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## PROCEEDINGS <br> (September 3, 2013)

THE COURT: This is Cause No. 2012-592, Candace Louise Curtis versus Anita Kay Brunsting and others. And Amy Ruth Brunsting. And I believe the law firm has been sued as well. I'm not sure if they have been served or not. In any event, let's see. Let's get an announcement here.

For the plaintiff, pro se, is that you,
Ms. Curtis?
MS. CURTIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And for the defendants?
MR. VIE: George Vie and Maureen Kuzik McCutchen for the defendants, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, say that again.
MR. VIE: George Vie and Ms. McCutchen for the defendants, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And I have the special master here as well.

MR. WEST: Good afternoon, Your Honor. William West, special master.

THE COURT: And you have counsel with you?
MR. MILLION: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Timothy Million.

THE COURT: All right. And another gentleman?
MR. WEST: Your Honor, this is my associate, William
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A. Potter, P-O-T-T-E-R.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Let's see. We have the special master here as well, I gather, as the defendants, two of the defendants, the two sisters.

I'm not sure. Are both of them serving as administrators or trustees of the estate?

MR. VIE: They are both co-trustees. Only Anita Brunsting is here today.

THE COURT: Any reason why Amy Ruth is not present?
MR. VIE: Just because of employment obligations, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. I believe that's everyone that's participating.

We have this suit that was filed by Ms. Curtis back in 2012, in fact. I believe, Ms. Curtis, somewhere around February of 2012. That was pending for a period of time, and it was initially brought as a kind of truth in limine accounting. She mixed a lot of stuff together there.

And, of course, the one aspect of the case that this Court -- I said one aspect. One of the aspects of this case that the Court saw was first that there was diversity of citizenship, that she was a California resident, and the sisters were Texas residents.

And, secondly, that she was making allegations about an estate that appeared to be substantial sums of money,
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or property, or both, were located, and that she was an heir, or at least felt that she was one of the heirs to the estate, and that she felt, I believe, at that time, that her sisters, who were co-trustees, were not properly managing the estate. I think that's, generally speaking, how this lawsuit developed.

So, in the process of conducting a couple of hearings, or at least -- I say hearings, opportunities for communication and dialogue, the Court set this matter for a hearing, and we had a hearing several months ago. Let's see if I can track that down. A telephone conference in July. I think it may have been the -- perhaps were the last communication we had. Proceeding here in the courtroom, for sure.

And the Court determined that a report, an accounting of income, receipts, and expenses, and disbursements would be appropriate, setting a time frame of December 21, 2010, through May 31st of 2013, and that that report should be filed. I would then conduct a hearing to determine not so much whether or not the accounting -- the report should be received, but to permit the master -- special master to answer questions from either side regarding the procedure and his findings, and then, also, for approval of his request for -- for pay.

And there, I believe, have been, since that
time, motions filed by the defense for, I believe, a renewal of a lease on the Iowa property. Objections to that and then other motions have been filed. So we will see how much, if not all of this, we can cover.

So, Ms. Curtis, will you be -- besides the special master, is there anyone else in the courtroom you are going to need to call and have testify or ask questions of?

MS. CURTIS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Sir, if you come forward, I will swear you in, and then you can take a seat over on my left.

Raise your right hand, please, sir.
(William West, witness, sworn.)
THE COURT: Please have a seat. And we can start with -- Ms. Curtis, we can start with you, if you have questions of the special master regarding -- you have a copy of his report, do you not?

MS. CURTIS: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Why don't you move up closer to us there -- no, no, no. I mean, you can have a seat there, but I just wanted you to move up closer and bring the paperwork up closer.

All right. This is a formal proceeding, Ms. Curtis, so that when you are addressing the Court, you will need to stand and address the Court, and -- and I will be requiring that all of the questioning that is done as to any
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witness should be done from the podium so it is easy for me to pay attention, for the lawyer and then the witness, and, of course, that same -- obviously, that same rule applies to counsel for the defense.

If you would also bend that microphone down so that, when you are standing in that area and speaking to me, we will be able to hear you, and the court reporter can take your remarks.

All right. Are you ready -- you have a copy of the report, I believe you said.

MS. CURTIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Do you have some questions you want to ask of the witness? If so, you may do so at this time.

MS. CURTIS: No, Your Honor. I have no questions.
THE COURT: You completely are, say, satisfied that you understand --

MS. CURTIS: I have no questions.
THE COURT: You just have no questions. All right.
Mr. Vie, do you have any questions you want to ask of this witness?

MR. VIE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Would you come to podium, sir.

Do you have a copy of your report with you? If not, let's get a copy of it to you. I think I have got some
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copies here.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. VIE:
Q. Good afternoon. I just have one or two questions just to clarify, as the Court said, the procedures under which the report was prepared.

On Exhibit 1 to the report --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you provided a statement of income, receipts, expenses, and disbursements for the period the Court directed; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. In conclusion, on page 2 of that report, where you indicate, at the bottom, a net of income receipts and less value of stock distributed, if you could explain, what is that trying to capture?
A. This is trying to capture either -- during the time frame in question, either the receipts received or dividends in kind from the dividend distribution -- excuse me, dividend reinvestment accounts, less any amounts paid or any stock distributed.
Q. So this number at the bottom of page 2, the net of income number, this doesn't reflect actually the value of this estate?

> It doesn't include the actual stock value that
remains in the estate?
A. Absolutely not. To do something like that you would need to get into something with a balance sheet -- and things of that nature.
Q. What we are being provided here is more of a statement of money going out and money coming in?
A. Correct.
Q. The other exhibit, Exhibit -- the exhibit that relates to your recapturing the stock distributions that were made, is there an Exhibit 3?

