 217:16
88:23 89:9	146:21,25	146:1,5,15	handful 229:22
90:14,15 91:15	149:3,18,19	234:14 236:11	handing 28:3
97:8,12 98:1	153:15,19	236:15 237:5	handle 61:12
98:18 102:4	180:22 196:10	237:16	173:4,8,11
104:4,7,15	196:11 207:19	grounds 208:7	174:5 179:18
106:15 109:25	211:5	231:11	188:13,15,19
111:16 112:16	gorrepati 6:14	group 34:14	189:3,20
112:23,24	gotten 63:3	38:2,12,12	191:18
113:10,12,12	72:21	56:17 58:7	handled 29:1
114:7 115:20	government	70:11 244:22	217:7
116:17 117:2	244:21	246:16	hands 116:14
119:12 125:3,5	grand 28:15	guess 11:2	hang 258:20
125:15 127:5	30:16 200:24	28:19 39:24	259:2
128:19 130:11	grant 38:15,16	77:1 81:21	happen 32:10
132:19,22	71:7 73:2	138:12 205:12	67:19 81:5,9
133:2 134:6,16	133:13	253:22	124:1 129:25
137:10 138:7	granted 38:4,9	guiding 267:1	happened 32:4
144:8 147:2	38:12 58:12,14	guy 67:21 73:8	38:7 86:17
150:24 152:19	115:15 197:22	223:9	123:17 124:5
154:3 155:6	215:1	guys 71:24	127:8,13,17
166:24 171:3	granting 38:15	h	128:13 129:1,5
173:15 187:3,7	grateful 266:23	h 4:15,25	129:14 130:8
189:9,10 193:9	gray 53:6	hadn't 108:17	140:23 236:22
196:2 225:5	great 57:4	hagan's 222:25	happening
227:8,18 228:5	59:13 67:16,22	half 16:19 39:1	86:6
228:8 233:17	67:24 102:10	156:10 158:7	
		130.10 130.7	

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

516-608-2400

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 405 of 529

[happens - honor]

			C
happens 80:11	heard 60:15	he'll 258:23	holy 219:12
81:7	64:25 73:11	he's 173:12	hon 2:2
happy 8:6,8	119:16 132:1	174:16 239:16	honor 8:6,8,11
51:11 56:11	134:7,8 210:4	260:10	8:18 9:1,13,18
57:7 65:13	269:20	high 47:11	10:3,7,16,20
75:22	hearing 3:1,4,8	92:5 151:21	11:5,8,9 13:11
hard 66:2	3:10,11,12	219:12	13:16 14:24
173:12 186:21	9:24 10:9 11:4	higher 49:15	16:21,22,25
189:7 267:15	34:16 38:15	51:21 152:1	25:14 38:19
harder 49:10	41:15 59:20,22	222:23 223:17	40:6 41:22
harm 66:24	60:1 66:9	highlight 57:11	42:9 44:10
68:2,18,23	70:11 155:7	highlighted	54:24 55:10
69:8,11 71:18	267:22	218:25 219:2	59:10 62:4
71:20 72:13	hearsay 96:20	219:10 221:6	64:12 65:6,24
82:2,6 180:15	97:2,5,5,17	highly 167:8	66:8 69:12
hasn't 78:3	145:10	169:25 265:7	73:8 78:13
183:10 184:12	heavily 72:4	hire 190:19	79:10,24 81:1
247:22	160:24,24	hired 190:25	88:24 89:12
hate 55:13	189:8	hiring 12:1	91:21,23 92:21
haven't 73:15	heavy 238:3	23:24 36:20	93:10 94:2,6
124:1 127:11	heffernan 95:4	91:3	94:15 96:8,11
155:10 156:17	hello 153:20	historical 62:9	98:5 99:5
190:23 204:17	help 18:16	158:6 160:20	103:3 104:13
he'll 93:21	40:12 162:23	historically	104:24 105:14
head 160:7,8	173:1,17	154:18	106:12 107:2
207:1	helped 196:23	history 27:8	107:17 111:3
heading 80:5,6	helpful 11:10	28:22 38:6	113:7 116:1,16
213:25 253:12	14:12 18:1,23	65:17 199:21	117:8 119:5,12
253:15,16	22:13,17 26:8	200:2,5	124:13 129:12
254:14	44:22 57:5,14	hmm 224:12	130:11 133:2
hear 12:6	62:25 63:4	hold 96:13	133:12 143:17
43:19 52:9	64:4	146:6	143:20 144:3,4
57:10,16 58:2	helping 178:11	holding 233:16	144:18 145:1,7
96:23 107:1	helps 162:9	holler 228:13	145:12 146:10
123:1 257:19	hereto 137:2	228:14	146:19 147:9
267:23	heuer 6:15	hollering 87:4	147:15 148:2
		87:6	149:3 151:20

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 406 of 529

[honor - improving]

Page 39

			C
157:21 160:5	hopefully	ian 266:22	impact 15:11
161:15 165:25	60:15 66:15	ice 85:12	70:23 73:21,24
166:25 168:11	147:11	icrp 148:10	77:14 84:4,17
170:13 176:5	hour 16:19	idea 117:3,19	84:18 85:10,12
188:6 191:22	233:19 266:1	192:5	92:9 132:18
192:24 194:14	266:11,12	identical 99:23	impacted 59:7
195:8,10 196:1	267:5	identified	191:4
201:19 203:1	hours 151:22	14:20 26:7	impair 69:25
204:21 207:3	152:4	68:23 219:5	impaired
207:10 213:19	housekeeping	243:13	240:21
221:18 222:13	9:2 263:12	identifies 19:1	impairment
222:15 224:10	267:10	19:9	69:24 114:15
225:7 228:4	housing 244:19	identify 15:7	implementati
233:5 236:20	hoyt 5:10	16:24 17:2,4	95:13
236:25 242:4	huh 228:23	25:16 36:10	implicate
242:24 243:1	hulme 6:16	53:7 89:13	14:18
243:16 244:13	hundred	94:4 120:10	implicated
245:12 247:17	165:12	184:21 194:15	17:22 33:7
249:10 250:1	hundreds	229:13 241:13	implicating
256:5 259:20	204:20 226:13	251:6 267:11	26:16
263:7,10 264:1	huneke 20:5	identifying	implicit 78:9
264:12 265:11	21:9	227:24	important
265:25 266:8	hybrid 3:4,12	identities 26:22	13:22 17:18
266:21,22	hyde 3:25	illustrate 19:21	35:9 60:11
267:3,5,10	271:3,8	illustration	172:23
268:9,12,25	hypothetical	49:16 50:15	importantly
269:1,3 270:6	90:7 137:10	51:4	138:20
honor's 38:1	138:7 139:5	immediately	impose 66:11
81:22	hypothetically	140:8 202:20	77:3 197:19
honor's 250:24	34:5	238:17	imposed 133:6
267:13,16	hypotheticals	imminence	imprecise
269:14	89:17	67:12,16 81:14	196:15
hook 87:17	i	imminent	improperly
hope 40:3	i.e. 114:2	67:11 68:2	225:23
139:4 189:10	iaian 9:18	69:7,11 70:18	improve 151:3
hopeful 187:5	iain 4:16 54:24	71:18	improving
	89:7,9,14 98:6		150:9

516-608-2400

[impute - information]

impute 36:24	increased	173:20 174:22	220:21 227:19
36:25	56:25 189:14	175:1,2 178:20	227:23 240:3
inability	increasing 57:9	189:8	246:16 260:12
237:18	incurred 54:11	indicates 115:3	individualized
inappropriate	115:16 126:3	indigestion	20:11 220:17
26:23	127:6,20	64:15	221:1 224:11
incident 32:5	181:16	indirectly	243:8
incidents 32:5	incurring	70:13	individually
include 201:18	121:5	indiscernible	198:16,17
230:16	indefinite 14:7	18:20 19:3	204:23 220:21
included	indemnificat	28:3 37:5	244:3
203:16 207:25	34:21 37:18	57:19 65:4	individuals
208:8 229:11	56:25 57:9,11	85:19 92:23	20:20 162:7
239:19	138:19 166:22	105:9,10 109:8	172:13 176:21
includes 22:24	168:2,15,25	110:4,9,22	177:1,16 178:9
26:15 151:12	181:8,12	111:2,9,17	179:24 189:25
	•		190:10,21
201:24 206:1		, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	199:21 206:12
215:16	l l	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	219:5 220:24
0			238:17 239:4
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · ·	239:18
			individual's
	· · · ·		199:21
			influencing
			269:13
	_		informal 29:1
-			information
	_		17:18,25 22:7
	- ·		28:1 63:3
			100:7,11 156:1
			163:5,23 164:5
			164:10,16,18
-			165:1,2,4,7
			169:24 170:2,4
			170:9,12,16,19
increase 189:10,10	indicated 13:9 151:4 167:22	200:3,19,21 218:20 219:8	170:22,23 173:10 175:9
	36:25 inability 237:18 inappropriate 26:23 incident 32:5 incidents 32:5 include 201:18 230:16 included 203:16 207:25 208:8 229:11 239:19 includes 22:24 26:15 151:12 155:14 201:23 201:24 206:1	36:2556:25 189:14inabilityincreasing 57:9237:18incurred 54:11inappropriate127:6,2026:23127:6,20incident 32:5181:16incidents 32:5incurringinclude 201:18121:5230:16indefinite 14:7included207:25203:16 207:2534:21 37:18203:16 207:2534:21 37:18208:8 229:1156:25 57:9,11239:19138:19 166:22includes 22:24168:2,15,2526:15 151:12181:8,12155:14 201:23indemnify201:24 206:170:22215:16indemnifyincluding33:21 34:2158:14 159:535:4 37:20,21159:13 163:2267:1 68:19199:21 201:2079:20,23 80:14205:3 209:781:6,19 84:19219:6 230:3182:3independent25:8 168:24income 133:9222:5inconsistentindependently56:25 67:1182:1072:15 80:15index 7:1 18:1081:2026:4 251:10,16219:13 220:6indicate 173:10incorrect 220:9193:23 253:14	36:2556:25 189:14175:1,2 178:20inabilityincreasing 57:9189:8237:18incurred 54:11indicates 115:3inappropriate115:16 126:3indigestion26:23127:6,2064:15incident 32:5181:16indirectlyinclude 201:18121:5indiscernible230:16indefinite 14:718:20 19:3includedindemificat28:3 37:5203:16 207:2534:21 37:1857:19 65:4208:8 229:1156:25 57:9,1185:19 92:23239:19138:19 166:22105:9,10 109:8includes22:24168:2,15,25110:4,9,2226:15 151:12181:8,12111:2,9,17155:14 201:23indemnify112:5,15,17201:24 206:170:22116:2,6 117:17215:16indemity121:2,20including33:21 34:2122:16 129:17158:14 159:535:4 37:20,21137:6,23159:13 163:2267:1 68:19140:11 144:7199:21 201:2079:20,23 80:14144:25 145:20205:3 209:781:6,19 84:19153:12 161:20219:6 230:3182:3162:1 220:13234:2 235:7independent224:4 235:5244:2325:8 168:24251:11 258:127:15 80:15index 7:1 18:1020:5 24:1781:2026:4 251:10,1632:6 36:1416:2013:20:526:4 251:10,1620:5 24:17154:20 169:8219:13 220:6indicate 173:10171:5 174:25indica

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 408 of 529

[information - insurers]

Page 41

-	-		C	
178:25 185:7,8	70:11 71:7	47:4,4,20 48:8	256:21 257:14	
185:11,13,14	72:14,16,20	48:17,20,24	257:16 258:1,6	
185:15 192:3	73:2,5 88:18	49:22,24 50:18	insure 91:9	
193:21,24	107:9 115:15	51:16 52:18	insured 90:24	
194:8,23 195:3	133:6 152:13	53:14,17 54:11	95:19 115:25	
199:13,20	185:22 210:6	56:24 57:8	127:24 129:7	
200:13 205:23	210:12 244:7	61:25 62:5	131:6,11,18,22	
206:1 207:22	244:15	63:12,19 84:18	132:4,9,15	
208:9 209:7,7	injunctions	85:11 89:10,11	138:15,21	
210:2 211:9,14	60:18	89:22 95:4,14	139:25 140:5	
211:16,21,24	insistence	95:21,22 96:1	140:12,14,24	
212:4,12	211:22	100:17 101:3	141:15,18	
220:19,22	insolvency	101:15,21	142:3,5 173:1	
227:24 229:2,6	54:1	106:25,25	insured's	
229:6,7,7,12	insolvent 33:22	107:9 109:16	116:12	
230:3,13,18	instance	113:19,22	insureds 140:3	
232:1 242:1	125:18	116:8 117:17	140:19 141:16	
248:24 249:2	institute 101:3	118:5 119:14	233:4 247:12	
254:6 255:21	institutional	133:3,9,20,23	258:10	
initial 27:14	190:21	134:6 136:5	insurer 65:2	
91:25 154:7	instructed	137:15 138:5	90:6,17,18	
initially 13:1	168:17 179:3	138:17,21,25	91:12 123:9	
131:16 150:7	182:16	139:6,13,15	132:15,19	
150:25	instructions	140:20 143:10	134:20 135:2,6	
initiated	168:20 179:6	150:22 159:21	135:10 137:13	
160:23	182:20	160:1,12,19	137:13 142:2	
injunction 3:4	insulate 58:24	163:25 165:21	insurer's 55:14	
8:20 11:12	insurable	171:13,14	132:8 142:6	
12:25 13:2,5	90:23	172:21 181:14	insurers 52:2,7	
13:15 29:13	insurance 7:9	181:17 182:23	52:10 53:25,25	
37:14 38:3,5,7	9:8,25 10:6	183:4 185:16	90:10,11	
38:9,13 40:22	11:19 14:19	193:14 208:8	120:17,19,20	
41:9,10 42:22	15:11 17:21	209:11 229:2,7	122:15,20	
43:2 58:7,13	33:18 34:10,12	229:12 230:17	124:6 125:2,10	
58:24 59:19	34:13,22,22	232:6 238:19	125:18 126:20	
63:11 66:25	43:14,16,17,18	247:9,11,13	127:1 131:19	
67:5,9 68:10	43:21 45:21	248:3,16,18	160:23 232:2,6	

516-608-2400

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 409 of 529

[insurers - issue]

232:9,16,21	217:14 218:13	171:4 172:2,7	202:21 228:17
240:7 247:19	218:18 219:3	177:17 189:8	245:21 246:9
248:4,10,14	219:20,25	199:12 204:7	259:24
257:2	220:3 221:5,14	220:12 234:10	issue 23:24
insurmounta	223:8,21	268:3	24:5,10 25:9
204:18,22	225:14,15,16	involvement	28:3 30:15,21
intend 9:6,7	226:1,4,23	96:5 169:15	31:1 32:25
222:2	interrupt 29:5	183:8,17,23	34:20 36:18,22
intended 30:12	intertwinement	184:7 196:17	42:15 43:15
intending	56:9	238:3 248:4	44:17 45:17
229:19	introduce 9:16	250:9,14 251:7	46:13 49:5
intent 222:1	207:4 256:12	involves 19:14	54:22 55:6,16
251:13	introduced	19:17 160:21	59:5 60:17
intentional	263:24 264:7	involving 19:6	63:1 64:14
20:19 91:4,8	inverse 200:4	30:24 31:25	66:22 68:11
91:10	inverted 114:7	115:20 116:22	69:24 70:10
intentionally	invested 115:7	247:12 250:13	75:11,15,19,21
26:22	investigated	ion 18:17	76:3,3,25
interact 150:19	220:21	ircp 25:22,25	80:10,16 82:22
161:14	investigation	147:17 148:2,2	82:24 83:15
interchangea	221:1	148:20	84:14,24,24
108:2	investment	irreparable	87:19 88:10
interest 30:13	244:23	66:24 69:7	126:13 133:8,9
63:1 64:2,2	invite 31:9	71:14,18	134:12 135:12
interested 28:9	invoke 81:2	island 261:12	141:12,19,21
34:17 85:15	involve 44:4	262:4	148:15 199:12
255:7	134:6 252:12	islands 142:24	200:8,14 203:1
interesting	involved 12:7	isn't 76:6 85:7	211:25 212:10
22:1,21,21	18:25 19:23	85:14 129:23	212:10 227:8
24:8	22:23 32:19	135:16 139:12	228:18 237:7
interrogatories	42:19 52:3	142:1 166:20	237:12 243:5
199:18,20	63:7 70:8,18	168:23 176:9	243:15,18
219:23,23	71:1,9 72:4	176:15,18,20	244:17 245:15
223:1 225:8	74:11 126:8	176:25 177:5,9	250:22 252:18
226:12	143:6 150:19	177:12 178:12	252:24 265:1
interrogatory	158:10 160:24	179:8 180:19	267:10 268:14
199:18 200:9	164:2 170:8,21	182:22 183:22	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 410 of 529

[issued - joinder]

Page 43

			e
issued 16:16	153:14 164:7	i'm 105:19	269:2
47:2 63:12	176:17 180:19	152:3,19 153:7	i've 150:18
67:14 84:3	182:22 183:9	153:24 154:3	158:6 174:22
108:3,22	185:19 193:16	155:3,6,8	175:1,20
214:23 221:11	196:5 203:2	159:18 161:3,6	186:19 202:25
issues 25:15,20	204:21,22	163:3 166:7,7	206:17,18,20
28:2,13 30:23	206:4 207:11	166:24 170:12	206:21 207:1
37:16,24 41:20	210:6,6,8,23	170:15 171:3	222:21 228:4
42:11 55:16	210:25 212:3	172:10 173:9	267:25
56:21 57:25	212:11 213:18	175:3,3,3	i
59:2 68:4	214:13 218:5	178:20 181:2	J : 4.20 110.22
80:14 85:2	218:13,21	184:2 187:20	j 4:20 119:22
89:10 96:19	231:24 233:7	191:12 193:17	jaeger 197:15
97:3 151:2	235:17 236:13	198:13 201:13	jaeger's 197:21
166:1,22 173:2	238:22 239:4,7	208:6 209:18	jager 213:7,8
181:9 198:10	239:15 241:19	209:23 210:20	james 5:15,25
199:14 201:4	242:7 243:18	211:19 213:25	6:16
203:22 204:13	245:19 247:2	216:5 220:22	january 13:4
205:8 206:17	249:2 250:10	221:12,14	13:18 150:2,4
206:18,20	251:5,16	222:12,15	196:14,18,21
224:13 232:17	252:21 253:18	223:3 225:5	226:6
242:18 243:4	259:24 263:11	226:14 228:5	jason 4:21
245:8 269:9,10	264:2,11	229:19 232:25	jeffrey 4:22
it'll 90:10	265:12,14,15	233:14 238:1	jennifer 5:5
112:4	265:21 269:4	240:5 242:3	94:5 195:17
item 253:25	270:7	243:22 244:5,6	256:15
254:1	i'd 212:19	244:14,14,15	jeopardized
items 150:8,25	217:16,17	246:13,15	63:12
151:12,14,15	224:3,9 245:9	247:16 248:16	jersey 143:8,9
159:25 166:7	259:8,9 261:9	250:21 251:11	jesse 4:23
166:16 169:3	263:18	252:21 254:11	job 239:15
169:23 173:15	i'll 153:14	254:13 255:13	251:15
182:13 253:9	200:13 201:6	256:11,13	john 5:1,4 6:19
253:10	247:5 262:12	257:19 259:22	220:1 221:5
it's 73:23 80:2	265:22 268:21	260:5 262:9,10	222:25
105:12 151:25	270:8	263:14 264:12	joinder 260:18
152:4 153:13		267:23,24	260:20,24

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

516-608-2400

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 411 of 529

[joinders - know]

joinders 145:8	140:3	72:20 73:5	kept 28:13
145:8 258:16	judgements	jurisdiction	268:7
joint 9:4 11:24	68:7 72:15	56:6 82:14,16	kerfuffle 85:21
32:21 33:1,11	80:15 81:20	82:18,22,25	kevin 2:5
33:11,16 45:6	84:21 127:9	83:12,14,16,25	key 72:7 155:1
47:23 48:1,7	judges 61:14	91:25 92:1	158:13 159:5
49:4 89:21	262:3	jury 28:15	159:13 178:5
jointly 91:13	judgment	30:16 46:3	180:9,16,20
jones 4:3,10	12:17,20 33:12	47:1,7,13,22	189:25 238:5
8:10 25:17	33:15,16,18	48:4,6,25	238:11,15
154:7 168:12	45:10,20 46:9	49:17 76:11,15	240:15
231:14,23	46:24 47:2,14	77:5,7,13 78:4	keys 220:15
237:1 256:15	47:16,22 49:2	78:17 79:6,14	kick 51:20
263:16 264:15	49:17,24 50:4	97:2 200:24	kicked 16:3
267:12 269:7	50:9 52:24	justice 197:15	kicks 132:15
jordan 260:7	55:4 126:21,23	197:16	kind 18:24
joshua 5:10	211:18 212:13	justified 14:9	19:11 23:9
judge 2:3 13:5	judgments	42:22 61:22	24:18 25:5
13:24 25:18	57:1 63:24	justify 59:6	26:14 31:20
39:10,13,14,18	67:1	k	34:18 42:10
40:25 60:22	judicata 37:25	karen 5:7,17	75:5 92:10
61:10,12,17,18	57:23 66:25	6:6 234:16,17	104:12 154:17
63:15 67:13,19	68:18 72:15	269:6	245:21
67:24 68:8	85:13 86:24	keep 20:9	know 11:2
72:22 75:15	163:25 165:21	21:12 68:24	16:16 24:9
77:13 153:4	166:17 168:1	73:5 79:22	27:5 28:13,14
168:5 189:24	168:15,24	81:23 84:9	28:18 30:10,16
197:21 213:6,8	181:8 182:8	87:23	31:1,6,10
262:6 263:2	judicial 60:4,5	ken 9:13 16:25	32:11,24 33:15
267:14 268:1	72:22 187:6,6	25:10 29:10	33:23 34:15,19
268:23 270:9	212:25 213:5	42:4 64:12	35:12,15,22
judgement	268:6	154:3 225:14	36:2 38:11,16
77:10 80:8	july 13:8 40:16	226:14	39:17,19 40:3
81:7,8,11	202:8 226:6	kenneth 4:15	40:15,23,24
84:12,13,14	jump 43:11,16	4:25 5:19 7:4	41:12,18,19
128:5 130:4	june 40:23	9:5 94:7,23	44:1 45:9,18
133:10 136:2	41:11,18 60:16	98:7	46:20 47:7,8

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 412 of 529

[know - law]

Page 45

-	-			C
	47:14,20 48:6	132:5,20,21	239:23 240:1,2	235:9,9
	48:24 49:2	133:13 134:5	240:11,23	kooks 67:17
	55:15 58:5,17	135:9 136:20	241:10 243:2,5	kramer 5:11
	58:24 59:2	144:15 145:19	243:19 246:4,8	krista 206:23
	60:4,16,17,21	146:22 147:25	246:10 248:7	1
	61:5,11,11	148:12 155:18	248:13,16,22	1 5:5
	62:8,17 63:2,6	155:25 157:13	249:10 250:22	1 5.5 167 3:6
	63:13,20 64:6	157:15 158:20	251:5,14	la 5:3
	65:14 66:20	158:22 159:16	252:14 253:8	lafferty 67:13
	67:19 68:5,6	161:12 163:11	254:21,23	67:19,25 68:8
	70:1,24 71:23	163:13,17	255:1,5 258:2	laicization
	71:24 72:24	167:4,12,17,18	258:5,6,18	208:12,18,19
	73:4 74:3,13	169:1 173:16	260:7 261:5,6	laid 190:14
	75:10 76:5	173:20 176:1	264:6 266:13	language 29:16
	79:17,21 80:19	176:16,21,24	266:15 267:13	29:17,18 123:5
	81:20,22 82:5	176:25 177:4,5	267:25 268:3,6	123:7 129:16
	82:7,12 84:19	177:12,16,22	knowledge	129:19 213:24
	85:10,18 86:5	178:1 179:23	36:25 37:1	217:15 218:25
	87:10 88:7,8,9	180:3 183:2,14	96:4,6 123:13	217:15 218:25 218:25 218:25
	90:13,20 91:9	183:22 184:3,3	123:15 125:21	253:15,21
	92:25 99:2	184:25 185:17	126:5 156:7,19	large 63:18
	100:25 103:2	185:19,21	157:9 163:6	65:2 108:16
	104:18,24	187:22 189:7	165:15 167:9	132:1 160:4
	111:20,25	192:7,8,9,17	171:22 172:1	228:25
	114:15 115:8,9	193:8 200:25	173:3,24	largely 58:6
	115:13 116:3,8	210:20 212:14	174:13 175:5	74:19 198:20
	116:9,12,15,21	215:2,3,7,8	176:4,9 177:9	203:3 211:16
	116:24 117:13	218:18 220:18	177:20 178:15	239:22
	118:1,3,20	221:20,22	178:21,23	larger 107:3
	122:23 123:3,7	223:11,15,16	179:8,12,17	112:1 165:3
	123:7,20 124:4	224:4,10 225:9	183:7,13,16,18	largest 242:3
	124:20,21,23	229:22 230:23	184:3,6 188:19	late 72:1 86:3
	124:25 125:24	231:25 232:3	190:21 220:11	latest 99:22
	126:18 127:1,7	234:16,17,22	239:17 240:20	law 23:23 24:6
	127:13 128:13	235:2,11,19,20	248:22	37:16,17,21
	129:2,4,10,11	235:21 236:10	knows 44:10	43:5,9 46:19
	129:14 130:2,3	236:22 239:4	80:18 157:13	46:23 75:24

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 413 of 529

[law - line]

			-
76:23 85:20	224:3 245:10	171:4,8	limit 44:24
86:9 136:5,5	247:5	levels 53:16	45:5,15,23
196:19 219:14	leaving 208:20	lever 69:5	47:14,21 48:8
219:15 220:8	led 12:10 31:10	leverage 68:22	49:13 52:18,23
221:7 226:8	ledanski 3:25	69:2,8	52:25 53:11,22
265:4 268:10	271:3,8	liabilities 33:23	92:7 131:6,9
laws 33:2	left 16:1 47:21	113:23 117:14	140:18 141:6,7
lawsuit 86:2,3	143:4 172:25	liability 11:24	141:9
86:19	191:1 246:22	14:3 17:12	limitation
lawsuits 11:22	legacy 62:18	23:23 32:13,14	53:19 56:1
76:6 151:5	legal 8:24	32:22 33:2,11	limitations
156:22,23	32:17,18 42:21	33:16 35:24	211:17,20,23
lawyer 74:1	59:2 71:15	36:1,6,9,14,16	244:11
85:20,21	86:20 89:1	36:21 44:25	limited 14:4
206:11 248:16	158:14,23	46:15 47:24	38:18 39:2
lawyers 74:9	159:5,13,19,24	48:7 49:4	53:23 56:2
74:11 86:1,7	159:25 160:7,9	56:25 70:22	60:13 110:13
86:10,14 98:24	162:12 166:6	77:3 91:13	110:20 154:22
169:1,2 182:10	166:21 192:20	119:21 125:23	156:9 164:16
269:12	219:6 225:23	126:3,15	181:14,17
layer 108:21	241:16 271:20	127:24 131:10	limits 44:20,25
139:15	lengths 227:13	138:3,13	45:2,4,18,19
layers 139:21	lengthy 187:4	154:19	47:8 50:21,25
laypeople	lesser 95:23	liable 47:2 49:1	51:5,17,19,21
208:20	letter 14:23	89:21 91:14	51:22,23,24
lead 150:14	15:13,16 202:7	liaison 198:1,2	52:15,16,17,20
196:23	letters 144:14	199:4	53:10,23 54:7
leadership	let's 105:12	life 208:20	54:7,8,10
209:13	187:23 195:11	lifted 40:11	55:22,22,23,24
leading 209:11	205:8 224:3	74:7 84:12	92:5 95:18
249:3	225:6 228:11	lifting 244:14	109:3 126:24
lean 173:20	233:7 236:5	lifts 22:3	127:8 128:2
186:20 191:15	level 46:6	likelihood	130:5,15,17
learn 100:10	53:16 92:10	167:10 215:8	131:10 136:13
learned 154:10	109:23 113:17	likely 42:24	line 85:20
leave 61:23	113:18,18	81:16 148:1	108:24 119:23
143:15 198:23	154:18 170:21	169:25 257:9	119:24 174:11

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 414 of 529

[line - loses]

Page 47

			C
176:4 187:17	13:14 14:2,11	locate 259:1	44:23 49:17
187:21 188:11	29:20 40:19	located 259:5,6	50:23 61:6
251:4 253:9,10	42:18 49:7,8	locations 26:23	63:9 72:12
253:13,18,25	57:21 59:14	logic 73:22	74:21 84:23
254:1,18,21,22	61:6 63:13,22	logical 159:24	88:11 102:24
255:12 263:3	68:5,10 69:16	logistical 243:4	105:1 111:21
lines 224:14	70:9 71:10	logs 231:15,16	112:12 136:19
linkage 72:8,10	86:15 92:8	london 43:23	139:19 174:10
73:19	122:22 138:2	52:6,10 54:4	205:24 223:3
linked 73:13	156:5 160:22	54:14,17 55:23	224:10 253:13
lips 80:25	164:2 169:13	62:17 84:7	253:13,18
liquidation	169:16 171:5,7	90:3 92:4	255:4 258:23
114:3	172:7,16,17	121:4 122:20	258:23
liquidity	178:15,21	124:6 125:2,9	looked 28:7,14
113:11 117:19	195:1 196:24	125:18 130:15	29:2,23 148:4
list 10:10 14:23	197:18 211:24	131:19 132:19	looking 14:13
17:19 21:15	213:23 230:15	137:12,13	37:8 38:1,2,21
200:2,5	238:4 239:18	138:4	41:16 103:23
listed 9:3	245:22	long 38:22	104:12 105:3,6
218:20 219:5	litigations	39:22 68:5	105:20 108:20
252:17,22	202:13 206:15	80:19 104:19	119:23 120:4
listing 193:3	litigator 63:14	146:22 196:12	136:24 137:1,3
listings 155:22	little 8:12	196:15 245:20	137:4 145:20
lists 15:17	11:13 14:12	261:12 262:4	145:21 161:21
litigate 12:12	16:20 60:3	265:20	161:22 212:22
58:21,22	64:15 88:24	longer 13:10	220:16,23
139:23 205:7	95:8 154:14	14:8,21 39:14	223:5 254:7
litigated 24:18	160:6 170:13	50:17 60:3	260:5
32:14 42:17	197:6,6 224:1	73:3 113:22	looks 22:19
54:23 55:7	245:19 261:12	199:3 233:17	23:14 56:22
74:6 154:23	266:16 270:7	look 11:23	103:4,14
227:9	live 228:2	14:14 15:19	104:13 122:8
litigating 12:5	236:7	18:2,23 19:21	loosely 198:12
41:5,14,20	llp 4:3,10	20:10 22:9,17	lose 35:15
169:5 260:11	lmi 54:25	24:3 25:1,3,6	loses 35:20
litigation 8:21	55:12,17 125:9	26:3,3,8 37:16	86:13,13,13
12:9,10,13		39:9 41:16	

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 415 of 529

[loss - materials]

