In the Matter Of:

LEONARD NORMAN COHEN vs. KELLEY A. LYNCH

HEARING

June 23, 2015

Court Reporters, Videography, Trial Preparation

Videoconference Center

Oakland • San Francisco • San Jose • Los Angeles

877.451.1580

www.aikenwelch.com

Aiken Welch COURT REPORTERS

```
1
            SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 2
                  FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
 3
     DEPARTMENT 24
                                HON. ROBERT L. HESS, JUDGE
 4
 5
     LEONARD NORMAN COHEN, ET AL,
                                         )
                                         )
 6
                      Plaintiff(s),
                                         )
                                         )NO. BC338322
 7
                                         )
     KELLEY A. LYNCH, ET AL,
                                         )
 8
                                         )
                      Defendant(s).
                                         )
 9
                                         )
10
               Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings
11
                      Tuesday, June 23, 2015
12
13
14
     Appearances:
15
     For Plaintiffs:
                            KORY & RICE, LLP
16
                            BY:
                                MICHELLE L. RICE, ESQ.
                            9300 Wilshire Boulevard
17
                            Suite 200
                            Beverly Hills, California 90212
18
                            (310) 285-1630
19
                            BERGMAN LAW GROUP
                            BY: DANIEL A. BERGMAN, ESQ.
20
                            Warner Center Plaza
                            21600 Oxnard Street
21
                            Suite 1100
                            Woodland Hills, California 91367
22
                            (818) 999-9100
23
     For Defendants:
                            KELLEY LYNCH
                            IN PROPRIA PERSONA
24
                            1754 North Van Ness
                            Hollywood, California 90028
25
                            (323) 331-4250
26
                            Lora J. Johnson, CSR No. 10119
27
                            Official Reporter Pro Tempore
28
```

| 1 | CASE NAME: | COHEN VS. LYNCH |
|----|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2 | CASE NUMBER: | BC338322 |
| 3 | LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA | JUNE 24, 2015 |
| 4 | DEPARTMENT 24 | HON. ROBERT L. HESS, JUDGE |
| 5 | REPORTER: | LORA J. JOHNSON, CSR #10119 |
| 6 | APPEARANCES: | (AS HERETOFORE MENTIONED.) |
| 7 | TIME: | 9:38 A.M. |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | THE COURT: All | right. Cohen vs. Lynch, |
| 10 | please. | |
| 11 | MS. RICE: Good | morning, Your Honor. |
| 12 | Michelle Rice on behalf of | Plaintiff Leonard Cohen and |
| 13 | Leonard Cohen Investments. | |
| 14 | MR. BERGMAN: Go | od morning, Your Honor. |
| 15 | Daniel A. Bergman, also ap | pearing on behalf of |
| 16 | Plaintiff. Ms. Rice will | be responding to the motion. |
| 17 | MS. LYNCH: Kell | ey Lynch. |
| 18 | THE COURT: All | right. Have a seat, please. |
| 19 | Ms. Lynch, this | is your motion for |
| 20 | terminating and other sanc | tions. The action was |
| 21 | originally filed many year | s ago in about 2005, and as |
| 22 | a among other things, a | Complaint for Breach of |
| 23 | Fiduciary Duty against you | . And a Default Judgment was |
| 24 | entered against you on May | 15th, 2006, and that Default |
| 25 | Judgment has been subsisti | ng since that time. |
| 26 | In August of 201 | 3, you filed a Motion to |
| 27 | Vacate and/or Modify Defau | lt Judgment, and that was |
| 28 | eventually heard on Januar | y 17th, 2014. And in that |

HEARING 06/23/2015

motion, you argued that the judgment is void and
 dismissal was mandatory because there was no
 jurisdiction over you because you had never been
 properly served with summons and complaint.

And at the conclusion of that hearing, the 5 6 Motion to Vacate was denied with prejudice on a variety of grounds, among other things, that it was 7 8 procedurally deficient because it did not -- it wasn't properly served on the Plaintiffs, your own declaration 9 10 was unsigned, that you had not acted with diligence in 11 bringing the Motion to Vacate because you said you 12 found out about the action in April of 2010 but did not 13 seek to have this set aside until August of 2013.

14 You bore the burden of persuasion that the 15 Proof of Service was false, and you had not carried that burden of proof because you had failed to produce 16 17 any evidence of that beyond an unsigned declaration by 18 yourself and a signed declaration by your son that said 19 only that you were home at all times during 2005. And 20 you did not demonstrate extrinsic fraud because you conceded you were living in the home where the 21 22 request -- where the Notice of Request for Default was 23 sent, and that you were home when the process server attempted to serve you on the six occasions before 24 serving -- before subserving the Jane Doe. 25

Now, when the Court made that order, at that point you had a couple of options, and one of those was to let it go, and the second one was to take an appeal.

877.451.1580

HEARING 06/23/2015

1 Well, I was arrested in a related MS. LYNCH: case and imprisoned. 2 THE COURT: Okay. But I -- you know, then 3 you had a -- you had the -- respectfully, the thing 4 that pops into mind is that's not my problem. 5 6 I don't know what happened. I have no -- no 7 notion what the arrest was all about or how -- when it 8 happened, when you were incarcerated or for how long or any of those things. But you had the option to -- to 9 10 take an appeal from that order, and you did not do so. And the -- I'm not sure that there's any 11 12 basis on which -- for me to act. This is not a proper 13 motion for reconsideration. A motion for 14 reconsideration under CCP 1008 has to be done very 15 promptly. It's about ten days. And you are supposed to present facts or new law that could not have been 16 17 presented the first time around. 18 We are in 2015 on this. We are -- your 19 motion was filed on March 17th of this year. It is 20 approximately 14 months after the court made its -made its prior order, and I -- and what you want me to 21 22 do is you want me to dismiss their complaint. And 23 that's -- that's not an appropriate remedy, and, procedurally, your motion is fundamentally flawed. 24 If you had -- if you believed that the 25 26 Default Judgement had been entered against you in 27 error, it would have behooved you to act with a modicum 28 of promptness on this. It would have behooved you to