Is that where that is located?
A. Yes.
Q. Stock distribution analysis?
A. Correct.
Q. These are all -- these are all distributions that took place during the time that Ms. Brunsting was alive, correct? A. From December 21st, 2010, to her demise. Q. I understand.

Specifically, you did not find any evidence of any stock distributions that were made to anyone after the date that she died, the date of her death?
A. Correct.

THE COURT: Mr. Vie, what is the date of her death?
Establish that.
BY MR. VIE:
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Q. November 11, 2011?
A. Correct.
Q. So during the period of time that she was the beneficiary of the trust and had the right to direct gifts and payments --

THE COURT: "She" being?
MR. VIE: Mrs. Brunsting, Nella Brunsting.
BY MR. VIE:
Q. The only transactions that you found for stock
distribution, as you have noted in Exhibit 3, was at the time she was alive and could direct those distributions?
A. To the first part of your question, I don't think I have enough information to respond. But from all of the documents that we had and everything appeared to tie, these are the distributions out of those accounts in that time frame. Q. Thank you.

Could you -- in addition to the documents that we provided, you asked for and we provided a Quicken file, an electronic file?
A. Correct.
Q. If you could explain to the Court what that file was, what you found in it, and how you used it.
A. That was an electronic accounting file that I asked for and that you had given me, and it was what I would generally term an electronic checkbook, which would show -- gave information about a date, an amount, and the payee.
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Q. And what account the payment came from?
A. To a limited extent, yes.
Q. How were you able to use that, then, into what became the master's report?
A. We used that in conjunction with the review of bank statements and other paper documents, brokerage firm account, information to create our database.

MR. VIE: No further questions.
THE COURT: I have a few, and this is to primarily supplement the record.

I want you to go back, Mr. West, and give us a general overview of what you did and -- and what these exhibits mean in terms of the income and expenses associated with this report.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
My report is comprised of an introduction where
I gave some of the background of the complaint to a limited extent which has been addressed today. Then I gave a timeline of records received. I started that process with calling the defendants' attorney. I set up the meeting with him. We had a meeting within a week or ten days of my initial call.

I received, at his office, a number of paper files and a number of records on -- in electronic format in CD -- on CD's. I was also given a schedule of those documents that they were giving me and a list of documents that they
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were not giving me, but which they were working towards obtaining.

THE COURT: Did you have the impression that this was a combination of records, some of which had been -- which were the, let's call it, original handwritten-type records, along with records that maybe had been prepared or were being prepared by the attorney for the defendant?

THE WITNESS: My broad answer to that is yes. Some were original documents that you could tell had come directly from the brokerage firm or a bank. Some were bank statements that appeared to have been downloaded over the Internet, which looked completely normal to me.

I have looked at literally thousands of documents of this nature over the years. Balances, account numbers, everything tied. I didn't think that anything had been created to be given to me.

THE COURT: By saying you were given a CD, what are you referring to?

THE WITNESS: A plastic disk.
THE COURT: I understand. What was contained on
that?
THE WITNESS: Those were bank statements.
THE COURT: Downloaded from?
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. For the most part, the paper documents -- they gave them to me, for the most part, in
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paper format and electronic format.
THE COURT: But you didn't have the impression that this was a way that the records had been kept; this is just the way they had presented them?

THE WITNESS: I can't tell if they were kept that way, but they had been compiled, and I think they have probably been compiled by counsel's staff.

THE COURT: All right.
THE WITNESS: As -- I received those approximately
the first of June -- actually, there's some dates reflected in the report. About a month later I received a -- some more paper files and some more CD's with information on them that answered a number of -- submitted a number of the documents that had been missing on the first turnover of documents.

As that was -- as that information was being processed from time to time, I had e-mails with defendants' counsel asking for particular questions or asking for more information to which, for the most part, he was able to respond, or if they weren't available, he -- he just told me so. So, I felt like he was trying to do the best he could.

THE COURT: At the end of the day, let's say sometime the latter part of July, when you had your hands full of the documents, did you have the impression that you had all of the documents that you needed to complete a proper and complete report?
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THE WITNESS: For the most part, Your Honor. I
listed in my report some accounts or statements that were not received. Defendants' counsel had explained why they were not received, or I believe there were a few things they were still trying to get. I conferred with my associate, who did a great deal of the work, you know, with my work and supervision. There were certain documents that we didn't have, but we did have some summary statements or some quarterly-type statements.

I can't say for certain. I felt like we did have what we needed to present a good report. Not anything is a hundred percent right, but I felt like we didn't have any really big unexplained gaps in the things that we were given.

THE COURT: That pushes you over into the work performed area where you are now talking about.

So is there something else in that area that you need to bring to the Court's attention?

Basically that you received the documents -I'm just following.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. We felt like we had substantially all of the documents or a very high percentage, and I'm saying that from years of experience as an accountant. If I had really felt uncomfortable about anything, it would have been highlighted and really brought to the forefront.

THE COURT: Whatever is necessary, you saw.
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THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: In the summary of the accounts received, you show several bank accounts and several, let's call them, stock accounts or stock brokerage accounts, various investment accounts. I don't know if these are stocks or just simply accounts where you would invest money and they would purchase stock. The point is that these are -- appear to be a substantial number of accounts.

Are you of the opinion that these are all the accounts -- first of all, these are the accounts provided?