Page 48

			· ·
loss 52:8,12	155:1 172:24	107:13 114:7	213:15,20
55:4 121:5	179:13 199:1	119:7 125:13	238:5,12,20
122:16,22	201:2 211:12	133:4 144:14	247:10 256:21
138:6,22	220:18 224:9	147:22 161:10	263:23
lost 35:10	227:15 229:23	171:18 172:20	manager 257:9
163:2 187:20	233:2 235:20	186:14 192:20	managing
189:25 190:10	242:6 254:9,9	197:19 201:13	149:21 171:7
lot 10:18 43:5	254:13 266:23	203:24 222:24	manchester
62:23 73:25	magistrate	231:25 239:21	142:16
74:7 112:7	39:10,12,14,18	245:24 246:22	mandated
151:23 190:21	40:25 60:22	253:8,25 255:8	113:19
205:22 206:1	72:22 267:14	255:22 261:3	mandatory
223:16 265:6	268:1	263:18 265:17	113:18,18
lots 30:10	magnitude	266:18	manner 100:3
louisiana 4:5	249:10	makes 50:15	man's 245:2
love 266:25	mahoney	157:22 258:25	march 99:11
low 47:10	226:22	making 39:25	mariner 67:15
51:19 52:20	maintain 192:2	40:25 57:3	marked 217:4
lower 83:4	192:11 193:14	58:15 90:25	market 125:18
lowest 49:14	193:21 194:2	170:25 198:7	marsal 149:22
49:15	216:1,15	244:6 246:17	149:23 150:14
lunch 143:25	maintained	256:11 258:6	190:3
146:22,23	20:3 55:11	mallory 6:7	martin 2:2
149:1 266:19	208:24 231:20	man 191:10	mary 207:2
m	maintaining	235:6,9 236:7	maryanne
m 3:1 227:12	160:19	236:9 259:1	206:22
mad 87:16	maintains	manage 178:11	mass 229:11
made 19:12	163:23 164:9	230:25 238:10	masse 212:5
21:13 22:24	167:22 185:8	241:7 246:8	227:16 229:3
23:17 26:14	194:22 215:20	managed 20:3	230:14
30:14 38:9	215:24	management	massive 231:4
40:4,16 41:2,6	majority	101:6 158:15	material 20:2,5
41:8 59:18,19	215:13 229:1	158:24 159:6	21:9 23:4
70:20 72:10,24	make 8:5 10:8	159:14 160:14	51:16 199:1
82:6 84:5	19:10 45:4	171:13 185:1	227:21
86:11 116:22	61:22 69:6	186:7,11,15,16	materials 13:9
127:9 154:8	81:21 88:19	188:24 213:6	227:22
127.7 137.0			

212-267-6868

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 416 of 529

[math - metuchen]

Page 49

-	-		C
math 130:24	82:18 83:11	60:12 68:15	262:5,8,10,14
130:25 143:3	85:4 86:22	73:24 81:24	262:15,24
matter 1:6	88:3,5,9 92:7	82:4 170:14,16	263:4,6
66:16 77:12	92:13 93:1	187:2,3 204:9	meet 56:19
82:17,22,25	106:9 114:16	211:12 230:2	115:3 135:22
83:12,14,16	116:15 126:19	232:11,14	meeting 263:22
91:25 92:1	139:22 146:23	268:4,17	melton 223:10
101:20 109:21	174:21 175:24	mediations	223:23,25
109:25 110:3	185:19 192:13	170:11,18	members
126:16 135:1,5	201:11 204:19	229:20,25	188:24 236:2
152:18 188:19	205:4 221:17	mediator 39:13	236:14,15
201:23 236:21	224:6 225:7	39:15,18,21	270:2,3
matters 25:10	229:3,17 239:7	40:9 60:4,5	memory 198:4
56:18 95:17	244:8,10 245:2	72:22 187:6	222:5,12
158:15 159:15	245:7,11	medico 5:5	245:20
171:15 172:21	meaning 33:22	93:25 94:2,5,6	mention
178:8 204:5	33:24 176:4	94:21,22,24	225:18
247:11	221:9,16	96:8 97:20	mentioned
matthew 6:21	meaningful	105:9,11,16,19	16:6 17:13
maximize	203:9	105:23 106:2	30:7 53:9
180:12	means 80:5,6	107:2 118:12	57:21 61:19
mcmahon 5:12	121:5 247:2	118:15 121:11	95:24 202:4
207:2	meant 38:24	121:13,16	menu 249:9
mean 11:11	60:6 61:3	122:24 136:7	merged 23:10
27:24 28:17	177:21 227:4,6	137:17,23	merits 13:9
30:10 32:25	250:12 251:15	139:16 143:20	27:13,21 35:10
33:3 34:18	251:20 253:20	195:17,17	56:14 233:2
35:25 36:4	255:25	196:2,5,7,9	268:2
39:8,20 40:8	measurable	202:3 203:18	mermelstein
41:7 47:19	76:4	206:10 207:3,8	5:13
49:3 55:10	mechanics	207:14 256:13	merson 260:6
59:18 63:9	128:21	256:15,15,18	260:7,9 261:5
66:16 68:21,25	mediation	257:21,22	261:16
69:3,12 71:23	13:12,24 14:5	258:21,25	met 83:9
72:21,25 73:15	14:10 38:25	259:3,6,7,13	metuchen
75:19 77:13,16	39:6,25 40:10	259:15,19,21	142:22
80:8,10 81:1	40:17 41:2,14	260:2,17,21,23	

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

[mg - move]

mg 1:3,4	minor 239:8	85:6,24 86:9	183:22 184:18
michael 6:17	minute 65:15	116:14	184:20 186:5
236:20,25	65:16,18,25	monitor 19:7	191:25 192:2
237:1,4,10,16	66:2,4 98:1	172:15,24	194:17,19
michelle 5:12	195:11	173:14 181:10	209:25 258:5
middle 18:3	minutes 65:19	241:6	moriarty 5:17
22:10 29:15	66:7 143:24	monitoring	6:6
174:11	222:16 228:8	164:3 257:11	morning 8:3
mike 5:14	266:8	257:13 258:7	14:24 16:17
million 45:10	misconduct	monsignor	66:9 94:25
45:12,20 46:1	154:19	223:10,12,17	98:9,10 199:11
46:6,24 47:1,3	miskell 5:14	223:20,23,25	200:16 207:19
47:7,11,17,17	missed 36:20	224:7,8 226:3	221:11 268:21
47:25 48:7,8,9	38:4	226:5,9	270:8
48:10,16,16,17	missing 88:3	monsignors	motion 3:4,8
49:1,2,17,20	mission 12:24	223:19	8:19 13:20
49:20 50:4,4,7	154:21	month 14:5	41:17 42:6
50:16,19 52:20	mitchell 6:12	39:1 40:3,15	59:18,20 60:1
52:20,25,25	6:17	70:19	60:15 61:21
54:8,8 62:19	mitigates 265:6	months 39:6	86:3 145:9
76:12 77:8,11	mix 120:17,19	39:22 59:23	152:13 154:14
78:4,10 92:8	120:19 145:10	115:4 116:4,18	155:7 197:22
92:12 115:7	mm 224:12	117:20,25	214:6,25
130:17,23,23	modified 204:9	151:25 190:1	229:10,10
205:21	244:10	202:9,10	242:19 246:17
millions 116:5	moffitt 5:15	moore 5:16 7:5	246:23 260:18
207:21	moment 80:5	58:3 70:4	260:24 267:18
minarovich	144:23 166:25	144:2 149:5,6	motions 197:20
6:18	174:3	149:11,14,16	198:15,16
mind 65:14	momentarily	149:18,21	motivation
66:12 79:22	82:19	152:8,19 153:8	215:4
84:10 222:11	monday	153:17,19	move 9:2,6,7
238:17 241:18	154:14	154:3 155:5	19:7 25:2 39:7
mineola 271:23	monetary	164:4 169:5	40:4,7,17
minimum 53:4	181:15 183:2	172:12 173:21	42:20,20 50:23
161:8 172:17	money 49:24	176:9,20 180:7	52:14 54:4
	49:25 53:3,24	182:22 183:7	56:4,10 57:7

[move - negligence]

74:22 87:23	238:8 253:6	107:20 108:17	31:16 114:21
92:22 96:8	254:15	108:19 110:10	143:11 167:25
130:12 144:21	named 11:20	111:2,10,12,24	182:14 222:11
145:24 153:8	16:4 17:14	112:4,9,12,15	near 72:9
225:6 238:9	31:22 42:14	112:18,21,23	necessarily
263:5	69:17 75:13,18	113:7,8 114:10	14:2 40:13
moved 13:14	89:4,4 155:23	114:21,24	42:16 178:9
104:9 151:11	155:23 156:22	115:23 116:1	251:25
moves 68:6	164:7 169:17	116:16,20,25	necessary 14:8
moving 20:4	183:9,11,23	117:7,12 118:9	15:12 33:1,2
56:14 58:11	185:2 186:1	118:14,16,17	56:11 75:11,19
255:15	197:3 202:13	119:5,9,11	145:16 146:16
multiple 75:14	214:13 219:4	120:3,9,12	necessity 71:9
136:12,12	241:25 250:10	121:19 122:5	need 16:24
139:24 163:22	names 23:19	122:10,12,14	37:7 42:8
221:24 244:1	204:4 205:5	123:1,2 124:13	49:23 56:5
259:18	nasatir 4:16	124:19 125:1,8	68:14,15 74:6
multiplied	9:18,18 10:2	125:15 130:11	87:22 98:14,18
243:19	54:24,25 55:10	130:14,21,22	99:3,3,4
mutual 24:19	55:17 87:6	132:7 133:2,15	111:19 149:13
n	89:12,14,14,16	133:17,18	163:22 164:1
n 4:1 6:16 8:1	89:24 90:11,14	134:24 136:9	172:15,19
217:16,19,20	90:18,21,24	136:25 137:3,6	187:2 195:25
271:1	91:5,11,19,21	137:9,20,24,25	204:14 209:24
nada 73:17	97:25 98:2,5,6	138:11 139:18	212:12 248:5
name 8:15 9:11	98:8,14,18,20	140:6,11,16,22	248:19 266:18
11:22 14:18	98:22 99:5,8,9	141:7,21,25	needed 58:10
16:24 21:19	102:6,9,13,15	143:17 144:4,9	67:4
29:8,9 41:25	103:2,7,9,11	144:11 145:25	needs 17:25
42:3 66:19	103:18,21,24	146:3 266:22	73:6 111:20,22
75:7,10 81:2	104:1,4,12,18	266:22	173:14 210:23
89:13 94:5	104:23 105:3,6	nassau 61:10	negative
149:20 155:19	105:10,12,17	197:11,13	269:15
155:19 156:24	105:21 106:12	199:8 212:25	negligence
169:13 205:10	106:15,17,19	262:4	11:25 20:18,22
206:23 216:19	106:23 107:6	nature 12:3	20:25 23:13
220:1 226:2	107:12,15,17	17:11 18:2,23	31:20 32:8,9

[negligence - objected]

	1		e
36:19 91:3	newark 142:14	notice 19:10	160:7,21
198:21	nine 29:14,14	23:21,25 24:4	198:15 200:21
negligent 12:1	ninety 61:17	24:9,12,14,17	203:24 204:18
12:1 20:18	ninth 67:17	24:20 25:9,15	205:18,24
21:5 23:24	212:24	25:21 26:18	206:1 207:7
25:4,4 32:8	nodding 211:5	28:2,13 29:24	212:2 215:1,22
36:3,3,19,20	nomenclature	30:15,21 86:5	218:3,5,7,10
91:3,3	201:10	147:20,23	218:13 219:3
negotiate	non 19:15	148:11 199:11	219:25 221:5
227:20	33:15 49:18	199:14 200:8	223:8,22 226:1
negotiations	51:18 58:25	200:14 201:18	226:4,23
13:17 69:5	62:23 70:12,22	205:7 228:12	245:23 251:10
net 52:8,12	75:16 79:25	235:8 247:18	251:17,19,25
55:4 121:5	90:25 97:5	247:22 268:6,7	253:14 254:21
122:16	156:4 185:15	269:11,20,21	259:12,17
neutral 35:3	210:14 227:24	noticed 108:18	260:12
nev 3:2	235:14 247:4	240:7 257:2	numbers 44:8
never 65:16	253:3 254:8	notices 239:24	62:16 131:17
81:16,18 109:7	nonaffiliated	241:6 247:14	218:9 226:16
109:12 239:11	11:18	248:12	232:17 251:21
nevertheless	nonconsensual	noticing	259:9
114:1	39:3	171:14,23	numbing 66:12
new 1:2,8,12	normal 93:17	247:11	numerical
1:21 4:13 8:23	normally 21:24	notification	251:24
9:12 23:22	21:25	160:2,22	numerous
35:25 36:5	northern 67:14	notify 148:5	181:11
37:17 46:22	67:17	notion 58:17	nurlan 5:18
61:18 86:9	notable 23:1	63:21 73:20	ny 1:21 4:13
100:7,11	26:9 69:12	notwithstand	271:23
113:22 114:19	notation 17:21	250:10	0
117:23 136:5	note 35:9 53:13	november	o 2:1 8:1 271:1
141:3,7 143:8	118:5,5 269:1	213:7	o'clock 146:23
143:8,9,9	noted 30:16	number 17:17	object 64:16
198:25 214:16	237:12 242:6	17:18 97:24	72:19 93:16
219:13,15	269:9	104:20,20,25	124:15
220:8 221:7	notes 112:19	106:24 117:22	objected 145:8
226:7 251:21		151:2 155:22	145:9 246:11
1		1	1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 420 of 529

[objection - okay]

			e	
objection 9:10	131:10,19	occur 81:11	official 4:11	
9:24 16:18	132:15,21	185:25 190:6	260:19,24	
26:6 87:23	138:23	occurred	officials 19:5	
97:5 122:24	obligations	140:23	oh 66:23 73:10	
136:7 137:17	85:8 115:4	occurrence	96:13 115:14	
139:16 144:6	117:20,25	44:24 45:2,3,4	213:15 226:15	
146:13 153:9	135:23,23	45:15,18,19,20	259:13 263:20	
187:21 188:6	163:8 173:17	45:23 47:8,14	264:4	
192:24 207:9	174:5,15 175:8	47:21 48:8	okay 8:4 9:9,23	
215:1 225:22	176:11 177:6	49:13 50:21,25	10:11,14,21	
229:11 259:23	181:13 248:14	52:23 54:7,8	11:9 15:1,24	
262:12 267:2	257:12,13	54:12 55:22	15:25 17:6	
269:9	observation	92:5 131:2,3	18:7,15,19,21	
objections	156:14	136:12 138:23	18:22 19:19	
16:12,18 17:3	observational	139:7 141:1,1	22:7 24:25	
17:10 23:22	239:17	141:2,3,4,5,13	25:1 26:2,3	
87:11 93:14	observations	142:4	27:16 30:3	
96:10,14,15,19	12:9 58:3	occurring 16:2	31:7,8,14	
96:22,22 97:2	171:18 239:3	138:4	36:11 38:18	
146:6,10	observed 135:6	october 106:2	41:6 42:9,12	
147:24 153:10	156:10 157:6	151:10 152:9	42:13 43:10	
153:15 207:12	158:9 171:6	offer 93:2	44:9 47:12	
212:20 218:22	239:11,25	144:14 239:21	48:3,14 50:23	
219:11 220:4	240:10,13	265:10	51:5,15 52:13	
226:4 235:7	observing	offered 69:14	52:14 53:9	
237:7,11	157:1	84:10 97:4	54:3 55:19,20	
263:25 264:1	obtain 214:4	146:12 269:16	56:4,13,14	
265:8,11	obvious 63:9	offering 153:5	57:4,7,20,21	
268:14 269:14	obviously	264:17	58:23 59:24,24	
269:19	21:24 33:12	offhand 115:14	60:3,25 65:4,7	
objection's	47:15 63:1	office 201:24	71:11 73:20	
219:9	73:8 76:14	officer 150:20	76:1 78:14,22	
objectives	97:2 221:23	150:22 171:11	78:25 79:16	
214:1	228:17 267:23	189:20 206:16	81:3 83:23	
obligation	269:17	238:18,21	86:20,22 87:4	
39:21 55:1,8	occasions	241:3	87:15 88:23	
55:18 90:2	75:14		89:7 90:14,14	
				1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 421 of 529

[okay - order]

-	•			C
	91:20 94:1,8	172:11 174:3	262:14 263:6	operating
	95:5,12 96:7	174:12,12	263:11,17	150:21 171:10
	97:11,18 98:3	193:19 195:12	264:14 265:15	206:16 238:18
	98:13 99:4,10	202:1,21 207:9	266:2,6,9,11	241:3
	99:17,20 100:1	207:20 209:15	267:20 268:19	operations
	102:1 103:19	209:25 210:5	270:5	150:9 151:1
	103:22 104:11	210:24 211:2,3	old 58:9 82:9	operators
	104:17 105:5,8	211:7 212:1,7	244:25 245:1	228:9
	105:22 106:3	212:9,22 213:5	271:21	opinion 16:17
	106:15 107:16	213:20 214:8	omnibus 16:12	38:6,11,14
	107:24 110:11	214:12,15,22	16:18 23:22	44:23 102:21
	111:7 112:19	215:12,12	96:15	221:10 244:18
	113:4 115:14	216:7,7,22	onboard 268:5	244:25 245:9
	117:5,11	217:20 218:2	once 27:19	opinions 56:8
	118:15 119:6	218:16 219:22	138:21,21	opportunity
	119:10 120:3	223:6 224:18	151:10,22	269:16
	121:13,23	224:20 225:21	202:20 248:14	oppose 89:5
	122:1,3,3,9,13	226:15,19	261:11	opposed 13:1
	122:13 123:13	227:7,10	ones 15:3 17:2	218:11 246:23
	123:25 124:11	228:17 233:9	28:11 58:20	opposing 99:1
	124:24 126:11	233:12,20,20	69:5,6,7 75:9	option 192:18
	129:10,20,24	234:6,12,20,23	82:8 143:5	oral 36:7
	133:15,22	235:11 236:17	222:21	order 9:4 13:6
	137:22 138:6	237:24 238:22	ongoing 63:13	19:16 22:2
	144:11,13,17	239:1,3 240:18	248:8	30:5 39:4
	144:20 145:5	245:16 247:25	open 97:23	40:23 41:11
	145:11,18,21	249:17,21,25	103:17,23	80:2 88:18
	146:4,12,17,21	250:6,15	247:2	114:7 126:2,20
	147:1,5,6,7,10	251:18 252:3	opened 107:5	127:5,10 130:6
	147:14 148:22	252:11 253:8	137:8 166:14	132:18 134:11
	152:6 153:15	253:22 254:7	opening 8:3,5	197:19 199:5
	155:10 157:5	255:8 256:2,4	65:8,9,23 75:1	202:10 204:2
	159:7 162:3,17	256:5,7 258:19	103:5,7 198:22	204:10 205:1,7
	163:19 165:7	258:21,21,24	199:10	212:24 213:6,8
	166:23 168:8	259:2,4,6,13	operate 98:23	213:15,16,18
	168:10,13	259:22 260:3,7	operated 19:15	213:21,24
	169:4 170:7	260:14 261:3,9	20:3	214:3,4,6,8,18

[order - paragraph]

	-		C
214:23,25	outline 101:20	193:14,21	161:25 205:21
215:5,6,8,9,10	outright	262:12	206:6 207:21
216:9,12,16	134:14	owned 20:2	paid 33:24
217:3 232:13	outside 42:25	70:13	34:14,22 35:6
235:22,25	43:1 51:23	р	35:16 45:6,16
241:6 245:21	53:10,22 80:19	p 4:1,1,21 5:20	47:24 48:21
246:1,3,7	81:8 82:10,11	p 4.1,1,21 5.20 7:6 8:1 30:4	50:4,18 51:8
251:2,3,4,10	231:24 241:9	210:6,9 220:1	52:24 53:2,10
251:17 261:8	overall 156:7	pace 68:6	53:20 55:11
261:22 263:24	171:8 206:1	pachulski 4:10	62:9,10,11
ordering	257:16	9:14,18,21	63:4,16,19
267:24	overarching	54:25 89:14	64:9 65:3
orders 39:9	13:22	98:6 144:19	125:25 126:18
88:14 93:12	overlap 32:18	237:1 263:15	127:11,22,23
204:12 227:20	44:3 54:14	269:6	130:7 132:2
ordinarily 93:1	overlapping	page 7:8 15:22	133:8,23
organization	53:2 57:23	15:23 102:14	138:21 139:2
165:14 186:20	overruled	102:25 102:14	181:16 222:8
organizations	96:23 122:25	102:23 103:3	265:7
123:21 154:22	124:16 139:17	107:10 111:16	paired 198:20
organize	188:7 193:1	112:16,18,22	papal 223:23
147:14 239:9	260:1	112:10,10,22	paper 74:4
organized	overruling	121:25 161:7	98:20
40:18	97:6	161:21,22	papers 85:18
oriented	oversee 231:23	161:21,22	paragraph
165:12	oversight	187:14,15	18:25 19:1,2,2
orienting	110:18 238:13	188:10,10,22	19:9,10,12,24
188:11	overwhelming	218:3,4,5,11	20:4 21:4,8
original 13:6	63:25 215:13	218:14 219:9	22:2,19,21,23
30:4 150:25	overwhelmin	220:23 222:6	23:2,8 26:10
251:14	63:18 206:3,3	223:3 259:9,11	26:17,21 31:14
originally	owe 42:5 85:24	259:14,16	31:16 101:18
86:15 197:15	86:9	260:4,14,16,18	102:12,13
orujlu 5:18	owed 21:3	260:20 261:4,4	111:21 112:24
outing 204:7	23:15	261:5	121:3,14,15,24
204:16	own 156:13	pages 15:21	122:12 136:19
	192:2 193:14	112:6 161:25	136:24 137:1
		112.0 101.23	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 423 of 529

[paragraph - parties]

Page 56

	-		-
138:1 154:16	34:11,14 35:15	63:22,25 65:3	198:25 199:2
158:4 163:19	35:17 36:2	71:10 85:16	201:7 212:24
165:20 169:4	45:11,18,22	87:3,12 90:8	214:14,17
171:3,18	46:16,25 47:2	92:9 116:13,23	225:14 243:1
172:11 178:3	47:3,3,16,23	132:2 134:20	257:15 259:24
180:7 181:2	47:24 48:12,16	148:11 154:21	259:24
194:6 210:7	48:18,21,25	156:23 160:17	participant
212:22 213:17	49:1,8,18,19	164:9 167:23	62:21,23
227:10,12,18	49:25 50:5,18	170:6,10,18	participants
238:2,16 241:1	51:8 76:12,18	185:8,9,11	62:24
247:8 253:12	77:9,11,18	192:2,10,12	participate
253:19 254:25	78:5 79:22	193:12,16,17	180:17 181:10
255:11,15	89:18,20,22	194:3,20,22,23	194:5
256:20 261:10	90:17 131:25	195:1 201:5	participation
paragraphs	135:1 136:22	203:4 209:8	19:4
239:2 250:7	137:11 138:4,5	210:3 211:21	particular
254:23	138:8,14,18,22	211:22 212:3	30:13 60:10
parallel 42:17	139:2,14	212:14 220:7	129:8 135:13
parameters	164:12,17	229:21,22,23	144:16 146:5
245:4	170:22 172:22	229:24 230:5,8	242:16
paraphrasing	185:10 193:24	242:14 244:8	particularized
137:20	194:5 200:3,5	245:6 246:5,16	69:11 71:21
pardon 42:2	200:10 211:9,9	249:4	particularly
67:23 81:4	211:11,14	parishes'	8:22 24:13
85:1 92:16	212:12 217:12	164:10	28:8,9 37:7
159:8 208:15	218:23 220:5,6	parish's 172:7	62:3 123:20
218:8 223:14	222:21 229:6,7	212:11	198:9 269:14
223:16	230:3,7 242:2	park 202:11	parties 3:7,12
parent 70:17	242:16 249:13	part 18:14 52:8	8:22 11:15,16
244:23	parish's 35:4	52:11 79:17	11:21 12:4,14
parish 11:25	48:17 74:9	86:2,3 107:3,7	14:10 21:20
19:9,18,24	91:13 138:13	110:1 118:9	33:1,2 49:19
20:8,12,13,19	parishes 11:17	121:5 154:13	51:18 54:6
20:25 23:25	17:12 18:13	169:25 170:24	58:15 59:14
24:13 27:7	23:9 32:13	180:8 185:21	75:11 85:15
31:21 33:12,17	36:25 37:1,21	185:22 197:14	86:15 88:17
33:20 34:2,6	62:10,12 63:19	197:21,22,22	139:25 144:24

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

212-267-6868

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 424 of 529

[parties - perpetrator]

	1		C
145:2 154:24	patrick 6:2	pays 47:4,25	63:18 65:2
155:1 156:23	pattern 26:21	62:22 63:3	102:18 132:1
169:7 181:5,9	199:4,16	109:6 245:8	151:17
181:13,14	226:10 243:7	pendency	percentages
187:7 216:19	pause 241:17	169:6	61:25
227:24 230:22	242:20 243:7	pending 11:14	perfect 251:15
261:22	pay 49:20,23	55:7 79:22	perfecting
parties' 251:7	52:12 55:1	81:9 213:5	100:17
partner 86:12	62:24 63:25	214:24 232:19	perform
86:13 267:17	85:7 90:7	244:21 269:19	176:22 177:1
parts 197:13	91:12 109:9	people 68:13	192:15 240:21
201:16	110:13 115:18	116:25 117:1	performance
party 32:8 45:1	117:2 122:21	150:24 159:21	151:2 239:12
50:10 75:20	123:10 124:7	160:10,12,14	performed
76:6 77:3,17	125:3 127:2,5	161:12,14	241:10
86:24 156:5,16	127:10 128:4,9	162:16,23	performing
157:11 167:6	128:12 129:23	163:7 173:17	249:13
167:15,21	131:11,17	175:22 190:25	period 39:2,23
169:17 171:19	134:16,17	191:11 204:7	54:9 60:10,20
172:4,9 175:7	135:15,21	246:21 265:7	61:20 81:8,23
177:14 179:10	136:1 139:7	266:23 267:1	157:3 169:22
183:3 184:9	140:24 142:2	percent 34:5	186:24 187:4
203:6 209:19	181:14	34:20 47:2,17	189:16 202:5
214:9,13,19	payable 117:20	47:23 48:20,25	periods 38:18
215:3 228:17	126:3 127:24	49:18,19 50:5	138:5
228:19,20	128:3	50:6 61:17,18	permissible
239:20 241:14	paying 52:6	62:9,10,10,11	198:10
243:9 244:4	54:20 62:20,21	62:12,12,15	permission
245:23 246:2	124:17 125:10	76:13,13,18	84:11 98:25
250:8,10 254:4	125:12,19	77:9 78:6	99:3 133:5
257:10	126:20 127:15	89:20 91:12	permit 8:4
passage 150:11	132:9 135:17	165:12 193:11	14:5 244:11
passed 151:5	payment 109:4	193:16 197:10	permitted 64:1
past 12:19	109:11 123:5	198:24,24	247:3 248:20
68:15 163:19	payments	226:19	perpetrator
patricia 6:18	125:22	percentage	20:5 24:15
		48:4 62:5	32:6 36:14

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 425 of 529

[perpetrator - pleading]

			C
136:11 223:10	216:4,4,8,12	phillips 27:9	places 175:20
226:2,21	216:13,15,18	phone 34:16	plaintiff 1:13
perpetrators	216:20 222:23	46:14 268:13	23:16 24:11
12:2 154:20	230:6 232:10	phrase 119:18	31:17 46:1,5
217:13	234:2,3,7	phrased	47:5 49:25
perplexed 88:6	235:12,14,14	250:14	50:1,3 136:23
person 3:13	237:6 238:5,12	physical	137:12,14
19:8 69:13	238:15 240:15	203:12,16	138:3,25
136:1 147:25	240:18 242:4,5	pi 13:7,10 14:8	200:20 204:15
148:5 160:13	242:15,22	14:15,16,22	204:15 226:1
160:24 220:25	269:21	17:17 22:2,11	226:20 264:11
235:9	perspective	27:20 30:4	265:21
personal 96:4	35:2 40:9	60:9	plaintiff's 35:5
123:13,15	204:2,24	piece 9:1 74:4	plaintiffs 24:11
158:5 167:9	peter 6:1	98:20 240:1	36:24 156:4
169:3 239:3	petition 11:19	piecemeal	163:21 181:15
personally	12:8 21:22	12:12 57:21	185:13 198:2
70:17 71:1	22:3 24:23	pitcher 94:17	208:1 210:13
150:3,15	27:4 28:11	pius 226:6	plaintiff's
227:24 234:22	66:14,15,18,20	placa 226:3,5,9	210:9 213:10
personnel	70:3,3,5 151:9	227:3	215:2,6 219:6
31:12 69:15	156:11,24	place 23:11	229:11 261:25
70:7 156:8,15	157:2 169:22	38:22 40:5,22	plan 12:21
157:2,10	171:5 203:8	73:5 77:6,17	61:11 78:4
158:14 159:5	213:2 216:14	81:23,24 87:23	80:23 81:10,17
159:13,16	217:2 229:9	95:25 108:6	116:3,4 147:8
161:8 172:2,7	238:4 239:6,13	113:20 114:1	plans 101:10
177:13,22	239:19,25	185:5 192:11	play 14:6 39:1
178:6 179:9	240:5,12,13	197:12 202:10	39:6 40:17
180:9,16,20	241:11 252:9	204:3,12 205:3	45:14,23
185:16,23	253:6 255:24	231:4 242:23	163:22
186:2 199:22	260:11	244:3 245:7	played 156:8
200:6,18 201:3	ph 218:21	258:6 260:6	playing 49:9
201:15,17,19	phase 13:12	placed 133:7	pleading
203:5 206:5	philadelphia	242:20	252:21 253:20
208:24 209:1	142:10	placement	254:14 255:2,9
215:16,22		95:21	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 426 of 529

[pleadings - posses]

			C
pleadings 33:1	132:14 133:4	54:10 55:12	126:22,25
155:10 157:25	179:16 198:5	65:2 84:21,22	127:4,12,14,18
212:19 248:5	225:7 245:10	91:9 101:19	127:23 128:8
253:23 254:11	pointing 24:19	109:12 110:6	128:11,14,16
pleasant 268:4	pointless	118:11 121:6	128:18,21,24
please 8:2	103:24	123:4 125:22	129:3,6,8,11
10:23 94:7,14	points 56:15	126:24 127:8	129:16,20,24
95:11 134:22	203:24	128:6,7,22	130:1,3,9
149:7,12,20	policies 7:9 9:8	129:17,22	131:24 132:5
163:1 167:11	9:25 10:6	130:5 135:19	133:11 140:1,7
173:22 174:10	17:21 43:20,20	135:23,25	140:17,21
183:5 195:24	43:24 44:14,16	136:3 138:5,6	141:11,14,17
196:4 201:8	45:4 49:12	138:25 141:6,6	141:20,22,24
219:3 237:23	51:5,17,19,20	141:7,9	142:9 143:23
plus 117:23	52:15,16 54:4	pool 232:16	146:2 258:5
172:25	54:15,17,25	population	porter's 97:24
pm 270:11	55:24 64:2	165:3	104:8 107:8
poc 200:20	84:9,15 85:9	porter 5:19 7:4	117:8 119:4
pocket 125:5	89:25 90:2,3,4	9:5 10:1 43:19	125:16
podium 93:24	92:3,4 95:25	94:7,8,13,15	portion 84:21
point 11:11	96:1,5,6	94:18,20,23,25	112:1 201:17
13:18,22,22	107:25 108:3,6	94:25 96:9	221:6 265:23
14:16 21:13	108:10,22,25	97:8 98:7,9	portions
22:20 23:10	109:3,18,22	99:10 106:5	201:20 208:23
24:9,14 31:24	110:5,5 113:13	107:22 110:8	209:1 265:17
32:3 37:6,25	121:4 123:11	111:6,8,13	posed 241:7
38:25 43:6	129:19 131:23	113:1,2,5	positing 48:3
44:11 50:14,15	134:6 135:20	114:20 116:20	position 55:14
53:9 57:24	139:19 160:19	116:20,21,24	125:3 149:20
60:7 61:4,22	201:25 208:8	117:3 118:10	166:8 182:12
62:1 69:22	216:5 229:14	121:17,23	211:22 212:4
71:7 74:6,15	230:17 232:6	122:1,3,7,11	212:11,17
76:2 81:21	232:23	122:13 124:9	222:24 269:17
86:23 87:2	policy 43:14	124:12,14,23	positions
89:3,18 90:15	44:6 47:9	124:25 125:9	212:15 238:12
118:4 128:1,2	51:23 52:2	125:25 126:7	posses 185:10
128:4 131:18	53:10,22 54:9	126:10,12,16	

