```
1
1
    STATE OF ILLINOIS
                         )
                            SS:
2
    COUNTY OF COOK
3
         IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
4
                COUNTY DEPARTMENT - LAW DIVISION
5
     PAUL DULBERG and THE PAUL
     DULBERG REVOCABLE TRUST,
6
                Plaintiffs,
7
                                           ) No. 2022 L 010905
             VS.
     KELLY N. BAUDIN a/k/a BAUDIN &
9
     BAUDIN, et al.,
10
                Defendants.
11
12
                    REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS via Zoom
13
    videoconference of the above-entitled cause before the
14
    Honorable Anthony Swanagan, Judge of said court on
15
    July 16, 2024, at the hour of 11:15 a.m.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

www.ChimniakCourtReporting.com 312.781.9111 630.983.0030

```
2
1
    APPEARANCES:
2
      MR. PAUL DULBERG
      BY: MR. PAUL DULBERG
3
           4606 Hayden Court
           McHenry, Illinois 60051
4
           847.497.4250
           Paul_dulberg@comcast.net
5
                    appeared as Pro Se Plaintiff;
6
7
      CHAPMAN SPINGOLA LLP
      BY:
            MR. ROBERT A. CHAPMAN
8
            190 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3850
            Chicago, Illinois 60603
            312.630.9202
            Rchapman@chapmanspingola.com
10
                    appeared on behalf of ADR Systems;
11
      MR. THOMAS KOST
12
      BY: MR. THOMAS W. KOST
            423 Dempster Street
13
            Mt. Prospect, Illinois 60056
            847.439.2198
14
            tkost999@qmail.com
15
                    trustee of the Paul Dulberg Revocable
                                                     Trust;
16
      KONICEK & DILLON, P.C.
17
      BY: MR. THOMAS J. LONG
            21 West State Street
18
            Geneva, Illinois 60134
            630.262.9655
19
            tlong@konicekdillonlaw.com
20
            appeared on behalf of Alphonse Talarico;
21
22
23
24
```

www.ChimniakCourtReporting.com 312.781.9111 630.983.0030

```
3
1
    APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
2
3
       TRIBLER ORPETT & MEYER P.C.
      BY: MR. JEREMY N. BOEDER
4
            225 West Washington Street, Suite 2550
            Chicago, Illinois 60606
5
            312.201.6400
            jnboeder@tribler.com
6
                     appeared on behalf of W. Randal Baudin,
7
                     Kelly Baudin and the Baudin Law Group.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
    Reported by: Hailey M. Schoot, CSR, RPR
```

www.ChimniakCourtReporting.com

312.781.9111

4 1 THE COURT: Good morning. Today is July 16th, 2 this is Calendar U and it's 11:15. 3 The one case I have on my calendar at 4 11:15 is Case Number 22 L 010905, Dulberg and the 5 Dulberg Trust versus multiple defendants, but I 6 believe we are here today for a motion by one of 7 the defendants, ADR Systems against the plaintiffs 8 and the plaintiff's attorney. 9 And I see we have two court reporters 10 here, so I always like to make sure court reporters 11 can hear me, No. 1, even though I'm not the 12 important person talking and, if you can, then I'll 13 ask everybody else here to introduce themselves for 14 the sake of the transcript. 15 MR. CHAPMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Who wants to jump in? 17 MR. CHAPMAN: I'll start. Thank you, Your 18 Honor. 19 Good morning. Robert Chapman on 20 behalf of the petitioner, ADR Systems. 2.1 THE COURT: Mm-hmm. 22 MR. LONG: Good morning, Your Honor. Thomas 23 Long on behalf of respondent, Alphonse Talarico. 24 THE COURT: Good morning.

www.ChimniakCourtReporting.com

312.781.9111

MR. BOEDER: Good morning, Your Honor. Jeremy
Boeder -- excuse me -- on behalf of defendants W.
Randal Baudin, Kelly Baudin and the Baudin Law
Group.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. DULBERG: Paul Dulberg.

THE COURT: Good morning.

And, let's see -- okay. Let me start by saying that, Mr. Dulberg, I see that you filed a motion yesterday that asks for various things, and I don't know if the other parties have seen it, but it's a relatively lengthy motion and it's not noticed for a hearing and so I'm going to discuss a couple of things about it and then anybody who wants to have a response right now, you can, but I think the important thing is this hearing has been pending for a while and so I'm not going to continue the hearing today.

I think -- I don't remember why, it is probably our fault, but I don't remember why we continued it so far from its originally scheduled date, but, as far as I'm concerned, that continuance time was time for everybody to have their say on the docket, and so while I will

consider what's there, what's in the motion, I'm not going to stop proceedings today, I'm not going to stop argument today, as I believe the motion requests.

And, another thing I'm not going to do, because I don't think I have the authority to do it, I don't think I get to make the court reporters who are assigned to our other courtrooms by higher authorities than me, I don't think I have the authority to make them come here. So there are two private court reporters here. This is an argument, so I don't know that this is evidence. Ι don't really see the prejudice in -- even though, clearly, the litigants want to have an accurate transcript, which is why we have court reporters here, I don't necessarily see the prejudice in you, Mr. Dulberg, not having your own court reporter provided for free, and so I don't think that's a reason for not going forward.

Even if I could make one of our assigned court reporters come here, and I just -- I have to admit, I don't know whether I can or can't, but I presume that if I haven't been told that I do have jurisdiction over folks like that, that I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

don't, so I'm not going to go farther down that road.

The other things you raised,
Mr. Dulberg, as I said, this is -- this hearing has
been postponed for I think time enough for
everybody to have their say, and I think it is
mostly about actions, Mr. Dulberg, that you should
have some awareness of already.

So you have made a request for discovery, you have asked that Mr. Talarico be ordered to give records to you, and I'll consider that, but I don't think me considering those requests are reasons for me to not let the parties who have had their say supplement their written say with an argument today.

So that's my general reaction on the motion filed yesterday, but if anybody else has something they want to say in response to that, I am all eyes and ears.

MR. LONG: Judge, the only thing I would add is I'm troubled by the intent to inject any ARDC proceedings or statements that were contained in ARDC complaints into this proceeding. As Your Honor knows, they're all confidential. They have

312.781.9111

8 1 no place here. 2 THE COURT: Mm-hmm. Fair enough. Anyone 3 else? 4 MR. CHAPMAN: Your Honor, I think your 5 comments from ADR's perspective were -- you know, 6 we're in concurrence with your comments. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Then if there is nothing 8 else, I'll tell you what then, Mr. Chapman, you're 9 the movant, and so you'll get to go first and last, 10 and Mr. Long and Mr. Dulberg, I'll let you respond 11 after his opening and before his closing. Okay? 12 Okay. 13 Thanks, Your Honor. MR. CHAPMAN: 14 THE COURT: The virtual floor is yours, 15 Mr. Chapman. You can --16 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you very much. 17 THE COURT: -- go whenever you're ready. 18 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 I am going to just ask the Court --20 and I'll skip over it if you are familiar with who 21 ADR Systems or what ADR Systems is. If you are 22 familiar --23 THE COURT: I am. 24 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay. So, Your Honor, in my

www.ChimniakCourtReporting.com 312.781.9111 630.983.0030

view, as I said at the beginning of our petition,
Mr. Long and I have both been at this a while and
as have you, and, you know, when I have won or lost
on motions to dismiss -- let's just focus of what I
have won. I'm always hesitant and have -- you
know, for many years, I don't file motions for
sanctions as, you know, A., because I won the
motion to dismiss, therefore I should file a motion
for sanctions. I'm about to celebrate my 38th
anniversary at this and I have done it less than
probably -- definitely less than five times in my
career, so I think it's important for the Court to
be aware that, you know, it's -- we take it
seriously. We don't do it just as a knee jerk
response to what happened here.