THE WITNESS: They were the ones provided. I think they were all that was provided. The plaintiff, in response, had raised the issue about some Treasury bills or Treasury bonds. I don't believe we saw any information in regards to them.

Now, technically, I would like to see the bonds. And technically, if it was something where they just sat there and interest was paid in a lump sum at a future date, and there was no income or cash income receipt activity during the period, then they be wouldn't reflected on here. But if it was an accrual-type income, then it should have been reflected.

THE COURT: So these accounts, as I understand it -and you are distinguishing between the accounts that may be in existence but just have not reported income on an accrual
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basis, but these accounts are reporting on a quarterly or annual basis income, and/or fees, or whatever else that might be reflected against the account.

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor, all these accounts.
THE COURT: For example, if there were Treasury -are Treasury bonds, and they are paying whatever interest they are paying, that certainly could be -- that might be -- you don't have those, but that interest theoretically, I guess, could be applied back into the principal and, therefore, would not be reflected on a statement.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
THE COURT: Okay. Tell us a little bit about the report exceptions and the missing documents area there on page 6.

THE WITNESS: These were -- as it is discussed here, there were some accounts that we did not have, or statements. In some cases, they were quarterly reports that were not -the second quarterly reports were not available yet, or I was told they were not available yet in the latter part of July, which was quite often the case, but that they could be supplied, if needed.

There were a couple of other accounts where we may have been missing a monthly account or maybe an earlier quarterly account, but we had a latter period account where, for the most part, everything -- we could kind of trace our
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way through the missing period. Again, I didn't see any great cause for alarm.

And then there were a number of things, disbursements, that we did not have documentation for, and those were explained to me that, for the most part, that they just didn't exist.

THE COURT: Okay. And these disbursements did not have -- did not have a paper backing. These would just be, let's say, for example, a check that might have been written for an amount of money, but there was no -- for your records there was no receipt or document indicating why that disbursement was being made. It might be reflected on the check itself.

THE WITNESS: Correct. We were able to go back to the pictures of check facsimiles and, you know, confirm that.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Now, you've also listed on page 8 a number of outstanding shares. These reflect the transfers that you say were made before November 11th of 2011, I gather. And then other stocks, perhaps, that might have -- that might have been reinvested, or income that might have been reinvested.

Am I seeing that right?
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. You make a statement on page 9, at the end of that section, that indicates that
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there are certain stocks available.
Is that the total of all stocks outstanding shares that are part of the trust?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, to the best of my recollection.

THE COURT: Those are three different, I believe -three different shares -- three different companies -- that might not be the proper term. How would you say it?

THE WITNESS: I think it was four -- Chevron, Exxon, John Deere, Deere Enterprises, and Metropolitan Life.

THE COURT: Okay. Those are the four. Okay. All right. And then you go on to make comments on certain accounts, and this is some of which you maybe already have stated having to do with the sale of certain securities and the disbursement. I'm not sure.

Is that what that is about?
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: One of the areas that you touched on earlier had to do with, for example, a check that may have been written to a family member that may or may not have had some document behind it. We are looking at the top of page 10, where is says, "Many of the payments were noted as reimbursements." These would be checks that would reflect reimbursement but not necessarily another check that showed the payment was made.
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THE WITNESS: Correct. The check was written to the individual from the Quicken files. It would say reimbursement for -- automobile repairs type of thing. And on the Quicken files, it may have been in that automobile repair expense account. But for purposes of this report and the issues raised in the complaint, I felt that it was important -- it was important to make this some special category.

THE COURT: All right. Now, going to Exhibit 1, this is the summary statement, is it not?

I say summary statement. It's a statement of income, receipt and expenses. Behind that would be the exhibits. I say exhibits, would be other exhibits that would reflect the individual checks written and/or to whom they may have been written in Exhibit No. 2. And in Exhibit 3 would be the distribution analysis of the stock payments.

Is that what I'm having there?
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: All right. So, just let me take a look at this. It shows, I gather, that they had an opening -- a beginning opening of 127,000 -- almost $\$ 128,000$ in farm income as a beginning item there.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. Farm rent during the time frame in question.

THE COURT: And, so, what you've done is you've accumulated all of the income from the farm for this period,
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"this period" being the period that I requested that you do, the December 21, 2010 through May 31, 2013.

THE WITNESS: The deposits we identified for farm rental income.

THE COURT: And that would be just a little over a two-year period, two years and a few months.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: All right. In addition to that, you show dividend income, interest income.

And by long-term capital gains and short term, are you reflecting there some income from Exxon or one of these companies?

THE WITNESS: No, sir. Actually the dividends from Exxon or Chevron would be in the dividend income amount.

THE COURT: On Exhibit 3?
THE WITNESS: Excuse me.
THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry, no, it would not be.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Could you repeat your question.

THE COURT: I was asking where did this long-term capital gains come from.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. The long-term capital gains and short-term capital gains, those were reported on the stock brokerage accounts. Those are called flow-through amounts from mutual funds and things of that nature.
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THE COURT: And then the income of 183,000 is stock sale. That's the liquidation of the stock -- did that include the liquidation of stock before 11/11/11?

THE WITNESS: That was the liquidation of stocks during that time frame, other than the stocks that were disbursed in kind.

THE COURT: Okay. So this is a separate
liquidation.
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Or a separate income, should I say.
This is income.
THE WITNESS: It's stock liquidated.
THE COURT: This is income from the sale of certain other stocks that has now has been liquidated and it brings total income to about \$216,600,000.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: The miscellaneous income is just other income that -- what would that be, sort of like what?