[possesses - pretty]

[possesses precey	1		1 450 00
possesses	practice 26:21	prefer 93:8	prepetition
193:24 194:23	93:17 123:9	preference	11:22 12:16
possession	158:6 163:20	266:20	16:8 18:14
167:20 202:25	229:10	prejudgment	27:5,12 52:1
242:1,2	practiced	211:24 212:5	74:17 156:22
possibility	26:24	prejudice	158:13 159:4
60:14	practices 27:15	96:23 97:7	159:12 165:2
possible 15:20	practicing 74:1	241:7	171:7,9,15,19
34:25 38:5	pre 66:14,20	preliminary	198:4 199:3
46:2 63:2 66:6	70:3,3,5 157:2	3:4 8:19 11:12	203:1
72:21 92:13	198:13 213:2	12:25 13:2,5	present 4:19
105:14 249:19	217:2 229:9	13:14 38:13	49:18 183:7,25
possibly	238:4 239:6,13	40:22 41:10	presentation
263:16	239:19 240:12	42:6,21 43:2	51:14
post 24:23 27:4	241:11 252:9	56:15 58:7,12	presented
28:10,11 66:15	253:6 260:11	59:19 60:17	122:16,21
66:18 108:5	precarious	70:11 71:7	126:1 251:2
156:24 169:22	85:3	72:20 73:2,5	263:22
203:8 239:24	precede 126:17	88:18 107:8	presenting
240:5,13	preceding	115:15 152:13	8:24
pot 53:23	84:14 165:22	185:22 210:11	presided
116:14	precise 64:8	216:24 228:2	197:15,16
potential 15:11	249:9	premiums 51:8	244:20
181:7,12,23	precisely 90:24	62:5,19 63:4	president 95:7
182:2 199:23	205:12 240:9	63:16,19,25	presiding
potentially	precision	132:2	246:6
17:21 32:10	205:25	preparation	pressured
33:6 34:11	preclude 69:25	100:10 154:13	31:17
44:7 46:10,25	97:8	prepare 154:6	presumably
49:7 117:16	preclusion	248:23 250:17	140:17 242:23
140:18 269:20	46:8 68:4,19	prepared	presumption
power 19:6,11	76:5	46:20 74:10	76:6
practical 53:11	preclusive 50:9	100:4 129:15	pretrial 9:4
53:19 56:1	77:16 78:19	133:11 154:7	61:13 144:25
117:9,10	79:7,13	231:14,16	145:3
126:16 135:5	predated 96:5	preparing	pretty 56:7
204:1		235:5 250:23	180:22

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 428 of 529

[prevent - productions]

Page 61

prevent 67:7	100:1 148:12	152:14 164:1	produced 30:1	
prevented	156:10 158:8	164:17 165:5	30:8 31:11	
63:22,23	202:18 211:18	173:13 210:10	164:11,17,22	
preventing	243:16 245:25	245:6 267:16	164:25 165:4,5	
82:7	250:22	proceedings	165:10,16	
preview 16:1	priority 125:22	54:1 240:20	170:3,4,6,18	
44:12 57:24	privacy 243:4	270:10 271:4	170:22,24	
previewed 63:1	privilege 208:7	proceeds 34:13	199:13,25	
previously	231:12,14,16	44:15 63:12	200:3,8,17	
28:21 212:3	privileged	101:21 109:16	201:20 202:5,6	
227:21,21	208:4 231:10	119:14 121:7	203:15 205:21	
priest 20:14	privity 85:16	137:15 138:6	207:21 208:1	
30:24 136:11	85:17,18 86:19	138:16,17	208:11,22,25	
200:2,3,4,10	86:25 87:3,13	139:1,2 181:14	209:2,4,6	
216:12 218:23	pro 33:24	181:17 182:23	210:13,15	
219:24,25	probably 26:8	258:7	211:10 212:13	
222:4 223:18	53:4 62:20,21	process 13:23	215:17 216:21	
priests 28:22	62:22 72:4	14:5,10 25:9	227:21,22	
186:3 201:4	151:21 202:10	27:19 31:10,18	229:3 230:13	
216:9,16	234:17 266:23	39:1,6 40:17	231:9,18 232:8	
217:12 220:6	problem 43:11	49:9 50:2	232:20 234:4	
221:25 222:21	58:5,16 98:5	60:12 67:11	235:13 237:12	
242:15	procedures	78:7,19 100:1	242:11 269:21	
primary 51:19	201:25 216:5	147:20 151:11	269:22	
108:22 109:23	230:17	151:14 172:14	producing	
130:20,21	proceed 11:7	178:11 180:12	170:9 240:19	
139:21,24	84:12 163:21	185:22 189:9	product 250:22	
140:2,13,18	167:7,15 169:6	190:5 204:8	production	
141:15 178:10	177:15,24	238:7	13:9 200:6	
principal	179:19 182:24	produce 28:21	201:23 211:20	
150:12	185:3 186:18	29:16,19 30:7	211:23 229:12	
principle 98:23	191:19 195:1	30:13,20 164:6	229:14 233:2	
principles	209:20 237:22	164:12 167:5	243:11	
37:17 77:1	248:20,25	167:13 200:12	productions	
prior 11:19	proceeding 3:1	204:10 210:12	198:7 207:25	
23:17,25 56:23	13:6 81:3	227:14,25	211:11 231:3,4	
99:14,17,23	106:7 114:2	230:14,19	231:17,25	
			1	1

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com [productions - put]

			C
235:20	proof 15:6,9,10	protective	provisions 90:3
professional	16:5,7 17:9	199:5 202:10	192:21 194:9
151:18 265:4	31:25 37:12,15	204:12 205:1	provocative
professionals	42:16 49:9	227:20 232:13	82:15
12:7 265:7	50:2 59:11	235:21,24	psip 257:18,18
program 11:17	69:11 74:6	protocol 148:3	257:24 258:2
16:3 43:18,20	77:19 85:8	204:3,8,11	public 91:9
62:8 95:14,18	proofs 15:7,17	prove 24:12,12	245:1
119:17,20,21	17:19 50:13	46:17 59:8	pull 17:15 18:8
119:22,24	157:18,20,24	69:7	22:11
120:15,16	propensity	proved 85:6	pulling 106:11
123:14,15,22	148:12	provide 27:20	116:14
130:15 131:16	proper 160:21	54:5 98:15	pure 251:24
132:12,21	property 44:14	123:5 129:12	purely 68:21
138:4 247:13	44:16 45:5	161:16 220:18	68:23
248:3 257:16	56:2 113:21	220:19 232:1	purpose 68:21
258:3,4,9	proposal 93:16	238:24 245:5	97:3 110:20
programs 19:3	proposed	provided 13:4	117:7 145:18
19:6 101:20	172:18 198:1	95:19 138:7	purposes 11:6
124:15 143:10	proposition	145:1,13,14	76:10 97:6
143:12 172:22	238:10	165:2 170:10	108:1 213:21
progress 40:1	propounded	170:17 185:23	264:8,9
40:4 41:1,2,6	217:1 226:13	199:17,20	pursuant 29:13
58:15 72:24	proprietary	203:15 220:22	146:1,2 193:12
199:1 233:23	119:21	227:16 230:2,7	212:23 217:3
progressed	prosecute 22:5	232:9 234:7,8	249:12
199:8,9	22:6	235:15	pursue 59:14
prohibit 21:25	prosecution	provides 51:18	pursuing
projection	169:21	100:13	151:16
187:9	protect 68:22	providing	pursuit 239:10
promised	204:3	163:23 235:22	put 13:20
243:1	protected	province 19:25	17:23 32:12
prong 66:23	68:10	23:5,12	41:18 42:6
82:4	protection	provision	43:10 53:17
pronounced	68:18 201:24	125:22 135:20	64:5,11,20,21
223:12	206:25 207:2	135:25	66:10 69:21,23
	230:13		103:2 104:5,7

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 430 of 529

[put - really]

			8
104:22 105:14	115:8 118:8	99:2 143:18	rather 14:3
111:19 116:10	120:15 125:7	154:4 166:25	41:13,20
117:23,24	125:10 128:23	168:18,21	ratio 113:16,16
121:18 187:15	129:18 133:16	179:4 182:17	ratios 53:15
197:12 205:2	139:4 140:4,7	184:16 188:23	rbc 113:15,18
211:15 213:10	141:4 142:1	191:6,21	read 8:4 35:14
217:18,21,23	155:3 156:18	194:11 199:11	37:19 43:4
220:15 249:19	159:15,18	216:25 228:7	96:22 111:16
252:4	161:5 162:9	238:1 256:6,19	112:23 114:4,8
putting 67:2	163:1 167:2,11	257:17,23	120:9 121:7,14
76:3 131:17	170:20 173:21	266:15 267:8	137:20 138:7,9
px 103:10	173:22 174:11	268:9 269:10	139:4 171:3
q	174:12,13	quibble 80:9	175:16 225:14
qualified 101:8	175:14,17	quick 25:3	reader 251:5
quantify	177:21 183:5,6	quickly 53:7	253:11
102:18	183:12,15,16	59:12	reading 35:25
quaranta 5:20	183:19 184:15	quite 173:8	121:11 122:4,7
quaranta 5.20 question 16:14	187:23,23	187:4	161:4,6 162:3
17:1 25:14,20	196:15 201:14	quoted 253:21	211:8 256:1
26:18 27:10	201:22 202:2	r	ready 65:12
28:19 30:13	208:21 210:17	r 2:1 4:1,22	149:1 261:12
31:8,10 34:16	210:22,23,25	5:23 6:5 8:1	261:17,20,23
41:6 42:5	211:1 225:2	145:7 258:12	262:1,17
44:15 45:9	234:1,24 235:1	258:16 259:5	real 25:3 40:25
46:9,13,19	235:3 237:5	271:1	41:2,6 51:5
50:8,12,12	243:1 244:6	raise 83:12,13	58:16 59:4
51:11 52:1,21	253:23 257:20	94:9 97:3	80:10 82:21
56:20 63:10	258:23 262:11	149:7 195:19	85:11,13 92:13
64:3,9 71:11	262:13 264:11	raised 11:2	180:15
73:1,3 76:11	269:18	30:23 41:15	reality 16:7
77:23 81:24	questioning	87:20 88:10	realize 38:21
82:10,15 83:4	146:3 187:18	133:19 222:7	realized 242:25
83:20 84:2	187:21 188:9	range 54:8	realizing 61:24
85:9 87:17	188:12 236:18	144:15	reallocate
91:24,25	245:17	ranging 95:17	172:14
102:11 111:13	questions	rata 33:24	really 17:11
111:19 114:18	42:13 93:4		34:18 41:1

[really - referred]

			C
56:18 57:2	257:1,3	reconcile 16:21	redact 227:23
58:20,23 60:11	recalling	record 15:18	redacted 21:17
67:18 68:4	139:20	16:23 36:11	205:5 227:25
80:6 81:15	receive 97:1	38:15 53:13	redaction
84:23 85:5	248:5	80:24 104:19	204:2,8,11,15
102:22,22	received	107:14 108:14	243:15
140:3,15	104:14 198:17	119:2,7 120:5	redactions
191:10 246:4	236:13 240:3	144:16 170:20	205:4,13
265:21 268:8	243:9	256:14 267:11	243:23
reason 29:22	receivership	268:7 271:4	redirect 7:3
36:22 40:1	110:16,17	recording	93:6 96:24
46:21 214:22	114:13,14	233:23	143:19,20
219:19 230:12	recent 67:14	records 27:7	184:17,18
261:15	recently 152:1	28:13,21 30:22	192:25 194:17
reasonable	190:10	163:23 167:23	256:11
23:16	recess 65:21	192:12 193:15	redone 204:23
reasons 42:22	66:2,4 143:25	194:3,21,22	reduce 169:10
45:8	148:24 195:11	199:22 201:25	reduced
rebut 117:8	195:14 228:9	203:10 204:4	238:14
rebuttal 7:10	233:21,22	204:10 208:12	reduction
7:11 146:16	recitation	208:21	160:9
213:10 217:4	265:3	recover 34:1	reductions
263:24 264:3,7	recognize	34:13,23 46:11	160:7,11
264:25 265:13	38:20,23 59:13	48:22 53:11	refer 119:3
265:23	recognized	59:8 64:1	155:6 166:5
recall 99:10	53:14	140:14	200:1 201:17
101:23 110:16	recognizing	recoverable	253:11
118:18 168:19	250:24	46:18	reference
168:20 178:16	recollection	recovered 34:7	22:23,24 26:14
179:2,6 186:8	114:11 161:4	recovering	197:9 210:8
187:19 188:3,9	162:6 200:7	63:23	referenced
188:16 189:4	211:11 220:16	recovers 33:15	199:16 200:23
194:6 210:3	220:25 224:17	34:3,4,5,7,19	references
211:19 217:11	226:18 227:5	49:1	200:25
217:14 228:16	258:13 261:8	recross 7:3	referred
228:16 243:16	recommend	191:25 256:10	152:10 157:22
256:23,24	230:25		162:19 170:1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 432 of 529

[referring - remember]

	-		_
referring 28:5	199:2 212:24	169:7,24 170:5	releases 135:6
111:22 155:8	214:14,17	170:6,22,24	135:11
158:20 161:8	register 157:21	171:15,18	relevance
165:24 166:21	157:23	181:5,9,13,14	264:23,25
175:13 213:6	regulate 245:7	183:3 185:7,12	relevant 29:19
213:17 238:15	rehabilitation	194:8 201:3	30:1 52:2 97:6
240:16 251:21	53:18 114:2	204:17 208:19	154:11 164:14
refers 118:20	reimbursable	231:19 232:10	215:14 227:14
254:23	121:6	relatedly	227:23 231:9
refior 6:19	reimburse 55:2	181:11	251:6
reflect 36:11	55:5,18 120:23	relates 68:3	relief 38:17
204:4 250:13	122:17	150:11 165:1	60:13 133:13
251:15	reimbursed	165:25 170:13	134:11
reflected 38:6	34:11 49:23	172:16 184:10	religious 19:15
38:14 211:15	138:16	185:6,15 187:2	208:20 216:9
212:15 254:6	reimbursement	189:16 190:6	216:16 219:14
254:22,24	128:3	194:7 219:25	relitigate 46:7
reflection	reinsurance	226:2,21 252:7	rely 86:19
38:25	95:22	252:23	100:7 193:12
refresh 114:11	reject 148:10	relating 28:2	193:17
155:4 161:3	rejoining	30:15 163:14	relying 124:14
162:6	208:20	170:9 219:23	126:19 129:16
refusing 26:22	relate 25:8	223:1 229:23	remain 39:21
regard 52:7,11	57:6 194:10	231:15 241:24	40:22 209:21
53:19 219:7	222:20,21,22	241:25 247:11	238:5
225:15	related 3:5	relationship	remainder
regarding 27:6	8:22 11:14,16	12:4,14 21:2	193:13,19,21
27:8 39:12	11:20 12:4	154:25 218:20	remained
138:23 164:17	16:5 17:19	219:4,6,7,7	23:11
168:1 200:13	29:24 30:20	220:20,24	remaining
210:2 211:21	32:7 42:16	223:9 225:15	139:6
216:2 219:5	54:6 83:25	relationships	remains 248:2
237:12 238:2	92:1 151:14	222:10	remedied
257:3,13	154:19,25	relay 86:20	72:13
regional	156:23 158:15	release 135:2	remember
197:12,14	159:15 160:20	137:13 194:7	26:12 66:3
198:14,25	164:21 165:16		73:25 167:24
1	1	1	1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 433 of 529

[remember - resolution]

Page 66

-	-		-
168:13 182:16	180:8,10,12,14	representative	171:11 172:2
182:19 211:25	180:23 181:20	26:8 79:12	172:21 177:13
removal 88:25	189:14 240:22	representing	177:23,23
remove 87:25	repeat 122:5	151:18 196:16	178:7 180:16
88:12,14 89:3	repeated 44:6	229:24 230:8	180:24 184:8
removed 14:23	repeating	234:9 269:12	210:1 227:19
removing	79:18	represents	248:23
88:21	rephrase	142:10 229:22	requirements
renewed 187:1	143:11	reproduce	167:17
renewing	replace 190:25	227:19	res 37:24 57:22
160:18	replacements	request 29:20	66:25 68:18
renker 70:24	190:19,24	30:12 40:15,15	72:15 85:13
71:24 72:3	reply 61:4,20	73:2 241:5	86:23 163:25
150:21 161:9	87:20 265:22	269:11	165:21 166:17
162:20 163:13	report 28:15	requested	168:1,14,24
166:2 168:6,7	31:17 111:14	38:17	181:8 182:8
168:8,9 171:11	115:3,5,10,12	requests 27:23	rescap 244:23
172:15,19	116:10 118:1	27:25 28:1	244:24
173:4,16,24	154:13 155:21	29:1 178:7,8	reserve 117:17
174:5,14,23	200:24 224:1,7	179:13 195:2	146:15 256:10
176:10,15,17	226:9	198:1,6,8	265:23 266:6
176:18,22	reported 40:25	199:4,16 213:2	reserved 3:9
177:2 178:5	220:25	217:8,11	134:14 265:19
179:22,25	reportedly	243:10,13,14	reserves
180:3 187:19	30:17	243:21 249:1	115:21 116:11
189:7 206:16	reporter	require 42:18	117:18
238:19,22,22	251:25	69:19 135:20	reserving
239:11,14	reporting	179:13 192:13	92:18 96:14
240:2 241:3,10	222:9 224:13	194:2,4 205:13	residential
241:15	248:14 257:12	205:14 232:6	244:20
renker's 188:4	repository	241:15	residents 226:6
188:12,19	215:13	required 28:20	resides 232:3
189:3	represent	30:20 74:8	resist 37:2
reorganization	270:2	75:17 156:14	resisted 215:7
67:11 69:19,21	representations	157:2,10	resolution 73:7
69:25 71:20	143:3	164:11,24	78:7 79:8
72:10 169:10		167:5,13	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 434 of 529

[resolve - return]

Page 67

			e
resolve 40:18	232:9 235:16	217:17 220:15	175:8 176:12
50:13 58:25	239:5,24	220:17,20	176:23 177:7
173:2	240:18 241:1	221:21 222:9	177:10 179:20
resolved 41:13	247:8 248:9	241:4	180:21 186:8
78:3 127:2	257:5,14,14	responsibilities	186:11,16
135:2	respectfully	95:15 161:12	188:5,14,20
resolves 12:22	269:11	173:9 179:24	189:4,22
resolving 59:2	respective	180:4 191:3	191:18 230:4
resources 41:5	235:18	240:4 257:6,8	265:5
41:14 110:20	respond 44:7	responsibility	rests 264:13
215:4	47:20 48:9	48:12 132:8	result 33:13
respect 14:17	51:11 55:9	142:6 220:7	56:25 73:1,4
15:2,17 16:10	221:1 244:4	257:23 258:9	80:23 138:24
16:17 20:8	261:22 269:16	responsible	158:7,12
25:25 27:7	responded	49:18,19,20	241:21
36:14 37:17	168:4 198:6	132:19 138:14	resulted
39:10 43:17	224:25 226:13	174:16 176:13	198:19,20
49:6 50:20,24	responding	196:24 241:12	resume 13:24
52:22 55:9	52:3 54:18	249:3 257:17	147:1 172:13
67:22,24 68:25	124:7 158:10	responsive	178:4 241:18
74:17,23 84:7	response 9:9	167:20 243:12	resumed 238:6
89:11 92:3	41:16 42:5	243:14,25	241:13 247:12
95:9 123:19,19	48:9 87:11,11	244:1	resuming
123:20 131:15	96:16 198:7	rest 264:11,16	14:11
132:3,3 161:20	199:15,18,19	restate 163:1	retained 95:20
164:4 165:15	211:13 214:6	167:11 173:22	265:5
172:8 174:5,15	216:25 219:10	257:21	retention 131:6
175:6 176:11	220:2 221:4,10	rested 265:16	131:11,18,22
181:9 188:15	222:7 223:8	restricted	132:4,15
188:23 189:2	224:11 226:3	235:22	138:15 140:12
189:21 194:20	226:23 234:24	restriction	141:16 142:3,5
197:7 199:14	236:11,12	236:3	retentions
201:22 202:17	237:4 249:3	restrictions	95:20 132:9
203:12 214:18	responses	234:16	173:1
214:23 221:5	27:24,24 160:1	restructuring	return 113:12
221:13 226:10	160:3 199:18	13:23 150:13	210:10
227:3,15 231:8	200:9 217:8,14	173:7 174:6,15	

[returned - rosalee]

Page 68

returned 47:7	81:12 84:13,19	184:11 186:23	119:14 132:21
returns 47:13	84:25 86:13	189:7 193:23	158:14,24
78:4	90:1 91:11,18	195:6,9,15,19	159:6,14,21
reverts 132:16	92:15 93:13	196:18 197:4	160:12,14
review 14:20	94:9,14 96:12	202:11 205:6,6	162:12 171:13
17:24 25:9	97:18,22 99:7	205:17 207:6	206:17 238:19
96:6 99:18	99:15,20,24	207:11,23	241:7 247:9
171:11 172:19	100:14 101:3	210:14 211:19	256:21 257:9
188:22 203:8	105:13,13	215:21 216:17	risks 38:1 67:2
227:23 241:6	106:1,4,18	217:3 225:12	67:4 81:15
241:15 255:22	107:2,21 108:6	226:16 229:8	113:13 168:1
reviewed 15:7	108:21,22,25	231:6 233:20	168:14,24
155:10,14	110:1,22,23	233:24 236:17	181:23 182:2
157:18,21,22	112:23 117:18	236:23 237:16	182:11,13,15
157:25 204:17	118:25 120:23	237:20 239:10	road 271:21
220:20 243:10	121:8,9 122:18	239:14 240:23	roadmap
reviewing	123:23 124:1,2	245:2 247:15	253:20
155:21	125:6 126:22	250:12 252:10	robinson
reviews 231:10	127:12,25	252:25 253:5	205:13
revised 232:13	128:8 129:3,8	253:24 254:3,3	rockville 1:8
revival 79:25	130:24 131:1	254:18 255:8	1:12 3:2 95:10
ribatu 218:21	131:11,12,20	260:6 264:2	95:25 116:23
218:23 219:16	132:17,23,25	266:9 267:4	123:20,23
richard 225:25	133:20 134:3	rights 84:18	124:2,5,18
richmond	134:13 135:7	85:22 90:5,8	126:9 143:1
142:18	135:24 136:13	134:15 256:10	149:24 214:11
right 8:2 9:24	136:17,18	265:18	role 12:5 32:9
10:4,15 18:3	137:7,15 139:7	rise 37:9 269:7	151:11 156:8
22:9 31:13	140:24 141:4	risk 53:15 56:8	209:13 241:9
35:8 37:4,22	141:11,19,20	57:9 72:14	roles 32:9
40:6 47:12	141:22 142:8	76:4,5 79:18	163:22 177:17
48:11 50:22	143:8,24	80:17 81:6	186:6
56:23 59:20	146:11 148:21	84:23 85:14	roman 1:8,12
60:6,24 61:2	148:22,25	86:23 90:23,25	3:1 20:6
61:19 65:22	149:7 153:15	101:21 102:2	room 229:4
66:5,7 73:14	159:10 160:9	102:16,19	rosalee 220:5
80:5,7 81:1,7	173:12 182:3,4	109:15 113:15	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 436 of 529

[rosenblum - section]

Page 69

rosenblum	runoff 113:25	48:7 49:17	scramble 40:12
5:21	114:21	55:12 64:17,17	screen 15:20
roughly 60:24	runs 60:22	68:4,5,9 71:23	43:19 56:24
62:20 132:10	S	91:14 103:25	103:3 104:22
197:9 198:24	s 3:6 4:1,17 5:3	113:9 116:10	105:1 111:5,25
199:17 202:8	5:9,13 8:1	116:17 135:25	120:1,7 145:21
213:9 251:16	sake 49:16	136:3 137:2	152:21 187:15
royal 43:22	sake 49.10 sale 151:16	213:24 218:21	217:19,21,24
49:11,12 51:16		221:6 223:9	249:23 250:4
52:5,15,16	sampling	225:19 226:24	252:5
53:9 54:15,15	226:19 santa 116:2	261:11	screens 108:15
55:22,24 62:17	santa 110.2 sarah 72:22	sc 248:9	108:16
84:7,9,15 85:9	satisfaction	scas 155:8	scribbles 74:4
89:25,25 92:3	34:17 45:9,14	scenario 34:11	search 30:14
107:25 108:2	46:14	35:1,9 81:16	searching
108:22 110:5	satisfied 33:17	140:23 142:1	27:22
114:19	33:18 45:13,21	scenarios	season 247:2
rt 251:25	125:23	151:7	seat 94:14
rubric 197:11	satisfy 50:19	scenes 191:12	149:12 195:24
rule 17:16	101:16	268:13	seated 8:2
34:17 40:21	saw 27:23,23	schedule 59:21	sec 258:20
45:14 56:17	54:9 74:16	249:12 266:17	second 22:11
57:18 136:6	saying 40:20	scheduled 16:8	22:18 23:9
206:7 254:24	41:5 59:24	41:17 60:1	40:7 46:21
ruled 38:16	66:3 70:2	70:18 266:14	48:16 52:15
56:16	78:24 82:12,15	scheduling	56:7 97:23
rules 33:6	84:20 93:17	267:14,19	106:14 107:10
46:22 88:20	101:23 105:19	scherer 6:25	113:2 140:5,13
250:24 255:1	122:11 125:18	school 20:3	140:19,24
ruling 43:6	127:19 136:22	46:16 219:12	142:2 149:2
77:4 82:21	137:11 139:12	schools 172:22	198:19 261:10
96:21	148:13 222:3	scope 30:12	secret 28:17,21
rulings 244:7	225:23 244:12	192:25 198:9	30:17 170:19
run 85:6	244:25	198:10 203:23	201:1,10 205:4
233:24,24	says 30:6 35:20	244:13 263:9	208:23
running	36:21 39:5	scouts 44:22,23	section 37:8
113:23 178:10	45:1 47:15,16	45:1	38:3 42:23

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

212-267-6868

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 437 of 529

[section - shared]

43:2 56:4,15	seeing 59:25	separate 10:10	setting 42:17
56:22 253:20	seek 19:3 39:13	44:21 45:11	144:23 154:18
sections 3:5	46:7 53:17	61:6 93:12	settle 58:22
8:20	85:25 114:1	227:22 254:11	137:12 138:24
securities	185:13 214:4	separately	settled 58:16
70:13	seeking 14:4,7	32:14 34:23	134:20 136:23
see 14:14,25	34:12 67:6	48:13 219:12	settlement 38:8
15:13,16 18:20	84:10 190:19	220:5	55:4 80:11,13
18:23 19:1	197:20 229:13	series 32:5	116:4,5 126:17
20:9,23 21:1,6	seem 45:13	serious 84:7	133:10 136:1
22:18 23:2,8	78:9	262:9,10	139:14 171:12
26:13 27:24	seems 43:7	268:15	248:6
35:2,19 39:9	246:24	seriously 84:1	settlements
43:13 47:22	seen 22:8 29:23	serve 74:3	63:24 127:9
51:1,2 57:12	56:10 103:12	served 133:4	172:3,18
57:14 60:12	103:25 104:2	133:23 134:12	settles 135:6
64:19,21 70:2	105:4,7 113:3	135:12,16,21	seven 132:11
74:13 93:7	124:1 136:4	136:6 218:23	seventy 54:13
97:14 105:12	190:23	243:14	several 11:24
118:19 120:7	select 152:4	services 95:17	13:7 19:3
129:19 137:17	selected 249:9	100:13 164:8	32:21 33:1,11
137:18,24	self 95:19	185:4 192:10	33:11,16 45:6
147:10 148:22	131:5,11,17,22	192:15,18,22	47:23 48:1,7
148:23 162:1	132:3,8,14	193:5,8,13	49:4 136:16
163:10 187:24	138:15 140:12	194:1,7 249:5	142:7 148:3
190:2,7 213:4	141:15 142:2,5	249:6,8,8,12	severally 89:21
213:25 218:22	173:1	249:14	91:13
218:25 219:16	send 239:24	session 65:22	sex 61:11
219:18 222:6	senior 238:12	195:15 233:25	217:13
232:24 236:5	sense 73:22	set 3:8 67:9	sexual 32:5
249:23 253:18	125:14 147:23	171:4 219:22	138:4 154:19
253:22 256:22	258:25	219:24 225:25	sexually 26:23
259:19 260:3,5	senses 60:3	226:20 229:4	shaded 53:5
260:14 261:1,3	sent 202:7	253:11 254:16	share 49:24
261:13 267:7,9	sentence	267:14	138:22 237:18
267:9 268:21	109:20	sets 243:23	shared 10:24
270:8			10:25 15:11

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 438 of 529

[shared - sorry]

			e
57:8 133:3,9	211:16	siobhain 6:18	smart 67:21
133:20 164:8	sides 24:10	sir 89:24 104:2	smith 205:8,12
172:21 183:4	41:8 83:15	118:18 131:15	software
230:4 233:1,3	87:18 265:16	132:20 138:15	251:14
236:1 237:8	sign 178:7	138:16,20	solely 21:20
247:13	signature	139:4 140:8,9	solemnly 94:10
shares 243:16	260:3,5 261:5	140:17,24	149:8 195:19
she'll 39:20	261:10 271:6	sirs 257:14	solid 117:4
shift 13:13	signed 153:1	258:7	solutions
14:1 42:21	154:8 196:19	sister 206:22	271:20
151:8	significant	sit 17:1 184:2	solve 41:20
shifting 68:22	171:8 185:6,23	193:10 239:14	solved 268:17
short 8:3,5	198:8 211:20	sits 67:23	solvent 33:17
28:3 39:23	261:21,23	sitting 221:21	somebody 74:3
93:21 149:1	262:21	222:10 261:15	77:17 78:23
228:9	significantly	situation 44:23	88:12 90:15
shouldn't 87:5	170:23	46:24 48:5	121:18 139:5
show 24:20	signify 107:24	50:19 113:9	148:5 166:12
28:25 29:11	silicon 38:11	134:19,25	205:10 228:12
30:22 36:23	silvershein	244:2	228:14 236:9
85:16 99:1	5:22	six 160:12	236:23 263:15
111:24 191:11	similar 22:19	187:7 255:23	sonya 3:25
showed 216:20	143:10 185:24	skip 57:13	271:3,8
showing 10:10	198:15 214:22	slam 46:13	soon 61:16
28:22 105:2	215:5,9 217:14	slash 251:22	sorensen 5:24
shown 36:2	261:12	slide 15:21	sorry 8:7,14
106:22 107:14	similarly	16:1 17:15	9:13 25:17
258:18	172:20 189:19	43:17 56:23	29:5 46:4 52:9
shows 38:2	240:1 247:9	103:6	74:24 77:24
51:2,3 71:9	simply 71:21	slides 10:20,24	94:5 98:3
107:9	72:14	11:3 43:13	112:9 120:18
shuffling 191:3	single 34:17	57:13	122:5 125:13
sick 82:9	45:3,9,14	slightly 54:4	130:23 153:7
side 8:5 16:2	46:14 69:13,13	130:12 165:3	163:3 175:3
24:11,11 55:13	83:19 197:14	slome 5:23	184:22 187:20
87:16 88:13	252:15,21	small 102:22	193:17 216:3
144:17 160:2			222:13 225:14