I -- I think if you -- and I'm assuming you have had a chance to read our brief, but the fundamental problem with the case that was brought on Mr. Talarico -- on Mr. Dulberg and his Trust's behalf was that it was -- it literally made no sense. And not only does it make no sense, but it's done in a vexatious manner in which Mr. Dulberg had filed a bankruptcy, his personal injury claim belonged to the trustee, the trustee

retained counsel to pursue the claim, the trustee sought the bankruptcy court's approval to engage in a binding mediation before ADR pursuant to a 50,000, 300,000 high-low agreement, which was the limits of the applicable policy. A signed agreement was presented to ADR Systems by Mr. Dulberg and his counsel. Mr. Dulberg admits that he was present and at ADR's facilities for the mediation, the mediation occurred before Judge Etchingham retired and Judge Etchingham found in favor of Mr. Dulberg, he awarded him \$561,000 not as per practice, Judge Etchingham was not made aware of the high-low agreement. The award was issued and then pursuant to the parties' agreement, the -- Allstate paid the money on the high-low, the 300,000, the money was deposited into the bankruptcy court and Mr. Dulberg took \$117,000 of the proceeds after his creditors were paid without objection and silence and we were done when we --ADR were done when we issued our award. That was it for us and then six years later we get this bizarre incomprehensible complaint that Mr. Talarico filed on behalf of Mr. Dulberg and his trust against ADR System and a host of other

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

defendants, law firms, trustee, et cetera, and I -to kind of cut it off, so to speak, I at least took the time -- you know, Illinois is different than federal court, Your Honor, in that there's not a safe harbor rule like there is under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, but as -- I think it's a smart curtesy and I don't -- again, I do it rarely with opposing counsel. I'm plaintiff enough, I don't like to get the letters, but I took the time to write to Mr. Talarico and say, look, your claim violates Rule 137 as a matter of fact and as a matter of law, and the response to that was silence and forging ahead, which was the theme of this whole litigation, which, in some ways, continues today, a forging ahead by Mr. Dulberg, his Trust, and Mr. Talarico.

And so we went to the -- we prepared a motion to dismiss, pointed out the fundamental flaw that Mr. Talarico had admitted in his complaint that the only binding and enforceable agreement was the one between ADR, Allstate and the -- and Mr. Dulberg, that was the enforceable agreement. So when the motion -- the response to the motion that was filed made no sense, and then

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

when -- after we then have to file a reply and then we have to appear before Judge Otto for oral argument, he, you know, threw it out -- you know, I don't want to characterize it, he heard argument and he threw it out, but, over my concern, he -objection, he agreed to let Mr. Talarico file an amended complaint and Mr. Talarico then, again, remained silent for months as the other parties, Mr. Boeder's client -- Jeremy's client and other clients went through their motions for summary judgment over a course of many months, we were then to the sidelines, those were all resolved and I came back and said, hey, you know, what about this amended -- is he going to amend or not. He didn't show up at the hearing to amend, and Judge Otto granted my request to dismiss the complaint with prejudice, within 30 days we filed the motion -petition.

Now -- and I probably covered most of what I would say in my description of what took place, but this is a situation of their own making. There never was, never could be a valid claim against ADR Systems in this case, and the Court is well aware of the standard under Rule 137, it's an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

objective standard. We're not claiming it was -we're certainly claiming it was vexatious. We're
not saying he did it to harass us. I have been in
other cases where litigation is used for an
improper purpose, but here it was clearly done in a
vexatious way, in a way that wasted both ADR's
resources and the Court's time. And the point I
think that we raised in our reply was a couple of
points.

One is, maybe Mr. Talarico didn't get it, but when I gave him the letter explaining it to him, then to, you know, just run -- you know, run roughshod over that and to continue and just to continually hear from the judge that this is not working and to keep going forward, this is a situation of their own making that we're here today.

And the point that I tried to raise in the reply, which is just for your consideration, why am I here, why am I the guy here, right? We got four or five other parties covered by insurance -- my client is not -- that are not here, why, because it's -- you know, ADR takes very seriously the idea that it performs a valuable

service. I'm not going to say it's not done -- you know, it's for a profit, I don't want to overshoot it, but it performs a -- I'm sure you have had cases in front of you over the years where parties lighten your case load and many other judges for many years now and it performs that important function for our system to take these cases out, and I can tell you, if a mediator or one of the retired judges is asked to testify or do anything to get brought into court, we take it very -- "we," ADR, I have been working with them for almost 24 years now, that, you know, we take it very seriously because it undermines that purpose that when that role that we play, if people can simply bring our mediators into court, sue us for no reason and increase the cost to ADR, increase the cost to the clients who participate and the members of the public who participate there.

So it's not -- our petition is not done willy-nilly, it's done -- we take it very, very seriously, and that's why I tried to get Mr. Talarico to stop.

And that we would ask, Your Honor, that you enter an award of sanctions -- I'll just

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

underscore this point -- jointly and separately against Mr. Talarico, Mr. Dulberg, and Mr. Dulberg's Trust, and that if, to the extent the Court does agree with us and grants that motion, I would then submit an appropriate fee petition to you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

Between Mr. Dulberg and Mr. Long, who wants to go next?

Mr. Long?

MR. LONG: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: First hand up so, Mr. Long, go ahead.

MR. LONG: Judge, I respect Mr. Chapman, I have known him for years, but I disagree that this is vexatious litigation. It may be an inartfully pled claim against ADR, it has to be looked at in the context of what had happened.

There was a bankruptcy and a bankruptcy trustee was involved as was counsel hired by the trustee to represent Mr. Dulberg involved in the setting up of the ADR proceeding. And, during the bankruptcy, there was the Court's approval of terms for the mediation, which, based

on Mr. Dulberg's representations to Mr. Talarico, weren't fulfilled when the mediation went forward.

Again, there's context. Mr. Dulberg insists he wasn't there, his signature was forged, all this information is being brought to Mr. Talarico, so he has to take a hard look at what happened. He takes his client's word and investigates. His investigation revealed the basis for a breach of contract claim. Specifically when you kind of cut through some of Mr. Talarico's verbiage -- you know, I hate to say that about my own client, but verbiage in here -- there was a contract that is affined to what the bankruptcy court could approve, but what was actually implemented was a situation which he put in some breaches of that contract by ADR, one of which, from my perspective, is significant in that the allocation of costs changed from the time the bankruptcy court approved the agreement to the time that mediation went forward. I think it's in Section III -- Roman Numeral III(b) of both agreements. It went from being the -- all of Mr. Gagnon, Allstate's responsibility to being split equally.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

So that's that kernel of change that puts an attorney, such as Mr. Talarico, on alert to look and see what happened here, and he's being provided information by his client, who is clearly not happy. I'm sure you'll hear from Mr. Dulberg soon.