877.451.1580

HEARING 06/23/2015

1 have -- get some legal representation to help you on this. But you chose to -- you chose to wait. You 2 3 chose to do it in pro per. MS. LYNCH: I chose to? 4 THE COURT: Yes, you chose to. 5 6 MS. LYNCH: Oh, I see. 7 THE COURT: And the -- and the showing you 8 made was deficient for quite a number of reasons, and I don't see any reason for me to revisit this at this 9 10 time. 11 If you would like to address this, I'll hear 12 you briefly. 13 MS. LYNCH: Well, first of all, I think it's 14 important to state that I didn't just simply choose to 15 represent myself, and I was suffering tremendous hardships over the situation. But beyond that -- and I 16 have addressed that in my papers -- this is not a 17 18 motion to reconsider, this is a motion addressing fraud 19 upon the Court which was used to obtain the Default 20 Judgement. I was not served. I was home. No one came 21 to my house. 22 THE COURT: We have adjudicated that already. 23 MS. LYNCH: But it was obtained through fraud upon the Court. There's tremendous perjury, fraudulent 24 25 misrepresentations, and other things I've addressed. 26 THE COURT: Ma'am, if I remember correctly, the Proof of Service on the underlying case was 27 28 filed -- was signed by the California Registered

877.451.1580

HEARING 06/23/2015

1 Processor, and under Evidence Code Section 647, the Affidavit of Service by a Registered Processor carries 2 a presumption of correctness that affects the burden of 3 producing evidence. 4 It is not conclusive, but it affects the 5 6 burden of producing evidence, and it requires you, as 7 the person who is -- who is challenging that service, 8 to persuade me that it is incorrect. It is -- there is 9 no doubt whatsoever that you were living at the evidence where the service was attempting to be made. 10 11 MS. LYNCH: Well, I was living there, but the 12 service wasn't made. 13 THE COURT: Well, I don't know. Do I 14 assume --15 MS. LYNCH: No, but I did provide declarations. 16 17 THE COURT: Excuse me. Excuse me. 18 Do I assume that you never budged from the 19 interior of the residence throughout that entire 20 period? Not for a moment? Not for an hour? Not to go 21 to the store? 22 MS. LYNCH: You can assume that because 23 that's factual. THE COURT: Well, I don't know. 24 25 MS. LYNCH: Well, I didn't have a car. I was 26 injured. I was miles up Mandeville Canyon Road. No, I 27 wasn't confined within the walls of my property; I did 28 go outside for a walk occasionally. But I did provide

877.451.1580

HEARING 06/23/2015

| 1 | declarations from individuals that stated that I did |
|----|--|
| 2 | not resemble the individual who was allegedly served. |
| 3 | THE COURT: The the process server's |
| 4 | declaration did not say that you were personally |
| 5 | served. |
| 6 | MS. LYNCH: Well, there was no other |
| 7 | co-occupant or female there, apart from Paulette. |
| 8 | THE COURT: The process server's declaration |
| 9 | says that a Jane Doe came to the door and then and |
| 10 | they subserved the Jane Doe after multiple attempts to |
| 11 | serve you, and thereafter it was mailed. |
| 12 | MS. LYNCH: Well, Plaintiffs are arguing that |
| 13 | it was me, first of all. |
| 14 | THE COURT: I don't know. |
| 15 | MS. LYNCH: But there was no co-occupant, and |
| 16 | no one has been identified, and I was home at all |
| 17 | times. My son, Rutger, lived with me, and his friend |
| 18 | Chad Knaack at that point was staying with us. On the |
| 19 | morning where I was allegedly served, Paulette Brandt |
| 20 | who is over here was with me. No one came to my house. |
| 21 | So it is conceivable that a process server lied or |
| 22 | simply didn't come there. |
| 23 | THE COURT: It is, but you have to it |
| 24 | affects the burden of producing evidence, and |
| 25 | unfortunately you had the opportunity to present that |
| 26 | in 2013, when you filed that motion in August 2013. |
| 27 | MS. LYNCH: Well, actually, I didn't realize |
| | |
| 28 | in 2013 that I would be confronting an inconceivable |

HEARING 06/23/2015

| 1 | amount of lies, fraud and perjured statements. I mean, |
|----|---|
| 2 | the latest issue is that my son's friend called a Scott |
| 3 | Edelman to tell him I wasn't served. They're saying |
| 4 | that means I was served. It's preposterous. |
| 5 | I have maintained for ten years that I was |
| 6 | not served, and it defies logic that Leonard Cohen, who |
| 7 | has two law firms representing him, wouldn't have me |
| 8 | properly served immediately if I alleged that. |
| 9 | And my declarants have stated that they know |
| 10 | I was home. Paulette Brandt is here; she's not lying. |
| 11 | My son Rutger was present. He was present when I asked |
| 12 | Chad to call and say I wasn't served. I've worked at |
| 13 | law firms. If somebody called and said I wasn't |
| 14 | served, I'd serve them. |
| 15 | THE COURT: Did you get the summons and |
| 16 | complaint in the mail? |
| 17 | MS. LYNCH: No, I did not. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Okay. I there's a whole |
| 19 | series of things that you would like me to believe, and |
| 20 | you |
| 21 | MS. LYNCH: Well, are you saying all my |
| 22 | declarants are lying also? |
| 23 | THE COURT: Ma'am, you had a full and fair |
| 24 | opportunity to present all your arguments, all your |
| 25 | evidence, in 2013. |
| 26 | MS. LYNCH: I disagree. |
| 27 | THE COURT: I denied the motion with |
| 28 | prejudice and and you had a remedy after that |
| | |