THE WITNESS: To be honest, Your Honor, without looking at the underlying documents, I can't remember right now. But it was a number of small items that didn't fit one of these other accounts that are listed in Exhibit 1.

THE COURT: But it is reflected in the deposits of the account?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
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THE COURT: The pension income, and I'm looking at Social Security income. Who is getting Social Security income to go into that account at this time?

I believe both the husband and the wife are deceased, right?

THE WITNESS: Mrs. Brunsting, she was alive for about 12 months.

THE COURT: You are right. Tax refunds, that would also be reflected. This is the sale proceeds from the house. That's all -- so we are talking about a total of 830-plus thousand dollars during this two years or two- to three-month period?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: And then we're talking in the next section about expenses, medical care, in-house care, and medical care, and all of that coming to the 122,000 , more or less.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: The pet care and pet food and all of that, that doesn't have anything to do with the farm. This must be at the house, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. And veterinarian expenses.
So we are talking about total expenditures of about half of what the income was, right?
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THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: And then you said net income, receipts, and expenses, disbursements.

How are you distinguishing that from total expenses and disbursements?

THE WITNESS: That's just the net of the total incoming receipts of 830,000 less the total expenses of 418.

THE COURT: Okay. And then you show the 298,000 in stock -- in stock transfer to family or whatever. This is a value of stock. This is the value beyond what was sold and became income.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: So we are looking at -- right at almost 500 -- well, 300,000, basically, that was transferred directly, apparently, by the estate before -- before Ms. Brunsting died in November 11, 2011.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: More or less.
THE WITNESS: In May and June of 2011.
THE COURT: What two or three numbers are you putting together to come to the 120,000 at the bottom?

THE WITNESS: 411,328 less 298,976 gets me to the 112,346.

THE COURT: All right. What you don't have or what didn't do and were not asked to do was to do an asset
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liability --
THE WITNESS: Correct.
THE COURT: -- sheet.
Are there any other concerns or statement that you need to make regarding this report before -- before I ask you a question regarding your billing?

THE WITNESS: The one item is, after the filing of my report, there was a disbursement for \$6500, which had been put into miscellaneous expenses because I had no backup for it.

THE COURT: It was a one-time payment of 6500? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Where is that reflected on page --
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Exhibit 1, page 1.
THE COURT: Page 1, Exhibit 1? All right.
THE WITNESS: Towards the bottom, Miscellaneous Expenses. That shows miscellaneous expenses \$6753. \$6500 of that amount should be reclassified to checks or cash to family members.

THE COURT: What you are calling miscellaneous expenses would be -- say that again. I'm sorry.

THE WITNESS: That miscellaneous expense, there was -- \$6500 of that amount we found -- defendants' counsel confirmed for me, subsequent to the filing of the report, that that was a distribution to a family member.

02:15:53PM

THE COURT: Okay. So this is not a part of the pre -- part of the distribution made by Ms. Brunsting before her death. This was expenses or monies that were paid to a particular family member -- a single family member or maybe two family numbers, whatever the number might be, that were made after that date?

THE WITNESS: Let me -- let me confirm that. That was subsequent to her demise.

THE COURT: What page are you looking at?
THE WITNESS: On Exhibit 2, page 16.
THE COURT: Where it says --
THE WITNESS: About two-thirds or three-quarters of the way down the page, it says "Miscellaneous Expenses."

THE COURT: Page 16 did you say?
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. Exhibit 2.
THE COURT: Okay. Miscellaneous, and then it shows a total of something like... co-op and then withdrawal, and then Houston Metro, those together totaling 6753.72.

THE WITNESS: That middle entry on November 14th of $\$ 6500$ should now be reclassified --

THE COURT: As disbursement?
THE WITNESS: -- as disbursement to family members.
THE COURT: As disbursement. You've got a code there of W-D-R-L. What does that mean to you?

THE WITNESS: Withdrawal. This withdrawal on the
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bank statement.
THE COURT: It is my lack of accounting acumen.
It's not your fault. I'm trying to make sure I understand, so that if I have a question, I can ask you.

Now, as it relates to your billing, it does not include an appearance here today, as I understand it, or the time that you have spent. You have already submitted a billing to the -- bill to the Court for payment, have you not?

THE WITNESS: That is correct.
THE COURT: And except for whatever time has been spent since this submission, have you received any objections from either the plaintiff, Ms. Curtis, or from the defense concerning the payment of your expenses?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.
THE COURT: Does your billing include the legal advice necessary that you received as well, or was it just separately an accounting function?

THE WITNESS: Mine was separately an accounting function, and I also submitted a separate invoice from my counsel.

THE COURT: Have you received any objections from either plaintiff or defendant in that regard?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
THE COURT: Ms. Curtis. Anything else?
MS. CURTIS: No.
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THE COURT: Mr. Vie?
MR. VIE: Just one thing, Your Honor.
BY MR. VIE:
Q. Just to be clear, because the Court has asked about the timing of this last expense that you mentioned being reclassified.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. If I understand the miscellaneous expense, the check that is noted for the $\$ 6500$, that is prior -- that's three days after Mrs. Nella's Brunsting's death? A. Correct.
Q. Do you recall what the transaction was, the $\$ 6500$ transaction?
A. I believe it was to Carol Brunsting. I feel confident about that. And I believe the -- the explanation that your firm gave me was that -- it was to be, I guess, used to help deal with some of her funeral expenses. Q. Was the money redeposited at some point after that? In other words, the money that had been taken out should there be some funeral expenses or other things necessary, would that money have been put back at some point?

THE COURT: Why don't you show him where you are talking about.