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 439 of 529

[sorry - state]

Page 72

			8
226:14 236:21	219:15 220:7	spending 41:14	stang 4:10 5:25
247:16 252:21	221:7 226:7	159:20,21	9:19,22 54:25
255:13 257:1	specific 31:24	180:23	89:14 98:6
257:19,21	31:25 111:21	spent 43:5	144:19 269:7
261:3 264:12	119:24 120:14	154:14 240:18	start 3:10
269:2	120:16 127:16	240:21,24	11:10 60:8
sort 31:22	128:23 130:7	split 66:21	97:22 132:1
110:17 126:1	131:15 138:19	spoken 147:24	137:10 183:19
200:4 216:6	139:2,8 144:14	sponsored	259:10 265:21
221:3 222:10	194:6 199:19	244:21	266:17 267:4
226:18 246:17	220:15 221:20	ssap 113:12	started 9:1
251:24 252:1	224:17 227:5	st 20:2,6 23:4	151:5 158:11
sorted 204:13	228:1 229:13	220:4 226:6	244:25
sorting 251:15	243:13,14,20	stabilized	starting 13:12
sorts 201:25	243:20,20	151:22	138:1 226:20
sought 12:13	253:12	stack 258:20	starts 51:1
169:23 242:10	specifically	staff 206:19	141:7,9 174:11
244:24	29:23 57:6	stage 12:19	225:22
sound 80:23	68:3 95:10	37:7,25 70:16	state 8:21
sounded	101:7,24	stake 84:22	11:13 12:10,12
162:10 210:22	111:15 124:17	stale 245:20	13:13 14:1,11
sounds 121:8,9	150:19 166:2	stand 94:7	14:13,14,17
213:9	225:8 241:2	186:22 195:18	15:19 23:23
source 203:4	specifics	235:10	24:6,6 27:2,6
254:24 257:10	128:17 129:12	standard 56:19	28:10 36:5
southern 1:2	specified	67:8 83:23	37:16,17 40:13
232:19 244:22	218:24 250:7	220:3	40:19 42:15
span 72:16	speculate	standardized	46:5,22 53:20
spare 76:1	167:16	74:20 213:1	55:25 61:6,8
speak 8:13,18	speculating	217:1,8 219:23	63:13 66:13
132:5 212:14	246:5	226:12	68:8,9,9 69:16
212:15 236:24	speculation	standards 86:9	70:25 71:10
speaking 139:8	246:9	standing 269:4	73:14,20,20
216:11	speed 21:9	standpoint	75:6,15,20,23
speaks 16:24	spend 14:12	72:13 164:3	77:2,9 80:8
special 21:2	41:5,19 238:13	191:11	88:2,15 89:19
110:19 209:10	240:24		110:2 117:15
1	1	1	1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 440 of 529

[state - streamline]

Page 73

			e
133:7 155:7,11	230:14,21	statute 75:20	259:8 260:3
155:18 156:7,9	234:9 235:15	statutory 53:16	262:16 267:17
156:15 157:25	235:23 236:1,4	stay 12:13 14:5	stephens'
158:10,16	238:4,6,13	14:7 15:4,12	249:20
159:15 162:25	239:5,13,18	21:25 22:3	stepped 234:18
163:9,14,21	241:8,10,11,13	38:5,21,23	steps 74:5
164:15,21,25	241:14,21,24	40:11 43:25	stevens 70:2
165:10,16	242:13,18	47:6 48:24	227:12
167:6,14,20	245:6,22,22	53:5 58:14	stipulated
169:5,16,22,25	246:5,10,12	59:3 74:7 75:2	10:13 17:23
171:9,15	247:3,12 248:9	77:6,16 81:23	53:6 63:5 80:1
172:12,25	248:19,24	84:12 86:11	80:2 88:14
173:5,13,18,25	250:8,9 255:23	117:15 133:6	103:1 251:3,9
174:6,17 175:7	257:3,5 260:10	138:2 184:5	stipulating
176:13 177:3,7	261:6 263:2	244:9,10	64:16
177:13,24	269:12,15,22	stayed 27:4	stipulation
178:4,13,18,24	269:25	202:20 214:20	29:15,18 64:18
179:9,19 180:1	stated 153:11	staying 210:20	82:11 144:10
180:17,24,25	154:18 162:14	stays 42:24	145:3,7 200:16
181:3,11,15,17	170:20 215:12	steinman	210:5 211:10
182:24 183:5	217:12 219:9	197:16	232:8
184:8 185:2,25	statement	stephens 6:1	stipulations
186:17 188:4	110:25 111:16	7:6 27:10,18	29:12 88:11
188:13,20	111:17 112:20	31:9,11 57:16	145:1
189:3,16,21	115:2 125:15	57:16 58:3	stole 36:7,12
190:6 191:19	125:16 221:12	195:18,23	stoneking 6:2
196:23 197:2	245:1 264:18	196:1,2,8,10	stop 77:23
197:11 202:12	264:20,21,24	196:12 202:4	188:1
203:2,19	statements 8:4	202:21 205:14	strang 237:1
204:10,12	8:5 53:12	206:11 207:5	strategic
205:2 206:15	199:10 208:9	207:17,19,20	150:10
209:16,18,25	states 1:1,19	212:23 213:13	strategies
211:18,24	218:22 219:11	213:16 224:6	171:12 172:17
213:2,22 214:5	220:4 223:22	235:3,11 238:1	strategy 58:12
215:14 217:2	226:5 238:3	245:19 246:9	172:8
219:13 227:20	statuary 53:16	249:17 256:17	streamline
228:18 229:16		256:19 258:11	246:8

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 441 of 529

[strenuously - supposed]

Page 74

			-
strenuously	82:25 83:11,14	206:8	summarize
89:2	83:16 91:25	substantially	253:1
stress 117:24	92:1 99:22	155:2	summarizes
117:24 226:12	109:9 153:13	substituting	252:9
stretch 59:4	155:6 184:5	35:3,4	summarizing
75:2 82:21	207:12 213:1	succeeded	250:6
266:16	218:22 219:10	138:3	summary
stretched	220:3 226:4	success 180:8	17:16,20 21:17
190:2	232:8 244:11	successful	55:21 104:15
stretching 66:7	269:20	180:10	250:7
stricken	subjects 99:13	sue 85:24 86:6	super 94:18
265:18	submissions	sues 85:23	supervise 19:7
strictly 123:23	100:17	suffer 66:24	19:12 241:4
strike 136:4	submit 116:16	180:14	247:10
179:16 183:6	207:4	suffered 58:20	supervised
183:19	submitted	suffice 247:6	217:7 220:14
strong 41:8	85:18 99:14,15	sufficient 45:4	221:2
stronger 83:16	154:14 155:24	113:11 266:3	supervising
structure	subpoenaed	suffolk 197:11	219:8 225:16
95:18 197:20	228:20	197:14 199:8	225:19
222:23 223:17	subrogation	212:25	supervision
stuart 5:13	90:4	sugayan 6:3	12:1 20:18
stuff 81:18	subsequent	suggest 43:3	21:5,11 23:24
147:14 155:15	222:9	97:12 115:5	25:5 32:8
styled 254:4,20	subset 165:1	246:14	36:20 91:3
255:2	206:4 238:13	suggested	238:6 250:21
su 2:5	252:7	28:16 30:17	supply 112:10
subject 14:15	subsets 227:25	37:19 110:11	support 13:10
14:22 15:4	subsidiary	110:12	89:5 107:8
16:12 17:3,9	70:13	suggests 75:20	110:12
17:10,17 23:21	substance	130:18	supporting
24:1 30:22	250:11	suite 271:22	151:11
38:5 40:23	substantial	sum 55:20	supports 64:7
41:11 43:24	40:4 67:3,12	250:11	suppose 135:8
53:4 64:25	71:18 76:5	summaries	supposed
72:20,23 75:7	82:2 171:14	57:18 253:2	104:21 116:12
79:25 82:17,22	180:15 202:8		223:3

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 442 of 529

[supreme - tell]

Page 75

supreme 245:1	survivor's 77:8	246:15 263:12	task 204:18,22
sure 8:6 10:8	survivors	taken 13:11	239:7,7
15:15 17:4	12:23 58:19	63:3 110:19	tasks 158:25
19:22 37:3	59:1,7 82:6	125:3 151:18	159:22 161:5
45:15 60:8	109:8,13 110:1	199:3 212:3	162:11,16
72:6 74:12	125:6,11,17,20	231:4	163:11,12,13
88:19 89:2	126:15 204:3,5	takes 65:19	174:16 176:12
90:18 95:12	sustain 262:12	68:5 72:9	176:22 177:1
98:16,18 102:7	sustained	118:1	177:23 184:25
107:13,15	136:8 137:19	talk 12:8 57:11	186:15 188:16
112:2 119:7	sustaining	72:12 76:23	191:18 197:7
120:7 132:5,6	16:18	147:2 160:16	197:18 239:4
145:19 147:16	svb 38:12 58:7	161:9 222:6,9	240:21
147:22 152:3	70:10,12	258:2 268:10	tax 38:2 56:17
159:18 162:10	swear 94:10	talked 57:7,8	team 150:14,20
197:9 199:15	149:8 195:20	57:22 67:16	151:4 185:1
201:6,13 205:9	switch 145:15	talking 28:4	186:16 196:24
209:12 210:17	228:9 241:20	31:11 37:8	217:7 220:14
222:17,25	switchover	61:25 68:2	249:2 250:19
228:10 245:24	233:10	79:19 83:24	teasing 73:10
250:19,21	sworn 93:2,21	84:13 88:24	technical
255:22 256:11	94:9	92:6 104:23	114:16,17
257:25 258:2,6	sydney 6:11	119:3,13	teed 203:22
265:24 266:18	system 49:4	122:10 123:23	242:18
surprise	t	136:15,16	telephone
250:21	t 5:10 271:1,1	139:11 165:24	41:15 268:1
surprised 24:3	take 11:23	177:16,19	telephonically
64:8	15:19 21:14	183:25 184:2	4:19
surprising	27:1 32:11	187:18 198:14	tell 9:11 30:25
21:24	37:7 65:11	202:7 205:16	88:13 94:25
survived 35:16	69:20 81:24	205:17,18	95:3,8 112:16
survivor 33:15	89:20 94:17	223:20 224:13	115:23 116:1
34:1,5,19	95:18 98:1	241:2 242:12	128:19 129:1,5
45:10,11 46:15	143:25 146:22	261:7	129:13,15
46:16 78:5	179:24 195:11	talks 254:25	130:7 146:23
82:11 136:10	228:8 233:13	targeted	148:16 149:20
204:16,24	238:10 245:15	227:25	168:5 197:6
	1		

[tell - that's]

Page 76

			e
199:13 234:6	227:12 245:25	227:11 228:2,3	207:16 212:22
254:7 255:3	testify 27:10	234:1 238:2	213:14 218:1
ten 65:17 143:3	64:5 158:5	241:1 243:6	222:15 237:20
143:7 152:4	167:19 178:6	245:19 247:8	237:20 255:20
195:11 198:24	193:4,7 212:23	249:18,20	256:9 263:8,10
198:24 266:8	228:1	250:6 252:3	268:12,16,23
tender 93:5,23	testifying	255:16,18	268:24,25
153:3 207:14	123:17 143:16	256:20 257:1	270:6,7,9
tendered	174:20 243:22	265:18 269:10	thanks 9:15
248:10,14	testimony 8:24	269:13	10:14 17:6
tendering	12:6 43:19	text 250:13	65:7 148:23,25
97:19,20	57:10,16 58:2	thank 9:23	152:6 202:1
tenders 136:1	69:14 70:2	10:7,23 11:9	that'd 22:13
tenth 212:24	71:23 93:3,12	15:15 17:8	that's 73:1,9
term 28:16	94:11 96:9,12	25:18 26:2	73:12,13 74:8
72:9 114:16,17	96:20,25 97:4	42:9 55:19	75:12 77:17
201:1,9 221:23	97:7,24 99:15	65:5,24 66:8,9	80:9,16 84:14
225:1 227:5	99:23 100:8	91:18,21,22	85:19 86:5
terminable	101:18 102:4,5	92:21 94:15,20	87:9,9 90:5
192:18 193:5	118:9 119:4,13	94:22 98:5,22	92:14 102:6
terminate 19:7	121:12 122:2,9	99:5 102:10	128:13 129:4
termination	122:15 124:15	106:21 108:17	130:25 141:3
192:21	136:19 143:14	111:8 112:9,14	152:10 154:10
terms 21:8	143:15 145:20	113:5,7 119:9	154:11 155:21
79:21 81:15	146:2 149:8	122:1,13	156:12,20,25
82:3 108:2	152:16,23	124:13 130:11	159:7 163:18
153:11 156:13	153:1,8 154:4	131:5 133:15	165:18 169:15
159:24,25	154:6,10,11,17	133:17 136:21	170:1,17,19,19
190:4 205:2	155:4,24 158:4	140:16 143:19	170:20,25
214:10 221:19	159:3 164:4	143:21,21,23	173:13,15
224:14 232:2	169:4 172:12	145:4 149:14	175:15 177:8
237:17	175:17 178:3	152:20 153:22	177:11,19
testified 137:11	181:3,22 195:7	158:21 161:1	179:11 184:11
174:19 186:5	195:20 207:5	176:15 184:17	184:13 185:16
187:14 190:9	210:3,4,8,10	191:23 194:12	189:10 192:4
209:25 210:7	212:23 213:4	195:6,8,13	193:23 194:8
216:24 227:10	213:21 216:24	196:1,4,6	197:5 201:10

[that's - thought]

			C	
204:24 205:6,6	230:12 243:4	36:22 37:6,13	111:6,8 114:6	
209:2,5 211:18	243:23 245:3	37:24,24,25	114:9 122:4,8	
211:19 212:6	252:15,21	38:1,25 39:5	124:15 129:13	
213:23 214:21	262:5,16	40:10,16 41:1	140:3 144:7	
216:17 217:3	they're 160:23	41:4,24 42:4	147:12 153:24	
220:1 221:13	214:24 231:20	42:20,21,22	154:5 157:13	
223:13 225:1	they've 88:9,10	43:8 45:25	167:10 174:12	
226:14,16,22	127:9 128:6	46:21 48:13	175:20 181:21	
227:8 228:21	136:11 232:8	49:5 50:13	186:23 190:9	
231:5 234:23	234:15 242:25	52:11 53:4	201:1 203:24	
236:22 239:10	247:14 265:6	54:16 55:25	203:25 205:14	
239:14,22	thin 85:12	56:1,6,7,7,9,12	209:17 210:6,6	
240:9,15,23	190:2 206:8	56:16,18,18,19	211:5 212:6	
241:17 242:1	thing 21:6 22:1	57:21,24 58:1	213:23 216:24	
244:17 246:9	23:1,8,10,14	59:1,3,4,4,12	221:23 223:17	
247:20,21,23	54:15 57:10	60:7,9,9,19	225:3,16	
249:15 252:1,9	59:9 73:9,12	61:18,20,23	226:11,14,14	
252:25 253:5	73:13 74:19	62:2,14,15,19	226:16 230:16	
254:3,3,18,22	83:20 91:23	66:23 67:3	233:18 235:9	
255:9 263:6	114:5 115:17	68:1,13,16	241:19,19	
267:1 268:11	145:6 147:15	69:12 72:2	243:15,17,18	
268:14	175:24 182:6,8	74:5,22,23	243:19 244:12	
theories 11:25	228:10 240:24	75:4,4,5,9,12	245:20,25	
32:17,18 46:15	245:14 246:23	76:2,4,6 77:14	246:2,2 247:5	
46:18	things 26:9	79:20 80:1	255:21 264:7	
theory 31:23	40:18 60:12	81:13 82:5,13	265:24 266:1	
thereabouts	82:3 102:4	82:18,23,25	266:20	
205:17	174:22 194:3	83:8,9,9,15,17	third 4:12	
there's 149:12	245:23 246:8	83:20,21,21	21:20 45:1	
153:10 160:5	think 13:13	84:6 85:4,8,11	203:6 216:19	
183:14 184:4	14:9,9,12	87:21 89:17	228:20 243:3,9	
191:2,3 203:24	17:25 18:8	91:24 92:2,3	244:4 257:10	
203:25 204:11	20:23 21:12	93:11,16,18	thirty 39:16	
204:12 205:22	25:2 27:13	101:12 102:4	thomas 5:23	
212:13 215:3	28:3 29:16	103:7,10,16	171:11	
216:18 222:18	32:13,20 34:9	105:22 107:6	thought 11:9	
226:11 228:25	34:9 35:1,8,23	108:5 110:11	18:22 22:13,17	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 445 of 529

[thought - towers]

Page 78

	1	1	
41:1 61:9 75:1	60:10 61:15,16	times 13:8 20:2	34:19 64:11
81:5 82:20,21	61:20,24 62:2	20:5 21:9 23:4	told 29:7
87:10 92:22	68:5,16 69:19	29:14,14 62:22	166:12 169:2
115:24 121:18	69:20 81:23	186:19 212:2	178:18 182:10
147:7 148:10	87:20 88:12,14	223:25 224:1	toldner 226:1
thoughts	93:9 96:1	226:9	tom 150:19,21
147:14	98:25 99:4	timing 49:6,10	162:14 206:19
thousand	113:2 114:3	213:8	238:18,21,22
153:24	126:2 151:18	title 95:5	239:14 241:3
thousands	151:21,24	260:15,18,22	tomorrow
204:19 205:17	154:15 155:24	260:24	40:11 147:7,13
threat 67:11	155:25 156:10	today 12:6	268:21 270:8
threatened	158:13,22	13:20 14:9	took 12:5
56:24	159:1,4,10,13	43:19 57:10,17	73:20 82:23
three 8:25 25:6	159:16,20	58:2 59:11	90:2 155:25
38:10 48:10	171:14 172:14	66:9,25 73:21	202:9 212:17
58:17 82:8	173:9 174:8,25	74:7 75:21	222:24 261:25
85:20 92:22	175:13,23	84:3,11 100:10	top 61:9
101:3 127:20	177:10 179:16	101:1 104:9	139:20 162:3
159:17 160:10	180:9,20,22	132:1 134:7,8	189:15 214:10
161:10 221:19	183:7,25	147:3,12	topic 130:12
threshold	186:24 187:4	153:25 174:20	133:2,4
56:20 204:16	187:18 188:15	175:10 184:2	tort 20:19
threw 174:12	188:20,21,23	193:10 210:9	157:23
thrust 240:11	189:14,15,16	213:19 216:25	tortfeasor 45:7
thumb 206:7	192:8 196:18	221:22 222:10	torts 91:4
tie 251:7	196:21,21	228:2,18	toss 227:11
ties 34:18	198:12 199:5	244:17 252:18	total 47:17,18
time 11:13	202:5,9 204:23	252:24 261:7	113:16 171:6
12:13 13:7,11	231:2 238:10	261:16 269:9	205:20 265:23
14:1,4,8,13	238:13 240:18	today's 155:7	266:4,5,11
16:23 38:18,22	240:20,24	todd 5:8 25:12	toward 39:7
39:3,23 40:9	244:11 245:7	25:17 149:3	towards 40:17
40:10,16 41:19	265:22,23	184:22 194:16	119:15
42:7 43:5	267:6	267:12	tower 136:15
49:16 53:18	timeframe	together 17:23	towers 136:16
55:5 59:15,15	72:16	20:7,13 21:14	139:13

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 446 of 529

[traditional - under]

traditional	131:21 139:12	169:4 172:11	typo 255:21
82:1	142:2 148:15	178:3 180:7	256:3
train 19:7,11	156:25 162:17	181:2 255:11	
,		turns 91:14	u
training 21:5	168:23,23		u 105:14
25:4 32:9	176:9,14,15,18	twelve 115:4	119:12 144:5
transcribed	176:20,25	116:18 117:20	144:22,23
3:25	177:5,8,9,12	117:25	145:22,23
transcript	178:12 179:8	twenty 136:25	146:1,8,11,12
161:5,7,16	180:19 182:22	two 3:8 12:6	u.s. 2:3
271:4	183:22 238:8	21:4,5,8 23:9	uday 6:14
transfer 87:24	239:4,22	25:3 42:22	uh 228:23
treat 129:2	240:15 271:4	43:22 45:25	ultimate 37:10
treated 141:1	trusha 6:13	51:21 57:15	52:8,12 55:4
142:4	truth 94:12,12	59:13 62:22	61:22 121:5
tremendous	94:12 149:9,9	64:6 70:11	ultimately
203:6	149:10 195:21	76:13,14 80:18	12:10 13:2,16
trial 47:15	195:21,22	86:1,7,10,14	13:20 32:17
61:14 72:5	try 8:18 60:3	93:11 114:7	33:8 34:4
77:10 78:8	138:13 147:10	127:20 131:13	36:24 52:7
86:13 178:13	161:10 215:5	134:21 136:25	58:16 62:15
261:12,17,20	228:5 230:25	152:12 160:15	70:21 235:20
262:1,17,19	261:16,22	189:25 190:10	246:7
263:1 266:14	262:6	190:20 191:1	umbrella 51:20
266:19	trying 19:20	201:7 207:10	108:25
trials 61:15	29:6 69:1	243:1 246:21	uncertain 46:9
181:11 266:17	91:24 140:15	type 17:11	
trick 264:11	148:9 161:3	132:24 196:20	uncertainties
tried 86:14	221:12,15	200:8 201:18	113:14 unaloan 170:12
222:8 262:1	244:5 262:3	206:17 222:10	unclear 170:13
trouble 8:12	turn 23:1	246:7 250:9	unconstrained
134:23	49:22 82:19	types 178:21	245:3
true 33:9,10	93:24 119:16	184:25 198:21	under 3:4 8:20
37:11,13 48:23	174:9 187:14	201:22	8:23 11:16
49:5 61:16	223:7 225:25	typical 20:23	19:25 21:10
63:17 68:12	243:2 261:4,4	206:5	23:5,11 43:2
71:2 75:4	turning 56:21	typically 11:16	43:22 46:22
109:9,18	158:4 163:19	135:5	55:24 56:7
102.2910			62:8 66:23

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 447 of 529

[under - verdict]

80:5 83:24	162:12 166:20	undertake	221:11,21,25
84:8,15 85:22	187:23,24	185:6 186:7	224:14,25
86:7,9,10	194:4 205:9	undertaking	225:17 259:12
88:20 109:12	221:12,15	172:23 185:1	used 108:2
110:17 113:10	235:1 245:24	undertook	128:6 175:11
113:20,24	260:11 268:13	197:18	175:14 176:3
121:3 131:22	269:17	undue 213:23	201:1 221:9,14
138:19 139:1,2	understanding	unequivocal	224:16
143:8 151:5,6	17:3 27:9,11	76:20	uses 131:13
164:8,25	115:6 162:22	unfair 72:2	191:12
185:25 213:25	163:24 164:13	unfortunately	using 117:5
219:13,15	164:20 165:20	106:11 190:20	120:3 162:20
220:8 226:7	165:23 166:1,9	235:2 259:8	224:15 225:1
234:15 247:12	168:1,3,14,16	uniform	usually 63:16
250:20 253:15	168:24 169:12	197:25 198:5,8	88:22 232:23
255:1 258:8	175:3 178:12	uninsurable	V
underlying	178:17 181:6	91:15	v 1:14 5:11
32:3,16,18	181:23 182:2	united 1:1,19	244:19
35:11 43:20	182:11,23	unknown	valid 97:5
128:5 129:23	190:17 191:7	112:6	valley 38:11
199:25 200:10	194:19 203:3,5	unnamed	value 14:3
208:1 210:14	203:7 208:19	166:5	180:12
232:7 242:7	211:16 212:11	unpack 80:4	varied 151:20
255:5,9	214:21 216:15	88:23	
255:5,9 understand	214:21 216:15 221:16 222:1	88:23 unredacted	varies 47:10
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			varies 47:10 variety 46:18
understand	221:16 222:1	unredacted	varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24
understand 18:1 28:4	221:16 222:1 227:2 229:15	unredacted 15:14	<pre>varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24 various 154:21</pre>
understand 18:1 28:4 33:14,14 37:20	221:16 222:1 227:2 229:15 235:24 237:6	unredacted 15:14 unsecured 4:11	<pre>varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24 various 154:21 158:24 173:1</pre>
understand 18:1 28:4 33:14,14 37:20 39:8,17 43:9	221:16 222:1 227:2 229:15 235:24 237:6 237:10 242:8	unredacted 15:14 unsecured 4:11 151:13 260:19	<pre>varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24 various 154:21 158:24 173:1 188:24 211:13</pre>
understand 18:1 28:4 33:14,14 37:20 39:8,17 43:9 59:16 64:13	221:16 222:1 227:2 229:15 235:24 237:6 237:10 242:8 242:17 247:21	unredacted 15:14 unsecured 4:11 151:13 260:19 260:25	<pre>varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24 various 154:21 158:24 173:1 188:24 211:13 244:11</pre>
understand 18:1 28:4 33:14,14 37:20 39:8,17 43:9 59:16 64:13 72:17 88:19	221:16 222:1 227:2 229:15 235:24 237:6 237:10 242:8 242:17 247:21 247:24 248:7	unredacted 15:14 unsecured 4:11 151:13 260:19 260:25 unwillingness	 varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24 various 154:21 158:24 173:1 188:24 211:13 244:11 varying 65:2
understand 18:1 28:4 33:14,14 37:20 39:8,17 43:9 59:16 64:13 72:17 88:19 89:2 90:13	221:16 222:1 227:2 229:15 235:24 237:6 237:10 242:8 242:17 247:21 247:24 248:7 248:12 249:7	unredacted 15:14 unsecured 4:11 151:13 260:19 260:25 unwillingness 13:19	<pre>varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24 various 154:21 158:24 173:1 188:24 211:13 244:11 varying 65:2 vendor 231:24</pre>
understand 18:1 28:4 33:14,14 37:20 39:8,17 43:9 59:16 64:13 72:17 88:19 89:2 90:13 92:11 100:23	221:16 222:1 227:2 229:15 235:24 237:6 237:10 242:8 242:17 247:21 247:24 248:7 248:12 249:7 249:11,15	unredacted 15:14 unsecured 4:11 151:13 260:19 260:25 unwillingness 13:19 updates 248:5	<pre>varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24 various 154:21 158:24 173:1 188:24 211:13 244:11 varying 65:2 vendor 231:24 232:3,3</pre>
understand 18:1 28:4 33:14,14 37:20 39:8,17 43:9 59:16 64:13 72:17 88:19 89:2 90:13 92:11 100:23 104:21 114:23	221:16 222:1 227:2 229:15 235:24 237:6 237:10 242:8 242:17 247:21 247:24 248:7 248:12 249:7 249:11,15 understood	unredacted 15:14 unsecured 4:11 151:13 260:19 260:25 unwillingness 13:19 updates 248:5 upper 139:12	<pre>varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24 various 154:21 158:24 173:1 188:24 211:13 244:11 varying 65:2 vendor 231:24 232:3,3 verbatim</pre>
understand 18:1 28:4 33:14,14 37:20 39:8,17 43:9 59:16 64:13 72:17 88:19 89:2 90:13 92:11 100:23 104:21 114:23 118:8 120:4,8	221:16 222:1 227:2 229:15 235:24 237:6 237:10 242:8 242:17 247:21 247:24 248:7 248:12 249:7 249:11,15 understood 30:19 59:10	unredacted 15:14 unsecured 4:11 151:13 260:19 260:25 unwillingness 13:19 updates 248:5 upper 139:12 upshot 42:13	<pre>varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24 various 154:21 158:24 173:1 188:24 211:13 244:11 varying 65:2 vendor 231:24 232:3,3 verbatim 121:14</pre>
understand 18:1 28:4 33:14,14 37:20 39:8,17 43:9 59:16 64:13 72:17 88:19 89:2 90:13 92:11 100:23 104:21 114:23 118:8 120:4,8 125:7 132:10	221:16 222:1 227:2 229:15 235:24 237:6 237:10 242:8 242:17 247:21 247:24 248:7 248:12 249:7 249:11,15 understood 30:19 59:10 165:8 245:12	unredacted 15:14 unsecured 4:11 151:13 260:19 260:25 unwillingness 13:19 updates 248:5 upper 139:12 upshot 42:13 use 28:16	<pre>varies 47:10 variety 46:18 150:24 various 154:21 158:24 173:1 188:24 211:13 244:11 varying 65:2 vendor 231:24 232:3,3 verbatim</pre>

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document

Pg 448 of 529

Page 81

[veritext - went]

veritext 271:20	voice 233:23	146:22,24	88:11 92:8
versus 44:21	void 86:8	161:3 171:17	114:11 124:4
155:19 183:9	volume 205:18	175:11,18	134:16 135:25
183:24 254:9	205:20 228:25	183:15 201:12	167:9 173:3
vicar 150:23	244:4	205:23,24	174:4,13 175:5
vicarious 23:23	voluntarily	222:24 228:6	175:9,13,16
35:24 36:1,6,8	190:15,16	229:19 232:23	176:1,10
36:13,16,21	voluntary	245:24 249:17	198:11,12
vice 95:7	160:11	255:22 258:22	203:9 211:14
victim 234:9	W	265:20 266:18	227:11 229:4
victims 8:23	wait 65:25	268:3	244:12 248:17
101:23 102:18	77:23 97:14	wanted 55:15	253:1 268:2
109:17 119:16	111:18 122:16	59:20 60:4	269:14
150:11 158:11	127:24	86:22 89:10	ways 45:25
196:19,25	waiving 219:11	91:16 119:6	79:9 151:3
view 11:3	220:3	147:22 155:3	245:11
114:12 117:8,9	walk 65:19	236:23 255:5,8	we've 9:6 22:8
169:3 186:14	217:18	264:7 266:16	55:21 56:10
191:14 194:1	want 9:11 15:3	267:24	57:8,22 62:5
203:21 208:4	24:12 34:25	wanting 268:9	66:20 82:5
views 39:25	36:24 38:20	wants 99:1	84:10 93:11
vigorously	41:5,21 43:8	111:20 263:15	142:5 147:23
187:7	50:7 55:11	warner 6:20	week 27:22
violates 86:8	64:22 65:11,12	washington 4:6	38:11 58:8,8
violation 24:12	69:1 72:25	wasn't 162:10	151:22 152:5
85:25 91:9	73:3 74:15	210:17 225:4	262:7
virgin 142:24	79:18 80:23	267:24	weeks 58:9
visibility	81:21 86:2	wasting 84:16	151:25 152:4
158:12,17	87:17,25 89:3	watch 263:12	187:8
159:4,12,19,20	89:17 93:4,22	water 94:16	weight 96:25
159:22 161:11	94:19 96:23	149:12,13	153:14 265:19
162:7,16	98:16,25 102:7	195:25	welcome
163:10 164:24	107:13 111:18	way 12:22	112:12 196:7
165:1,3 175:21	112:1 119:7	26:10 29:6	218:2
175:24 176:3	120:7 129:1,1	69:24 70:4	went 12:19
180:20,22	120:7 129:1,1 129:18 133:4	75:6 80:17,19	13:18 27:13
185:17 191:9		80:19 87:22	30:11 67:13
	145:19,23		

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 449 of 529

[went - worked]