Γ

HEARING 06/23/2015

1 which --MS. LYNCH: I still don't know if your order 2 3 was entered. I mean, I was in jail. I got out of jail. Jeffrey Cohen had sent me an e-mail on 4 January 22nd saying I would like you to approve or 5 6 comment on this. When I got out of jail a number of 7 months later, I called him. He said he would serve me; 8 I never received anything. I don't even know if an order was filed. It's not on L.A. Superior Court's 9 website. And he refused to serve me anything, which is 10 11 pretty fascinating. 12 THE COURT: Is there anything else you would 13 like to add? 14 MS. LYNCH: Yes. I'm addressing fraud upon 15 the Court. And I think that you, sir, should address the fact that this judgment was obtained through fraud 16 and perjury, and it -- this is not a motion to 17 18 reconsider, this is a motion for fraud upon the Court. 19 THE COURT: Plaintiffs, do you wish to 20 address any issue here? 21 MS. RICE: Yes, Your Honor. With regard to 22 Ms. Lynch's claims that this -- you know, she has 23 demonstrated extrinsic fraud in her Motion for Terminating Sanctions. It's our contention that her 24 25 claims are only intrinsic, and it does not provide 26 relief from the Default Judgement under the prevailing California authority. 27

28

And Ms. Lynch, in her moving papers, actually

877.451.1580

1 cites to cases that actually hold that she has to demonstrate extrinsic fraud, and she has not 2 demonstrated any extrinsic fraud. 3 All of the claims that she is alleging 4 constitutes misconduct on the part of Plaintiffs would 5 6 be intrinsic. She alleges perjury. She alleges that 7 there was fraudulent misrepresentations in Plaintiffs' 8 complaint. She alleges that there was fraudulent 9 evidence that was produced to obtain the Default 10 Judgement. 11 You know, Ms. Lynch, like I said, relies on 12 Hazel-Atlas Glass in her reply papers, but that case has not been -- it's a 1944 U.S. Supreme Court case. 13 14 It has not been followed in the State of California. 15 And Plaintiff cited in their opposition papers the case of Smith vs. Great Lakes Airlines, which clearly 16 17 declines to follow Ms. Lynch's Hazel-Atlas Glass case 18 that she relies on very heavily in her reply papers. 19 THE COURT: Anything else you would like to 20 say, ma'am? 21 MS. LYNCH: Only I would like to ask 22 something about the sealing of the documents that I'm 23 unclear about. THE COURT: Sealing of which documents? 24 25 MS. LYNCH: The documents you sealed at the 26 last hearing. Many of those are available publicly on 27 PACER or submitted as evidence in the Natural Wealth 28 vs. Leonard Cohen and Robert Kory matter in Colorado.

877.451.1580

HEARING 06/23/2015

THE COURT: How would I know that? MS. LYNCH: Well, I believe the Plaintiff should have advised you, but I did raise it in my documents.

And for instance, the CAK bond litigation 5 matter in the Southern District of New York, Leonard 6 7 Cohen's declaration there and other papers is available 8 through the Southern District of New York. And my own e-mails refuting Leonard Cohen's lawyer, who did not 9 10 represent the corporate entities, would not have 11 attorney-client privilege. But furthermore, there is 12 a -- a letter from Leonard Cohen to Richard Westin and 13 Neal Greenberg wrapping them into attorney-client 14 privilege. And Hockman Rettig told me -- Steve Klon, 15 that they received a call from Richard Westin advising them that I did not have attorney-client privilege, 16 which I did not. 17

And you know, we are talking about corporate documents. So what I want to know is -- I have filed this same evidence prior to filing this document in March with the tax court in Washington, and I just would like to know how your seal affects that matter. The evidence is --

24THE COURT: I don't know. I'm sorry. I see25some documents here that were -- are in envelopes.

```
26 MS. LYNCH: Well, you sealed documents --
27 THE COURT: And -- and --
28 Did I make a sealing order?
```

877.451.1580

1

2

3

4

| 1 | MS. RICE: You did, Your Honor. We had an |
|----|---|
| 2 | ex parte hearing on May 29th, 2015 |
| 3 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 4 | MS. RICE: where Plaintiffs alleged that |
| 5 | there was a majority of Ms. Lynch's declaration |
| 6 | exhibits that actually disclosed improperly in the |
| 7 | public record attorney-client privileged communications |
| 8 | with Mr. Cohen's former and current attorneys. And |
| 9 | Mr. Richard Westin is a co-defendant in the matter, and |
| 10 | Ms. Lynch has just acknowledged that. |
| 11 | THE COURT: What did I what did I seal? |
| 12 | Because, I'm sorry, I don't have a present recollection |
| 13 | of that. |
| 14 | MS. RICE: Sure. There was a declaration |
| 15 | that Ms. Lynch submitted in support of her Motion for |
| 16 | Terminating Sanctions that, in 32 of the paragraphs, |
| 17 | she actually disclosed quotes from attorney-client |
| 18 | privileged communications. |
| 19 | And then she also attached 90 exhibits to her |
| 20 | declaration, 28 of which actually contained disclosures |
| 21 | of attorney-client communications. They were actually |
| 22 | letters that said, very clearly marked, attorney-client |
| 23 | privileged communication, confidential. Ms. Lynch |
| 24 | disclosed those and filed those in the public record. |
| 25 | So there is an order that Your Honor granted |
| 26 | on May 29th sealing the record with regard to those |
| 27 | communications. |
| 28 | THE COURT: All right. |
| | |