So Mr. Talarico files a complaint for breach of contract saying ADR, who was a party, in the sense of they're agreeing to charge and accept fees, so they're a party, breached that by changing the terms of the agreement or being part of the change in the sense of the fees. And I think the contract also provides that -- or the agreement, I should say, mediation agreement, provides that no changes are to be made without agreement of the parties, and, from Mr. Talarico's perspective, based on what Mr. Dulberg said, he never agreed to a change in cost or anything else.

So, in simple terms, we have a contract, we have a breach, i.e. the change in terms and damages, Mr. Dulberg being responsible for some of the costs. We have that. That's a seminal breach of contract claim. Where it goes, who knows. We have all been in cases over our

years here, a lot of experience on the screen, where he files a complaint with a legal basis and Mr. Chapman, being the good attorney that he is, files a motion to dismiss. Okay. We have all been there. And I think it's important to know what happens next.

Well, let me step back. Mr. Chapman seems to place emphasis on Mr. Talarico filing the action after he sends the letter. Well, I think -- I know I have sent countless letters like that over my career, and I can count on one hand how many times the plaintiff said, oh, you're right, Tom, I'm not filing suit. You go ahead, it gets filed, you do the motion and everybody goes about their business, if it's granted. So then we move on to the motion part.

Mr. Chapman files a motion, Judge
Otto grants it. Okay. It's without prejudice.
This is not a claim that is so patently ridiculous
that Judge Otto -- I wasn't there, so I'm just kind
of reading into it, Mr. Chapman, correct? Whoever
was there can correct me if I'm wrong, but --

MR. CHAPMAN: You're wrong.

MR. LONG: I figured as much.

But he dismisses it without prejudice, meaning, to me, there is a grain of something there, and Mr. Talarico and Mr. Dulberg are given the opportunity to elaborate, reconfigure it to move forward.

Mr. Talarico decides okay, I'll turn my focus on to the other defendants, Mr. Boeder's defendants and leave ADR alone. That is not vexatious. That is someone asserting a claim and leaving that claim behind when a judge says it's dismissed, and that's where it went. He didn't try to file it again. He didn't drag ADR in on three amended complaints. And, again, we have all seen that. That's not this.

So when you look at it in the context of what happened and what was pled and how Mr. Talarico responded when Judge Otto said it's dismissed, but maybe you can file something, chose not to. If he had gone ahead, that's vexatious. That's sanctionable. Here, it's not. It's a complaint that was dismissed and that should be the end of it.

And, for those reasons, Judge, I would respectfully request you deny the motion for

20 1 sanctions. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 3 Mr. Dulberg. 4 MR. DULBERG: Hi, Your Honor. I'm not sure --5 I have never done this. Forgive me if I'm a little 6 nervous, but in that motion that I filed yesterday 7 there were exhibits at the bottom that are 8 applicable, and one of them is video 27, and it is 9 a response. 10 I can't articulate this. Can I -- is 11 it possible for me to have my guardian and trustee 12 speak for me? 13 THE COURT: Pardon me? 14 MR. DULBERG: Is it allowed for me to have my 15 guardian and trustee speak for me on these matters 16 or... 17 THE COURT: Mr. Kost, you mean? 18 MR. DULBERG: Yes. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Kost, is that -- is that 20 something you would like to take on? 2.1 MR. DULBERG: Absolutely. Absolutely. 22 THE COURT: Wait. Who just said "absolutely?" 23 MR. DULBERG: Yes. He is here with me because 24 we --

www.ChimniakCourtReporting.com 312.781.9111 630.983.0030

THE COURT: Oh, he's with you. Okay. I'm looking at his Zoom screen and I'm seeing that it's --

MR. KOST: No, I couldn't get in. Couldn't -- could you see me? Can you see me?

THE COURT: No, I couldn't see you. I can see your name, though, I see "Thomas Kost," but I never heard you speak up, so...

MR. KOST: Things appear to be frozen.

MR. LONG: And, Judge, if I may, I don't want to make this more complicated, but I'm not quite sure Mr. Kost's status. Is he a trustee of the Trust or is he a guardian? I heard guardian.

MR. DULBERG: He is a --

MR. LONG: Just so the record is clear as to who he is and what authority he has to speak for Mr. Dulberg.

THE COURT: Yeah. Mr. Kost, go ahead, tell us your status as far as --

MR. KOST: I'm the full trustee of the Paul Dulberg Revocable Trust, but I have also been helping Paul Dulberg for approximately 13 years on these cases.

Paul Dulberg has been attacked

312.781.9111

brutally and I created a series of -- eight series of videos, over 70 videos, which are available to the public, sent to the ARDC, all recorded, approximately 14 ARDC complaints all --

MR. LONG: Judge, ARDC is not relevant here.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. KOST: But I sent this yesterday --

THE COURT: Both of you stop for the moment.

Okay? One at a time. Court reporters can only record one speaker at a time.

Judges make rulings on the admissibility and relevance of evidence and argument all the time. It doesn't mean I can't hear it, so I am presumed to disregard what is inappropriate, and I understand that's my task. So I'm not going to stop Mr. Kost from talking. To the extent that I conclude that I don't need to consider anything he is saying, I won't consider it. So, go ahead, Mr. Kost.

MR. KOST: Okay. Over a period of time I have produced a series -- eight series of videos, over 70 videos all available online to the public and they have all been sent to the ARDC in various ARDC complaints and they are highly relevant in this

case because, in this particular case, in the case 22 L 010905, Paul Dulberg was completely set up from the beginning and the evidence -- direct evidence, clear and convincing evidence is contained in the videos that I have provided to the ARDC and that I attempted -- we attempted to provide to the Court yesterday.

And, furthermore, Talarico didn't even represent us when he filed his response in this motion. He resigned on the 14th of January, I provided evidence to the Court yesterday -- or attempted to -- so he never represented us when he filed his answer. He's hostile. He's extremely hostile to our cause and I have documented it, again, in eight series of videos, and so I stand by the statements in the videos. That's my best answer to this.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. LONG: Judge, may I say something?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. LONG: I just want to clarify one thing before Bob goes back.

Just so the record is clear, the

www.ChimniakCourtReporting.com

312.781.9111 630.983.0030

response filed by Mr. Talarico was submitted to the Court on February 8th. Mr. Talarico was not granted leave to withdraw until February 29th, there's an order. So I wanted that cleared up before creating a record for this.

Sorry, Bob.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Chapman, last words go to you.

MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Just a couple of points that I'll raise, which is, Mr. Talarico -- in the complaint itself, Mr. Talarico alleged that Mr. Dulberg was present at ADR's facilities on the day of the mediation. Forget that. You know, that's just a point of correction, but then the point was -- that Judge Otto highlighted was the statement in paragraph 94 of the complaint, which was there was a valid and enforceable contract between plaintiff Paul Dulberg and defendant ADR Systems and Allstate Property and Casualty Company dated

December 8th, 2016, "please see Exhibit 11 attached."