L J			U
115:16 117:13	who've 69:6	170:21 176:5	wood 209:10
151:24 154:7,9	wholly 70:13	178:21,24	word 11:10
171:6 181:21	william 5:20	185:21 186:3	131:13 174:21
190:4 269:10	6:15 171:13	187:1,5,11	175:12,14
weren't 204:7	226:22 238:20	190:16,20	221:11,14,17
237:15	247:10 256:22	191:2 192:14	221:21,24
west 266:22,25	williams 6:21	195:8,9,12,16	222:1 224:14
we'd 255:4	226:24	196:6 199:15	224:16,25
we'll 187:24	willing 122:19	200:15 201:6,9	225:17
195:12 213:20	266:14	201:12 203:14	words 44:4
233:7,10,13	win 86:2	204:21 205:6	60:2 76:2
249:20 266:10	wind 97:6	205:12,20,24	114:7 123:16
267:4,7,9,9	winds 49:2	206:4,7 207:15	137:18 213:25
we're 105:19	wish 8:3	210:17 216:11	222:6
148:25 149:1	221:18	216:17 220:14	work 16:20
154:17 161:21	witching 233:5	221:18 222:5	62:6 64:7,11
161:22 180:22	withdrawing	230:1,9 232:11	64:20 70:8
205:16,17,18	145:6 183:6	232:25 235:10	74:1,8 90:8
209:17 223:5	withheld 208:5	235:19,24	95:16,24 112:5
223:20 227:11	208:6 231:11	240:9 242:3,13	132:3 150:2,15
228:8 233:20	witness 64:5	242:17 247:21	156:14 157:1,1
255:13 261:7	92:20 93:2,2,3	249:7,15	160:6 171:23
we've 153:10	93:6,20,23	250:19 251:9	172:10 186:21
177:16,19	97:19,20 98:11	251:13,20,24	196:20 206:11
235:20 251:1	98:15,25 99:4	witnessed	226:25 239:9
252:16	102:7,10	134:19,25	239:19 240:9
what's 165:23	103:25 105:4	witnesses 3:13	241:21 248:8
170:16 191:7	106:17,21,22	7:3 8:25 92:24	250:22 262:16
205:18 208:14	106:23 112:2	178:6,12,17,22	262:21 268:13
233:1 251:15	116:11 144:1,2	179:9 199:23	268:14
264:23	145:20 149:2,5	woman 263:18	worked 70:3,5
whichever	151:20 152:3	263:21 264:19	93:9 150:3,18
92:23 235:16	153:3 157:20	wondering	199:23 206:13
white 119:23	158:1 160:5,15	224:21	206:17,18,21
120:6,10	165:25 166:6	won't 245:4	206:24 207:1
145:15	166:11,13,16	261:18	220:19 221:15
	166:21 170:12		

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 450 of 529

[working - '78]

			C
working 19:8	wrong 36:4	247:25 252:15	york's 8:23
95:9 151:4,13	114:6 137:8	254:19 258:17	you'll 155:8
158:6 161:13	wrote 38:11	259:1	201:6 253:18
173:12 232:16	116:8	year 59:22	you're 156:3
242:16 250:20	X	65:2 80:17,18	158:20 165:9
265:9	x 1:5,11,17	99:11 117:4	165:24 172:6
workload	X 1.3,11,17 30:21	132:11 156:10	174:20 196:7
190:18		158:7 251:22	209:21 213:6
works 128:25	Y	year's 138:17	213:16 214:22
189:7	y 144:22,24	years 28:15	215:7 218:2
world 52:18	145:3 146:12	38:10 47:9	233:17 240:16
92:6,13	yeah 8:17 9:11	49:12 51:2,3	246:5 248:18
worth 265:14	18:5 25:16	51:20 52:2	266:14
265:15	29:5 30:9 51:3	54:14,15 55:22	you've 72:21
would've 34:14	54:3 57:19	58:17 59:13	77:16,17 81:6
wouldn't 91:5	64:2 65:20	62:18 63:7	82:16 110:4
91:8 115:16	71:25 80:3,4	74:6 75:14	112:1 132:24
168:21 229:3	81:1 82:12	80:18 82:8	154:5 163:2
244:10 261:16	86:7 87:6,9	110:6 130:24	176:3 186:5
would've	92:12 103:8	132:11 136:12	187:20 215:12
254:13,15	104:6,6 105:10	137:13 138:12	217:4 232:24
269:25	105:12 116:7	142:7 221:19	240:7
wrap 59:12	121:10 122:11	yep 32:3	Z
writing 113:22	123:12 124:19	yesterday 62:4	z 144:22,24
114:19	126:7,12 127:4	62:4 267:15	145:3 146:12
written 27:14	128:21 131:4	york 1:2,8,12	zepf 6:4
37:20 84:19	134:9 141:14	1:21 4:13	ziehl 4:10
93:3,13 96:9	141:17 143:9	23:23 35:25	237:1 269:7
152:16,23	146:8 147:16	36:5 37:17	zoom 3:13
172:11 178:3,7	153:7 166:13	46:22 61:18	73:11 236:7,9
181:3,22 186:5	166:22 182:19	86:9 136:6	236:23 263:15
212:23 238:2	213:15 214:2,4	143:8,9 198:25	,
238:24 241:1,5	214:10 218:10	214:16 219:13	
249:18 250:23	222:19 228:17	219:15 220:8	'74 226:6
250:25 252:3	230:16 233:15	221:7 226:8	'78 226:6
255:14	235:6,19	251:21	
	238:23 240:7		

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 451 of 529

EXHIBIT D

20-12345-ı	mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 452 of 529
	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	Case No. 20-12345-mg
4	x
5	In the Matter of:
6	
7	THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF ROCKVILLE CENTRE, NEW YORK,
8	
9	Debtor.
10	x
11	
12	United States Bankruptcy Court
13	One Bowling Green
14	New York, NY 10004
15	
16	May 16, 2023
17	2:01 PM
18	
19	
20	
21	BEFORE :
22	HON MARTIN GLENN
23	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
24	
25	ECRO: JONATHAN

	Page 2
1	HEARING re Status Conference Using Zoom for Government Re:
2	Debtor's Eighth Omnibus Claim Objections: Claim(s)
3	Number: 90355, 90231, 90264, 90208, 90209, 90317, 90327,
4	90330, 90345, 90349, 90391, 90472, 90512, 90514,
5	90517, 30035, 90174, 90495, 90100, 90181, 90544, 90542,
6	90020, 90053, 90075, 90392, 90244, 90245, 90324,
7	90090. (Doc# 1730, 1731, 1774, 1856 to 1858, 1860, 1861,
8	1863 to 1871, 1872, 1874, 1911, 1984, 1987, 2062,
9	2063, 2086, 2093)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde
l	

Γ

1 APPEARANCES: 2 3 JONES DAY LLP 4 Attorneys for the Debtor and Debtor-in-Possession 5 250 Vesey Street 6 New York, NY, 10281 7 8 BY: TODD GEREMIA 9 ERIC PETER STEPHENS 10 11 PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP Attorneys for Official Committee Of Unsecured Creditors 12 13 780 Third Avenue, 34th Floor 14 New York, NY 10017 15 16 BY: BRITTANY MICHAEL 17 KAREN B. DINE JAMES STANG 18 19 20 PAUL MONES, P.C. 21 Attorneys for CLAIMANT/SEX ABSUE VICTIMS 22 13101 Washinton Blvd. 23 Los Angeles, CA 90066 24 25 BY: PAUL MONES

-12345-m	g Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 455 of 529
	Page 4
1	WESTERMAN BALL, et al.
2	Attorneys for Parishes
3	1201 RXR Plaza
4	Uniondale, NY 11556
5	
6	BY: WILLIAM HEUER
7	
8	JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES
9	Attorneys for Certain Survivors
10	363 7th Avenue, 12th Floor
11	New York, NY 10001
12	
13	BY: PAT STONEKING
14	JEFF ANDERSON
15	
16	CULLEN & DYKMAN LLP
17	Attorneys for Certain Parishes
18	One Battery Park Plaza, 34th Floor
19	New York, NY 10004
20	
21	BY: MICHELLE MCMAHON
22	
23	
24	
25	

20-12345-r	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 456 of 529
	Page 5
1	WORLOW LAW
2	Attorneys for Claimant 90544
3	615 Willow Street
4	North Little Rock, AR 72114
5	
6	BY: JACOB WORLOW
7	
8	PFAU COCHRAN VERTETIS AMALA PLLC
9	Attorneys for PCVA and Marsh Law Survivors
10	403 Columbia Street, Suite 500
11	Seattle, WA 98104
12	
13	BY: JASON P. AMALA
14	
15	ROBERT E. GERBER, Pro Se
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 6 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 CLERK: All right. Starting the calendar for May 16th, 2023, the 2 PM hearing. I'm calling the Roman 3 Catholic Diocese of Rockville Center, New York, Case Number 4 5 20-12345. Mr. Geremia, if we could start with you, if you 6 could give your appearance. 7 MR. GEREMIA: Sure. Good afternoon, Miss 8 Anderson, Todd Geremia of Jones Day for the debtor, the 9 Diocese of Rockville Center. 10 CLERK: All right. Thank you. Are your co-11 counsel going to be joining as well? 12 MR. GEREMIA: I expect Eric Stephens to be 13 joining. 14 CLERK: All right. Thank you. Mr. Gerber. 15 MR. GERBER: Yes, Robert Gerber, a future claims 16 representative appearing on my own behalf. I may or may not 17 be speaking today. I doubt if I will unless the need 18 arises. 19 CLERK: Okay. Thank you for giving your 20 appearance. All right, you can pause the recording for now. 21 (Pause) 22 Miss Michael, if you could give your CLERK: Yes. 23 appearance, please. 24 MS. MICHAEL: Hi, good afternoon. This is 25 Brittany Michael from Pachulski Stang Ziehl and Jones, on

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 458 of 529

Page 7 1 behalf of the committee of unsecured creditors. 2 CLERK: All right. Is anyone else going to be 3 joining on behalf of the committee? 4 MS. MICHAEL: Karen Dine and Jim Stang may be 5 joining, but I will be speaking on behalf of the committee 6 to the extent necessary. 7 Thank you. You could pause the recording. CLERK: 8 (Pause) 9 CLERK: All right. For the parties that have 10 joined if you have not given your appearance and you are 11 speaking this morning -- pardon me, this afternoon, please 12 unmute one at a time and give your appearance. 13 MR. MONES: Paul Mones, M O N E S for Claimants 14 90324 and 90245. Thank you. 15 CLERK: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Heuer, are you 16 giving your appearances for this afternoon? 17 MR. HEUER: Yes, good afternoon, Your Honor. 18 William Heuer of Westerman Ball for a number of parishes in the case. Thank you. 19 20 CLERK: Thank you. Are there any additional 21 parties that would like to make their appearance? Okay. 22 All right. You can pause the recording for now. 23 (Pause) 24 CLERK: Mr. Stoneking, are you going to be noting 25 your appearance for this afternoon?

Page 8 1 MR. STONEKING: Yes, Pat Stoneking, Jeff Anderson 2 and Associates. 3 CLERK: All right. Thank you. Mr. Stephens. MR. STEPHENS: Good afternoon, Eric Stephens with 4 5 Jones Day on behalf of the debtor. 6 CLERK: All right. Thank you. Mr. Anderson. All 7 right. Mr. Anderson, if you could unmute and give your 8 appearance, please. 9 MR. ANDERSON: This is Jeff Anderson appearing on 10 behalf of certain survivors. 11 CLERK: Okay. Thank you. Am I missing anyone? 12 Ms. McMahon. 13 MS. MCMAHON: Yes. Hello. Michelle McMahon from Cullen and Dykman on behalf of certain of the parishes. 14 15 CLERK: Okay. Thank you. 16 MS. MCMAHON: Thank you. 17 CLERK: Any additional appearances at this time? 18 All right. For the parties that have joined, if anyone is 19 speaking on the record this afternoon, please unmute your 20 line and give your appearances. 21 MR. HEUER: Yeah, Deanna, it's Bill Heuer, I noted 22 my appearance but I do not expect it to speak. That's fine. Thank you, Bill. 23 CLERK: 24 MR. WORLOW: Ma'am, I'm not sure if you heard me, 25 but this is Jacob Worlow appearing for Claimant 90544.

: g : • • • • = •
Page 9
CLERK: I did not. Thank you for confirming.
Thank you for your appearance. Are there any additional
parties that are making their appearance? All right, for
the parties that have joined, is anyone speaking on the
record this afternoon? If so, please unmute your line and
give your appearance. Yes, Karen. Would you like to note
your appearance?
MS. DINE: Yes, Karen Dine, Pachulski Stang Ziehl
and Jones on behalf of the committee.

10 CLERK: All right. Thank you. For the other 11 parties that have joined, if anyone's speaking on the record 12 this afternoon, please unmute your line one at a time and 13 give your appearance for the record. Okay. Is Jason Amala 14 on the line?

MS. MICHAEL: He should be coming. I can, I can 15 16 see if he has any problems with the link.

17 CLERK: Yes, please do so. Thank you. All right. 18 Mr. Stan, are you noting your appearance for this

afternoon's hearing? 19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

20 MR. STANG: Yes, please.

21 CLERK: Yes. All right. So James Stang is here 22 on behalf of the committee. Any additional parties that have joined that need to make their appearance and have not 23 24 done so at this time? Mr. Amala, I see I admitted you. 25 Thank you. I apologize. I will save MR. AMALA:

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 461 of 529

Page 10

1	you the explanation. Thank you. Sorry.
2	CLERK: Okay. Your appearance is noted, Mr.
3	Amala. Are we waiting on anyone else? Any parties?
4	Debtors counsel, creditors counsel? All right. Judge,
5	would you like to begin?
6	THE COURT: Yes, good afternoon, everyone. So I
7	scheduled this conference after issuing the opinion and then
8	entering an order on the eighth omnibus objection. Because,
9	you know, as I said in the opinion, I'm certainly not
10	inclined to open up broad discovery, but let me, let me
11	express what my concerns were and are and then hear what
12	people have to say.
13	So at Page 7 of the opinion, when I talked, I said
14	here, the debtors state that proofs of claim at issue on the
15	objection, alleged abuse by an individual where the claim
16	meets all of the following criteria. And then there were
17	five bullet points. And, yes, so the second bullet point,
18	"The accused perpetrator is not on the list of perpetrators
19	for whom the district has paid an award to a claimant
20	through the debtor's independent reconciliation and
21	compensation program or as to whom there has been an adverse
22	determination before the Diocesan Review Board, the list of
23	accused clergy and with a web address."
24	And then in the next bullet point, I say, "The
25	accused perpetrator is not on a list of accused abusers
l	

212-267-6868

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 462 of 529

Page 11

1	compiled by the official committee of unsecured creditors in
2	this case. To supplement the diocese list, the UCC asserts
3	that the individuals on its list have been accused of
4	committing sexual abuse and either allegations against them
5	have been found credible or sexual abuse lawsuits have been
6	filed against them." So when I obviously, this came from
7	the debtors' explanation of what was and what wasn't covered
8	by the omnibus subjection. And, you know, my concern is
9	and then later in the opinion, I think in a footnote, I
10	asked a question at a hearing, unrelated to the eighth
11	omnibus objection, about who had the so-called private
12	personnel files. And I think what the gist of which that I
13	was told was, it was produced to the committee but not to
14	all of the counsel or the abuse survivors unless they
15	happened to be representing somebody on the committee.
16	And I was concerned about gaps. So I know, I
17	don't know whether it was which one of the individual
18	plaintiff's counsel, whether it was you, Mr. Amala, who
19	talked about secret files, secret personnel files that were
20	never shared. And I'm, it seemed to me that what you refer
21	to as secret files were the confidential personnel files
22	that the debtor has referred to. And I'll ask, you know,
23	whether the debtors counselor can confirm that. But let,
24	let me, let me go on. So it seemed to me on the second
25	bullet point, well, what if the accused perpetrator never

212-267-6868

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 463 of 529

Page 12

	-
1	had a determination before the Diocesan Review Board? In
2	that case, you know, there's no adverse determination. So
3	those could be included in these proofs of claim, these
4	contested claims. So that's one factual question I have.
5	And then, of course, the next bullet point that
6	dealt with the committee's list. And I, you know, I've
7	looked online. I've seen the list from both the diocese and
8	from the creditors committee and I'm not sure, you know,
9	what's excluded from that. And obviously, I've for many
10	of the claims involved in this eighth omni objection, I
11	sustained the objections with leave to amend and I'm not
12	opening things up to broad discovery, but I think that, you
13	know, I single out of Mr. Amala's clients or Mr. Mones'
14	clients, you know, were they were the accused abusers
15	ever the subject of any allegation or information to the
16	diocese, whether they acted on it or not? I guess if they
17	had acted on it is one thing. But what if there was no
18	determination? Let me ask, you know, Mr. Geremia, what was
19	covered and what was not covered in these omnibus, in this
20	round of omnibus objections?
21	MR. GEREMIA: In a shorthand, Judge, as to those
22	two bullets, these are just the point was that we were
23	addressing accused abusers that weren't known to the
24	dioceses or the committee. You know they weren't on our
25	list of accused abusers. They weren't on the committee's

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 464 of 529

Page 13

1	list of accused abusers, you know, thereby making it in our
2	view the less likely that the diocese would have any notice
3	that they were, had the propensity to engage in abuse.
4	THE COURT: So when you, when you say they were
5	not on your list of accused abusers, I read what you
6	provided as saying, they were not accused abusers as to
7	which a claim had been paid or as to whom there had been an
8	adverse determination before the Diocesan Review Board. I
9	don't know whether there was, you know, whether it never got
10	that far, whether yes, there was information about Priest X,
11	but it never resulted in a determination by the Diocesan
12	Review Board or they found it unsubstantiated, but
13	nevertheless, the records indicate there were allegations
14	against them.
15	MR. GEREMIA: Yeah, I know that the person would
16	not appear on our list if well, they would only appear on
17	our list if an award was paid or there was an adverse
18	determination before the DRB. This was a list that at the
19	very beginning of the case my partner Eric Stephens may
20	be able to inform the Court better but there was a
21	dialogue with the committee with respect to how and when and
22	where this list would be displayed. And then the committee,
23	as Your Honor is aware, you know, manifested its list as
24	well. So this was something that was, that was preexisting
25	these objections and was established at the beginning of the

Page 14 1 case. 2 THE COURT: But let me ask you this, can you provide evidence under oath from people who can demonstrate 3 they would have knowledge of this, that there never was an 4 5 allegation made against a priest who was alleged to have 6 abused, you know, one of Mr. Mones' or Mr. Amala's clients? 7 In other words, it may well be that yeah, they had some, the 8 confidential personnel folder indicated yeah, there were 9 some allegations made, but they were never substantiated. 10 But if, in fact, there were allegations made about 11 particular priests but no adverse determination made against 12 them, I think it would be particularly relevant to the 13 claimant's counsel to know that. And I kept studying the 14 limitations. I'm not accusing you of anything improper 15 about it. But when I looked at how you defined those 16 creditors as to which you were carrying objections forward 17 or not, I couldn't be sure that there hadn't been 18 allegations made against the particular priest. It didn't 19 result in an adverse determination. There hadn't been any 20 prior state court litigation filed against them. Let me 21 stop there. 22 MR. GEREMIA: Yeah, I don't right now know the 23 answers to that because the criteria is just about, you 24 know, as I said, is were they on our list? Were they on 25 committee's list? I do know that we were prepared to

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 466 of 529

Page 15

1	discuss with Your Honor the documents that we are, that we
2	have searched and are prepared to produce and any such
3	allegations would be reflected in those documents. In some
4	cases, for example, I don't think there are any in this, in
5	this set of claims that meet this, but there are, you know,
6	in the abuse, alleged abuse may have happened in 1978 and in
7	the file, when the CVA claim is filed, there's a report of
8	the allegation of abuse, you know, some 30 years later or
9	something like that. So the allegations of abuse are
10	reflected in the personnel files and the documents that we
11	searched and are prepared to produce in response to Your
12	Honor's order. And in that respect, you know, claimants
13	will have that information once it is produced.
14	THE COURT: Okay. I sort of put on, I mean, this
15	is, this is what led me to schedule this hearing. Well, let
16	me, let me turn to the plaintiffs. I'll give you a chance
17	again, Mr. Geremia, to speak to it. And I know you all
18	agreed on an order in which you were going to speak and
19	that's fine with me. So who is going to speak first?
20	MR. STONEKING: That would that be me, Pat
21	Stoneking, Your Honor. Thank you.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Stoneking.
23	MR. STONEKING: And just in response to what Mr.
24	Geremia has said, our main concern, I do represent a
25	committee member. My committee member is being one of the

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 467 of 529

_	
1	claimants being objected to here. So in response to what
2	Mr. Geremia had just said, I would have major concerns in
3	this Court believing that allegations of abuse would be in
4	the files that they're going to produce. They are in
5	just speaking for this one particular committee member, the
6	production relating to him amounts to one index card and
7	he's a diocesan priest that served in the diocese for many
8	years, was transferred. That's not a, that's not a
9	realistic production for if you're saying that they handed
10	over his employment file, secret file, whatever, it's just
11	not it. So you would expect to have significant
12	correspondence with the bishop every single time he changed
13	assignments, which he did. And there would be regular check
14	ins with the bishop and especially back when he was
15	operating, all this was done by mail. So you do see that
16	from time to time, but none of that is in the, in the
17	production. So to the extent that the Court would expect
18	that sort of information to be produced as a part of opening
19	this up to everybody, I think, I think the Court would be
20	disappointed.
21	THE COURT: What's your understanding of where
22	that correspondence would be filed, if at all?
23	MR. STONEKING: It should be with the diocese and
24	it opens up questions about why it's not there. And there
25	would be, if you were to ask me what sort of discovery that

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 468 of 529

1	I would do on behalf of this client, it would be, where is
2	the file? What happened to it? Why was it, why was it
3	destroyed, if it was destroyed? And when? So there should
4	be a significant file there. It hasn't been produced and I
5	don't know why.
6	THE COURT: Do you know the history for take
7	the one example you're giving for example, do you know when
8	the priest was assigned or reassigned? How many times, et
9	cetera?
10	MR. STONEKING: Yeah. He had an initial period of
11	three years in a parish. He was moved to Corpus Christi
12	School where the period of abuse took place. And he was, he
13	was moved three years after that into military service where
14	he completed the rest of his career in military service. So
15	there are questions to be drawn from that history and you
16	would expect some sort of documentation explaining why that
17	happened. But none of that exists beyond the index card.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else you want to add
19	at this point?
20	MR. STONEKING: No, it just that's not an isolated
21	case either. I would just say that that's common among
22	several of these objected to claims. There's a lack of file
23	which I don't think necessarily proves a lack of notice or
24	that there wasn't any notice. It's just suspicious that
25	there's no file.

Page 18

1	THE COURT: All right. I don't know who, Mr.
2	Mones or Mr. Amala, which of you were going to speak next?
3	MR. AMALA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jason
4	Amala. I was going to go second. So, Your Honor, the file
5	for Claimant 90100 is I'd say the other end of the spectrum
6	from what Mr. Stoneking just described, but it too raises
7	issues. And before I talk about that file, I think the
8	Court has zeroed in on the exact issue, which is I do not
9	believe there has been a representation under oath by the
10	diocese that someone, who either has personal knowledge or
11	has acquired a sufficient foundation to swear under oath,
12	has reviewed these files and has confirmed that there has
13	not been an allegation involving each of these priests. I'm
14	pretty sure that that has not happened.
15	I do not recall how this diocese has defined the
16	term "credibly accused." I believe that other diocese have
17	defined that term to require at least two people have
18	accused a priest, credibly accused a priest of abuse and
19	then that is what allows them to be put on the list.
20	So back to the Court's question, I do not believe
21	anyone has represented from the diocese under oath with
22	personal knowledge or sufficient foundation that there have
23	not been allegations of abuse. Or, I should be really clear
24	too, or not just allegations of abuse, but a priest who has
25	not admitted at some point that they abused children or that

Pg 470 of 529

Page 19 they were sent to, for example, sexual deviancy treatment 1 2 for abusing children. So I just want to answer the Court's 3 question on that. Turning --THE COURT: Just elaborate. Just come back. 4 Ι 5 want to be sure, I understand you entirely. 6 MR. AMALA: Sure. 7 THE COURT: Just cover that point again. 8 MR. AMALA: So, so the Court asked the question, 9 Can someone from the diocese represent under oath that each 10 of these priests has not been the subject of I'll say 11 allegations of child sexual abuse? And that's a very fair 12 question because I don't think that has happened. I'm 13 virtually positive that that has not been represented to the 14 Court. The distinction I was trying to draw is there are 15 also priests who have been the subject -- who go to sexual 16 deviancy treatment, I'm going to talk about the priest in 17 our case in a second, who go to sexual deviancy treatment 18 usually later when they -- in the mid-eighties once they 19 finally started to deal with this issue, a lot of these 20 priests who were caught or who they reviewed the records and 21 figured out, gosh, we have someone who has a problem here, 22 they were sent to sexual deviancy treatment. And in the 23 course of that treatment, they admit to having molested 24 children. So that's the distinction I'm drawing. There may 25 have been complaints by someone saying this priest abused me

Page 20

1	or you could have files where the priest was never
2	complained about. But they later admit, yeah, I was abusing
3	children. That's the distinction I'm trying to draw here.
4	THE COURT: Let me other than what I read in
5	the press or saw it in the movies or something, you know,
6	sexual abuse of adults or children by members of the clergy
7	were something I only heard about from a distance. Okay?
8	So I've sort of been doing this deep dive into the issues
9	that this raises. And I have to say when I worked on this
10	opinion on the eighth omnibus objection and really started
11	digging in, and I know you've appealed and all that, but at
12	least what I understood the law in New York to be about
13	notice, I will admit it came as something of a surprise to
14	me in that New York, I view it as quite protective of
15	determination of liability against the diocese because of
16	acts of a priest. So I think this came up at one of the
17	hearings I don't remember it's on an omnibus hearing or
18	otherwise. You know say what you want about the independent
19	review proceeding, and I know that's you're appealing,
20	somebody's appealing that, what I what I ruled, but as I
21	understand it, knowledge of an abuser's prior history was
22	not a required criteria for compensation. The questions
23	asked were, Did you report the abuse to you, to someone
24	else? And I understand why that question was asked. But it
25	did not set out as a separate criteria. And I dare say, I

Page 21

1 don't, I don't know this for sure, it could well be that 2 survivors did receive compensation even though there had 3 been no prior notice of predisposition of a priest's sexual 4 abuse. But that was the independent review process. That's 5 not New York law. New York law was, it was something of an 6 eyeopener to me and I spent a lot of time reading cases. 7 Okay.

8 So you know, I say this all now because you say 9 that in the course of sexual deviancy treatment, a priest 10 may have admitted to having abused children, but that 11 wouldn't automatically result in liability for the diocese. It would still raise the issues of what was their notice of 12 13 a predisposition? I don't. You live with these cases all 14 the time. And I'm not, I'm not fully familiar with the 15 terminology in all of them, but I think the point I'm trying 16 to communicate is I don't, I don't know whether if, you 17 know, unless the priest admitted to sexual abuse of children 18 and say that, you know, Monsignor So-and-So knew about this 19 before, before I abused this particular child. Just saying 20 that someone admitted that yes, I abused children is not 21 enough under New York law. You may disagree with that, but 22 that's the way I read the cases.

23 MR. AMALA: Your Honor, we had a colloquy at one 24 point where I'm definitely afraid of speaking over you. So 25 my long pause is making sure.

	Page 22
1	THE COURT: I can see your lips moving a little
2	bit. You got the floor.
3	MR. AMALA: Okay. So, Your Honor, today was about
4	discovery. I will, since the Court raised it, the Poly Prep
5	decision that you cited, I just want to flag for the Court's
6	attention since you raised this issue. It cites the case
7	called Diamond Jewels versus Lewis. It's 2019 WL 5896224 at
8	23. And I just want to flag that for the Court because the
9	Poly Prep case does acknowledge that in New York, you don't
10	always need notice of the particular offender if it's a
11	situation where you have a special relationship with the
12	child. There's a lot of focus on when you have a special
13	relationship with the perpetrator, with the employee. But
14	there's an entirely separate body of law that New York Law
15	acknowledges when you're talking about a special
16	relationship with the child.
17	In Poly Prep. The court actually acknowledges
18	that you don't always need actual notice about the
19	individual perpetrator. But then went on to say in that
20	case, the plaintiff had not quote that the plaintiff

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

"failed to allege facts demonstrating that the danger and

risk of harm was foreseeable to the defendant." So in that

case, our view is that that was an insufficient pleading by

the plaintiff. If the plaintiff in Poly Prep had said this

school had a long history of knowing that its teachers were

21

22

23

24

25

Γ

Pg 474 of 529

Page 23

molesting children and failed to do anything in response,
 that would be sufficient. I believe Poly Prep would have
 upheld that and said that's sufficient.

So, Your Honor, today is not the day to have that 4 5 discussion. I appreciate the Court's decision. I'm not 6 here to try to reargue that. But since you raised it, I do 7 think in New York we have the Novak decision where the court 8 acknowledges that it's not just the setting of a school. 9 That entire body of law, I hate it when people plead, with 10 all respect to my colleagues, when they plead in loco 11 parentis because you hit it on the head. That's not a cause 12 That's not a duty. The duty comes from having a of action. 13 special relationship with the child and that's, that's in 14 their statement of torts. That's black letter law across 15 the country. When you have a special relationship with the 16 child, not the employer, the child, you have to take 17 reasonable steps to protect that child from foreseeable 18 harm, not just known harm but foreseeable harm. Which in 19 this context, when you have a diocese that has this long 20 history of knowing that it has this problem, you need to 21 take that -- that raises the question of what were you doing 22 to protect children from that harm regardless of what you 23 knew about an individual priest? So today's a discovery 24 conference, Your Honor, but I feel like since you raised it, 25 I needed to address it.

Page 24 1 THE COURT: You get to argue that to the district 2 court. I appreciate that, Your Honor, and I 3 MR. AMALA: appreciate it. Since you raised it, I felt I needed to 4 5 respond just so you never said, why didn't you raise this 6 when we were talking about it? 7 THE COURT: No, just come back to this point about -- you're the one who said, you know, sexual deviance 8 treatment and in the course of the treatment, the priest 9 10 admits having abused children. So let's assume that that's 11 what, that's the state of facts. Under New York law, doesn't it matter whether the diocese knew about it before 12 13 the first time, before the alleged victim, the victim, your 14 client was abused? 15 MR. AMALA: Your Honor, thank you for bringing us 16 back to that question. The reason I raised that is Mr. 17 Stoneking and I and the Court in its opinion, talked about 18 these transfers of priests that happened outside of the five 19 years, that that's a sign that something's going on. In mv 20 experience, when you see a sexual deviancy report that maybe 21 comes out in the nineties or the two thousands. One of the 22 things that it educates us on is the priest may say, yeah, I 23 abused kids back when I was at the parish of Saint John of 24 God. That was a place I was abusing kids. And if we go 25 back and talk to the people at parish of Saint John or

	2
1	parish of Saint John of God, lo and behold, we find out
2	that, yep, that's why he was transferred. That's why it was
3	outside the five years because lo and behold, yeah, he was
4	abusing kids. Someone found out about it; someone
5	complained about it. The pastor was freaked out about it
6	and the guy is gone. So it helps inform the area of
7	inquiry. And when the court was looking back to the
8	standard for Twombly, what are the factual allegations here?
9	What would be the evidence we would look at to say, I think
10	it's pretty probable that we're going to find out that this
11	diocese knew back at the parish of Saint John of God would
12	be the priest saying, yeah, I was molesting kids back then.
13	Or, yeah, I was molesting kids because generally, if he's
14	molesting kids, especially if he's transferred to outside of
15	those five years, that's usually what you're going to find.
16	And that's why if you were alluding to the movie
17	Spotlight, Your Honor, right, that's one of the moments in
18	the movie Spotlight where they look at the Catholic
19	directories and go, gosh, look at these, take these leave of
20	absences. Look at these, right, the trend. Sure. And
21	that's generally what we find too, which the Court noted in
22	its opinion.
23	So those sexual deviancy treatment records, if
24	you're looking for indicia that you're going to find notice
25	that knew or should have known, those sexual deviancy

	Pg 477 of 529
	Page 26
1	treatment records for us usually go, that's where I want to
2	look. That's where I'm going to find it and more often than
3	not, we find it.
4	THE COURT: So where have you obviously, before
5	you got into bankruptcy court, you're litigating these in
6	state court, which, I think as my opinion acknowledged is in
7	different pleading standards, cases would move to discovery,
8	where were there, where did you find records of sexual
9	deviancy treatment?
10	MR. AMALA: In the possession of the dioceses.
11	And then, Your Honor, you asked at the beginning of the
12	conference, you noted that we talked about secret files or
10	andidantial files

- 13 confidential files.
- 14 THE COURT: Right.