1 MS. LYNCH: But what I am saying is that some of these documents are available, and I bought them 2 through PACER. So it's preposterous. 3 THE COURT: Well, I don't know. This -- some 4 of these documents are available and so vague that that 5 contains no content whatsoever. It's not a basis on 6 which I can make a decision. 7 8 MS. LYNCH: Well, I explained that the CAK litigation matter before the Southern District of 9 New York -- there are two documents or three documents, 10 11 Leonard Cohen's declaration, which states that he 12 clearly was aware of these dealings, et cetera, and 13 understood his royalty income. You can walk in and buy 14 them at the Southern District of New York. 15 The Neal Greenberg documents were attached, Natural Wealth. There are exhibits attached to his 16 17 lawsuit against Leonard Cohen and Robert Kory. Those documents, I don't recall specifically 18 19 offhand, but it's -- oh, there are two IRS warning 20 letters that Neal Greenberg sent. These were attached 21 as evidence to a lawsuit, and there are other documents 22 that were as well. 23 My own e-mails refuting that Leonard Cohen LC Investments had an office within my management offices 24 25 are sealed. My February 2002 e-mail to Leonard Cohen and Robert Kory -- I mean, and Richard Westin 26 explaining that I did not handle IRS matters, 27 28 accounting or financial loan documents, and addressing

HEARING 06/23/2015

| 1 | the \$1,000,000 and \$7,000,000 inadvertent 1099s. These |
|----|--|
| 2 | are not attorney-client privileged. That is my setting |
| 3 | forth my version of events. That's not attorney-client |
| 4 | privileged. |
| 5 | THE COURT: Well, there were certain specific |
| 6 | things. The clerk has handed me a copy of the order. |
| 7 | THE CLERK: There's a number that |
| 8 | following this, that apparently lists what it is. |
| 9 | THE COURT: Yes. |
| 10 | MS. LYNCH: Also, some of the information is |
| 11 | with the accountants who do not have attorney-client |
| 12 | privilege. I did not have it. I was an independent |
| 13 | contractor. I was excluded from A-C privilege. These |
| 14 | are corporate records. |
| 15 | They also pertain to a tax fraud matter, and |
| 16 | there should be a crime fraud exception if the Court |
| 17 | determined that there was attorney-client privilege. |
| 18 | THE COURT: You know, this is a moving |
| 19 | you're a moving target. |
| 20 | You know, every time you come in here, |
| 21 | there's something new, there's something different, |
| 22 | there's some new theory. |
| 23 | MS. LYNCH: There's nothing new. |
| 24 | THE COURT: And it's and it's, you know, |
| 25 | it's incredibly vague. You know, I listen to you here |
| 26 | and I and the things you say. You know, you gave me |
| 27 | four volumes of stuff here. |
| 28 | MS. LYNCH: Well, the lies are extensive. |

Γ

```
1
     That's not my fault. And the burden has been shifted
 2
     to me, I think, unfairly.
               But what I'm saying is, I'd like to know the
 3
     extent of your seal, if you've made a determination --
 4
               THE COURT: The order is for specific pages.
 5
 6
               MS. LYNCH: Right.
 7
               THE COURT: Specific pages and is what is
 8
     sealed.
 9
               MS. LYNCH: But I'm saying to you, sir, that
     I've submitted this identical evidence to the tax court
10
     in Washington before I filed my Motion for Terminating
11
12
     Sanctions.
13
               Does your seal affect that?
14
               THE COURT: My sealing order --
15
               MS. LYNCH: Yeah.
               THE COURT: -- affects the public access to
16
     the documents that were filed in this case. I have no
17
18
     jurisdiction to make an order with respect to things
19
     that are filed in the tax court.
20
               MS. LYNCH: So do you -- did you make a
     determination about whether or not these are
21
22
     attorney-client privileged?
23
               THE COURT: I sealed them --
24
               MS. LYNCH: Right.
25
               THE COURT: -- on a showing by the
     Plaintiff --
26
27
               MS. LYNCH: Yes.
28
               THE COURT:
                           -- that satisfied me that
```

```
1
    particular specific things ought to be sealed from
    public view.
 2
               MS. LYNCH: But was that based on a
 3
    determination of attorney-client privilege?
 4
               THE COURT:
                           That was based on the criteria
 5
     set forth in California Rule of Court 2.551, I believe.
 6
 7
               MS. LYNCH: Uh-huh. And how long does the
    seal last?
8
               THE COURT: Until it is lifted.
9
               MS. LYNCH: So you just seal documents
10
11
    without reviewing them with us to even know -- do you
12
    know who Ken Cleveland is, for instance?
13
               THE COURT: Ma'am, I'm not going to subject
14
    myself to an interrogation by you.
15
               MS. LYNCH: It's not an interrogation.
               THE COURT: I beg your pardon.
16
17
               MS. LYNCH: But there are --
18
               THE COURT: I don't know what -- I don't know
19
    how you would characterize it.
20
               MS. LYNCH: Well, I mean --
21
               THE COURT: But you're -- but you are
    certainly purporting to interrogate me now.
22
23
               MS. LYNCH: No, I'm asking you questions.
                                                          Ι
    mean, this is important. You've sealed my own
24
25
    documents.
26
               THE COURT: Ma'am, I made the determination.
    If you wish to -- if you wish to take steps to have
27
28
    that reversed --
```