That's the signed document that ADR performed the mediation pursuant to. We were not a

party to the bankruptcy, we were not a witness, we were not asked to sign anything or appear before the bankruptcy court, whatever draft of something that was presented to the bankruptcy court, we, ADR, weren't a party to. And, as Mr. Talarico alleged, and as Judge Otto noted, the only valid agreement was the one that was signed and then pursuant to which the mediation occurred.

The -- I'll give Mr. Long credit for coming up with something here, which is, well, the costs. Well, you know, Judge, we have paid -- Mr. Dulberg received \$300,000, his trust -- the bankruptcy trustee on his behalf received 300,000. What would the cost be of a binding mediation? A couple thousand dollars? Was there ever a protest to ADR Systems these costs should not have been allocated to me? Was there a protest in the bankruptcy court? Judge, I can't take the 117,000 because I'm really entitled to 120,000 because costs were allocated improperly? Of course not. Mr. Dulberg took the money.

And so I appreciate that Mr. Dulberg or Mr. Kost might feel there was something done improper, I don't know what the evidence is to

support it, but if they feel like it, it wasn't ADR Systems who did anything improper and I don't -- I don't represent the attorneys involved, I don't represent the trustee involved, and, you know, whether Judge -- you know, as someone who was there at the time, Judge Otto allowed Mr. -- made it without prejudice so that the other motions could be heard, some were on summary judgment, and that then Mr. Talarico could decide what to do. That was the reason why he did it. If you read the transcript of that hearing, I did not get any sense that Judge Otto perceived a kernel of truth or a kernel of something to which could be added on to, and it doesn't matter anyway, it's an objective standard for you to apply, Your Honor, in this situation, which is, was the complaint, as a matter of fact, did it have a reasonable basis in fact and law to be filed? The answer is unequivocally it did not. Based on that answer, you should grant our request for an award of sanctions.

THE COURT: Okay. Did I leave anybody out?

All right. What I'm going to do is

I'll take the motion and the briefs under

advisement. I'm going to continue the case to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

August 28th at 9:00 for a ruling. It may be that I'll issue a written ruling before then and strike the date, but, you know, that's lay plans, but, anyway, if somebody can just send us an order to that affect. Yeah, Mr. --MR. CHAPMAN: Your Honor, on the order what -should the order reference the motion that was filed today? THE COURT: Today's order doesn't have to say that. My order will address it to the extent I need -- I think it needs addressing. MR. CHAPMAN: Understood. THE COURT: Okay. Okay. MR. CHAPMAN: Okay. I will prepare the order and I will circulate it. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you, all.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you, all.

Thank you to both court reporters,

Mr. Dulberg, everyone.

Everybody have a good day. Okay.

MR. LONG: Thanks, Judge, you, too.

MR. BOEDER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thanks a lot.

MR. CHAPMAN: Your Honor, if for some reason you need a copy of today's transcript, please let

www.ChimniakCourtReporting.com

312.781.9111

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

28 1 us know and we'll obtain it. 2 MR. DULBERG: I would like one. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for that. 4 MR. CHAPMAN: And I'll send the court reporter 5 information to Mr. Dulberg if he would like to 6 order a transcript from the court reporter, but 7 with the knowledge that he would have to pay for 8 it. 9 THE COURT: Fair enough. 10 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Your 11 Honor. I'll get that taken care of. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks, everybody. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

www.ChimniakCourtReporting.com

312.781.9111

29 1 STATE OF ILLINOIS) Ss: 2 COUNTY OF C O O K 3 I, Hailey M. Schoot, CSR, RPR, a 4 Certified Shorthand Reporter of said state, do hereby 5 certify that I reported in shorthand the proceedings 6 had at the taking of said hearing and that the 7 foregoing transcript is a true record of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid, and contains all the 9 requested proceedings at said hearing. 10 In witness whereof, I have hereunto set 11 my hand this 23 day of July, 2024. 12 13 14 (Electronically Signed) 15 16 Hailey M. Schoot, CSR, RPR C.S.R. License No. 084-004897 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

www.ChimniakCourtReporting.com 312.781.9111 630.983.0030

A	24:13	amend	asked	16:13,19 25:1
	advisement	12:14,15	7:10 14:9 25:2	25:3,4,13,18
a.m 1:15	26:24	amended	asks	based
1.15 a/k/a	affect	12:7,14 19:13	5:10	15:24 17:17
1:8	27:5	anniversary	asserting	26:19
above-entitled	affined	9:10	19:9	basis