MR. AMALA: For whatever it's worth, Your Honor, the reason we use the term "secret," I believe that's the Latin translation of the law that says what the files are called. So we're not trying to use cheap rhetoric. It's just what the files are literally called under the church's own doctrine.

21 So putting that aside, those treatment records are 22 usually, in my experience, are in the possession of the 23 diocese. And if I may, Your Honor, just talking about the 24 file for our claimant, those at the issue of the objection, 25 that file does show this priest, he's assigned to the parish

Pg 478 of 529

Page 27

1 of Saint John of God in '61. He's then transferred in '63, 2 just two years later so outside of the five years. He's 3 then, in 1970, thinking about laicization, he starts seeing a psychiatrist. He's terminated from that assignment, 4 5 petitions for laicization. His assignment is revoked. Then 6 they put him back into service and I won't go through all 7 the correspondence, but this is a very troubled individual 8 and I will eventually get to -- and I'll give the Court the Bates number, Bates Number 35525. This priest, in February 9 10 of 1989, makes the slightest reference to having received 11 treatment at a facility called Saint Luke's. Those of us who've done a lot of work in this area know that Saint 12 13 Luke's was one of the few places in the country where the 14 Catholic church would send its priests for sexual deviancy 15 treatment. It was one of the main spots on the east coast. 16 That's where you went. If you were molesting kids, that's 17 where they send you. 18 So, I've got a priest here who's transferred 19 outside of the five years and who eventually is talking 20 about getting treatment at Saint Luke's. What I don't have, 21 I don't have the file, the treatment file that I would 22 expect to have. I don't have updates. Normally there is correspondence when a priest is sent to Saint Luke's. 23 24 There's almost always correspondence between the bishop or 25 the archbishop and the treatment center about the priest.

Page 28

1	I'm sending Father So-and-So to you. Please keep me
2	updated. They go back and forth and eventually they'll say,
3	Okay, we're sending him back to you. As time went on.
4	They'd say, of course, he can't be around kids, right? A
5	lot of times it's still in code. My favorite, not favorite
6	is I think I mentioned this before is, you know, we've
7	realized with our priests who tempted the virtue of the
8	young that you got to be careful where you assign them. So
9	the letters aren't always directly saying, hey, he's here
10	for abusing kids, keep him away from kids. But that
11	correspondence, Your Honor, is missing from this file. I
12	don't, maybe a privileged log has been produced and I missed
13	it. I have not seen it. So I don't have a privileged log
14	telling me what they've withheld. I don't know if they have
15	these records. Normally, those records would be in the
16	secret file because that's where they're supposed to be
17	kept. I don't have those records.
18	THE COURT: Let me, let me ask you this. I have
19	enough trouble keeping track of names, and keeping track of
20	claim numbers is even more difficult for me. Okay? So the
21	specific, what was the result with respect to the claimant
22	that you just described? Did I dismiss it with prejudice?
23	Dismiss it with leave to amend? What, what did I do.
24	MR. AMALA: It's Claimant 90100, and, Your Honor,
25	you sustained the objection with the right to amend.

Page 29

1 THE COURT: Amend. So I mean if you're pleading, 2 if you amend the claim with respect to 90100, I see it. You 3 know I got the schedule one in front of me. It's Number 24 on the list. And you allege everything that you just 4 I'm not ruling on something in the 5 described to me. 6 abstract, but I find it hard in those circumstances to think 7 that the result is going to be dismissal with prejudice. It 8 does efficiently allege the claim. I mean what you're 9 describing to me, and I did review these claims, is that's 10 not in there. Maybe you think, you know, it was unnecessary 11 for it to be in there. But you've described a set of facts that would I think satisfy a Iqbal, Twombly standard for 12 13 stating a claim. I don't know whether the debtor -- on what 14 basis it would object to, you know, seek to expunge the I mean I don't -- look, I sort of felt 15 claim that did that. 16 a dilemma here. Okay? I said this often enough, you know, 17 the foresee question didn't call for any of this stuff. Okay? And yet the standard by which a proof of claim should 18 19 be judged as the pleading standard and I said in the -- I 20 just thought it was unfair to apply that here because you 21 didn't have to do that when you filed the claim. Okay? You 22 did what they asked. So now you got to go back and you'll 23 amend the claim. And if the debtor moves to expunge it 24 again, I'll rule on it. 25 I'm not going to apologize for following the law,

1	what I understand the law to require in order to state a
2	viable claim. Okay? If what you described to me now
3	you're singling out one that may be the strongest one you
4	have. I don't know, I'm not suggesting it is or it isn't
5	but I'd be somewhat surprised if the diocese objects to that
6	claim or like you describe a long history and do you know
7	exactly who said what to whom about him? No. But, you
8	know, it seems to me that you've, the argument will be
9	your argument will be, you've raised reasonable credible
10	inferences that a proper claim with the required notice has
11	been asserted. I don't know, you know, the debtors' lawyers
12	may well come back and say no, it's not because of this list
13	of reasons. Okay. I'm not, I'm not ruling on specific ones
14	now, other than to say that all of what you laid out sounds
15	very persuasive just with me listening, but that's not in
16	the proof of claim that I reviewed. Nor do I think it had
17	to be, but it does now. Okay? Are there other examples you
18	want to give? I'm not, I don't want you to go through each
19	one of your clients, you know, most we're only on the
20	eighth omnibus objection and I only disallowed one, 90542,
21	because they didn't respond.
22	MR. AMALA: Your Honor I'm sorry.
23	THE COURT: The long list is subject to amendment.
24	Go ahead, Mr. Amala, I'm sorry.
25	MR. AMALA: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

1 No, go ahead. THE COURT: 2 MR. AMALA: No, we only had one claim that was 3 subject to the objection. 4 THE COURT: Okay. The reason, Your Honor, the reason I 5 MR. AMALA: 6 offered that was not being critical of the Court's decision 7 in the least. 8 THE COURT: You can be. I don't, I don't have 9 thick skin about people criticizing my decision. You're 10 going to do that on appeal. That's fine. Don't be 11 sensitive about that.

MR. AMALA: It's not that, Your Honor. What I 12 13 mean is I was given that explanation. I appreciate what you 14 said. Thank you, Your Honor. But I, what I was trying to 15 offer that for is examples of the Court I thought had asked 16 for this conference and started this conference by asking 17 the question of the diocese, can someone represent that they 18 have personal knowledge? Has someone looked at this file, 19 actually looked at this file and said, for example, that 20 that -- and I want to be clear, Your Honor. I then to agree with you, of course, and I hope that the Court would 21 22 overrule another objection if I lay out what I just did. 23 But I think what's important to note is, does the diocese have the sexual deviancy treatment file? Did someone review 24 25 it? Does that sexual deviancy treatment file have this

Page 32

1	priest admitting in 1989 that he was molesting children?
2	Does he admit that he was molesting parish children, the
3	parish of Saint John of God, so that someone on the diocese
4	end who's looking at this, because I don't have it, goes,
5	boy, we shouldn't object to this claim and represent to the
6	Court that there was no notice because boy, it sure looks
7	like this guy was transferred because he was molesting kids.
8	Has anyone done that analysis? Has anyone looked at that
9	file? Does the file exist, the sexual deviancy treatment?
10	So I was trying to give that as example to the Court's
11	question to the diocese because one would hope before the
12	diocese makes this objection that they go in and someone's
13	looked at the file that I don't have and has said, get rid
14	of that guy. There's no way he's ever going to find notice
15	that's clean as a whistle.
16	THE COURT: May I ask you this? In any of your
17	state court cases, did you ask for and did any of the
18	dioceses, because this is not the only one that you're
19	representing clients in front, produce a sexual deviancy
20	treatment file?
21	MR. AMALA: Yes, that was the subject of the
22	appellate decision in the Harmon versus the Diocese of
23	Albany case that we prevailed on last year at the appellate
24	level. So that's controlling law in New York with the
25	Diocese of Albany decision in Harmon. And then we also have

212-267-6868

	Page 33
1	one that with a case, it's Myda (ph). I can provide it to
2	the Court and the counsel. It is at the state court level.
3	It's on appeal now involving the Diocese of Brooklyn where
4	Justice well, it's both, Justices Love and Tish ruled
5	that we are entitled to the sexual deviancy treatment
6	records in that case because they're in the possession of
7	the diocese. The Diocese of Brooklyn has appealed that.
8	So, absolutely, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: All right. Is that a term of art that
10	if I permitted you, if I directed the diocese to produce
11	sexual deviancy treatment files, is that a term commonly
12	understood in the sexual abuse cases?
13	MR. AMALA: It generally is, Your Honor, but I
14	would someone corrected me. I used to say "throw caution
15	to the wind" and then someone said you're using the term
16	wrong. So whatever the term would be, I guess I would
17	caution Your Honor, I believe a lot of us who do this work
18	understand what that that is a term of art. I think the
19	concern though, Your Honor, is the files may be about sexual
20	deviancy treatment, but the priest is sent just for
21	treatment to Saint Luke's. I think all of us have then as
22	colloquially, however you say the word
23	THE COURT: You've assumed that that's for sexual
24	deviancy treatment.
25	MR. AMALA: I think that's generally true. A lot

	Page 34
1	of the other lawyers, on both sides on this call, can
2	correct me. But I just want to say, Your Honor, if Your
3	Honor says produce sexual deviancy treatment records, that
4	may not be sufficiently inclusive because there may be
5	records that don't say the word "sexual deviancy treatment"
6	or specifically say we're giving him treatment for
7	pedophilia. But in the records it's, you can tell what
8	they're talking about.
9	THE COURT: Okay. I'll come back to you and let's
10	unless there's another point you want to make now.
11	MR. AMALA: I'll stop where I hope I'm ahead, but
12	I don't know if I am. Thank you, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Well, I don't know yet either. Mr.
14	Mones.
15	MR. MONES: Good morning, Your Honor. Just as a
16	quick follow up to your question you asked, Mr. Amala.
17	We've obtained prior to the CVA from area dioceses, the
18	files involving sexual deviancy, just for the Court's
19	information. So, basically
20	THE COURT: Let me just stop you.
21	MR. MONES: Yes, sir.
22	THE COURT: What were those files called when you
23	say "files involving sexual deviancy"?
24	MR. MONES: Well, they actually not to correct
25	Mr. Amala, they weren't called sexual deviancy files. They

	Page 55
1	were just contained in the priest's personnel file that they
2	sent this person for treatment to Pennsylvania to Saint John
3	Vianney. And this was a Rockville this was a priest
4	working in Rockville Center who was attached to an order
5	that was in Brooklyn. So both the Diocese of Rockville
6	Center and the Diocese of Brooklyn were sued. This is a
7	2014 case. And we received the progress notes from Saint
8	John Vianney as part of the full priest personnel file that
9	we requested because we made an omnibus request for all
10	treatment records, et cetera. And so we received that
11	document from both dioceses.
12	THE COURT: And is it your experience in these
13	cases that the diocese if a greased within the diocese
14	had been sent for sexual deviancy treatment that the diocese
15	would have and generalize it, so I'm not limiting it to
16	the Diocese of Rocket Center a diocese would have a copy
17	of treatment records for alleged abusers?
18	MR. MONES: Yeah, I mean I believe Mr. Stoneking
19	addressed this as well. Specifically, being sent to Saint
20	Luke's or being sent to the Servants of the Paracletes and
21	other treatment institutions, Saint John Vianney, it's a
22	condition of employment. And so the diocese pays for the
23	treatment. That's not free. The diocese pays for the
24	treatment and the diocese has a specific point person who
25	receives daily progress report not daily, strike that

Page 36

1	who receives regular progress reports from the treatment
2	center to find out when the priest is available to come back
3	and whether or not that priest, depending upon the timing
4	we're talking about, should come back into service and be
5	around children or should come back and service and be in a
6	hospital for adults, et cetera. But there's no doubt in my
7	mind that every diocese that sends and this is all my
8	experience over decades I've been doing these cases that
9	they always have this, that the, that there is a file in
10	that part of the file is this treatment record that is
11	maintained. And it's only also because they say it's a
12	condition of employment, which tends to be the way in which
13	plaintiffs can get copies of these records because it is a
14	condition of employment under New York law and we would have
15	access to it. But it's not that the priest goes on his own
16	and says I need treatment and then the priest keeps the
17	file. That's not the way it works.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Anything you want to add now?
19	MR. MONES: Excuse me, Your Honor?
20	THE COURT: Is there anything you wish to add?
21	MR. MONES: Oh, yeah, I do want to add. I have a
22	couple of couple of things if I could please. Thank you for
23	the time.
24	I understand that the Court is not going to grant
25	extensive discovery, so if I would request from the Court

Pg 488 of 529

1	for 90324 and 90245 the altar servers, list of the altar
2	servers and the priests that served alongside the two
3	alleged perpetrators in this case, that would be our
4	request. I don't know if the Court is going to grant it in
5	the sense that it is the Court seemed to indicate that
6	it's going to be extremely circumspect in its granting of
7	discovery in this case.

8 I expect to be extremely circumspect. THE COURT: Okay. Secondly, I just want to say 9 MR. MONES: 10 following up on one of our cases, in the Alan Rimmer, who 11 was 90245, he is the priest, there was, we only had two 12 pages in the personnel file. There was nothing else. He 13 was a priest from England and we at least, just for fairness 14 purposes, should have the diocese request if there is a file 15 there from the Diocese in England where Father Rimmer came 16 from because he was in the United States for about a month 17 at the time this happened. And our client, otherwise, does 18 not have the benefit of these other documents, very similar 19 to what Mr. Stoneking said in terms of his client. So we 20 would make that request.

21 I would say now, Your Honor, based upon reviewing 22 90234, we found a letter -- and I was going to request more 23 information, but I don't think I need to now -- we found a letter in the file and this goes to the issue that the Court 24 25 was asking, how do you determine credibility? This is a

> Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

Page 38 1 Father Nielsen, just if I can indulge a Court for about 20 2 seconds, just less than that to read from --3 THE COURT: You're going to use more than 20 4 seconds asking to indulge, but go ahead. Just tell me. 5 MR. MONES: Okay, Your Honor. This is a letter 6 from a parishioner. 7 "I really hoped that Father Nielsen would be transferred this year. But when he was not, I decide to 8

9 speak to him about it and how he and I could possibly help 10 each other communicate a little better than we had in the 11 past. I also wanted to tell him that there are people in 12 this parish who are hurting and need to be ministered to and that he is oblivious to it all. The kindest rationalization 13 14 that I've heard is that Father Nielsen does not relate to 15 adults. I have a problem with that and I imagine you do 16 too."

17 That, for me, is the kind of code language that 18 has been used by both parishioners even, but clearly by the 19 diocese for individuals who have a predilection to being 20 around children more than adults. And I would say, Your 21 Honor, and I -- and this letter has to be read in pari 22 materia, I believe, with the findings of the grand jury in 23 2003. I raised this last time we spoke. What's unique 24 about the grand jury report, we can make all these 25 allegations about cover up, et cetera. You can even make

Page 39

	5
1	those allegations, you know they are just allegations in
2	Boston or in most of the other diocese. But where there's a
3	finding from a duly appointed a grand jury and it finds that
4	the diocese ignored quote this is Page 172 "ignored
5	credible complaints about the sexually abusive behavior of
6	priests and they failed to act on obvious warning signs of
7	sexual abuse, including instances where they were aware
8	priests had children in their private rooms in the rectory
9	overnight, et cetera." Then when we read those two
10	together, it seems to me and we will, of course, put this in
11	our - because the Court did grant us to amend we will put
12	this in our amended claim. But we believe there is clearly
13	the evidence that there was something going on here with
14	Father Nielsen.
15	For some reason, the diocese still objected to
16	this. I don't know how they could have read this paragraph
17	and still went ahead with the objection, but they did and we
18	will address it in our amended claim. But that's basically
19	the issues I wanted to present to the Court. I appreciate
20	the time.
21	THE COURT: Thanks very much, Mr. Mones. Mr.
22	Geremia, the go ahead and respond and then I'll ask
23	questions. I'll let you respond first.
24	MR. GEREMIA: Sure. First of all, we, the
25	committee and the counsel representing committee members,
l	Veritext Legal Solutions

212-267-6868

Page 40

1	has had all of the personnel files
2	THE COURT: Nope, nope, nope. Well, you told me
3	at a hearing, I believe it was you, perhaps it was Mr.
4	Stephens that the files were produced to the committee. And
5	if a committee member happened to be represented by counsel,
6	then he would have gotten it. But you did not produce the
7	personnel files to each counsel. Maybe I, maybe I
8	misunderstood what I was told. That's one of the reasons I
9	wanted to have this here. I wanted to be sure that each
10	counsel for a claimant has had access to whatever files were
11	produced to the committee. It wasn't clear to me that they
12	did.
13	MR. GEREMIA: Why don't I ask my partner Eric
14	Stephens to address that. My point is to address, you know,
15	Mr. Stoneking and Mr. Amala were talking documents produced
16	to them and in some respects, alluding to purported
17	shortcomings in the production. This is the first we are
18	ever hearing of that.
19	THE COURT: Well, we're hearing about it now.
20	It's now, most of them have gotten leave to amend.
21	MR. GEREMIA: Yeah.
22	THE COURT: And when I wrote the opinion, I felt
23	it was important to have this conference today. You know,
24	as I said, I sort of analogized that the federal rules have
25	sort of taken the decisions applying to the federal rules
1	

Page 41

1	have sort of said, who's the party likely to be in
2	possession of the information? I mean if the information is
3	exclusively in the possession of the defendant, you may ease
4	the burden placed on the plaintiff in their pleading.
5	That's sort of what was motivating my thinking. My opinion
6	said what it said. Okay. That wasn't exactly it. So let
7	me come back to one of the things that Mr. Amala and I were
8	discussing and that is, I'm not opening while I'm not
9	opening this up to broad discovery, it does seem to me that
10	the diocese, which is in possession of whatever files it
11	has, should be a person with personal knowledge or
12	sufficient foundation established that they searched the
13	records, whether it's just a personnel, if it's just the
14	personnel card, but if it happens that there's a separate
15	sexual deviancy treatment file, has somebody searched that?
16	I mean I want to be satisfied that the diocese for each of
17	the accused abusers where notices are issued, the diocese
18	has searched its files and a person with sufficient personal
19	knowledge, they conducted a search and says, we've searched
20	the files. There are no records either sexual deviancy
21	treatment files, I don't have all the labels here, relating
22	to the alleged abuser.
23	And so if it was Mr. Amala's client, you would
24	provide Mr. Amala with or Mr. Stoneking or Mr. Mones with
25	respect to their client. I'm not saying plaintiffs' lawyers

Page 42

You've looked for, Mr. Amala has got one client in these claims that we're dealing with, one or more declarations that say the files, including any sexual deviancy treatment files, personnel files, correspondence files, have been examined and no records showing any allegations of sexual abuse by the priest have been located. I mean that, you know, Mr. Amala thinks that's not been done. Is that true? Maybe it's never been required. I understand your position is, you know, they have the burden of pleading and they do, but we're talking about information that would be uniquely in the possession of the diocese. MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived from more than one source, including the confidential/secret files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout the country where they found this. If those records are to be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And each claimant will get that personnel file. We have also	1	get to see every personal file of every priest. Okay?
that say the files, including any sexual deviancy treatment files, personnel files, correspondence files, have been examined and no records showing any allegations of sexual abuse by the priest have been located. I mean that, you know, Mr. Amala thinks that's not been done. Is that true? Maybe it's never been required. I understand your position is, you know, they have the burden of pleading and they do, but we're talking about information that would be uniquely in the possession of the diocese. MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived from more than one source, including the confidential/secret files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout the country where they found this. If those records are to be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	2	You've looked for, Mr. Amala has got one client in these
files, personnel files, correspondence files, have been examined and no records showing any allegations of sexual abuse by the priest have been located. I mean that, you know, Mr. Amala thinks that's not been done. Is that true? Maybe it's never been required. I understand your position is, you know, they have the burden of pleading and they do, but we're talking about information that would be uniquely in the possession of the diocese. MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived from more than one source, including the confidential/secret files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout the country where they found this. If those records are to be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	3	claims that we're dealing with, one or more declarations
 examined and no records showing any allegations of sexual abuse by the priest have been located. I mean that, you know, Mr. Amala thinks that's not been done. Is that true? Maybe it's never been required. I understand your position is, you know, they have the burden of pleading and they do, but we're talking about information that would be uniquely in the possession of the diocese. MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived from more than one source, including the confidential/secret files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout the country where they found this. If those records are to be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And 	4	that say the files, including any sexual deviancy treatment
7abuse by the priest have been located. I mean that, you8know, Mr. Amala thinks that's not been done. Is that true?9Maybe it's never been required. I understand your position10is, you know, they have the burden of pleading and they do,11but we're talking about information that would be uniquely12in the possession of the diocese.13MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and14Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the15committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each16individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire17personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived18from more than one source, including the confidential/secret19files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of20treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to21litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout22the country where they found this. If those records are to23be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	5	files, personnel files, correspondence files, have been
know, Mr. Amala thinks that's not been done. Is that true? Maybe it's never been required. I understand your position is, you know, they have the burden of pleading and they do, but we're talking about information that would be uniquely in the possession of the diocese. MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived from more than one source, including the confidential/secret files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout the country where they found this. If those records are to be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	6	examined and no records showing any allegations of sexual
9 Maybe it's never been required. I understand your position is, you know, they have the burden of pleading and they do, but we're talking about information that would be uniquely in the possession of the diocese. 13 MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived from more than one source, including the confidential/secret files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to 11 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout the country where they found this. If those records are to be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	7	abuse by the priest have been located. I mean that, you
10 is, you know, they have the burden of pleading and they do, 11 but we're talking about information that would be uniquely 12 in the possession of the diocese. 13 MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and 14 Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the 15 committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each 16 individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire 17 personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived 18 from more than one source, including the confidential/secret 19 files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of 20 treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to 21 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout 22 the country where they found this. If those records are to 23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	8	know, Mr. Amala thinks that's not been done. Is that true?
but we're talking about information that would be uniquely in the possession of the diocese. MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived from more than one source, including the confidential/secret files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout the country where they found this. If those records are to be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	9	Maybe it's never been required. I understand your position
12 in the possession of the diocese. 13 MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and 14 Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the 15 committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each 16 individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire 17 personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived 18 from more than one source, including the confidential/secret 19 files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of 20 treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to 21 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout 22 the country where they found this. If those records are to 23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	10	is, you know, they have the burden of pleading and they do,
13 MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and 14 Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the 15 committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each 16 individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire 17 personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived 18 from more than one source, including the confidential/secret 19 files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of 20 treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to 21 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout 22 the country where they found this. If those records are to 23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	11	but we're talking about information that would be uniquely
Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived from more than one source, including the confidential/secret files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout the country where they found this. If those records are to be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	12	in the possession of the diocese.
15 committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each 16 individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire 17 personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived 18 from more than one source, including the confidential/secret 19 files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of 20 treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to 21 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout 22 the country where they found this. If those records are to 23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	13	MR. GEREMIA: Right. And what we have done, and
16 individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire 17 personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived 18 from more than one source, including the confidential/secret 19 files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of 20 treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to 21 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout 22 the country where they found this. If those records are to 23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	14	Eric can fill in details is, you know, produced to the
17 personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived 18 from more than one source, including the confidential/secret 19 files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of 20 treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to 21 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout 22 the country where they found this. If those records are to 23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	15	committee. We are prepared to produce to counsel for each
18 from more than one source, including the confidential/secret 19 files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of 20 treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to 21 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout 22 the country where they found this. If those records are to 23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	16	individual claimant at issue on these objections the entire
19 files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of 20 treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to 21 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout 22 the country where they found this. If those records are to 23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	17	personnel file for that accused abuser, which is derived
20 treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to 21 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout 22 the country where they found this. If those records are to 23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	18	from more than one source, including the confidential/secret
21 litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout 22 the country where they found this. If those records are to 23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	19	files where Mr. Amala said he would expect any evidence of
the country where they found this. If those records are to be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	20	treatment records to be contained. I mean we have to
23 be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And	21	litigate these claims, not claims in other parts throughout
	22	the country where they found this. If those records are to
24 each claimant will get that personnel file. We have also	23	be in the personnel files, that's where they will be. And
	24	each claimant will get that personnel file. We have also
25 done a search. Mr. Stephens has headed up this effort	25	done a search. Mr. Stephens has headed up this effort

212-267-6868

Page 43

1	across the entire document database of production, more than
2	700,000 documents, and we have searched on the individual
3	accused abusers for these claims. And we are prepared to
4	sort through that information from the vendor and produce to
5	each individual claimant every document that has hit on that
6	search. So claimant, each claimant's counsel will have all
7	of the documents that relate to this accused abuser and then
8	can amend their claims if they see as warranted. Eric, I
9	don't know if you have anything to add to the production
10	that we have done or are prepared to do?
11	MR. STEPHENS: Your Honor, Eric Stephens with
12	Jones Day. Todd, Mr. Geremia has described the proposal
13	that we had intended to make to Your Honor was, you know, we
14	have obviously this document database. I testified at some
15	length about it. You had questions for me, the committee
16	had questions.
17	THE COURT: And I think some of the plaintiffs'
18	lawyers got upset that it wasn't a hearing where they
19	attended. Anyway, go ahead.
20	MR. STEPHENS: What we have done, what we have
21	done in anticipation of today's conversation is we have run
22	searches for the names of the accused at issue in the
23	objections that have been given leave to amend. And what we
24	had, what we would had intended to propose to Your Honor
25	today was that subject to a privilege review and filtering

Page 44

1	out mishits and those sorts of things, that to the
2	individual counsel for each individual claimant, we would
3	produce to them the nonprivileged search hits. In terms of
4	logistics, we thought we could manage that process, you
5	know, probably sometime in the next 10 days.
6	The other, the other administrative issue that we
7	wanted to raise with Your Honor, if this is to be the path
8	forward, is that there are individual claimant counsel who
9	are not parties to the Protective Order. And so we would
10	need to address that. That's not an issue for the state
11	court counsel who you've heard from today, who are committee
12	members.
13	I would just, I do also want to emphasize to the
14	Court, our understanding is that the collection and the
15	productions to date, which were completed May 31st, 2022,
16	were complete. And you heard testimony about that at the
17	April 19th hearing. And I've looked back as I wanted to
18	make sure that I wasn't misremembering, but you then also
19	asked committee counsel for their understanding of the
20	completeness of the production. And so I'm looking at Page
21	233 of the April 19th, 2023, hearing in this matter. We
22	just come back from a break and the question from the Court
23	was, "Before we continue, I have a question for committee
24	counsel. The testimony has been that all of the personnel
25	files, including the confidential personnel files for all of

Pg 496 of 529

1 the alleged abusers, have been produced to the committee. 2 Do you agree with that?" Mr. Brown's response for the 3 committee was yes.

So what I, you know, while we came prepared today 4 5 to make that offer and we think that's a sensible way to 6 proceed, I now have concerns that what I don't want this to 7 turn into is an extensive frolic and detour into additional collections and requests when the parties have been 8 9 operating from a place where for a year now, you know, we've 10 understood that these records are complete. So clearly, the 11 10-day process that I've proposed, or that the debtor is 12 proposing, you know, would need to, you know, would not 13 accommodate, you know, frankly a do-over of what was years' 14 long, you know, collection, review, and production process.

15 MS. MICHAEL: Your Honor, Brittany Michaels, 16 Pachulski Stang Ziehl and Jones on behalf of the committee. 17 May I just correct the record there slightly? What we 18 stated at the hearing that Mr. Stephens referred to was that 19 we agreed that the debtor had represented to us that they 20 have produced all of the personnel files. We never agreed 21 that we had all the personnel files. That's not something 22 that we would have the information to be able to agree to. 23 All we have ever said is that the debtor has repeatedly represented to us that they had produced all the personnel 24 25 We have never made any statements about the files.

Pg 497 of 529 Page 46 1 completeness or otherwise agreed that those records contain 2 everything that they should. 3 THE COURT: Let me, let me come back and I don't 4 know, Mr. Stephens or Mr. Geremia -- and I'm not saying I'm 5 requiring this, but I'm not saying I'm not going to either -6 - but so Mr. Amala has said there's been no representation 7 under oath by someone with sufficient knowledge that the 8 files, all the files have been reviewed, and confirming that 9 there have been no allegations against the alleged priest 10 abuser. I mean, look --11 MR. GEREMIA: One of the criteria we had for this, 12 Your Honor, the first bullet point from Page 7 you read is 13 that for this round of objections, the accused perpetrator 14 was accused in only one proof of claim. And that's after an 15 extensive process by which these plaintiffs' counsels 16 advertised the bankruptcy and advertised the opportunity to

17 submit a claim. So these are not alleged repeat abusers.

18 They're alleged people, whether it be once --

19 THE COURT: Whether it be a repeat abuser or a 20 one-time abuser, the one-time abuser doesn't get a free pass 21 and the diocese doesn't get a free pass --22 MR. GEREMIA: Understood. 23 THE COURT: -- if it had prior knowledge of 24 predisposition, predilection, I don't know what the exact 25 term is, so, yeah, I'm happy there's only that from this

1	collection, there's no more than one abuse claim. But here
2	is we're not going to get this fully resolved today, but
3	hopefully we are I want Mr. Stephens, Mr. Geremia to
4	confer with Mr. Stoneking, Mr. Amala, Mr. Mones, and include
5	Ms. Michael or someone else on behalf of the committee in
6	this discussion. And, you know, I'm trying to take notes as
7	all the lawyers are talking, but I don't think I've ever
8	gotten a clear response as to whether the Diocese of
9	Rockville Center kept in a file or files, whatever that file
10	may be called, any sexual deviancy treatment records. You
11	know what, what the plaintiff's counsel is suggesting is
12	there should be one. The diocese pays for the treatment, if
13	some if a priest is sent to such treatment, that there
14	are a number of specific locations that sort of seem to
15	specialize in sexual deviancy treatment. And I don't want
16	any of you, I don't want to have egg on your faces when it
17	turns out that well, there was this piece of paper. It did
18	show that Priest X had been referred on one occasion or two
19	occasions. You know, I don't know. Let me ask you, Mr.
20	Geremia, does the diocese maintain in a file or in multiple
21	personnel files, any sexual deviancy treatment records?
22	MR. GEREMIA: I don't know the answer to that
23	sitting right now. I don't know if Eric does. And if not,
24	we will find out the answer for you.
25	THE COURT: Okay.