| 1 | MS. LYNCH: I do wish to take steps. |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE COURT: you're welcomed to do it. |
| 3 | MS. LYNCH: All right. I do wish to take |
| 4 | steps. |
| 5 | THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's up to you. |
| 6 | All right. The motion is denied. And your |
| 7 | claims that you were not served with summons and |
| 8 | complaint were raised and denied in January 2014. You |
| 9 | have not demonstrated to my satisfaction that there was |
| 10 | extrinsic fraud, and there is no basis for no basis |
| 11 | shown to |
| 12 | MS. LYNCH: And what about the fraud and |
| 13 | perjury? |
| 14 | THE COURT: to set aside the Default |
| 15 | Judgement. |
| 16 | MS. LYNCH: And what about the fraud and |
| 17 | perjury raised? |
| 18 | THE COURT: You know, you have all these |
| 19 | allegations, ma'am. That's what they are. |
| 20 | MS. LYNCH: That is what they are, and you |
| 21 | have evidence. |
| 22 | THE COURT: Ma'am, the motion |
| 23 | MS. LYNCH: I was not served, Your Honor. |
| 24 | THE COURT: The motion is |
| 25 | MS. LYNCH: I was not served. |
| 26 | THE COURT: I know. That's do you like |
| 27 | opera, ma'am? |
| 28 | MS. LYNCH: Yes, I do, actually. |

```
1
               THE COURT: Okay. Do you like Wagnerian
 2
    opera?
 3
               MS. LYNCH: Somewhat.
               THE COURT: Do you know what a leitmotif is?
 4
    L-E-I-T-M-O-T-I-F. Okay. That's your leitmotif: I
 5
 6
    wasn't served.
 7
               MS. LYNCH: Because I wasn't.
8
               THE COURT: Okay.
9
               MS. LYNCH:
                           So you are violating my rights to
10
    due process.
                   That's my opinion. I wasn't served.
11
               THE COURT:
                          Ma'am. Ma'am.
12
               MS. LYNCH: Yeah.
13
               THE COURT:
                           I understand that anybody who
14
    doesn't agree with you violates your rights to due
15
    process.
16
               MS. LYNCH: Do you understand that?
17
               THE COURT:
                           That's -- that -- you have made
18
     it guite clear. So the motion is denied.
19
               MS. LYNCH: Well, you don't know me, so it
20
    would be hard to make that statement; wouldn't it?
21
               THE COURT: Ma'am, how much -- how much
22
     contact have you and I had?
23
               MS. LYNCH: Not much. But you have never
24
     seen me with anyone else, either.
25
               THE COURT: Well, I know -- I know what you
26
    have presented to me, and I know how you have come
27
    across in the matters where you have been before me.
28
    And unless you are presenting yourself in an entirely
```

```
1
     different way in this setting than you normally do, I
     think I have a sense of you.
 2
               MS. LYNCH: Well, you have a sense that I'm
 3
     upset. That's correct. Anyone would be.
 4
               THE COURT: And defense -- Plaintiff, submit
 5
 6
     an order.
 7
               MS. RICE: Your Honor, we have submitted a
 8
     proposed order on May 26. Should --
               THE COURT: Just a minute.
 9
               Do we have that, Jeff? Is that in the
10
11
     package there?
12
                  (Pause in proceedings.)
13
               THE COURT: Oh, here it is.
14
               Have you seen their proposed order, ma'am?
15
               MS. LYNCH: No.
               THE COURT: It was served apparently with
16
17
     their opposition. Did you see their opposition?
18
               MS. LYNCH: Yes.
19
               THE COURT: Okay.
20
               All right. The order has been signed.
                                                        Thank
21
     you very much.
22
                      (The proceedings were
23
                      adjourned at 10:06 a.m.)
24
                             --000--
25
26
27
28
```

Page 20

| 1 | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES |
| 4 | THE REAL NO. OF THE REAL THERE THERE |
| 5 | DEPARTMENT NO. 24 HON. ROBERT L. HESS, JUDGE |
| 6 | LEONARD NORMAN COHEN, ET AL,) |
| 7 | Plaintiff(s),)NO. BC338322) |
| 8 | VS.)REPORTER'S)CERTIFICATE |
| 9 | |
| 10 | KELLEY A. LYNCH, ET AL, |
| 11 | Defendant(s).) |
| 12 | |
| 13 | I, Lora J. Johnson, Official Reporter |
| 14 | Pro Tempore of the Superior Court of the State of |
| 15 | California, for the County of Los Angeles, do hereby |
| 16 | certify that the foregoing pages, 1 through 19, |
| 17 | comprise a full, true and correct transcript of the |
| 18 | proceedings held in the above-entitled matter on |
| 19 | Tuesday, June 23, 2015. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | Dated this 24th day of June, 2015. |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | front Almon |
| 26 | Lora J. Johnson/CSR No. 10119 Official Reporter |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| | |
| | |

HEARING 06/23/2015

Page 21 Index: #10119..cites

| | | | Index: #10119cli |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| | | alleged 8:8 12:4 | behalf 2:12,15 |
| # | 3 | allegedly 7:2,19 | behooved 4:27,28 |
| #10119 2:5 | 32 12:16 | alleges 10:6,8 | believed 4:25 |
| | | alleging 10:4 | Bergman 2:14,15 |
| \$ | 6 | amount 8:1 | bond 11:5 |
| \$1,000,000 14:1 | 647 6:1 | and/or 2:27 | bore 3:14 |
| \$7,000,000 14:1 | | ANGELES 2:3 | bought 13:2 |
| | 9 | apparently 14:8 19:16 | Brandt 7:19 8:10 |
| - | 90 12:19 | appeal 3:28 4:10 | Breach 2:22 |
| 000 19:24 | 9:38 2:7 | APPEARANCES 2:6 | briefly 5:12 |
| 000 19.24 | 3.30 2.7 | appearing 2:15 | bringing 3:11 |
| 1 | A | approve 9:5 | budged 6:18 |
| 4008 4.44 | | approximately 4:20 | burden 3:14,16 6:3,6 |
| 1008 4:14 | A-c 14:13 | April 3:12 | 7:24 15:1 |
| 1099s 14:1 | a.m. 2:7 19:23 | argued 3:1 | buy 13:13 |
| 10:06 19:23 | access 15:16 | arguing 7:12 | C |
| 14 4:20 | accountants 14:11 | arguments 8:24 | |
| 15th 2:24 | accounting 13:28 | arrest 4:7 | CAK 11:5 13:8 |
| 17th 2:28 4:19 | acknowledged 12:10 | arrested 4:1 | California 2:3 5:28 |
| 1944 10:13 | act 4:12,27 | assume 6:14,18,22 | 9:27 10:14 16:6 |
| 2 | acted 3:10 | attached 12:19 13:15, | call 8:12 11:15 |
| | action 2:20 3:12 | 16,20 | called 8:2,13 9:7 |
| 2.551 16:6 | add 9:13 | attempted 3:24 | Canyon 6:26 |
| 2002 13:25 | address 5:11 9:15,20 | attempting 6:10 | car 6:25 |
| 2005 2:21 3:19 | addressed 5:17,25 | attempts 7:10 | carried 3:15 |
| 2006 2:24 | addressing 5:18 9:14 13:28 | attorney-client 11:11, 13,16 12:7,17,21,22 | carries 6:2 |
| 2010 3:12 | adjourned 19:23 | 14:2,3,11,17 15:22 16:4 | case 2:1,2 4:2 5:27 10:12,13,15,17 15:17 |
| 2013 2:26 3:13 7:26,28 8:25 | adjudicated 5:22 | attorneys 12:8 | cases 10:1 |
| 2014 2:28 17:8 | advised 11:3 | August 2:26 3:13 7:26 | CCP 4:14 |
| 2015 2:3 4:18 12:2 | advising 11:15 | authority 9:27 | cetera 13:12 |
| 22nd 9:5 | affect 15:13 | aware 13:12 | Chad 7:18 8:12 |
| 24 2:3,4 | affects 6:3,5 7:24 11:22 | | challenging 6:7 |
| 26 19:8 | 15:16 | B | characterize 16:19 |
| 28 12:20 | Affidavit 6:2 | based 16:3,5 | choose 5:14 |
| 29th 12:2,26 | agree 18:14 | basis 4:12 13:6 17:10 | chose 5:2,3,4,5 |
| LUII 12.2,20 | Airlines 10:16 | BC338322 2:2 | cited 10:15 |
| | allegations 17:19 | beg 16:16 | cites 10:1 |