1:13	16:13	answer	assigned	16:8 18:2 26:17
_	aforesaid	23:13,17 26:18	6:8,21	Baudin
absolutely 20:21,21,22	29:8	26:19	assuming	1:8,8,9 3:6,7,7
, ,	agree	Anthony	9:17	5:3,3,3
accept 17:9	15:4	1:14	attached	beginning
accurate	agreed	anybody	24:22	9:1 23:3
6:14	12:6 17:17	5:14 7:17 26:21	attacked	behalf
action	agreeing	anyway	21:24	2:10,20 3:6 4:20
18:9	17:9	26:14 27:4	attempted	4:23 5:2 9:20
actions	agreement	appear	23:6,6,12	10:23 25:13
7:7	10:4,6,13,14	12:2 21:9 25:2	attorney	believe
add	11:21,23 16:19	APPEARANCES	4:8 17:2 18:3	4:6 6:3
7:20	17:11,13,14,15	2:1 3:1	attorneys	belonged
added	25:7	appeared	26:3	9:24
26:13	agreements	2:5,10,20 3:6	August	best
address	16:22	applicable	27:1	23:16
27:10	ahead	10:5 20:8	authorities	binding
addressing	11:13,15 15:13	apply	6:9	10:3 11:20
27:11	18:13 19:19	26:15	authority	25:14
admissibility	21:18 22:19	appreciate	6:6,10 21:16	bizarre
22:12	al	23:18 25:22	available	10:22
admit	1:9	appropriate	22:2,22	Bob
6:22	alert	15:5	award	23:23 24:6
admits	17:2	approval	10:13,20 14:24	Boeder
10:7	alleged	10:2 15:24	26:20	3:3 5:1,2 27:21
admitted	24:12 25:6	approve	awarded	Boeder's
11:19	allocated	16:14	10:11	12:9 19:7
ADR	25:17,20	approved	aware	bottom
2:10 4:7,20 8:21	allocation	16:19	9:13 10:13	20:7
8:21 10:3,6,20	16:18	approximately	12:24	breach
10:24 11:21	allowed	21:22 22:4	awareness	16:9 17:8,20,23
12:23 13:23	20:14 26:6	ARDC	7:8	breached
14:11,16 15:17	Allstate	7:21,23 22:3,4,5		17:10
15:22 16:16	10:15 11:21	22:23,23 23:6	B	breaches
17:8 19:8,12	24:19	argument	back	16:16
24:19,23 25:5	Allstate's	6:3,12 7:15 12:3	12:13 18:7	brief
24.19,23 25.5 25:16 26:1	16:23	12:4 22:13	23:23	9:17
ADR's	Alphonse	articulate	bankruptcy	briefs
8:5 10:8 13:6	2:20 4:23	20:10	9:23 10:2,17	26:23
0.5 10.0 13.0	= 2-00		15:19,20,23	
	I	I	<u> </u>	1

bring	16:18	client's	contains	couple
14:15	changes	16:7	29:8	5:14 13:8 24:10
brought	17:15	clients	context	25:15
9:19 14:10 16:5	changing	12:10 14:17	15:18 16:3	course
brutally	17:10	closing	19:15	12:11 25:20
22:1	Chapman	8:11	continually	court
business	2:7,7 4:15,17,19	come	13:14	1:3,14 2:3 4:1,9
18:15	8:4,8,13,15,16	6:10,21	continuance	4:10,16,21,24
	8:18,24 15:14	coming	5:23	5:5,7 6:7,11,15
C	18:3,7,17,21	25:10	continue	6:17,21 8:2,7
С	18:23 24:7,9	comments	5:18 13:13	8:14,17,19,23
29:2	27:6,12,14,23	8:5,6	26:24	9:12 10:17
C.S.R	28:4,10	Company	continued	11:4 12:23
29:16	characterize	24:20	3:1 5:21	14:10,15 15:4
calendar	12:4	complaint	continues	15:7,12 16:14
4:2,3	charge	10:22 11:20	11:15	16:19 20:2,13
care	17:9	12:7,16 17:7	contract	20:17,19,22
28:11	Chicago	18:2 19:21	16:9,13,16 17:8	21:1,6,18 22:6
career	2:8 3:4	24:11,17 26:16	17:13,20,23	22:8,9 23:7,11
9:12 18:11	chose	complaints	24:18	23:18,21 24:2
case	19:18	7:23 19:13 22:4	convincing	24:7 25:3,4,18
4:3,4 9:18 12:23	CIRCUIT	22:24	23:4	26:21 27:9,13
14:5 23:1,1,1	1:3	completely	COOK	27:16,17,22
26:24	circulate	23:2	1:2,3	28:3,4,6,9,12
cases	27:15	complicated	сору	court's
13:4 14:4,7	Civil	21:11	27:24	10:2 13:7 15:23
17:24 21:23	11:6	concern	correct	courtrooms
Casualty	claim	12:5	18:21,22	6:8
24:20	9:24 10:1 11:11	concerned	correction	covered
cause	12:22 15:17	5:22	24:15	12:19 13:21
1:13 23:14	16:9 17:23	conclude	cost	created
celebrate	18:19 19:9,10	22:17	14:16,17 17:18	22:1
9:9	claiming	concurrence	25:14	creating
certainly	13:1,2	8:6	costs	24:5
13:2	clarify	confidential	16:18 17:22	credit
Certified	23:22	7:24	25:11,16,20	25:9
29:4	clear	consider	counsel	creditors
certify	21:15 23:4,24	6:1 7:11 22:18	10:1,7 11:8	10:18
29:5	cleared	22:18	15:20	CSR
cetera	24:4	consideration	count	3:24 29:3,16
11:1	clearly	13:19	18:11	curtesy
chance	6:14 13:5 17:4	considering	countless	11:7
9:17	client	7:12	18:10	cut
change	12:9,9 13:22	contained	COUNTY	11:2 16:10
17:1,12,18,20	16:12 17:4	7:22 23:5	1:2,3,4 29:2	D
changed				

damages	5:13	eight	eyes	firms
17:21	dismiss	22:1,21 23:15	7:19	11:1
date	9:4,8 11:18	elaborate		first
5:22 27:3	12:16 18:4	19:4	F	8:9 15:12
dated	dismissed	Electronically	facilities	five
24:20	19:11,18,21	29:14	10:8 24:13	9:11 13:21
day	dismisses	emphasis	fact	flaw
24:13 27:19	19:1	18:8	11:11 26:17,17	11:19
29:11	disregard	enforceable	Fair	floor
days	22:14	11:20,22 24:18	8:2 28:9	8:14
12:17	DIVISION	engage	familiar	focus
December	1:4	10:2	8:20,22	9:4 19:7
24:21	docket	enter	far	folks
decide	5:24	14:24	5:21,22 21:19	6:24
26:9	document	entitled	farther	foregoing
decides	24:23	25:19	7:1	29:7
19:6	documented	equally	fault	forged
defendant	23:14	16:24	5:20	16:4
24:19	dollars	et	favor	Forget
defendants	25:15	1:9 11:1	10:11	24:14
1:10 4:5,7 5:2	draft	Etchingham	February	forging
11:1 19:7,8	25:3	10:10,10,12	24:2,3	11:13,15
definitely	drag	everybody	federal	Forgive
9:11	19:12	4:13 5:23 7:6	11:4,6	20:5
Dempster	Dulberg	18:14 27:19	fee	forward
2:12	1:5,5 2:2,2,15	28:12	15:5	6:19 13:15 16:2
deny	4:4,5 5:6,6,9	evidence	feel	16:20 19:5
19:24	6:17 7:4,7 8:10	6:12 22:12 23:3	25:23 26:1	found
DEPARTMENT	9:19,23 10:7,7	23:4,4,11	fees	10:10
1:4	10:11,17,23	25:24	17:10,12	four
deposited	11:15,22 15:2	excuse	figured	13:21
10:16	15:8,21 16:3	5:2	18:24	free