MR. VIE: Well, I understand where his reference was on page 16, where he highlights the miscellaneous expense of
6500.

THE COURT: I know, but how would he know whether or not it is put back unless you know where it is?

MR. VIE: If he has a corresponding entry for a deposit for 6500.

THE COURT: I see.
THE WITNESS: I don't recall one.
BY MR. VIE:
Q. If there was one, where are the costs like that reflected in the report?
A. It would probably be under a miscellaneous --

THE COURT: Keep your voice up, Mr. West.
THE WITNESS: I would think it should be under miscellaneous income, and I don't find it there. There's a possibility it could have always been misposted, but I would need to look through the ledger in total.

BY MR. VIE:
Q. Would you -- it was -- your understanding, it was represented to you it was not a gift; it was some expenses that were funds made available for funeral expenses?
A. That's what I was told.

MR. VIE: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Well, your understanding is based upon what counsel told you. It had nothing to do with and independent audit, right?
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THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: You may step down, sir. Thank you very much.

All right. If there is no objection, I will ask -- no objection to the report and the invoice request of counsel for himself, as an accounting function, as well as advice of counsel, if there's no objection, I'm going to order that those be paid.

Any objection, Ms. Curtis?
MS. CURTIS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Vie, speaking on behalf of your clients?

MR. VIE: No, Your Honor, no objection.
THE COURT: All right. Okay. All right. That's all we have. Thank you very much, and that will take care of it.

No, no, no. I'm sorry. All we have with accountants. If they want to leave, they can. There are some other motions we need to address.

MR. MILLION: Your Honor, would you like us to submit a proposed order?

THE COURT: Would you do that? It would make it a lot -- well, how about that, just happen to have it right there, right?

You shared this with -- the expense paperwork,
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you shared the expense report and/or request for payment with both Ms. Curtis and with Mr. Vie?

MR. WEST: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Ms. Curtis, you have some other -- well, I will start with you, Mr. Vie. I believe you have filed a motion that has drawn some -- you all want to be excused?

MR. MILLION: Yes, Your Honor. I do want to bring one other thing to the Court's attention.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, sir.
MR. MILLION: In the pleadings that were filed by the plaintiff and defendant, there has been some indication that they are wanting additional work to be performed by the special master. And I know one of the proposed forms of order said you've got to do something within 10 days.

Just given the tax season issues with respect to corporate filings and such, any additional work that the special master might request to do, he is happy to do whatever the Court needs. However, he would need more than 10 days to be able to comply with that.

THE COURT: Yeah, I think I might have said this to both sides. If I did not, you will hear it now.

My purpose in asking Mr. West to come in was not to make him a person for them to utilize to do any of their work. He was working for the Court to bring some
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matters to the Court's attention that would be too much contention between the parties for me to ask either side to present anything to me that I could, at least in good faith, at the time, rely upon as a way of making some determinations.

So I wanted to find out where the income was and what had happened to it. Those were some of the allegations made by Ms. Curtis.

The function of doing other financial reports I think the parties should be able to handle and do themselves. And if they choose to employ someone to do it, they certainly will be able to do it. We have got fundamentals of stuff ready and in place for them to go ahead and get that done. If there is some need, certainly, Mr. West may be asked do it. If so, it would be by the Court, not by the parties.

MR. MILLION: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much, gentlemen. Have a good day.

Ms. Curtis -- I'm sorry. Mr. Vie, you filed a motion to -- let me just get it out here -- a motion to -request for the renewal of the farm lease, I believe. Let me see if I can find that document number.

I believe that's Instrument No. 65, filed about 10 days ago.

MR. VIE: Yes, Your Honor.

02:26:02PM

THE COURT: And as I understand, Ms. Curtis, that you have reviewed that, and your objection is, essentially -correct me if I am wrong -- that it is automatically renewed at this point because no objection was filed and no disapproval of that renewal occurred within the time frame that needed to be made.

Am I correct?
MS. CURTIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So in that regard, the objection is simply a matter of record as to how things are and the -- the renewal of the farm lease, while the Court might have the authority to cancel it, it is automatically renewed. It would take some affirmative action.

So why should I cancel it? Tell me why I
should cancel it.
Is there any basis for me to cancel it at this point?

MS. CURTIS: The farm lease?
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
MS. CURTIS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The motion will be granted unless there is something additional I need to know, Mr. Vie, about this before that occurs.

MR. VIE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. I believe there was an order

02:27:04PM

02:27:16PM
entered, and I know there was one entered, but I believe the second order was entered for the payment of certain property taxes.

That has been taken care of, right?
MR. VIE: Yes, Your Honor. You have already entered that.

THE COURT: All right. I have reviewed your responses to the report. It seems to me the next item, then, has to do with objection that you have made -- I'm trying to figure out what you meant, Ms. Curtis, by "recommit matter to master for consideration."

Tell me what you are talking about there. You filed this on September 3rd. This was filed, what, today?

MS. CURTIS: This was filed this morning.
THE COURT: Wow. You are faster than the lawyers are. Where were you when you filed this?

MS. CURTIS: In the clerk's office.
THE COURT: All right. I didn't know if you were filing electronically or not.

MS. CURTIS: I do not file electronically.
THE COURT: Well, you filed this motion -- or objections to defendants' motion for order to recommit matters to master for consideration.

Tell me what you are talking about there.
MS. CURTIS: Well, there is a letter that Mr. Vie
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provided to Mr. West in support of missing documents and other questions that the master had. It is dated July 15th, 2013. It was Appendix Tab 1 in Document No. 67 filed by the defendants, which is their response to the report of master.