877.451.1580

HEARING 06/23/2015

Page 22 Index: claims..fundamentally

exhibits 12:6,19 13:16

Excuse 6:17

explained 13:8

| | | Ir |
|---|--|--|
| claims 9:22,25 10:4 | couple 3:27 | DEPARTMENT 2:4 |
| 17:7 | court 2:9,18 3:26 4:3, | determination 15:4,21 |
| clear 18:18 | 20 5:5,7,19,22,24,26 6:13,17,24 7:3,8,14,23 | 16:4,26 determined 14:17 |
| clerk 14:6,7 | 8:15,18,23,27 9:12,15, | |
| Cleveland 16:12 | 18,19 10:13,19,24 11:1, 21,24,27 12:3,11,28 | diligence 3:10 |
| co-defendant 12:9 | 13:4 14:5,9,16,18,24 15:5,7,10,14,16,19,23, | disagree 8:26 |
| co-occupant 7:7,15 | 25,28 16:5,6,9,13,16, | disclosed 12:6,17,24 |
| Code 6:1 | 18,21,26 17:2,5,14,18, | disclosures 12:20 |
| Cohen 2:1,9,12,13 8:6 9:4 10:28 11:12 13:17, 23,25 | 22,24,26 18:1,4,8,11, 13,17,21,25 19:5,9,13, 16,19 | dismiss 4:22 dismissal 3:2 |
| Cohen's 11:7,9 12:8 | Court's 9:9 | District 11:6,8 13:9,14 |
| 13:11 | crime 14:16 | document 11:20 |
| Colorado 10:28 | criteria 16:5 | documents 10:22,24, |
| comment 9:6 | CSR 2:5 | 25 11:4,19,25,26 13:2, 5,10,15,18,21,28 15:17 |
| communication 12:23 | current 12:8 | 16:10,25 |
| communications | | Doe 3:25 7:9,10 |
| 12:7,18,21,27 | D | door 7:9 |
| complaint 2:22 3:4 4:22 8:16 10:8 17:8 | Daniel 2:15 | doubt 6:9 |
| conceded 3:21 | days 4:15 | due 18:10,14 |
| conceivable 7:21 | dealings 13:12 | Duty 2:23 |
| conclusion 3:5 | decision 13:7 | E |
| conclusive 6:5 | declarants 8:9,22 | |
| confidential 12:23 | declaration 3:9,17,18 | e-mail 9:4 13:25 |
| confined 6:27 | 7:4,8 11:7 12:5,14,20 13:11 | e-mails 11:9 13:23 |
| confronting 7:28 | declarations 6:16 7:1 | Edelman 8:3 |
| constitutes 10:5 | declines 10:17 | entered 2:24 4:26 9:3 |
| contact 18:22 | Default 2:23,24,27 3:22 | entire 6:19 |
| contained 12:20 | 4:26 5:19 9:26 10:9 | entities 11:10 |
| content 13:6 | 17:14 | envelopes 11:25 |
| contention 9:24 | defense 19:5 | error 4:27 |
| contractor 14:13 | deficient 3:8 5:8 | events 14:3 |
| copy 14:6 | defies 8:6 | eventually 2:28 |
| corporate 11:10,18 14:14 | demonstrate 3:20 10:2 | evidence 3:17 6:1,4,6, 10 7:24 8:25 10:9,27 |
| correct 19:4 | demonstrated 9:23 10:3 17:9 | 11:20,23 13:21 15:10 17:21 |
| correctly 5:26 | denied 3:6 8:27 17:6,8 | exception 14:16 |
| correctness 6:3 | 18:18 | excluded 14:13 |
| | | |

explaining 13:27 extensive 14:28 **extent** 15:4 extrinsic 3:20 9:23 10:2,3 17:10 F fact 9:16 facts 4:16 factual 6:23 failed 3:16 fair 8:23 false 3:15 fascinating 9:11 fault 15:1 February 13:25 female 7:7 Fiduciary 2:23 filed 2:21,26 4:19 5:28 7:26 9:9 11:19 12:24 15:11,17,19 filing 11:20 financial 13:28 firms 8:7,13 flawed 4:24 follow 10:17 found 3:12 fraud 3:20 5:18,23 8:1 9:14,16,18,23 10:2,3 14:15,16 17:10,12,16 fraudulent 5:24 10:7,8 friend 7:17 8:2 full 8:23 fundamentally 4:24