Page 48

1	MR. STEPHENS: And Your Honor, this is Eric
2	Stephens for the debtor. We will confirm, but my
3	understanding is that they are not, they would not be
4	separately kept. My expectation is consistent with what Mr.
5	Mones described, was that they would be part of the
6	personnel file for this client. And, you know, from Mr.
7	Mones' description, it sounds like documents of that type
8	were in the file that he mentioned, which to me suggests
9	that at least he and I have the same understanding.
10	THE COURT: Look, I'm not entering an order or
11	ruling today. I'm directing that you confer and see if you
12	can come to an agreement. I appreciate that the diocese
13	being prepared today to say what they're ready to produce or
14	within 10 days will produce. I want you to have this
15	dialogue. It may be that you can't agree on everything. I
16	don't agree that I'm going to somehow open this up to
17	depositions and discovery of other priests or parish
18	employees or officials asked about, you know, to take
19	depositions and well, did you have any idea that so-and-so
20	was spending too much time with children? Okay. You know,
21	look, I'm Jewish, reasonably active, sure. I've had a rabbi
22	who is best in dealing with children than he is with senior
23	citizens, which I consider myself to be. Okay. He just is.
24	He's not abusing any children. I'm absolutely certain of
25	it, but he's absolutely great with the kids. Okay? So the

	Page 49
1	fact you may say history shows the priests who are
2	spending too much time with children is a sign, I'm not
3	ready to buy, I'm not buying into that. Okay? That's not
4	going to be the basis for opening up broad discovery. You
5	know I had a rabbi in the past. The one thing he was the
6	worst at was dealing with elderly congregants who were sick
7	and making hospital visits. He was great for lots of
8	others. So it's not all great at the same thing. Okay?
9	MR. MONES: Your Honor, may I
10	THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Mones.
11	MR. MONES: May I interject just for one second?
12	THE COURT: Sure, go ahead.
13	MR. MONES: I know as being a Jew as well, the
14	difference between rabbis who like kids and also rabbis
15	actually out there who abuse children. But I will tell you
16	the line that concerned me was not that he was close to
17	children and, you know, we'll plead this and the Court will
18	decide what it's going to decide, but the kindest rationale
19	is he doesn't relate to adults, I have a problem with that.
20	I imagine you do too. That's not saying, I'm sure you would
21	not say about this rabbi that you have that well, in writing
22	to if there was a complaint about him, that you would have a
23	problem that it was a problem that he doesn't relate to
24	adults. He may have a better relationship with children
25	than adults, but I think there's a lot of nuance in these

Pg 501 of 529

Page 50 1 cases, Your Honor, that Mr. Amala and Mr. Stoneking alluded 2 to, over the years we have, you know, traversed through this underbelly of American Society and learned that within, 3 there are certain buzzwords --4 5 THE COURT: Okay. There isn't going to be 6 discovery because of buzzwords. Okay? I'm just telling you 7 right now. 8 MR. MONES: Well, we'll just have go with what 9 Your Honor will decide. 10 THE COURT: This will be a meet and confer. If I 11 need to schedule another hearing because you can't come to a 12 complete agreement, we will. I want for those claims that 13 have been, you know, where I sustained the objection with 14 leave to amend on information that's the possession of the 15 diocese, the claimants' lawyers should have that information 16 before they have to plead again. Okay? 17 I think, you know, Mr. Geremia, much of what 18 you're proposing to do sounds fine to me, okay? But the 19 devil is going to be in the details. But I do and then I 20 will come back to this point because I have required this in 21 other cases, and that is going to be a certification on the 22 scope of the search that's been made. I think that's required. Well, I'm requiring it. Okay? I don't have any 23 24 doubt, Mr. Geremia, that you and your colleagues that I have 25 the greatest respect for, are going to absolutely fulfill

	Page 51
1	the professional responsibility of lawyers who represent
2	defendants in cases in discovery, okay, and, you know, it
3	may be more, I don't know who's doing the search. It may be
4	more appropriate, it's got to be whether it's the general
5	counsel of the diocese or whoever, but there's going to be a
6	certification, an appropriate certification. Okay?
7	MR. GEREMIA: That will be fine, Your Honor. We
8	won't have an issue with that. As I think Your Honor knows,
9	Mr. Stephens testified to this. These documents were
10	produced pursuant to court order. So we were, you know, we
11	did it in accordance with the court order, followed the
12	court order. But we'll do a certification that will not be
13	an issue.
14	THE COURT: That's fine.
15	MR. GEREMIA: We are to confer with the three
16	counsels you mentioned then regarding the scope of the
17	document production?
18	THE COURT: And include somebody from committee
19	counsel in the discussion as well.
20	MR. AMALA: Your Honor
21	MR. GEREMIA: Okay. We will do that.
22	THE COURT: Who, who wanted to be heard? Was that
23	Mr. Amala or was that somebody else?
24	MR. AMALA: Yes, Your Honor, Jason Amala.
25	THE COURT: Go ahead.

	rage 32
1	MR. AMALA: Just I'm sure this came up before, but
2	the diocese likely employs an archivist who should be very,
3	very familiar with how these records are kept.
4	THE COURT: Do me a favor, raise it with the Jones
5	Day folks. And if you can't get to an agreement, we'll have
6	another hearing about it. I'm not going to let this linger
7	on very long, but I do want, okay, the best thing is not
8	negotiating over the phone with me, who doesn't know what's
9	in these documents? Okay?
10	MR. AMALA: Your Honor, where I was going with
11	that was not trying to bicker right now. The one question I
12	just wanted to ask, the privilege log, I don't know if
13	that's been produced and while we've got, I just want to
14	make sure we've got that because Mr. Stephens referred to
15	producing non-privileged documents, which, of course, begs
16	the question of what's being held on privilege. So I just,
17	I just want to make sure we'll get that or that we can have
18	that, Your Honor. That's why I'm raising it with you. I
19	don't remember the contours of what you said we can have and
20	can't have. So is that something we can have?
21	MR. GEREMIA: We'll address that when we talk
22	THE COURT: You you need to, you need to address
23	where this is going from here. Okay? Anything else for
24	today?
25	MR. AMALA: Thank you, Your Honor.

20-12343-111	Pg 504 of 529
	Page 53
1	MR. GEREMIA: Not from the debtor, Your Honor,
2	thank you.
3	THE COURT: Okay. You know the clock is ticking
4	on the month of May when the mediation is supposed to be
5	going on. I hope that's going on. So we'll leave it at
6	that.
7	MR. GEREMIA: It is.
8	THE COURT: Okay. We're adjourned. Thank you
9	very much.
10	(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at
11	3:09 PM)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
20	
22	
23	
24	
25	

20-12345-n	ng Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 505 of 529
	Page 54
1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing
4	transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.
5	
6	Soneya M. destande Hyd
7	
8	Sonya Ledanski Hyde
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Veritext Legal Solutions
21	330 Old Country Road
22	Suite 300
23	Mineola, NY 11501
24	
25	Date: May 17, 2023
l	Veritext Legal Solutions

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 506 of 529

[& - abuse]

&	1987 2:8	4	90324 2:6 7:14
& 3:11 4:8,16	1989 27:10	403 5:10	37:1
	32:1		90327 2:3
1	19th 44:17,21	5	90330 2:4
10 44:5 45:11	2	500 5:10	90345 2:4
48:14	2 6:3	5896224 22:7	90349 2:4
10001 4:11	2 0.3 20 38:1,3	6	90355 2:3
10004 1:14	20 38.1,3 20-12345 1:3	61 27:1	90391 2:4
4:19	6:5	615 5:3	90392 2:6
10017 3:14	2003 38:23	63 27:1	90472 2:4
10281 3:6	2003 38:23 2014 35:7	7	90495 2:5
11501 54:23	2014 33.7 2019 22:7		90512 2:4
11556 4:4	2019 22.7 2022 44:15	7 10:13 46:12	90514 2:4
1201 4:3	2022 44.15 2023 1:16 6:3	700,000 43:2	90517 2:5
12151 54:6	44:21 54:25	72114 5:4	90542 2:5
12th 4:10	2062 2:8	780 3:13	30:20
13101 3:22	2002 2:0 2063 2:9	7th 4:10	90544 2:5 5:2
16 1:16	2005 2:9	9	8:25
16th 6:3	2000 2:9 2093 2:9	90020 2:6	98104 5:11
17 54:25	23 22:8	90053 2:6	a
172 39:4	233 44:21	90066 3:23	able 13:20
1730 2:7	24 29:3	90075 2:6	45:22
1731 2:7	250 3:5	90090 2:7	absences 25:20
1774 2:7	2:01 1:17	90100 2:5 18:5	absolutely 33:8
1856 2:7	3	28:24 29:2	48:24,25 50:25
1858 2:7		90174 2:5	abstract 29:6
1860 2:7	30 15:8	90181 2:5	absue 3:21
1861 2:7	300 54:22	90208 2:3	abuse 10:15
1863 2:8 1871 2:8	30035 2:5	90209 2:3	11:4,5,14 13:3
1871 2.8 1872 2:8	31st 44:15	90231 2:3	15:6,6,8,9 16:3
1874 2:8	330 54:21 34th 2:12 4:18	90234 37:22	17:12 18:18,23
1911 2:8	34th 3:13 4:18 35525 27:9	90244 2:6	18:24 19:11
1911 2.8 1970 27:3	363 4:10	90245 2:6 7:14	20:6,23 21:4
1978 15:6	3:09 53:11	37:1,11	21:17 33:12
1978 15:0 1984 2:8	J.V/ JJ.11	90264 2:3	39:7 42:7 47:1
1707 2.0		90317 2:3	49:15

[abused - amala]

			C
abused 14:6	acknowledged	21:20	15:8 18:13
18:25 19:25	26:6	admitting 32:1	allegations
21:10,19,20	acknowledges	adults 20:6	11:4 13:13
24:10,14,23	22:15,17 23:8	36:6 38:15,20	14:9,10,18
abuser 41:22	acquired 18:11	49:19,24,25	15:3,9 16:3
42:17 43:7	act 39:6	adverse 10:21	18:23,24 19:11
46:10,19,20,20	acted 12:16,17	12:2 13:8,17	25:8 38:25
abuser's 20:21	action 23:12	14:11,19	39:1,1 42:6
abusers 10:25	active 48:21	advertised	46:9
12:14,23,25	acts 20:16	46:16,16	allege 22:21
13:1,5,6 35:17	actual 22:18	afraid 21:24	29:4,8
41:17 43:3	actually 22:17	afternoon 6:7	alleged 10:15
45:1 46:17	31:19 34:24	6:24 7:11,16	14:5 15:6
abusing 19:2	49:15	7:17,25 8:4,19	24:13 35:17
20:2 24:24	add 17:18	9:5,12 10:6	37:3 41:22
25:4 28:10	36:18,20,21	18:3	45:1 46:9,17
48:24	43:9	afternoon's	46:18
abusive 39:5	additional 7:20	9:19	allows 18:19
access 36:15	8:17 9:2,22	agree 31:20	alluded 50:1
40:10	45:7	45:2,22 48:15	alluding 25:16
accommodate	address 10:23	48:16	40:16
45:13	23:25 39:18	agreed 15:18	alongside 37:2
accordance	40:14,14 44:10	45:19,20 46:1	altar 37:1,1
51:11	52:21,22	agreement	amala 5:8,13
accurate 54:4	addressed	48:12 50:12	9:13,24,25
accused 10:18	35:19	52:5	10:3 11:18
10:23,25,25	addressing	ahead 30:24	18:2,3,4 19:6,8
11:3,25 12:14	12:23	31:1 34:11	21:23 22:3
12:23,25 13:1	adjourned	38:4 39:17,22	24:3,15 26:10
13:5,6 18:16	53:8	43:19 49:10,12	26:15 28:24
18:18,18 41:17	administrative	51:25	30:22,24,25
42:17 43:3,7	44:6	al 4:1	31:2,5,12
43:22 46:13,14	admit 19:23	alan 37:10	32:21 33:13,25
accusing 14:14	20:2,13 32:2	albany 32:23	34:11,16,25
acknowledge	admits 24:10	32:25	40:15 41:7,24
22:9	admitted 9:24	allegation	42:2,8,19 46:6
	18:25 21:10,17	12:15 14:5	47:4 50:1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 508 of 529

[amala - believe]

[]			0 -
51:20,23,24,24	appear 13:16	asked 11:10	b
52:1,10,25	13:16	19:8 20:23,24	b 1:21 3:17
amala's 12:13	appearance	26:11 29:22	b 1.21 5.17 back 16:14
14:6 41:23	6:6,20,23 7:10	31:15 34:16	18:20 19:4
amend 12:11	7:12,21,25 8:8	44:19 48:18	24:7,16,23,25
28:23,25 29:1	8:22 9:2,3,6,7	asking 31:16	25:7,11,12
29:2,23 39:11	9:13,18,23	37:25 38:4	27:6 28:2,3
40:20 43:8,23	10:2	asserted 30:11	29:22 30:12
50:14	appearances	asserts 11:2	34:9 36:2,4,5
amended 39:12	7:16 8:17,20	assign 28:8	41:7 44:17,22
39:18	appearing 6:16	assigned 17:8	46:3 50:20
amendment	8:9,25	26:25	ball 4:1 7:18
30:23	appellate 32:22	assignment	bankruptcy
american 50:3	32:23	27:4,5	1:1,12,23 26:5
amounts 16:6	apply 29:20	assignments	46:16
analogized	applying 40:25	16:13	based 37:21
40:24	appointed 39:3	associates 4:8	basically 34:19
analysis 32:8	appreciate	8:2	39:18
anderson 4:8	23:5 24:3,4	assume 24:10	basis 29:14
4:14 6:8 8:1,6	31:13 39:19	assumed 33:23	49:4
8:7,9,9	48:12	attached 35:4	bates 27:9,9
angeles 3:23	appropriate	attended 43:19	battery 4:18
answer 19:2	51:4,6	attention 22:6	beginning
47:22,24	april 44:17,21	attorneys 3:4	13:19,25 26:11
answers 14:23	ar 5:4	3:12,21 4:2,9	begs 52:15
anticipation	archbishop	4:17 5:2,9	behalf 6:16 7:1
43:21	27:25	automatically	7:3,5 8:5,10,14
anyone's 9:11	archivist 52:2	21:11	9:9,22 17:1
anyway 43:19	area 25:6	available 36:2	45:16 47:5
apologize 9:25	27:12 34:17	avenue 3:13	behavior 39:5
29:25	argue 24:1	4:10	behold 25:1,3
appeal 31:10	argument 30:8	award 10:19	believe 18:9,16
33:3	30:9	13:17	18:20 23:2
appealed 20:11	arises 6:18	aware 13:23	26:16 33:17
33:7	art 33:9,18	39:7	35:18 38:22
appealing	aside 26:21		39:12 40:3
20:19,20			57.12 10.5

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 509 of 529

[believing - clear]

believing 16:3	buy 49:3	caution 33:14	circumspect
benefit 37:18	buying 49:3	33:17	37:6,8
best 48:22 52:7	buzzwords	center 6:4,9	circumstances
better 13:20	50:4,6	27:25 35:4,6	29:6
38:10 49:24	c	35:16 36:2	cited 22:5
beyond 17:17	c 3:1 6:1 54:1,1	47:9	cites 22:6
bicker 52:11	c 3:23	centre 1:7	citizens 48:23
bill 8:21,23	calendar 6:2	certain 4:9,17	claim 2:2,2
bishop 16:12	call 29:17 34:1	8:10,14 48:24	10:14,15 12:3
16:14 27:24	called 11:11	50:4	13:7 15:7
bit 22:2	22:7 26:18,19	certainly 10:9	28:20 29:2,8
black 23:14	27:11 34:22,25	certification	29:13,15,18,21
blvd 3:22	47:10	50:21 51:6,6	29:23 30:2,6
board 10:22	calling 6:3	51:12	30:10,16 31:2
12:1 13:8,12	card 16:6	certified 54:3	32:5 39:12,18
body 22:14	17:17 41:14	cetera 17:9	46:14,17 47:1
23:9	career 17:14	35:10 36:6	claimant 3:21
boston 39:2	careful 28:8	38:25 39:9	5:2 8:25 10:19
bowling 1:13	carrying 14:16	chance 15:16	18:5 26:24
boy 32:5,6	case 1:3 6:4	changed 16:12	28:21,24 40:10
break 44:22	7:19 11:2 12:2	cheap 26:18	42:16,24 43:5
bringing 24:15	13:19 14:1	check 16:13	43:6 44:2,8
brittany 3:16	17:21 19:17	child 19:11	claimant's
6:25 45:15	22:6,9,20,23	21:19 22:12,16	14:13 43:6
broad 10:10	32:23 33:1,6	23:13,16,16,17	claimants 7:13
12:12 41:9	35:7 37:3,7	children 18:25	15:12 16:1
49:4	cases 15:4 21:6	19:2,24 20:3,6	50:15
brooklyn 33:3	21:13,22 26:7	21:10,17,20	claims 6:15
33:7 35:5,6	32:17 33:12	23:1,22 24:10	12:4,10 15:5
brown's 45:2	35:13 36:8	32:1,2 36:5	17:22 29:9
bullet 10:17,17	37:10 50:1,21	38:20 39:8	42:3,21,21
10:24 11:25	51:2	48:20,22,24	43:3,8 50:12
12:5 46:12	catholic 1:7 6:4	49:2,15,17,24	clean 32:15
bullets 12:22	25:18 27:14	christi 17:11	clear 18:23
burden 41:4	caught 19:20	church 27:14	31:20 40:11
42:10	caught 19.20 cause 23:11	church's 26:19	47:8
	cause 23.11		

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 510 of 529

[clearly - counsels]

clearly 38:18	44:22 46:3	complete 44:16	consider 48:23	
39:12 45:10	48:12 50:11,20	45:10 50:12	consistent 48:4	
clergy 10:23	comes 23:12	completed	contain 46:1	
20:6	24:21	17:14 44:15	contained 35:1	
clerk 6:2,10,14	coming 9:15	completeness	42:20	
6:19,22 7:2,7,9	committee	44:20 46:1	contested 12:4	
7:15,20,24 8:3	3:12 7:1,3,5	concern 11:8	context 23:19	
8:6,11,15,17	9:9,22 11:1,13	15:24 33:19	continue 44:23	
8:23 9:1,10,17	11:15 12:8,24	concerned	contours 52:19	
9:21 10:2	13:21,22 15:25	11:16 49:16	controlling	
client 17:1	15:25 16:5	concerns 10:11	32:24	
24:14 37:17,19	39:25,25 40:4	16:2 45:6	conversation	
41:23,25 42:2	40:5,11 42:15	concluded	43:21	
48:6	43:15 44:11,19	53:10	copies 36:13	
clients 12:13	44:23 45:1,3	condition	copy 35:16	
12:14 14:6	45:16 47:5	35:22 36:12,14	corpus 17:11	
30:19 32:19	51:18	conducted	correct 34:2,24	
clock 53:3	committee's	41:19	45:17	
close 49:16	12:6,25 14:25	confer 47:4	corrected	
coast 27:15	committing	48:11 50:10	33:14	
cochran 5:8	11:4	51:15	corresponde	
code 28:5	common 17:21	conference 2:1	16:12,22 27:7	
38:17	commonly	10:7 23:24	27:23,24 28:11	
colleagues	33:11	26:12 31:16,16	42:5	
23:10 50:24	communicate	40:23	counsel 6:11	
collection	21:16 38:10	confidential	10:4,4 11:14	
44:14 45:14	compensation	11:21 14:8	11:18 14:13	
47:1	10:21 20:22	26:13 42:18	33:2 39:25	
collections	21:2	44:25	40:5,7,10	
45:8	compiled 11:1	confirm 11:23	42:15 43:6	
colloquially	complained	48:2	44:2,8,11,19	
33:22	20:2 25:5	confirmed	44:24 47:11	
colloquy 21:23	complaint	18:12	51:5,19	
		P • 0.1		
columbia 5:10	49:22	confirming 9:1	counselor	
come 19:4 24:7	complaints	46:8	11:23	
come 19:4 24:7 30:12 34:9	-	46:8 congregants	11:23 counsels 46:15	
come 19:4 24:7	complaints	46:8	11:23	

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 511 of 529

[country - deviancy]

Page 6

country 23:15	49:10,12,17	date 44:15	defined 14:15
27:13 42:22	50:5,10 51:10	54:25	18:15,17
54:21	51:11,12,14,18	day 3:3 6:8 8:5	definitely
couple 36:22	51:22,25 52:4	23:4 43:12	21:24
36:22	52:22 53:3,8	45:11 52:5	demonstrate
course 12:5	court's 18:20	days 44:5	14:3
19:23 21:9	19:2 22:5 23:5	48:14	demonstrating
24:9 28:4	31:6 32:10	deal 19:19	22:21
31:21 39:10	34:18	dealing 42:3	depending
52:15	cover 19:7	48:22 49:6	36:3
court 1:1,12	38:25	dealt 12:6	depositions
10:6 13:4,20	covered 11:7	deanna 8:21	48:17,19
14:2,20 15:14	12:19,19	debtor 1:9 3:4	derived 42:17
15:22 16:3,17	credibility	3:4 6:8 8:5	describe 30:6
16:19,21 17:6	37:25	11:22 29:13,23	described 18:6
17:18 18:1,8	credible 11:5	45:11,19,23	28:22 29:5,11
19:4,7,8,14	30:9 39:5	48:2 53:1	30:2 43:12
20:4 22:1,4,8	credibly 18:16	debtor's 2:2	48:5
22:17 23:7	18:18	10:20	describing
24:1,2,7,17	creditors 3:12	debtors 10:4	29:9
25:7,21 26:4,5	7:1 10:4 11:1	10:14 11:7,23	description
26:6,14 27:8	12:8 14:16	30:11	48:7
28:18 29:1	criteria 10:16	decades 36:8	destroyed 17:3
30:23 31:1,4,8	14:23 20:22,25	decide 38:8	17:3
31:15,21 32:6	46:11	49:18,18 50:9	details 42:14
32:16,17 33:2	critical 31:6	decision 22:5	50:19
33:2,9,23 34:9	criticizing 31:9	23:5,7 31:6,9	determination
34:13,20,22	cullen 4:16	32:22,25	10:22 12:1,2
35:12 36:18,20	8:14	decisions 40:25	12:18 13:8,11
36:24,25 37:4	cva 15:7 34:17	declarations	13:18 14:11,19
37:5,8,24 38:1	d	42:3	20:15
38:3 39:11,19	d 6:1	deep 20:8	determine
39:21 40:2,19	daily 35:25,25	defendant	37:25
40:22 43:17	danger 22:21	22:22 41:3	detour 45:7
44:11,14,22	danger 22:21 dare 20:25	defendants	deviance 24:8
46:3,19,23	database 43:1	51:2	deviancy 19:1
47:25 48:10	43:14		19:16,17,22
	тт		

516-608-2400

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 512 of 529

[deviancy - england]

			-
21:9 24:20	35:14,16,16,22	displayed	e
25:23,25 26:9	35:23,24 36:7	13:22	e 1:21,21 3:1,1
27:14 31:24,25	37:14,15 38:19	distance 20:7	5:15 6:1,1 7:13
32:9,19 33:5	39:2,4,15	distinction	54:1
33:11,20,24	41:10,16,17	19:14,24 20:3	ease 41:3
34:3,5,18,23	42:12 46:21	district 1:2	east 27:15
34:25 35:14	47:8,12,20	10:19 24:1	ecro 1:25
41:15,20 42:4	48:12 50:15	dive 20:8	educates 24:22
47:10,15,21	51:5 52:2	doc 2:7	efficiently 29:8
devil 50:19	dioceses 12:24	doctrine 26:20	effort 42:25
dialogue 13:21	26:10 32:18	document	enor 42.25 egg 47:16
48:15	34:17 35:11	35:11 43:1,5	eighth 2:2 10:8
diamond 22:7	directed 33:10	43:14 51:17	11:10 12:10
difference	directing 48:11	documentation	20:10 30:20
49:14	directly 28:9	17:16	eighties 19:18
different 26:7	directories	documents	either 11:4
difficult 28:20	25:19	15:1,3,10	
digging 20:11	disagree 21:21	37:18 40:15	17:21 18:10
dilemma 29:16	disallowed	43:2,7 48:7	34:13 41:20
dine 3:17 7:4	30:20	51:9 52:9,15	46:5
9:8,8	disappointed	doing 20:8	elaborate 19:4
diocesan 10:22	16:20	23:21 36:8	elderly 49:6
12:1 13:8,11	discovery	51:3	emphasize
16:7	10:10 12:12	doubt 6:17	44:13
diocese 1:7 6:4	16:25 22:4	36:6 50:24	employee
6:9 11:2 12:7	23:23 26:7	draw 19:14	22:13
12:16 13:2	36:25 37:7	20:3	employees
16:7,23 18:10	41:9 48:17	drawing 19:24	48:18
18:15,16,21	49:4 50:6 51:2	drawn 17:15	employer
19:9 20:15	discuss 15:1	drb 13:18	23:16
21:11 23:19	discussing 41:8	duly 39:3	employment
24:12 25:11	discussion 23:5	duty 23:12,12	16:10 35:22
26:23 30:5	47:6 51:19	dykman 4:16	36:12,14
31:17,23 32:3	dismiss 28:22	8:14	employs 52:2
32:11,12,22,25	28:23		engage 13:3
33:3,7,7,10	dismissal 29:7		england 37:13
35:5,6,13,13			37:15
55.5,0,15,15			

[entering - floor]

Page 8

10.0		C	1(.22.20.21
entering 10:8	excluded 12:9	factual 12:4	16:22 29:21
48:10	exclusively	25:8	files 11:12,19
entire 23:9	41:3	failed 22:21	11:19,21,21
42:16 43:1	excuse 36:19	23:1 39:6	15:10 16:4
entirely 19:5	exist 32:9	fair 19:11	18:12 20:1
22:14	exists 17:17	fairness 37:13	26:12,13,17,19
entitled 33:5	expect 6:12	familiar 21:14	33:11,19 34:18
eric 3:9 6:12	8:22 16:11,17	52:3	34:22,23,25
8:4 13:19	17:16 27:22	far 13:10	40:1,4,7,10
40:13 42:14	37:8 42:19	father 28:1	41:10,18,20,21
43:8,11 47:23	expectation	37:15 38:1,7	42:4,5,5,5,19
48:1	48:4	38:14 39:14	42:23 44:25,25
especially	experience	favor 52:4	45:20,21,25
16:14 25:14	24:20 26:22	favorite 28:5,5	46:8,8 47:9,21
established	35:12 36:8	february 27:9	fill 42:14
13:25 41:12	explaining	federal 40:24	filtering 43:25
et 4:1 17:8	17:16	40:25	finally 19:19
35:10 36:6	explanation	feel 23:24	find 25:1,10,15
38:25 39:9	10:1 11:7	felt 24:4 29:15	25:21,24 26:2
eventually 27:8	31:13	40:22	26:3,8 29:6
27:19 28:2	express 10:11	figured 19:21	32:14 36:2
everybody	expunge 29:14	file 15:7 16:10	47:24
16:19	29:23	16:10 17:2,4	finding 39:3
evidence 14:3	extensive 36:25	17:22,25 18:4	findings 38:22
25:9 39:13	45:7 46:15	18:7 26:24,25	finds 39:3
42:19	extent 7:6	27:21,21 28:11	fine 8:23 15:19
exact 18:8	16:17	28:16 31:18,19	31:10 50:18
46:24	extremely 37:6	31:24,25 32:9	51:7,14
exactly 30:7	37:8	32:9,13,20	first 15:19
41:6	eyeopener 21:6	35:1,8 36:9,10	24:13 39:23,24
examined 42:6	f	36:17 37:12,14	40:17 46:12
example 15:4	f 1:21 54:1	37:24 41:15	five 10:17
17:7,7 19:1	faces 47:16	42:1,17,24	24:18 25:3,15
31:19 32:10	facility 27:11	47:9,9,20 48:6	27:2,19
examples	fact 14:10 49:1	48:8	flag 22:5,8
30:17 31:15	facts 22:21	filed 11:6	floor 3:13 4:10
	24:11 29:11	14:20 15:7	4:18 22:2

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 514 of 529

[focus - hearing]

[8]			1.000
focus 22:12	general 51:4	38:4 39:22	granting 37:6
folder 14:8	generalize	43:19 49:10,12	greased 35:13
folks 52:5	35:15	50:8 51:25	great 48:25
follow 34:16	generally	god 24:24 25:1	49:7,8
followed 51:11	25:13,21 33:13	25:11 27:1	greatest 50:25
following	33:25	32:3	green 1:13
10:16 29:25	gerber 5:15	goes 32:4 36:15	guess 12:16
37:10	6:14,15,15	37:24	33:16
footnote 11:9	geremia 3:8	going 6:11 7:2	guy 25:6 32:7
foregoing 54:3	6:5,7,8,12	7:24 15:18,19	32:14
foresee 29:17	12:18,21 13:15	16:4 18:2,4	h
foreseeable	14:22 15:17,24	19:16 24:19	handed 16:9
22:22 23:17,18	16:2 39:22,24	25:10,15,24	happened
forth 28:2	40:13,21 42:13	26:2 29:7,25	11:15 15:6
forward 14:16	43:12 46:4,11	31:10 32:14	17:2,17 18:14
44:8	46:22 47:3,20	36:24 37:4,6	19:12 24:18
found 11:5	47:22 50:17,24	37:22 38:3	37:17 40:5
13:12 25:4	51:7,15,21	39:13 46:5	happens 41:14
37:22,23 42:22	52:21 53:1,7	47:2 48:16	happy 46:25
foundation	getting 27:20	49:4,18 50:5	hard 29:6
18:11,22 41:12	gist 11:12	50:19,21,25	harm 22:22
frankly 45:13	give 6:6,22	51:5 52:6,10	23:18,18,18,22
freaked 25:5	7:12 8:7,20 9:6	52:23 53:5,5	harmon 32:22
free 35:23	9:13 15:16	good 6:7,24	32:25
46:20,21	27:8 30:18	7:17 8:4 10:6	hate 23:9
frolic 45:7	32:10	18:3 34:15	head 23:11
front 29:3	given 7:10	gosh 19:21	headed 42:25
32:19	31:13 43:23	25:19	hear 10:11
fulfill 50:25	giving 6:19	gotten 40:6,20	heard 8:24
full 35:8	7:16 17:7 34:6	47:8	20:7 38:14
fully 21:14	glenn 1:22	government	44:11,16 51:22
47:2	go 11:24 18:4	2:1	hearing 2:1 6:3
future 6:15	19:15,17 24:24	grand 38:22,24	9:19 11:10
g	25:19 26:1	39:3	15:15 20:17
g 6:1	27:6 28:2	grant 36:24	40:3,18,19
gaps 11:16	29:22 30:18,24	37:4 39:11	43:18 44:17,21
8°P	31:1 32:12		45:18 50:11

[hearing - judge]