description	17:5,17,21	Exhibit	file	6:18
12:20	19:3 20:3,4,14	24:21	9:6,8 12:1,6	front
different	20:18,21,23	exhibits	19:12,18	14:4
11:3	21:14,17,21,22	20:7	filed	frozen
DILLON	21:24 23:2	experience	5:9 7:17 9:23	21:9
2:16	24:12,19 25:12	18:1	10:23 11:24	fulfilled
direct	25:21,22 27:18	explaining	12:17 18:13	16:2
23:3	28:2,5	13:11	20:6 23:9,13	full
disagree	Dulberg's	extent	24:1 26:18	21:20
15:15	15:3 16:1	15:3 22:17	27:8	function
discovery		27:10	files	14:7
7:10	E	extremely	17:7 18:2,4,17	fundamental
discuss	ears	23:13	filing	9:18 11:18
	7:19		18:8,13	
	i	i	1	i

furthermore	guy	high-low	13:5 25:24 26:2	9:14
23:8	13:20	10:4,13,15	improperly	jnboeder@tri
	Н	higher	25:20	3:5
		6:9	inappropriate	jointly
Gagnon	Hailey	highlighted	22:15	15:1
16:23	3:24 29:3,16	24:16	inartfully	judge
general	hand	highly	15:16	1:14 7:20 10:9
7:16	15:12 18:11 29:11	22:24	incomprehen	10:10,12 12:2
Geneva 2:18		hired	10:22	12:15 13:14
_	happened 9:15 15:18 16:7	15:21	increase	15:11,14 18:17
give 7:11 25:9	17:3 19:16	Honor	14:16,16	18:20 19:10,17
		4:15,18,22 5:1	information	19:23 21:10
given 19:4	happens 18:6	7:24 8:4,13,18	16:5 17:4 28:5	22:5 23:20
		8:24 11:4	inject	24:16 25:6,11
go	happy	14:23 20:4	7:21	25:18 26:5,6
7:1 8:9,17 15:9	17:5	24:9 26:15	injury	26:12 27:20
15:12 18:13	harass	27:6,21,23	9:24	judges
21:18 22:19	13:3	28:11	insists	14:5,9 22:11
24:8	harbor	Honorable	16:4	judgment
goes	11:5	1:14	insurance	12:11 26:8
17:23 18:14	hard	host	13:22	July
23:23	16:6	10:24	intent	1:15 4:1 29:11
going	hate	hostile	7:21	jump
5:13,17 6:2,2,5	16:11	23:13,14	introduce	4:16
6:19 7:1 8:19	Hayden 2:3	hour	4:13	jurisdiction
12:14 13:15	hear	1:15	investigates	6:24
14:1 22:16 26:22,24	4:11 13:14 17:5		16:8	K
20.22,24 good	22:14	i.e	investigation	K
4:1,15,19,22,24	heard	17:20	16:8	29:2
5:1,5,7 18:3	12:4 21:8,13	idea	involved	_
27:19	26:8	13:24	15:20,22 26:3,4	keep 13:15
	hearing	III	issue	Kelly
grain 19:2	5:13,16,18 7:4	16:21	27:2	1:8 3:7 5:3
	12:15 26:11	III(b)	issued	kernel
grant 26:19	29:6.9	16:21	10:14,20	17:1 26:12,13
granted	helping	Illinois	J	kind
12:16 18:15	21:22	1:1,3 2:3,8,13	J	11:2 16:10
24:3	hereunto	2:18 3:4 11:3	2:17	18:20
grants	29:10	29:1	January	knee
15:4 18:18	hesitant	implemented	23:10	9:14
Group	9:5	16:15	Jeremy	know
3:7 5:4	hey	important	3:3 5:1	5:11 6:12,22 8:5
guardian	12:13	4:12 5:16 9:12	Jeremy's	9:3,6,7,13 11:3
20:11,15 21:13	Hi	14:6 18:5	12:9	12:3,3,13
21:13	20:4	improper	jerk	13:12,12,23
£1.10	20.7	mibi obei	JUIK	13.12,12,23

14:2,12 16:11	29:16	11:11,12 26:14	movant	occurred
18:5,10 24:14	lighten	26:16	8:9	10:9 25:8
25:11,24 26:4	14:5	matters	move	oh
26:5 27:3 28:1	limits	20:15	18:15 19:5	18:12 21:1
knowledge	10:5	McHenry	Mt	okay
28:7	literally	2:3	2:13	5:8 8:7,11,12,24
known	9:20	mean	multiple	15:7 18:4,18
15:15	litigants	20:17 22:13	4:5	19:6 20:2 21:1
knows	6:14	meaning		22:9,20 23:18
7:24 17:24	litigation	19:2	N	24:7 26:21
KONICEK	11:14 13:4	mediation	N	27:13,13,14,16
2:16	15:16	10:3,9,9 15:24	1:8 3:3	27:19 28:3,10
Kost	little	16:2,20 17:14	name	28:12
2:11,12 20:17	20:5	24:14,24 25:8	21:7	online
20:19 21:4,7,9	LLP	25:14	necessarily	22:22
21:18,20 22:7	2:7	mediator	6:16	opening
22:16,19,20	load	14:8	need	8:11
25:23	14:5	mediators	22:17 27:11,24	opportunity
Kost's	Long	14:15	needs	19:4
21:12	2:17 4:22,23	members	27:11	opposing
21.12	7:20 8:10 9:2	14:17	nervous	11:8
L	15:8,10,11,12	MEYER	20:6	oral
L	15:14 18:24	3:3	never	12:2
1:7 4:4 23:2	21:10,15 22:5	Mm-hmm	12:22,22 17:17	order
LaSalle	23:20,22 25:9	4:21 8:2	20:5 21:7	24:4 27:4,6,7,9
2:8	27:20	moment	23:12	27:10,14 28:6
law	look	22:8	noted	ordered
1:4 3:7 5:3 11:1	11:10 16:6 17:3		25:6	7:11
11:12 26:18	19:15	money 10:15,16 25:21	notes	_ = = = =
lay	looked	months	29:8	originally 5:21
27:3			noticed	
leave	15:17	12:8,11	5:13	ORPETT
19:8 24:3 26:21	looking	morning	Number	3:3
leaving	21:2	4:1,15,19,22,24	4:4	Otto
19:10	lost	5:1,5,7	Numeral	12:2,15 18:18
legal	9:3	motion	16:21	18:20 19:17
18:2	lot	4:6 5:10,12 6:1	10.21	24:16 25:6
lengthy	18:1 27:22	6:3 7:17 9:8,8	0	26:6,12
5:12	M	11:18,23,24	0	overshoot
let's	M	12:17 15:4	29:2,2	14:2
5:8 9:4	3:24 29:3,16	18:4,14,16,17	objection	P
letter	making	19:24 20:6	10:19 12:6	P.C
13:11 18:9	12:21 13:16	23:10 26:23	objective	2:16 3:3
letters	manner	27:7	13:1 26:14	paid
11:9 18:10	9:22	motions	obtain	10:15,18 25:11
License	matter	9:4,6 12:10 26:7	28:1	paragraph
LICCIISC	matter			Paragraph

24:17 8:5 16:17 17:16 11:17 purpose reconfigure Pardon 9:1 12:18 14:19 10:8 24:13 pursuant 19:4 part 15:5 presented 10:3,14 24:24 21:15 22:10 17:11 18:16 petitioner 10:6 25:4 25:8 23:24 24:5 participate 4:20 presume 25:8 23:24 24:5 particular 8:1 12:21 18:8 presumed 29:7 14:17,18 place 6:23 10:1 recorded particular 8:1 12:21 18:8 presumed 22:3 23:1 plaintiff 22:14 put 22:3 parties 2:5 11:8 18:12 private put 22:3 5:11 7:13 12:8 24:18 6:11 17:2 reference 13:21 14:4 plaintiff's pro Q quite 27:7 10:1 reference 27:7 relatively 10:1 relevance 22:11 10:1 relevance 22:12