Page 23 Index: gave..misrepresentations

| | | | x: gavemisrepresentatior |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|
| G | immediately 8:8 | jurisdiction 3:3 15:18 | LOS 2:3 |
| | important 5:14 16:24 | | lying 8:10,22 |
| gave 14:26 | imprisoned 4:2 | K | Lynch 2:1,9,17,19 4:1 |
| Glass 10:12,17 | improperly 12:6 | Kelley 2:17 | 5:4,6,13,23 6:11,15,22, 25 7:6,12,15,27 8:17, |
| Good 2:11,14 | inadvertent 14:1 | Ken 16:12 | 21,26 9:2,14,28 10:11, |
| granted 12:25 | incarcerated 4:8 | Klon 11:14 | 21,25 11:2,26 12:10,15, 23 13:1,8 14:10,23,28 |
| Great 10:16 | income 13:13 | Knaack 7:18 | 15:6,9,15,20,24,27 |
| Greenberg 11:13 | inconceivable 7:28 | Kory 10:28 13:17,26 | 16:3,7,10,15,17,20,23 17:1,3,12,16,20,23,25, |
| 13:15,20 | incorrect 6:8 | | 28 18:3,7,9,12,16,19,23 19:3,15,18 |
| grounds 3:7 | incredibly 14:25 | L | Lynch's 9:22 10:17 |
| н | independent 14:12 | L-e-i-t-m-o-t-i-f 18:5 | 12:5 |
| | individual 7:2 | L.A. 9:9 | |
| handed 14:6 | individuals 7:1 | Lakes 10:16 | M |
| handle 13:27 | information 14:10 | latest 8:2 | made 3:26 4:20,21 5:8 |
| happened 4:6,8 | injured 6:26 | law 4:16 8:7,13 | 6:10,12 15:4 16:26 |
| hard 18:20 | instance 11:5 16:12 | lawsuit 13:17,21 | 18:17 |
| hardships 5:16 | interior 6:19 | lawyer 11:9 | mail 8:16 |
| Hazel-atlas 10:12,17 | interrogate 16:22 | LC 13:23 | mailed 7:11 |
| hear 5:11 | interrogation 16:14,15 | legal 5:1 | maintained 8:5 |
| heard 2:28 | intrinsic 9:25 10:6 | leitmotif 18:4,5 | majority 12:5 |
| hearing 3:5 10:26 12:2 | Investments 2:13 | Leonard 2:12,13 8:6 | make 11:28 13:7 15:18, 20 18:20 |
| heavily 10:18 | 13:24 | 10:28 11:6,9,12 13:11, 17,23,25 | management 13:24 |
| HERETOFORE 2:6 | IRS 13:19,27 | letter 11:12 | mandatory 3:2 |
| HESS 2:4 | issue 8:2 9:20 | letters 12:22 13:20 | Mandeville 6:26 |
| Hockman 11:14 | J | lied 7:21 | March 4:19 11:21 |
| hold 10:1 | | lies 8:1 14:28 | marked 12:22 |
| home 3:19,21,23 5:20 7:16 8:10 | jail 9:3,4,6 | lifted 16:9 | matter 10:28 11:6,22 |
| HON 2:4 | Jane 3:25 7:9,10 | listen 14:25 | 12:9 13:9 14:15 |
| Honor 2:11,14 9:21 | January 2:28 9:5 17:8 | lists 14:8 | matters 13:27 18:27 |
| 12:1,25 17:23 19:7 | Jeff 19:10 | litigation 11:5 13:9 | means 8:4 |
| hour 6:20 | Jeffrey 9:4 | lived 7:17 | MENTIONED 2:6 |
| house 5:21 7:20 | JOHNSON 2:5 | living 3:21 6:9,11 | Michelle 2:12 |
| | JUDGE 2:4 | loan 13:28 | miles 6:26 |
| I | Judgement 4:26 5:20 9:26 10:10 17:15 | | mind 4:5 |
| identical 15:10 | judgment 2:23,25,27 | long 4:8 16:7 | minute 19:9 |
| identified 7:16 | 3:1 9:16 | LORA 2:5 | misconduct 10:5 |
| | JUNE 2:3 | | misrepresentations |