[9 J9]			8
52:6	honor's 15:12	individual	issue 10:14
hearings 20:17	hope 31:21	10:15 11:17	18:8 19:19
held 52:16	32:11 34:11	22:19 23:23	22:6 26:24
hello 8:13	53:5	27:7 42:16	37:24 42:16
help 38:9	hoped 38:7	43:2,5 44:2,2,8	43:22 44:6,10
helps 25:6	hopefully 47:3	individuals	51:8,13
heuer 4:6 7:15	hospital 36:6	11:3 38:19	issued 41:17
7:17,18 8:21	49:7	indulge 38:1,4	issues 18:7
8:21	hurting 38:12	inferences	20:8 21:12
hey 28:9	hyde 2:25 54:3	30:10	39:19
hi 6:24	54:8	inform 13:20	issuing 10:7
history 17:6,15	i	25:6	i
20:21 22:25		information	J
23:20 30:6	idea 48:19	12:15 13:10	jacob 5:6 8:25
49:1	ignored 39:4,4	15:13 16:18	james 3:18
hit 23:11 43:5	imagine 38:15	34:19 37:23	9:21
hits 44:3	49:20	41:2,2 42:11	jason 5:13 9:13
hon 1:22	important	43:4 45:22	18:3 51:24
	31:23 40:23		jeff 4:8,14 8:1
honor 7:17	improper	50:14,15	8:9
13:23 15:1,21	14:14	initial 17:10	jew 49:13
18:3,4 21:23	inclined 10:10	inquiry 25:7	jewels 22:7
22:3 23:4,24	include 47:4	ins 16:14	jewish 48:21
24:3,15 25:17	51:18	instances 39:7	jim 7:4
26:11,15,23	included 12:3	institutions	john 24:23,25
28:11,24 30:22	including 39:7	35:21	25:1,11 27:1
30:25 31:5,12	42:4,18 44:25	insufficient	32:3 35:2,8,21
31:14,20 33:8	inclusive 34:4	22:23	joined 7:10
33:13,17,19	independent	intended 43:13	8:18 9:4,11,23
34:2,3,12,15	10:20 20:18	43:24	joining 6:11,13
36:19 37:21	21:4	interject 49:11	7:3,5
38:5,21 43:11	index 16:6	involved 12:10	jonathan 1:25
43:13,24 44:7	17:17	involving	jones 3:3,11
45:15 46:12	indicate 13:13	18:13 33:3	6:8,25 8:5 9:9
48:1 49:9 50:1	37:5	34:18,23	43:12 45:16
50:9 51:7,8,20	indicated 14:8	iqbal 29:12	52:4
51:24 52:10,18	indicia 25:24	isolated 17:20	
52:25 53:1			judge 1:23
			10:4 12:21

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 516 of 529

[judged - look]

judged 29:19	21:18 24:8	latin 26:17	limiting 35:15
jury 38:22,24	27:12 28:6,14	law 5:1,9 20:12	line 8:20 9:5,12
39:3	29:3,10,13,14	21:5,5,21	9:14 49:16
justice 33:4	29:16 30:4,6,8	22:14,14 23:9	linger 52:6
justices 33:4	30:11,11,19	23:14 24:11	link 9:16
k	34:12,13 37:4	26:17 29:25	lips 22:1
karen 3:17 7:4	39:1,16 40:14	30:1 32:24	list 10:18,22,25
9:6,8	40:23 42:8,10	36:14	11:2,3 12:6,7
keep 28:1,10	42:14 43:9,13	lawsuits 11:5	12:25 13:1,5
keeping 28:19	44:5 45:4,9,12	lawyers 30:11	13:16,17,18,22
28:19	45:12,13,14	34:1 41:25	13:23 14:24,25
keeps 36:16	46:4,24 47:6	43:18 47:7	18:19 29:4
keeps 30.10 kept 14:13	47:11,19,19,22	50:15 51:1	30:12,23 37:1
28:17 47:9	47:23 48:6,18	lay 31:22	listening 30:15
48:4 52:3	48:20 49:5,13	learned 50:3	literally 26:19
kids 24:23,24	49:17 50:2,13	leave 12:11	litigate 42:21
25:4,12,13,14	50:17 51:2,3	25:19 28:23	litigating 26:5
27:16 28:4,10	51:10 52:8,12	40:20 43:23	litigation 14:20
28:10 32:7	53:3	50:14 53:5	little 5:4 22:1
48:25 49:14	knowing 22:25	led 15:15	38:10
kind 38:17	23:20	ledanski 2:25	live 21:13
kindest 38:13	knowledge	54:3,8	llp 3:3,11 4:16
49:18	14:4 18:10,22	legal 54:20	lo 25:1,3
knew 21:18	20:21 31:18	length 43:15	located 42:7
23:23 24:12	41:11,19 46:7	letter 23:14	locations 47:14
25:11,25	46:23	37:22,24 38:5	loco 23:10
know 10:9 11:8	known 12:23	38:21	log 28:12,13
11:16,17,22	23:18 25:25	letters 28:9	52:12
12:2,6,8,13,14	knows 51:8	level 32:24	logistics 44:4
12:18,24 13:1	l	33:2	long 21:25
13:9,9,15,23	labels 41:21	lewis 22:7	22:25 23:19
14:6,13,22,24	lack 17:22,23	liability 20:15	30:6,23 45:14
14:25 15:5,8	laicization 27:3	21:11	52:7
15:12,17 17:5	27:5	likely 13:2 41:1	look 25:9,18,19
17:6,7 18:1	laid 30:14	52:2	25:20 26:2
20:5,11,18,19	language 38:17	limitations	29:15 46:10
20:3,11,18,19		14:14	48:10,21
21.1,0,10,17			

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 517 of 529

[looked - nevertheless]

Page 12

			_
looked 12:7	makes 27:10	michaels 45:15	morning 7:11
14:15 31:18,19	32:12	michelle 4:21	34:15
32:8,13 42:2	making 9:3	8:13	motivating
44:17	13:1 21:25	mid 19:18	41:5
looking 25:7	49:7	military 17:13	move 26:7
25:24 32:4	manage 44:4	17:14	moved 17:11
44:20	manifested	mind 36:7	17:13
looks 32:6	13:23	mineola 54:23	moves 29:23
los 3:23	marsh 5:9	ministered	movie 25:16,18
lot 19:19 21:6	martin 1:22	38:12	movies 20:5
22:12 27:12	materia 38:22	mishits 44:1	moving 22:1
28:5 33:17,25	matter 1:5	misremembe	multiple 47:20
49:25	24:12 44:21	44:18	myda 33:1
lots 49:7	mcmahon 4:21	missed 28:12	n
love 33:4	8:12,13,13,16	missing 8:11	n 3:1 6:1 7:13
luke's 27:11,13	mean 15:14	28:11	5 4:1
27:20,23 33:21	29:1,8,15	misunderstood	names 28:19
35:20	31:13 35:18	40:8	43:22
m	41:2,16 42:7	molested 19:23	necessarily
m 7:13	42:20 46:10	molesting 23:1	17:23
ma'am 8:24	mediation 53:4	25:12,13,14	necessary 7:6
made 14:5,9,10	meet 15:5	27:16 32:1,2,7	need 6:17 9:23
14:11,18 35:9	50:10	moments 25:17	22:10,18 23:20
45:25 50:22	meets 10:16	mones 3:20,25	36:16 37:23
mail 16:15	member 15:25	7:13,13 12:13	38:12 44:10
main 15:24	15:25 16:5	14:6 18:2	45:12 50:11
27:15	40:5	34:14,15,21,24	52:22,22
maintain 47:20	members 20:6	35:18 36:19,21	needed 23:25
maintained	39:25 44:12	37:9 38:5	24:4
36:11	mentioned	39:21 41:24	negotiating
major 16:2	28:6 48:8	47:4 48:5,7	52:8
make 7:21 9:23	51:16	49:9,10,11,13	never 11:20,25
34:10 37:20	mg 1:3	50:8	13:9,11 14:4,9
38:24,25 43:13	michael 3:16	monsignor	20:1 24:5 42:9
44:18 45:5	6:22,24,25 7:4	21:18	45:20,25
52:14,17	9:15 45:15	month 37:16	nevertheless
	47:5	53:4	13:13
			10.10

516-608-2400

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 518 of 529

[new - paracletes]

Page 13

new 1:2,7,14	ny 1:14 3:6,14	offered 31:6	opens 16:24
3:6,14 4:11,19	4:4,11,19	official 3:12	operating
6:4 20:12,14	54:23	11:1	16:15 45:9
21:5,5,21 22:9	0	officials 48:18	opinion 10:7,9
22:14 23:7	o 1:21 6:1 7:13	oh 36:21	10:13 11:9
24:11 32:24	54:1	okay 6:19 7:15	20:10 24:17
36:14	oath 14:3 18:9	7:21 8:11,15	25:22 26:6
nielsen 38:1,7		9:13 10:2	40:22 41:5
38:14 39:14	18:11,21 19:9 46:7	15:14,22 17:18	opportunity
nineties 24:21		20:7 21:7 22:3	46:16
non 52:15	object 29:14	28:3,20 29:16	order 10:8
nonprivileged	32:5	29:18,21 30:2	15:12,18 30:1
44:3	objected 16:1	30:13,17 31:4	35:4 44:9
nope 40:2,2,2	17:22 39:15	34:9 36:18	48:10 51:10,11
normally 27:22	objection 10:8 10:15 11:11	37:9 38:5 41:6	51:12
28:15		42:1 47:25	outside 24:18
north 5:4	12:10 20:10	48:20,23,25	25:3,14 27:2
note 9:6 31:23	26:24 28:25	49:3,8 50:5,6	27:19
noted 8:21	30:20 31:3,22	50:16,18,23	overnight 39:9
10:2 25:21	32:12 39:17	51:2,6,21 52:7	overrule 31:22
26:12	50:13	52:9,23 53:3,8	own 6:16 26:20
notes 35:7 47:6	objections 2:2	old 54:21	36:15
notice 13:2	12:11,20 13:25	omni 12:10	р
17:23,24 20:13	14:16 42:16	omnibus 2:2	-
21:3,12 22:10	43:23 46:13	10:8 11:8,11	p 3:1,1 5:13 6:1
22:18 25:24	objects 30:5	12:19,20 20:10	p.c. 3:20
30:10 32:6,14	oblivious 38:13	20:17 30:20	pachulski 3:11
notices 41:17	obtained 34:17	35:9	6:25 9:8 45:16
noting 7:24	obvious 39:6	once 15:13	page 10:13
9:18	obviously 11:6	19:18 46:18	39:4 44:20
novak 23:7	12:9 26:4	ones 30:13	46:12
nuance 49:25	43:14	online 12:7	pages 37:12
number 2:3	occasion 47:18	open 10:10	paid 10:19
6:4 7:18 27:9,9	occasions	48:16	13:7,17
29:3 47:14	47:19	opening 12:12	paper 47:17
numbers 28:20	offender 22:10	16:18 41:8,9	paracletes
	offer 31:15	49:4	35:20
	45:5		

516-608-2400

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 519 of 529

[paragraph - press]

			e
paragraph	path 44:7	40:1,7 41:13	pllc 5:8
39:16	paul 3:20,25	41:14 42:5,17	pm 1:17 6:3
pardon 7:11	7:13	42:23,24 44:24	53:11
parentis 23:11	pause 6:20,21	44:25 45:20,21	point 10:17,24
pari 38:21	7:7,8,22,23	45:24 47:21	11:25 12:5,22
parish 17:11	21:25	48:6	17:19 18:25
24:23,25 25:1	pays 35:22,23	persuasive	19:7 21:15,24
25:11 26:25	47:12	30:15	24:7 34:10
32:2,3 38:12	pcva 5:9	peter 3:9	35:24 40:14
48:17	pedophilia	petitions 27:5	46:12 50:20
parishes 4:2,17	34:7	pfau 5:8	points 10:17
7:18 8:14	pennsylvania	ph 33:1	poly 22:4,9,17
parishioner	35:2	phone 52:8	22:24 23:2
38:6	people 10:12	piece 47:17	position 42:9
parishioners	14:3 18:17	place 17:12	positive 19:13
38:18	23:9 24:25	24:24 45:9	possession 3:4
park 4:18	31:9 38:11	placed 41:4	26:10,22 33:6
part 16:18 35:8	46:18	places 27:13	41:2,3,10
36:10 48:5	period 17:10	plaintiff 22:20	42:12 50:14
particular	17:12	22:20,24,24	possibly 38:9
14:11,18 16:5	permitted	41:4	predilection
21:19 22:10	33:10	plaintiff's	38:19 46:24
particularly	perpetrator	11:18 47:11	predisposition
14:12	10:18,25 11:25	plaintiffs 15:16	21:3,13 46:24
parties 7:9,21	22:13,19 46:13	36:13 41:25	preexisting
8:18 9:3,4,11	perpetrators	43:17 46:15	13:24
9:22 10:3 44:9	10:18 37:3	plaza 4:3,18	prejudice
45:8	person 13:15	plead 23:9,10	28:22 29:7
partner 13:19	35:2,24 41:11	49:17 50:16	prep 22:4,9,17
40:13	41:18	pleading 22:23	22:24 23:2
parts 42:21	personal 18:10	26:7 29:1,19	prepared
party 41:1	18:22 31:18	41:4 42:10	14:25 15:2,11
pass 46:20,21	41:11,18 42:1	please 6:23	42:15 43:3,10
past 38:11 49:5	personnel	7:11 8:8,19 9:5	45:4 48:13
pastor 25:5	11:12,19,21	9:12,17,20	present 39:19
pat 4:13 8:1	14:8 15:10	28:1 36:22	press 20:5
15:20	35:1,8 37:12		

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 520 of 529

[pretty - rationalization]

pretty 18:14	probable 25:10	professional	q
25:10	probably 44:5	51:1	question 11:10
prevailed	problem 19:21	program 10:21	12:4 18:20
32:23	23:20 38:15	progress 35:7	19:3,8,12
priest 13:10	49:19,23,23	35:25 36:1	20:24 23:21
14:5,18 16:7	problems 9:16	proof 29:18	24:16 29:17
17:8 18:18,18	proceed 45:6	30:16 46:14	31:17 32:11
18:24 19:16,25	proceeding	proofs 10:14	34:16 44:22,23
20:1,16 21:9	20:19	12:3	52:11,16
21:17 23:23	proceedings	propensity	questions
24:9,22 25:12	53:10 54:4	13:3	16:24 17:15
26:25 27:9,18	process 21:4	proper 30:10	20:22 39:23
27:23,25 32:1	44:4 45:11,14	proposal 43:12	43:15,16
33:20 35:3,8	46:15	propose 43:24	quick 34:16
36:2,3,15,16	produce 15:2	proposed	quite 20:14
37:11,13 42:1	15:11 16:4	45:11	1
42:7 46:9	32:19 33:10	proposing	quote 22:20
47:13,18	34:3 40:6	45:12 50:18	39:4
priest's 21:3	42:15 43:4	protect 23:17	r
35:1	44:3 48:13,14	23:22	r 1:21 3:1 6:1
priests 14:11	produced	protective	54:1
18:13 19:10,15	11:13 15:13	20:14 44:9	rabbi 48:21
19:20 24:18	16:18 17:4	proves 17:23	49:5,21
27:14 28:7	28:12 40:4,11	provide 14:3	rabbis 49:14
37:2 39:6,8	40:15 42:14	33:1 41:24	49:14
48:17 49:1	45:1,20,24	provided 13:6	raise 21:12
prior 14:20	51:10 52:13	psychiatrist	24:5 44:7 52:4
20:21 21:3	producing	27:4	raised 22:4,6
34:17 46:23	52:15	purported	23:6,24 24:4
private 11:11	production	40:16	24:16 30:9
39:8	16:6,9,17	purposes 37:14	38:23
privilege 43:25	40:17 43:1,9	purposes 57:11 pursuant 51:10	raises 18:6
52:12,16	44:20 45:14	put 15:14	20:9 23:21
privileged	51:17	18:19 27:6	raising 52:18
28:12,13 52:15	productions	39:10,11	rationale 49:18
		J J + I V + I I	1
pro 5:15	44:15	putting 26:21	rationalization

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 521 of 529

[read - rimmer]

Page 16

			_
read 13:5 20:4	26:1,8,21	report 15:7	respond 24:5
21:22 38:2,21	28:15,15,17	20:23 24:20	30:21 39:22,23
39:9,16 46:12	33:6 34:3,5,7	35:25 38:24	response 15:11
reading 21:6	35:10,17 36:13	reports 36:1	15:23 16:1
ready 48:13	41:13,20 42:6	represent	23:1 45:2 47:8
49:3	42:20,22 45:10	15:24 19:9	responsibility
realistic 16:9	46:1 47:10,21	31:17 32:5	51:1
realized 28:7	52:3	51:1	rest 17:14
really 18:23	rectory 39:8	representation	result 14:19
20:10 38:7	refer 11:20	18:9 46:6	21:11 28:21
reargue 23:6	reference	representative	29:7
reason 24:16	27:10	6:16	resulted 13:11
26:16 31:5,5	referred 11:22	represented	review 10:22
39:15	45:18 47:18	18:21 19:13	12:1 13:8,12
reasonable	52:14	40:5 45:19,24	20:19 21:4
23:17 30:9	reflected 15:3	representing	29:9 31:24
reasonably	15:10	11:15 32:19	43:25 45:14
48:21	regarding	39:25	reviewed 18:12
reasons 30:13	51:16	request 35:9	19:20 30:16
40:8	regardless	36:25 37:4,14	46:8
reassigned	23:22	37:20,22	reviewing
17:8	regular 16:13	requested 35:9	37:21
recall 18:15	36:1	requests 45:8	revoked 27:5
receive 21:2	relate 38:14	require 18:17	rhetoric 26:18
received 27:10	43:7 49:19,23	30:1	rid 32:13
35:7,10	relating 16:6	required 20:22	right 6:2,10,14
receives 35:25	41:21	30:10 42:9	6:20 7:2,9,22
36:1	relationship	50:20,23	8:3,6,7,18 9:3
reconciliation	22:11,13,16	requiring 46:5	9:10,17,21
10:20	23:13,15 49:24	50:23	10:4 14:22
record 8:19 9:5	relevant 14:12	resolved 47:2	18:1 25:17,20
9:11,13 36:10	remember	respect 13:21	26:14 28:4,25
45:17 54:4	20:17 52:19	15:12 23:10	33:9 42:13
recording 6:20	repeat 46:17	28:21 29:2	47:23 50:7
7:7,22	46:19	41:25 50:25	52:11
records 13:13	repeatedly	respects 40:16	rimmer 37:10
19:20 25:23	45:23		37:15

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com 20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 522 of 529

[risk - slightest]

Page 17

			C
risk 22:22	46:4,5 49:20	seem 41:9	24:20 25:23,25
road 54:21	says 26:17 34:3	47:14	26:8 27:14
robert 5:15	36:16 41:19	seemed 11:20	31:24,25 32:9
6:15	schedule 15:15	11:24 37:5	32:19 33:5,11
rock 5:4	29:3 50:11	seems 30:8	33:12,19,23
rocket 35:16	scheduled 10:7	39:10	34:3,5,18,23
rockville 1:7	school 17:12	seen 12:7 28:13	34:25 35:14
6:4,9 35:3,4,5	22:25 23:8	send 27:14,17	39:7 41:15,20
47:9	scope 50:22	sending 28:1,3	42:4,6 47:10
roman 1:7 6:3	51:16	sends 36:7	47:15,21
rooms 39:8	se 5:15	senior 48:22	sexually 39:5
round 12:20	search 41:19	sense 37:5	shared 11:20
46:13	42:25 43:6	sensible 45:5	shortcomings
rule 29:24	44:3 50:22	sensitive 31:11	40:17
ruled 20:20	51:3	sent 19:1,22	shorthand
33:4	searched 15:2	27:23 33:20	12:21
rules 40:24,25	15:11 41:12,15	35:2,14,19,20	show 26:25
ruling 29:5	41:18,19 43:2	47:13	47:18
30:13 48:11	searches 43:22	separate 20:25	showing 42:6
run 43:21	seattle 5:11	22:14 41:14	shows 49:1
rxr 4:3	second 10:17	separately 48:4	sick 49:6
S	11:24 18:4	servants 35:20	sides 34:1
s 2:2 3:1 6:1	19:17 49:11	served 16:7	sign 24:19 49:2
7:13	secondly 37:9	37:2	signature 54:6
saint 24:23,25	seconds 38:2,4	servers 37:1,2	significant
25:1,11 27:1	secret 11:19,19	service 17:13	16:11 17:4
27:11,12,20,23	11:21 16:10	17:14 27:6	signs 39:6
32:3 33:21	26:12,16 28:16	36:4,5	similar 37:18
35:2,7,19,21	42:18	set 15:5 20:25	single 12:13
satisfied 41:16	see 9:16,24	29:11	16:12
satisfy 29:12	16:15 22:1	setting 23:8	singling 30:3
save 9:25	24:20 29:2	several 17:22	sir 34:21
saw 20:5	42:1 43:8	sex 3:21	sitting 47:23
saying 13:6	48:11	sexual 11:4,5	situation 22:11
16:9 19:25	seeing 27:3	19:1,11,15,17	skin 31:9
21:19 25:12	seek 29:14	19:22 20:6	slightest 27:10
28:9 41:25		21:3,9,17 24:8	

516-608-2400

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 523 of 529

[slightly - sustained]

1. 1.41 45 17	22.15		1 4 46 17
slightly 45:17	23:15	statements	submit 46:17
society 50:3	specialize	45:25	substantiated
solutions 54:20	47:15	states 1:1,12	14:9
somebody	specific 28:21	37:16	sued 35:6
11:15 41:15	30:13 35:24	stating 29:13	sufficient
51:18,23	47:14	status 2:1	18:11,22 23:2
somebody's	specifically	stephens 3:9	23:3 41:12,18
20:20	34:6 35:19	6:12 8:3,4,4	46:7
someone's	spectrum 18:5	13:19 40:4,14	sufficiently
32:12	spending 48:20	42:25 43:11,11	34:4
something's	49:2	43:20 45:18	suggesting
24:19	spent 21:6	46:4 47:3 48:1	30:4 47:11
somewhat 30:5	spoke 38:23	48:2 51:9	suggests 48:8
sonya 2:25	spotlight 25:17	52:14	suite 5:10
54:3,8	25:18	steps 23:17	54:22
sorry 10:1	spots 27:15	stoneking 4:13	supplement
30:22,24,25	stan 9:18	7:24 8:1,1	11:2
sort 15:14	standard 25:8	15:20,21,22,23	supposed
16:18,25 17:16	29:12,18,19	16:23 17:10,20	28:16 53:4
20:8 29:15	standards 26:7	18:6 24:17	sure 6:7 8:24
40:24,25 41:1	stang 3:11,18	35:18 37:19	12:8 14:17
41:5 43:4	6:25 7:4 9:8,20	40:15 41:24	18:14 19:5,6
47:14	9:21 45:16	47:4 50:1	21:1,25 25:20
sorts 44:1	start 6:5	stop 14:21	32:6 39:24
sounds 30:14	started 19:19	34:11,20	40:9 44:18
48:7 50:18	20:10 31:16	street 3:5 5:3	48:21 49:12,20
source 42:18	starting 6:2	5:10	52:1,14,17
southern 1:2	starts 27:3	strike 35:25	surprise 20:13
speak 8:22	state 10:14	strongest 30:3	surprised 30:5
15:17,18,19	14:20 24:11	studying 14:13	survivors 4:9
18:2 38:9	26:6 30:1	stuff 29:17	5:9 8:10 11:14
speaking 6:17	32:17 33:2	subject 12:15	21:2
7:5,11 8:19 9:4	44:10	19:10,15 30:23	suspicious
9:11 16:5	stated 45:18	31:3 32:21	17:24
21:24	statement	43:25	sustained
special 22:11	23:14	subjection 11:8	12:11 28:25
22:12,15 23:13			50:13

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 524 of 529

[swear - trying]

swear 18:11	testimony	third 3:13	transcribed
t	44:16,24	thought 29:20	2:25
t 54:1,1	thank 6:10,14	31:15 44:4	transcript 54:4
take 17:6 23:16	6:19 7:7,14,15	thousands	transferred
23:21 25:19	7:19,20 8:3,6	24:21	16:8 25:2,14
47:6 48:18	8:11,15,16,23	three 17:11,13	27:1,18 32:7
taken 40:25	9:1,2,10,17,25	51:15	38:8
talk 18:7 19:16	10:1 15:21	throw 33:14	transfers 24:18
24:25 52:21	24:15 31:14	ticking 53:3	translation
talked 10:13	34:12 36:22	time 7:12 8:17	26:17
11:19 24:17	52:25 53:2,8	9:12,24 16:12	traversed 50:2
26:12	thanks 15:22	16:16,16 21:6	treatment 19:1
talking 22:15	39:21	21:14 24:13	19:16,17,22,23
24:6 26:23	thick 31:9	28:3 36:23	21:9 24:9,9
27:19 34:8	thing 12:17	37:17 38:23	25:23 26:1,9
36:4 40:15	49:5,8 52:7	39:20 46:20,20	26:21 27:11,15
42:11 47:7	things 12:12	48:20 49:2	27:20,21,25
teachers 22:25	24:22 36:22	times 17:8 28:5	31:24,25 32:9
tell 34:7 38:4	41:7 44:1	timing 36:3	32:20 33:5,11
38:11 49:15	think 11:9,12	tish 33:4	33:20,21,24
telling 28:14	12:12 14:12	today 6:17	34:3,5,6 35:2
50:6	15:4 16:19,19	22:3 23:4	35:10,14,17,21
tempted 28:7	17:23 18:7	40:23 43:25	35:23,24 36:1
tends 36:12	19:12 20:16	44:11 45:4	36:10,16 41:15
term 18:16,17	21:15 23:7	47:2 48:11,13	41:21 42:4,20
26:16 33:9,11	25:9 26:6 28:6	52:24	47:10,12,13,15
33:15,16,18	29:6,10,12	today's 23:23	47:21
46:25	30:16 31:23	43:21	trend 25:20
terminated	33:18,21,25	todd 3:8 6:8	trouble 28:19
27:4	37:23 43:17	43:12	troubled 27:7
terminology	45:5 47:7	together 39:10	true 33:25 42:8
21:15	49:25 50:17,22	told 11:13 40:2	54:4
terms 37:19	51:8	40:8	try 23:6
44:3	thinking 27:3	took 17:12	trying 19:14
testified 43:14	41:5	torts 23:14	20:3 21:15
51:9	thinks 42:8	track 28:19,19	26:18 31:14
J1./			32:10 47:6

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 525 of 529

[trying - yeah]

52:11	united 1:1,12	view 13:2	westerman 4:1
turn 15:16	37:16	20:14 22:23	7:18
45:7	unmute 7:12	virtually 19:13	whistle 32:15
turning 19:3	8:7,19 9:5,12	virtue 28:7	who've 27:12
turns 47:17	unnecessary	visits 49:7	william 4:6
two 12:22	29:10	W	7:18
18:17 24:21	unrelated	wa 5:11	willow 5:3
27:2 37:2,11	11:10		wind 33:15
39:9 47:18	unsecured 3:12	waiting 10:3 want 17:18	wish 36:20
twombly 25:8	7:1 11:1	19:2,5 20:18	withheld 28:14
29:12	unsubstantiat	,	wl 22:7
type 48:7	13:12	22:5,8 26:1 30:18,18 31:20	word 33:22
u	updated 28:2	34:2,10 36:18	34:5
u.s. 1:23	updates 27:22	36:21 37:9	words 14:7
ucc 11:2	upheld 23:3	41:16 44:13	work 27:12
under 14:3	upset 43:18	45:6 47:3,15	33:17
18:9,11,21	use 26:16,18	47:16 48:14	worked 20:9
19:9 21:21	38:3	50:12 52:7,13	working 35:4
24:11 26:19	used 33:14	52:17	works 36:17
36:14 46:7	38:18	wanted 38:11	worlow 5:1,6
underbelly	using 2:1 33:15	39:19 40:9,9	8:24,25
50:3	usually 19:18	44:7,17 51:22	worst 49:6
understand	25:15 26:1,22	52:12	worth 26:15
19:5 20:21,24	v	warning 39:6	writing 49:21
30:1 33:18	vendor 43:4	warranted	wrong 33:16
36:24 42:9	veritext 54:20	43:8	wrote 40:22
understanding	versus 22:7	washinton 3:22	X
16:21 44:14,19	32:22	way 21:22	x 1:4,10 13:10
48:3,9	vertetis 5:8	32:14 36:12,17	47:18
understood	vesey 3:5	45:5	
20:12 33:12	viable 30:2	we've 28:6	y
45:10 46:22	vianney 35:3,8	34:17 41:19	yeah 8:21
unfair 29:20	35:21	45:9 52:13,14	13:15 14:7,8
uniondale 4:4	victim 24:13	web 10:23	14:22 17:10
unique 38:23	24:13	went 22:19	20:2 24:22
uniquely 42:11	victims 3:21	27:16 28:3	25:3,12,13
		39:17	35:18 36:21

[yeah - zoom]

40:21 46:25
year 32:23
38:8 45:9
years 15:8 16:8
17:11,13 24:19
25:3,15 27:2,2
27:19 45:13
50:2
yep 25:2
york 1:2,7,14
3:6,14 4:11,19
6:4 20:12,14
21:5,5,21 22:9
22:14 23:7
24:11 32:24
36:14
young 28:8
Z
zeroed 18:8
ziehl 3:11 6:25
9:8 45:16
zoom 2:1

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 527 of 529

EXHIBIT E

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 528 of 529

Karen B. Dine

From:	Stephens, Eric P. <epstephens@jonesday.com></epstephens@jonesday.com>
Sent:	Monday, December 18, 2023 12:46 PM
То:	Karen B. Dine; Geremia, Todd R.; Ball, Corinne; Rosenblum, Benjamin; Butler, Andrew M.
Cc:	James Stang; Gail S. Greenwood
Subject:	RE: In re Roman Catholic Diocese of Rockville Centre, New York, Case No. 20-12345 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)
	- informal conference request

Karen, please give me a call if you have a minute. I'm free until 1 PM. I can also speak tomorrow morning.

The comment you're referring to in your letter to relates to the redaction issue we previously discussed with you during the Wednesday call two weeks ago. I.e. there are documents that were produced in mediation that require additional redactions that will be produced in litigation for the first time in the state court actions. I explained to the state court on Friday what those additional redactions will be.

To be clear, we have not identified any CVA documents that are to be produced in the state court litigations that were not previously produced to the Committee. Indeed, our review in connection with the state court subpoenas is only a few days old since subpoenas were being served until December 8. Of course, if we do identify truly "new" CVA documents, we'll provide them to the Committee along with an explanation for why they were not previously identified as CVA documents.

Eric P. Stephens <u>(bio)</u> JONES DAY[®] - One Firm Worldwide[™] 250 Vesey Street New York, NY 10281 Phone: (212) 326-3916 Fax: (212) 755-7306 epstephens@jonesday.com

From: Karen B. Dine <kdine@pszjlaw.com>
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2023 12:37 PM
To: Stephens, Eric P. <epstephens@jonesday.com>; Geremia, Todd R. <trgeremia@JonesDay.com>; Ball, Corinne
<cball@JonesDay.com>; Rosenblum, Benjamin <brosenblum@JonesDay.com>; Butler, Andrew M.
<abutler@jonesday.com>
Cc: James Stang <jstang@pszjlaw.com>; Gail S. Greenwood <ggreenwood@pszjlaw.com>
Subject: FW: In re Roman Catholic Diocese of Rockville Centre, New York, Case No. 20-12345 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.) - informal conference request

Further to our request to the Court, please let us know if you are available to meet and confer on this issue this afternoon or tomorrow in advance of the hearing. Regards, Karen

20-12345-mg Doc 2875 Filed 02/02/24 Entered 02/02/24 17:39:15 Main Document Pg 529 of 529

Subject: In re Roman Catholic Diocese of Rockville Centre, New York, Case No. 20-12345 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.) - informal conference request

To the Chambers of Judge Glenn,

Please see the attached letter requesting an informal conference pursuant to Chambers' Rule concerning Discovery Disputes. I note that as this issue was brought to the attention of the Committee on Friday afternoon, and the Committee has not had an opportunity to meet and confer with the Debtor with respect to the issue. Committee counsel is prepared to make itself available to the Debtor's counsel to meet and confer with respect to this issue in advance of the hearing tomorrow. The Committee is sending this request to your Honor now since the parties are scheduled to be before your Honor on other matters tomorrow.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen B. Dine Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP Direct Dial: 212.561.7731 Tel: 212.561.7700 | Cell: 917.279.7047 | Fax: 212.561.7777 KDine@pszjlaw.com vCard | Bio



Los Angeles | San Francisco | Wilmington, DE | New York | Houston

This e-mail (including any attachments) may contain information that is private, confidential, or protected by attorney-client or other privilege. If you received this e-mail in error, please delete it from your system without copying it and notify sender by reply e-mail, so that our records can be corrected.