THE COURT: All right.
MS. CURTIS: And I am objecting to even spending another penny with the master when there is nothing substantive in here. This was all just excuses and explanations.

THE COURT: You mean on the part of the defendants?
MS. CURTIS: The defendants, for missing records or how they categorized the expenses, which was not what the master was instructed to do. He was just instructed to list the income and the expenses that occurred for this period of time.

He did the best he could to categorize these things. He had questions, like about the 6500 in miscellaneous income. And he did not receive third-party receipts or original statements or any documentation. All the master received were excuses for these transactions, which is not the basis of the master's report. He was just asked to report on the income and expenses.

So I think this entire thing is just irrelevant and a waste of time.

THE COURT: So your objection and -- your objection
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there is to -- has to do with the statements being made in the defendants' report or request or statements to the master, and that no further work should be done by the master -- special master regarding these documents and these statements?

MS. CURTIS: That is correct.
THE COURT: I think I've already cured that. I've just let him go.

What else did you have there? You filed, as well, I think a motion to show cause why a judgement of civil contempt should not be -- and I know they have not had a chance to respond to this. But that's also been filed before the Court. But is there anything else, other than that motion pending?

MS. CURTIS: I have not filed anything else, no, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So, you are coming out of California, and I'm trying to find out how we -- how soon would you be ready and what evidence would you be presenting on this? Because I don't want to have you just coming back and forth, expense to you.

MS. CURTIS: I have a statement to make. I don't know if that will help.

THE COURT: I don't know if Mr. Vie is prepared to respond, but I will permit you to make your statement.

MS. CURTIS: I don't expect a response. I just came
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prepared with this statement.
THE COURT: Okay. Go right ahead, then.
MS. CURTIS: "The absent of immunity results in responsibilities for which there is no exemption. Since no one may be in legal relation with their self, trustees, de facto or de jure, encumbered with duties, and empowered to perform such duties are bound in a jural relation to the beneficiaries, which confers upon said beneficiaries specific rights which are well-known to the law.
"Among such rights is a distinct and calculable property interest in a complete and accurate accounting. Withholding such information, whether by failure or refusal, constitutes a palpable injury to a beneficiary evidenced by the resulting inability to cure and perfect their claim.
"Said failure to perform the duties of trustee endows the beneficiary with the legal powers to act against said trustees in order to lay claim to that which is [property] -- properly theirs and to which they are entitled.
"I object to the July 15th letter from defendants to the master insofar as it contains excuses and explanations that are prejudicial, non-probative, and thus immaterial. The time for these explanations and excuses has long since passed. I would, however, offer the letter into evidence as an offer of proof that the omissions contained therein establish evidence of facts that are clear, positive,
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uncontradicted and of such nature they cannot rationally be disbelieved, and the Court is, therefore, compelled to conclude that those facts have been established as a matter of law.
"Defendants admit that they failed to keep books and records, and, therefore, are incapable of providing a full, true and complete accounting. Further, defendants admit to self-dealing, commingling, and [applications] of -misapplications of fiduciary attached to expressions of bias.
"I would also like to offer defendants' response to plaintiff's request for disclosure and defendants' answer into evidence as an offer of proof that defendants refused to provide non-proprietary trust instruments and admit that they can provide no evidence of notices to the other co-beneficiaries of any of their acts from alleged changes to the trust, changes of trustees, changes in trustee compensation or any of their other proclaimed acts of trust administration.
"Plaintiff's claim for breach of fiduciary is ripe for summary judgment on the merits of these admissions and the accounting that supports the admissions. Plaintiff asks this Court for summary judgment on the claim for breach of fiduciary and asks that defendants be removed from conducting any further trust business.

This is Texas Trust Code 113.082, Sections 4, 5
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and 6(b). Plaintiff further moves that this Court bifurcate all the remaining issues, including questions of damages, until more necessary information can be obtained."

THE COURT: I saw attached to your motion what I believe to be a request for certain discovery.

That is certain information that you have wanted provided to you; is that right?

MS. CURTIS: It is information I wanted provided to me.

THE COURT: All right. But once that information -- let's assume that that's what it is and that they are going to respond and give you certain information pursuant to your request, and now you have got the information, let's say.

What is your next -- you are asking the Court, I gather, to have a hearing to determine whether or not the parties should be removed as trustees. You understand that would require the Court then appointing someone to serve as a trustee.

MS. CURTIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And then the parties would then have to, then, present to the Court, I gather, the name -- the name or names of individuals who they believe -- whom they believe would be qualified to handle those -- those functions, and could not -- it would seem to me, because of the controversy,
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it doesn't seem it could include you or another family member.
Do you see the problem there?
MS. CURTIS: I do understand.
THE COURT: So is that what you are asking the Court to do in your -- that's what I think I heard you say.

Is that right?
MS. CURTIS: Yes, that's correct.
THE COURT: Why haven't you gone on and hired a
lawyer?
MS. CURTIS: Because these are things that -- these are things that I don't need an attorney for. I'm going --

THE COURT: I don't disagree that as a matter of course, you are entitled to what you are requesting. The problem is that you are not -- you are so far away from the courthouse, and it creates some problems with the communication that -- when I say "communication," meaning if I want to have a hearing on something, you either have got to fly in here, or I have got to have you on the telephone. And I'm not really sure the telephone is a proper way to have these types of proceedings.