Pardon petition present 13:5 14:13 19:4 part 15:5 petitioner 10:8 24:13 pursuant record 17:11 18:16 petitioner 10:6 25:4 25:8 23:24 24:5 participate 4:20 presume pursue 29:7 14:17,18 place 6:23 pursue 29:7 particular 8:1 12:21 18:8 presumed put 22:3 23:1 plaintiff 22:14 pot put 22:3 particular 2:5 11:8 18:12 presumed put 22:3 recorded particular 2:5 11:8 18:12 private put 22:3 records 23:1 1 plaintiff 22:14 private puts 7:11 reference 13:21 14:4 plaintiffs 17:2 quite 27:7 relatively 10:14 1:6 4:7 probably probably problem 22:11 relevance 18:19 14:14 play 11:6
20:13
Dart 15:5 Detitioner 10:6 25:4 25:8 23:24 24:5 Darticipate 4:20 Detitioner 10:6 25:4 25:8 Dursue 29:7 14:17,18 Dace 6:23 10:1 Dut 22:3 Darticular 8:1 12:21 18:8 Dursue 29:7 Darticular 8:1 12:21 18:8 Dursue 29:7 Darticular 2:5 11:8 18:12 Dut 22:3 Darticular 2:6 11
17:11 18:16
participate 4:20 presume pursue 29:7 14:17,18 place 6:23 10:1 recorded particular 8:1 12:21 18:8 presumed 22:3 23:1 plaintiff 22:14 16:15 records parties 2:5 11:8 18:12 private puts 7:11 reference 5:11 7:13 12:8 24:18 6:11 17:2 reference 27:7 relatively 27:7 relatively 5:12 relatively 5:12 relatively 5:12 relevance 22:12 relevance 22:5,24 relevance 13:18 24:11 relevance 22:5,24 remained 12:8 remained 12:8 remember 7:3 13:8 remember 7:11 remember 5:19 20
14:17,18 particular place 6:23 presumed 10:1 put recorded 23:1 plaintiff 22:14 private 16:15 puts records 5:11 7:13 12:8 24:18 private puts 7:11 reference 5:11 7:13 12:8 24:18 plaintiff's Pro 27:7 relatively 17:16 parties' plaintiffs probably 5:12 relevance 10:14 party plaintiffs probably 5:20 9:11 12:19 problem problem 17:8,10 25:1,5 patently play procedure 11:6 procedure 13:18 24:11 relevance 22:5,24 relevant 18:19 paul play 14:14 please 11:6 proceeding 7:23 15:22 proceedings 7:3 13:8 proceedings 7:3 13:8 proceedings 7:3 13:8 proceedings 15:5 2:2,2,15 proceedings proceedings 7:10 proceedings 7:11 proceedings 7:11 proceedings 7:12 proceedings 15:5 2:2,2,15 proceedings proceedings 7:3 13:8 proceedings 7:3 13:8 proceedings 7:10 proceedings 15:5 2:2,2,15 proceedings proceedings 7:10 proceedings 7:11 proceedings 7:11 proceedings 15:5 2:5 proceedings 7:10 proceedings 7:12 proceedings 7:13 proceedings
particular 8:1 12:21 18:8 presumed put 22:3 23:1 plaintiff 22:14 16:15 records parties 2:5 11:8 18:12 private puts 7:11 5:11 7:13 12:8 24:18 6:11 17:2 reference 13:21 14:4 plaintiff's Pro 27:7 relatively 17:16 4:8 2:5 quite 27:7 relatively parties' plaintiff's probably 5:20 9:11 12:19 problem 21:11 relevance party plans problem Raise 22:12 relevant 22:5,24 patently play proceeding 13:18 24:11 remained 12:8 18:19 14:14 please proceeding 7:3 13:8 remember 5:6 21:20 22 pled proceedings Randal 5:19 20
23:1
parties 2:5 11:8 18:12 private puts 7:11 5:11 7:13 12:8 24:18 6:11 17:2 7:11 13:21 14:4 plaintiff's Pro 27:7 27:7 17:16 4:8 probably 9:18 5:12 7:11 17:16 1:6 4:7 probably 5:12 7:11 7:11 17:16 4:8 2:5 27:7 7 <td< td=""></td<>
5:11 7:13 12:8 24:18 6:11 17:2 reference 13:21 14:4 plaintiff's 2:5 quite 27:7 17:16 4:8 2:5 quite 5:12 10:14 1:6 4:7 5:20 9:11 12:19 7:2 reference 17:2 Q relatively 7:11 10:14 1:6 4:7 5:20 9:11 12:19 7:21:11 relevance 17:2 Q quite 21:11 relevance 21:11 R raise 22:12 relevance 22:12 relevant 22:5,24 remained 13:18 24:11 remained 12:8 remember 12:8 remember 5:19 20
13:21 14:4 plaintiff's Pro 27:7 17:16 4:8 plaintiff's quite 5:12 parties' plaintiff's probably 5:20 9:11 12:19 quite 21:11 party plans problem 21:11 relevance party plans procedure naise 22:12 17:8,10 25:1,5 play procedure 13:18 24:11 remained patently please proceeding 7:3 13:8 remember 1:5,5 2:2,2,15 24:21 27:24 7:23 15:22 Randal 7:3 13:8
17:16
parties' plaintiffs probably quite 5:12 10:14 1:6 4:7 5:20 9:11 12:19 21:11 relevance party plans problem 22:12 relevant 17:8,10 25:1,5 play procedure 13:18 24:11 remained patently play proceeding 13:18 24:11 remained paul please proceedings 7:23 15:22 remember 5:6 21:20 22 pled proceedings Randal 5:19 20
10:14
party plans problem 17:8,10 25:1,5 27:3 9:18 patently play Procedure 18:19 14:14 please 1:5,5 2:2,2,15 24:21 27:24 proceedings 5:6 21:20 22 pled proceedings 7:23 15:22 proceedings Randal 5:19 20
17:8,10 25:1,5 patently 27:3 play 9:18 procedure raise 13:18 24:11 raised 22:5,24 remained 18:19 paul please 7:23 15:22 proceedings 7:3 13:8 remember 5:6 21:20 22 pled pled proceedings Randal 7:19 20
patently play Procedure 13:18 24:11 22:5,24 18:19 14:14 please 11:6 raise 13:18 24:11 remained 1:5,5 2:2,2,15 24:21 27:24 7:23 15:22 7:3 13:8 remember 5:6 21:20 22 pled proceedings Randal 5:19 20
18:19
Paul please proceeding 7:3 13:8 remember 5:6 21:20 22 pled proceedings
1:5,5 2:2,2,15
5:6 21:20 22 pled proceedings Randal 5:19 20
21:24 23:2 15:17 19:16 1:12 6:2 7:22 3:6 5:3 reply
24·19 noint 29·5 9 rarely 12·1 13·8 19
Paul_dulberg 13:7,18 15:1 proceeds 11:8 REPORT
2.4 24.15.15 10.18 Rchapman@c 1.12
nay nointed produced 2:9 reported
28:7 11:18 22:21 reaction 3:24 29:5
pending points 7:16 reporter
1.5·17 13·9·24·10 14·2 read 6·17·28·4·6·29·4
neonle policy Property 9:17 26:10 reporters
14:14 10:5 24:20 reading 4:9,10 6:8,11,1
perceived possible Prospect 18:21 6:21 22:9
26:12 20:11 2:13 ready 27:17
performed postponed protest 8:17 represent