Page 24 Index: modicum..Rice

| | | | Index: modicumRice |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 5:25 10:7 | 15:5,14,18 19:6,8,14,20 | pretty 9:11 | reason 5:9 |
| modicum 4:27 | originally 2:21 | prevailing 9:26 | reasons 5:8 |
| Modify 2:27 | | prior 4:21 11:20 | recall 13:18 |
| moment 6:20 | P | privilege 11:11,14,16 | received 9:8 11:15 |
| months 4:20 9:7 | PACER 10:27 13:3 | 14:12,13,17 16:4 | recollection 12:12 |
| morning 2:11,14 7:19 | package 19:11 | privileged 12:7,18,23 14:2,4 15:22 | reconsider 5:18 9:18 |
| motion 2:16,19,26 3:1, 6,11 4:13,19,24 5:18 | pages 15:5,7 | pro 5:3 | reconsideration 4:13, 14 |
| 7:26 8:27 9:17,18,23 | papers 5:17 9:28 10:12,15,18 11:7 | problem 4:5 | record 12:7,24,26 |
| 12:15 15:11 17:6,22,24 18:18 | paragraphs 12:16 | procedurally 3:8 4:24 | records 14:14 |
| moving 9:28 14:18,19 | pardon 16:16 | proceedings 19:12,22 | refused 9:10 |
| multiple 7:10 | part 10:5 | process 3:23 7:3,8,21 18:10,15 | refuting 11:9 13:23 |
| | parte 12:2 | Processor 6:1,2 | regard 9:21 12:26 |
| N | Paulette 7:7,19 8:10 | produce 3:16 | Registered 5:28 6:2 |
| Natural 10:27 13:16 | pause 19:12 | produced 10:9 | related 4:1 |
| Neal 11:13 13:15,20 | period 6:20 | producing 6:4,6 7:24 | relief 9:26 |
| Notice 3:22 | perjured 8:1 | promptly 4:15 | relies 10:11,18 |
| notion 4:7 | perjury 5:24 9:17 10:6 | promptness 4:28 | remedy 4:23 8:28 |
| number 2:2 5:8 9:6 14:7 | 17:13,17 | proof 3:15,16 5:27 | remember 5:26 |
| 14.7 | person 6:7 personally 7:4 | proper 4:12 | reply 10:12,18 |
| 0 | persuade 6:8 | properly 3:4,9 8:8 | REPORTER 2:5 |
| | persuasion 3:14 | property 6:27 | represent 5:15 11:10 |
| obtain 5:19 10:9 obtained 5:23 9:16 | pertain 14:15 | proposed 19:8,14 | representation 5:1 |
| occasionally 6:28 | Plaintiff 2:12,16 10:15 | provide 6:15,28 9:25 | representing 8:7 |
| occasions 3:24 | 11:2 15:26 19:5 | public 12:7,24 15:16 | request 3:22 |
| offhand 13:19 | Plaintiffs 3:9 7:12 9:19 | 16:2 | requires 6:6 |
| office 13:24 | 10:5 12:4 | publicly 10:26 purporting 16:22 | resemble 7:2 residence 6:19 |
| offices 13:24 | Plaintiffs' 10:7 | purporting 10.22 | respect 15:18 |
| opera 17:27 18:2 | point 3:27 7:18 | Q | respectfully 4:4 |
| opinion 18:10 | pops 4:5 prejudice 3:6 8:28 | questions 16:22 | responding 2:16 |
| opportunity 7:25 8:24 | preputice 3.6 8.28 preposterous 8:4 13:3 | questions 16:23 quotes 12:17 | Rettig 11:14 |
| opposition 10:15 | present 4:16 7:25 8:11, | | reversed 16:28 |
| 19:17 | 24 12:12 | R | reviewing 16:11 |
| option 4:9 | presented 4:17 18:26 | raise 11:3 | revisit 5:9 |
| options 3:27 | presenting 18:28 | raised 17:8,17 | Rice 2:11,12,16 9:21 |
| order 3:26 4:10,21 9:2, 9 11:28 12:25 14:6 | presumption 6:3 | realize 7:27 | 12:1,4,14 19:7 |
| | | | |
| | | - | |

HEARING

Page 25 Index: Richard..York

| Richard 11:12,15 12:9 | showing 5:7 15:25 | | violating 18:9 |
|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| 13:26 | shown 17:11 | T | void 3:1 |
| rights 18:9,14 | signed 3:18 5:28 19:20 | talking 11:18 | volumes 14:27 |
| Road 6:26 | simply 5:14 7:22 | target 14:19 | |
| Robert 2:4 10:28 13:17, 26 | sir 9:15 15:9 | tax 11:21 14:15 15:10, | W |
| royalty 13:13 | situation 5:16 | 19 | Wagnerian 18:1 |
| Rule 16:6 | Smith 10:16 | ten 4:15 8:5 | wait 5:2 |
| Rutger 7:17 8:11 | son 3:18 7:17 8:11 | terminating 2:20 9:24 12:16 15:11 | walk 6:28 13:13 |
| | son's 8:2 | theory 14:22 | walls 6:27 |
| S | Southern 11:6,8 13:9, | thing 4:4 | warning 13:19 |
| sanctions 2:20 9:24 12:16 15:12 | 14 specific 14:5 15:5,7 | things 2:22 3:7 4:9 5:25 8:19 14:6,26 15:18 | Washington 11:21 15:11 |
| satisfaction 17:9 | | 16:1 | Wealth 10:27 13:16 |
| satisfied 15:28 | specifically 13:18 state 5:14 10:14 | time 2:7,25 4:17 5:10 | website 9:10 |
| Scott 8:2 | | 14:20 | welcomed 17:2 |
| seal 11:22 12:11 15:4, | stated 7:1 8:9 statement 18:20 | times 3:19 7:17 | Westin 11:12,15 12:9 |
| 13 16:8,10 | | told 11:14 | 13:26 |
| sealed 10:25 11:26 | statements 8:1 states 13:11 | tremendous 5:15,24 | whatsoever 6:9 13:6 |
| 13:25 15:8,23 16:1,24 | staying 7:18 | U | worked 8:12 |
| sealing 10:22,24 11:28 12:26 15:14 | steps 16:27 17:1,4 | | wrapping 11:13 |
| seat 2:18 | Steve 11:14 | U.S. 10:13 | Y |
| Section 6:1 | store 6:21 | Uh-huh 16:7 | |
| seek 3:13 | stuff 14:27 | unclear 10:23 | year 4:19 |
| sense 19:2,3 | subject 16:13 | underlying 5:27 | years 2:21 8:5 |
| series 8:19 | submit 19:5 | understand 18:13,16 | York 11:6,8 13:10,14 |
| serve 3:24 7:11 8:14 9:7,10 | submitted 10:27 12:15 15:10 19:7 | understood 13:13 unfairly 15:2 | |
| served 3:4,9 5:20 7:2,5, | subserved 7:10 | unsigned 3:10,17 | |
| 19 8:3,4,6,8,12,14 17:7, 23,25 18:6,10 19:16 | subserving 3:25 | upset 19:4 | |
| server 3:23 7:21 | subsisting 2:25 | V | |
| server's 7:3,8 | suffering 5:15 | | |
| service 3:15 5:27 6:2,7, 10,12 | summons 3:4 8:15 17:7 | Vacate 2:27 3:6,11 vague 13:5 14:25 | |
| serving 3:25 | Superior 9:9 | variety 3:6 | |
| set 3:13 16:6 17:14 | support 12:15 | version 14:3 | |
| setting 14:2 19:1 | supposed 4:15 | view 16:2 | |
| shifted 15:1 | Supreme 10:13 | violates 18:14 | |

877.451.1580