If you had counsel, particularly local counsel, that's someone who could make motions and proceed to do discovery and all of that on your behalf. It seems to me that would be a much easier way to proceed. I'm just throwing that out there for you.
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However, under the rules of discovery, I'm not quite sure that the way that you have presented this is a way in which the defendants are required to respond. In other words, you have attached to your motion, your ex parte motion -- and I think you filed it under seal. I'm not sure why.

Why did you file it under seal?
MS. CURTIS: I just gave it to the clerk this morning.

THE COURT: Okay. So it doesn't really need to be under seal. There are no -- I don't think there are any -- we generally have things filed under seal that would -- where there may be some indication of information, family private information, confidential information, that should not be disclosed to the public. But this is a public proceeding, so there is nothing, I gather, as far as you know that --

MS. CURTIS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- would require that. I'm going to, then, have it removed from being under seal. I don't know if counsel has gotten a copy of it yet, but he would be able to access it. You should provide him a copy of it.

MS. CURTIS: I did.
THE COURT: Okay. Very good. But if you look at what you have got as p-68. Does that mean there's a p-67 someplace and a p-66?
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MS. CURTIS: The p-67.
THE COURT: It's attached to the motion. That's what I am referring to. It's attached to your ex parte motion. It is a five-page document, demanding --

MS. CURTIS: I have it. It was the only exhibit that I attached.

THE COURT: But this suggests there are 67 other exhibits out there somewhere, right?

MS. CURTIS: Yes. I have just continued adding exhibit numbers from the very beginning.

THE COURT: Okay. So some of these exhibits are attached to your original proceeding?

MS. CURTIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And all along there may have been some that were added to or attached to your motions, and you are now at number 68. That's what that is. Okay.

MS. CURTIS: Yes, Your Honor. And --
THE COURT: Have you read the rules, Federal Rules of Procedure related to discovery requests?

MS. CURTIS: Yes, Your Honor. I have something to say about that, also.

THE COURT: Well, let me say my say first. And that is, this is not going to get.

MS. CURTIS: I understand.
THE COURT: Go ahead and say your say.
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MS. CURTIS: "The public policy considerations involved in a common law information demand pursuant to a fiduciary obligation are very different from those involved in a discovery request under Rules of Civil Procedure for the following reasons: If trustee is administering property, the trust estate that belongs to the beneficiaries of the trust. In other words, the beneficiaries hold equitable title to the trust estate.
"The trustee acting in his individual capacity usually has no personal interest whatsoever in the estate of the trust that he is administering. Consequently, the information requested does not belong to the trustee. In legal discovery requests, a party to a lawsuit is requesting proprietary information and documents that belong to another party. This is not the case with respect to equitable demands for information.
"The trustee of a trust holds the trust estate for the benefit of the trust beneficiaries who have an equitable interest in all information and documents. There is usually a financial disparity between the beneficiary who is using his personal financial resources to obtain information and the trustee who is using the estate of the trust to pay for the cost of his compliance with the information demand. In essence, the beneficiary is paying everyone's fees.
"This situation does not occur in legal
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discovery requests where independent parties are involved in litigation. The beneficiary of a trust is the only person authorized to enforce the trust. It is not possible for him or her to perform this function without disclosure from the trustee regarding how the trust is being administered. Where, as here, the trustee is conflicted, the duty to disclose is even higher than that of ordinary corporate trustees.
"In discovery, under the rules the scope of discovery is whether the information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In common law disclosure, the scope of discovery is material facts known to the trustee that might affect the beneficiaries' rights.
"There is no law in place allowing formal objections to reasonable common law disclosure demand for information directed from a beneficiary to a trustee. Unlike interrogatories, there is no limitation on the number of demands for information that can be made on the trustee if the trustee breaches his duty to disclose his subject to all equitable remedies. Moreover, his breach is a factor in the award of legal fees in the overall case pursuant to Texas Trust Code 114.064."

I have been asking, first, nicely, then I made a common law demand in writing in late 2011, after my mother passed away. I made a statutory demand for the exact same
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information I was entitled to in January of 2011. And to this day, I have gotten nothing but excuses and explanations for records and documents that I am entitled to as a beneficiary.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you, when you say you have gotten nothing, are you saying that you have received absolutely nothing from defendants or their attorneys?

MS. CURTIS: I have received nothing responsive.
THE COURT: So now there is an argument as to what responsive is, isn't it?

So here's what I am getting to. These kinds of disputes as to whether or not -- whatever you might have received -- and I don't even suggest that it's what you requested, but whatever the dispute is, these matters are matters that now are in this Court. And you are asking me to address them, and I'm in no position to address them because I don't have the documents before me that you do have.

And the way this request has to be made now is not in a common law fashion as you would do if you were writing a letter to a person and requesting. That simply sets you up to go to court and get a judge to enter an order that you be provided with the documentation that you believe you are entitled to. My job would then be to decide whether or not the information that you have requested is relevant or important to any issue in the case.

Because the point is, the bottom line here, in
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my opinion, and it seems where you are headed, is that you are asking this Court to do one of several things, or maybe several things.

One, it sounds like you are asking the Court to remove the trustees and appoint a trustee. I think I heard you say that.

Second, it seemed to me you want the estate dispersed so that you have your share of the estate and it is not under the supervision and/or hands of your sisters.

And, third, you want your sisters or the trustees, whoever was acting as -- I think it was both of them, co-trustees, since November 11th of 2011, or whatever period of time. You want them to account to you, that, by accounting, I think I hear you saying you want them to reimburse you for what they have taken that doesn't belong to them, as a disbursement to them, assuming that that has occurred.

And it sounds to me like you are asking for attorney's fees that have not -- following through. And this would not come from the estate per se. It would come from them individually. That's what I understand I am hearing.