24.24 7.5 25.15.17 really 15.21.23.9.26.3
performs practice provide 6:13 25:19 26:4
13:24 14:3,6 10:12 23:7 representation
period prejudice provided 6:19 14:16 16:1
22:20 6:13,16 12:17 6:18 17:4 23:5 26:10 27:23 represented
nerson 18:18:19:2 23:11 reasonable 23:12
4:12 26:7 provides 26:17 request
personal prepare 17:13,14 reasons 7:9 12:16 19:24
9:23 7:13,14 7:13 19:23 7:9 12:10 19:24 26:20
perspective prepared 14:18 22:3,22 received requested
perspective prepared 14.16 22.3,22 25:12,13

29:9	role	6:16 17:3 21:5	significant	12:24 13:1
requests	14:14	21:5,6,6,7	16:17	26:15
6:4 7:13	Roman	24:21	silence	start
resigned	16:21	seeing	10:19 11:13	4:17 5:8
23:10	roughshod	21:2	silent	state
resolved	13:13	seen	12:8	1:1 2:17 29:1,4
12:12	RPR	5:11 19:13	simple	statement
resources	3:24 29:3,16	seminal	17:19	24:16
13:7	rule	17:23	simply	statements
respect	11:5,5,11 12:24	send	14:14	7:22 23:16
15:14	Rules	27:4 28:4	situation	status
respectfully	11:6	sends	12:21 13:16	21:12,19
19:24	ruling	18:9	16:15 26:16	step
respond	27:1,2	sense	six	18:7
8:10	rulings	9:21,21 11:24	10:21	stop
responded	22:11	17:9,12 26:11	skip	6:2,3 14:22 22:8
19:17	run	sent	8:20	22:16
respondent	13:12,12	18:10 22:3,7,23	smart	Street
4:23		separately	11:7	2:8,12,17 3:4
response	S	15:1	somebody	strike
5:15 7:18 9:15	safe	series	27:4	27:2
11:12,23 20:9	11:5	22:1,1,21,21	soon	submit
23:9 24:1	sake	23:15	17:6	15:5
responsibility	4:14	seriously	Sorry	submitted
16:23	sanctionable	9:14 13:24	24:6	24:1
responsible	19:20	14:13,21	sought	sue
17:21	sanctions	service	10:2	14:15
retained	9:7,9 14:24 20:1	14:1	South	suit
10:1	26:20		2:8	18:13
retired	saying	set 23:2 29:10		Suite
10:10 14:9	5:9 13:3 17:8		speak	2:8 3:4
	22:18	setting 15:22	11:2 20:12,15	
revealed	says		21:8,16	summary 12:10 26:8
16:8	19:10	shorthand	speaker	
Revocable	scheduled	29:4,5,7	22:10	supplement
1:5 2:15 21:21	5:21	show	Specifically	7:14
ridiculous	Schoot	12:15	16:9	support
18:19	3:24 29:3,16	sidelines	SPINGOLA	26:1
right	screen	12:12	2:7	sure
5:15 13:20	18:1 21:2	sign	split	4:10 14:3 17:5
18:12 24:7	Se	25:2	16:24	20:4 21:12
26:22 27:16,22	2:5	signature	Ss	Swanagan
road	Section	16:4	1:1 29:1	1:14
7:2	16:21	signed	stand	system
Robert		10:5 24:23 25:7	23:15	10:24 14:7
2:7 4:19	see 4:9 5:8,9 6:13	29:14	standard	Systems
	4.3 5.0,3 6.13		1	

2:10 4:7,20	8:13 27:20,22	Tom	27:12	wants
8:21,21 10:6	28:12	18:12	unequivocally	4:16 5:15 15:9
12:23 24:19	theme	transcript	26:18	Washington
25:16 26:2	11:13	4:14 6:15 26:11		3:4
	thing	27:24 28:6	V	wasn't
T	5:16 6:5 7:20	29:7	valid	16:4 18:20 26:1
take	23:22	TRIBLER	12:22 24:18	wasted
9:13 14:7,10,12	things	3:3	25:6	13:6
14:20 16:6	5:10,14 7:3 21:9	tried	valuable	way
20:20 25:18	think	13:18 14:21	13:24	13:6,6
26:23	5:16,19 6:6,7,9	troubled	various	ways
taken	6:18 7:5,6,12	7:21	5:10 22:23	11:14
28:11 29:8	8:4 9:12,16	true	verbiage	we'll
takes	11:6 13:8	29:7	16:11,12	28:1
13:23 16:7	16:20 17:12	trust	versus	we're
Talarico	18:5,9 27:11	1:5 2:15 4:5	4:5	8:6 13:1,2,2,16
2:20 4:23 7:10	Thomas	10:24 11:16	vexatious	went
9:19 10:23	2:11,12,17 4:22	15:3 21:13,21	9:22 13:2,6	11:17 12:10
11:10,16,19	21:7	25:12	15:16 19:9,19	16:2,20,22
12:6,7 13:10	thousand	Trust's	video	19:11
14:22 15:2	25:15	9:20	20:8	weren't
16:1,6 17:2,7	three	trustee	videoconfere	16:2 25:5
18:8 19:3,6,17	19:12	2:15 9:24,24	1:13	West
23:8 24:1,2,11	threw	10:1 11:1	videos	2:17 3:4
24:12 25:5	12:3,5	15:20,21 20:11	22:2,2,21,22	whereof
26:9	time	20:15 21:12,20	23:5,15,16	29:10
Talarico's	5:23,23 7:5 11:3	25:13 26:4	view	willy-nilly
16:10 17:16	11:10 13:7	truth	9:1	14:20
talking	16:18,19 22:9	26:12	violates	withdraw
4:12 22:16	22:10,13,20	try	11:11	24:3
task	26:6	19:11	virtual	witness
22:15	times	turn	8:14	25:1 29:10
tell	9:11 18:12	19:6	vs	won
8:8 14:8 21:18	tkost999@gm	two	1:7	9:3,5,7
terms	2:14	4:9 6:11		word
15:24 17:11,19	tlong@konice		W	16:7
17:21	2:19	U	W	words
testify	today	U	2:12 3:6 5:2	24:8
14:9	4:1,6 5:18 6:2,3	4:2	Wait	working
Thank	7:15 11:15	undermines	20:22	13:15 14:11
4:17 8:16,18	13:17 27:8	14:13	want	write
15:7 20:2	today's	underscore	6:14 7:18 12:4	11:10
23:18 24:9	27:9,24	15:1	14:2 21:10	written
27:16,17,21	told	understand	23:22	7:14 27:2
28:3,10	6:23	22:15	wanted	wrong
Thanks	3.23	Understood	24:4	
		<u> </u>		1

18:22,23	16th	4		
	4:1	423		
X	190	2:12		
Υ	2:8	4606		
Yeah		2:3		
21:18 27:5	2	-		
	2016	5		
years 9:6 10:21 14:4,6	24:21	50,000		
14:12 15:15	2022	10:4		
18:1 21:22	1:7	561,000		
yesterday	2024	10:11		
5:10 7:17 20:6	1:15 29:11			
	21	6		
22:7 23:7,11	2:17	60051		
Z	22	2:3		
Zoom	4:4 23:2	60056		
1:12 21:2	225	2:13		
	3:4	60134		
0	23	2:18		
010905	29:11	60603		
1:7 4:4 23:2	24	2:8		
084-004897	14:12	60606		
29:16	2550	3:4		
	3:4	630.262.9655		
1	27	2:18		
1	20:8	7		
4:11	28th	70		
11	27:1	22:2,22		
11:5 24:21	29th	22.2,22		
11:15	24:3	8		
1:15 4:2,4	3	847.439.2198		
117,000	30	2:13		
10:17 25:18	12:17	847.497.4250		
120,000	300,000	2:4		
25:19	10:4,16 25:12	8th		
13	25:13	24:2,21		
21:22	312.201.6400			
137	3:5	9		
11:11 12:24	312.630.9202	9:00		
14	2:9	27:1		
22:4	3850	94		
14th	2:8	24:17		
23:10	38th			
4.0		1	1	
16 1:15	9:9			