So, there are some documents that may be important or relevant to those kinds of requests, but everything wouldn't necessarily be. Whether or not -- for example, if you are looking for do you have certified copies
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of letters, or whatever, that might have gone from this person to that person, that might not be relevant.

What is relevant, it seems to me, is that there is a money issue here, and it can be solved by accounting and disbursement. One of the things that the Court is going to have to get around to, it seems to me, because I'm not sure that you are going to do it voluntarily, or the parties or the defendants, is at some point an asset/liability statement has to be prepared and presented in this case. Otherwise, there's no way for the Court to know what the value of the estate is and/or what the -- what any disbursements might look like. I'm not sure that disbursement is the proper venue, but I am certain that that's part of what you are requesting.

Am I correct in some of that?
MS. CURTIS: You are correct in almost 99 percent of that, but I would like to know where the EE bonds are.

THE COURT: The who?
MS. CURTIS: The EE Treasury bonds.
THE COURT: Here's my point. You can ask that, but you need to do it. You can ask for a revelation of these documents, these Treasury bonds, whatever else you think that's missing and have not been accounted for. And the reason, theoretically, at least in part, that they have not been accounted for is that they are not paying an interest as an income to the estate, necessarily. The interest,
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apparently, is being accumulated in the bond itself. So you would have to cash the bond to get the principal and the interest. That may be an explanation for it.

You are entitled to know what those assets are, but you've got to ask for them. What I said to you was the way that you attached it to this motion is not the way that it should be done under the rules of discovery. So simply file your motion for requesting whatever it is that you are requesting discovery wise with counsel, Mr. Vie, who has the duty to either object to what you are requesting or to respond. Okay?

But I don't want it attached to your motion for an order to show cause because that's a different -- that's a different vehicle. This is discovery attached to something that it should not be attached to. So you need to file a separate discovery motion. All right? Or at least provide that -- file that request with Mr. Vie.

MS. CURTIS: Excuse me, Your Honor. But the reason I attached the demand for production of documents, this is a -- this has already been given to defendants. They have already responded to it.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay.
MS. CURTIS: And the reason that I attached it is because I still don't have the information that I need to be able to make a decision about anything having to do with my
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beneficial interests.
THE COURT: So that's the basis for this application, for civil contempt.

MS. CURTIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I see. Okay. Now, see, I don't know what's going on outside of the Court. So I apologize for being too far ahead of you in that respect, or behind you, whatever.

The point is that this application, then, would require the Court to conduct a hearing. They have a duty to respond and an opportunity to respond within a certain number of days. It would require a hearing, and, in my opinion, it would require a hearing here in open court so the record is made of whatever that proceeding is. So, there you have it. It is going to be -- I cannot let you participate by telephone.

MS. CURTIS: I understand.
THE COURT: Because you might need to be questioned, as well, under the proceeding. All right?

So I will set a date for that, and Mr. Vie can respond within that time frame, and then we will see whether or not there's a hearing probably within the next 30, 40 days.

MS. CURTIS: Okay.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MS. CURTIS: No, Your honor.
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THE COURT: And you are still not going to get a lawyer, right?

MS. CURTIS: Not quite yet.
THE COURT: Okay.
Mr. Vie, did you have anything that you needed to bring to the Court's attention?

MR. VIE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So I will go ahead and set this matter for a hearing perhaps the 1st of October.

Do we have a date that we can give them now?
Is October 1st too soon?
You haven't had a chance to respond yet. So, theoretically, you have got 21 days.

MR. VIE: I think it is on the docket for the -- I think the submission date is the 19th.

THE COURT: That's an automatic submission. I'm talking about a date for the hearing on the motion. You are going to be responding or -- or not, one way or the other. I would have to have a hearing before I could decide the motion.

MR. VIE: Tuesday, the 1st?
THE COURT: Would that be fine?
MS. CURTIS: Your Honor, the nature of my work requires me to be in my office on Monday or Tuesday of any given week.

THE COURT: What's a good day for you?
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MS. CURTIS: Wednesday, Thursday or Friday. Any Wednesday, Thursday or Friday I will be here.

THE COURT: So if you have to travel, how are you going to get here on Wednesday if you have got to be in there on Tuesday?

MS. CURTIS: I can travel at night.
THE COURT: You can work that out.
MS. CURTIS: I will work that out.
THE COURT: So let's pick a Wednesday. October 2nd, how is that for you?

MR. VIE: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: October 2nd. Is 11:30 a good time or is it better in the afternoon, Ms. Curtis?

MS. CURTIS: 11:30 is fine.
THE COURT: Is that fine with you, then, Mr. Vie?
MR. VIE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: 10/11, at 11:30 a.m. -- 10/2. 10/11 must be a holiday. 10/2. I apologize. October 2nd. We are not going to send out an additional -well, we might send a notice out, but don't wait on us to send you a notice. You might get a notice indicating that -- a reminder that this is occurring, and that would be the nature and extent of the -- so let me ask a couple of questions, Mr. Vie. And, I'm not sure, you might confer with your client there.

I just signed an order, and you know that is a fairly expensive -- I will deal with your order. I need to sign it.

Can we pull up his order on the motion for the

I want to make sure that the funds are available to pay the attorney and the accountant before -- I don't want hear him call me and say, Judge, I haven't seen or heard anything.

MR. VIE: They are available, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Very good. I believe everything else that was requested for payment, the taxes, that's been taken care of.

MR. VIE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The only thing I need is your order here.

The Court has entered an order on that. I believe that's all that I have. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.
(Concluded.)
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