

1 CASE NO: BS140207
2 CASE NAME: BAT WORLD SANCTUARY
VS. MARY CUMMINS
3
4 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA THURSDAY, JANUARY 7TH, 2016
5 DEPARTMENT 24 HON. ROBERT L. HESS, JUDGE
6 APPEARANCES: (AS HERETOFORE NOTED)
7 REPORTER: JANE HONG-ELSEY, CSR 11975
8 TIME: A.M. SESSION

9 --000--
10 THE COURT: IS BAT WORLD ON THE PHONE?
11 MR. WATTS: DAVID WATTS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS.
12 THE COURT: YES.
13 MS. CUMMINS: MARY CUMMINS, DEFENDANT.
14 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, WE HAVE A MOTION FOR
15 AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: VACATION OF SISTER STATE
16 JUDGMENT ORDERS, WHICH WE MIGHT TREAT AS A MOTION TO VACATE
17 THE SISTER STATE'S JUDGMENT.
18 NOW, LET ME -- AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THE FINAL
19 SITUATION IS THAT MS. LOLLAR HAS A SIX MILLION DOLLAR
20 JUDGMENT, BUT BAT WORLD'S JUDGMENT WAS -- OF \$186,000 AND
21 CHANGED WAS REVERSED BY THE TEXAS COURT. SO WE HAVE A VALID
22 AND SUBSISTING JUDGMENT OF SIX MILLION DOLLARS IN FAVOR OF
23 LOLLAR AGAINST MS. CUMMINS.
24 AND WHAT OUGHT TO BE DONE IS SIMPLY TO, I THINK --
25 JUST A MINUTE -- STRIKE THE PORTION OF THE PRIOR ORDER THAT
26 RELATED TO BAT WORLD, AND LEAVE THE REST STANDING.
27 IS THERE A REASON --
28 MR. WATTS: YES. I AGREE. WE CAN DISMISS THE BAT

1 WORLD DEFENDANT FROM OUR -- BAT WORLD PLAINTIFF, FROM THIS
2 CASE AND LEAVE -- WHETHER IT IS A MOTION TO STRIKE OR JUST
3 THAT PARTICULAR DEFENDANT -- PLAINTIFF. SORRY.

4 WHATEVER THE COURT'S PLEASURE, IF THAT'S SEEMS TO
5 BE THE BEST COURSE OF ACTION.

6 THE COURT: MS. CUMMINS?

7 MS. CUMMINS: YES, YOUR HONOR. I FILED AN AMENDED
8 MOTION TO VACATE. IT LISTED AS THE ORIGINAL ORDER A MOTION
9 TO VACATE. IT SHOULD -- IT'S STILL PENDING IN THE --

10 THE COURT: MS. CUMMINS --

11 MS. CUMMINS: I DON'T BELIEVE THAT JUDGMENT WAS
12 LEGALLY ACTIVE AT THAT TIME.

13 MR. WATTS: YOUR HONOR, WE ADDRESSED THIS MANY,
14 MANY MONTHS AGO WHEN THE LEVIED. FIRST WAS, I BELIEVE, ON A
15 MOTION TO RETURN -- TO RETURN THOSE FUNDS TWO YEARS AGO.
16 THERE WAS NO STAY IN EFFECT. THE LEVY WAS SUCCESSFUL IN
17 TAKING ABOUT \$4,300.

18 WE'VE ALREADY GO OVER THIS ISSUE. THERE WAS NO
19 STAY. MS. CUMMINS HAS NOT POSTED A BOND OR UNDERTAKING TO
20 HAVE A STAY IN PLACE. SO THERE'S NO NEED -- THERE'S NO NEED
21 TO RETURN THE MONEY OR ADDRESS ISSUES ALREADY ADDRESSED BY
22 THE COURT.

23 THE COURT: I THINK THE LEVY WAS ON BEHALF OF
24 MS. LOLLAR, WAS IT NOT?

25 MS. CUMMINS: NO.

26 MR. WATTS: CORRECT.

27 THE COURT: WELL, YOU SAY NO.

28 MR. WATTS: IT WAS.

1 THE COURT: I HAD THE IMPRESSION THAT IT WAS. AM
2 I INCORRECT HERE?

3 MR. WATTS: THERE WERE TWO INDIVIDUAL JUDGMENTS
4 THAT WERE DOMESTICATED IN CALIFORNIA INTO THIS PARTICULAR
5 CASE NUMBER. SO WHETHER THAT PORTION -- THAT LEVY IS
6 ASSIGNED TO -- MY POSITION IS THAT THAT LEVY IS ASSIGNED TO
7 THIS CASE AS A WHOLE.

8 THERE'S STILL A SIX-MILLION-DOLLAR JUDGMENT, PLUS
9 INTEREST, ON THE BOOKS AND THE \$4,300 THAT HAS BEEN SO FAR
10 COLLECTED DOES NOT IN ANY WAY APPROACH THAT NUMBER.

11 SO DISMISSING THE BAT WORLD PLAINTIFF DOESN'T
12 AFFECT THE LEVY AT ALL.

13 MS. CUMMINS: YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE THE LEVY WAS
14 FOR BOTH PARTIES. IT DIDN'T SEPARATE OUT WHICH PORTION OF
15 THE PERCENTAGE WAS ONE PARTY OR THE OTHER.

16 THE COURT: WHY SHOULD LOLLAR NOT GET ALL OF IT?

17 MS. CUMMINS: I RAISED OTHER ISSUES IN MY AMENDED
18 MOTION TO VACATE. IT WAS THAT SISTER STATE --

19 THE COURT: WHY -- JUST A MINUTE. I HAVE THIS
20 SOMETHING CALLED AMENDED MOTION TO VACATE SISTER STATE
21 JUDGMENT, WHICH APPARENTLY WAS ONLY FILED YESTERDAY.

22 WHAT'S THIS ALL ABOUT? WHY DO YOU THINK YOU GET
23 TO FILE SOMETHING? THIS IS NOT AN EX-PARTE APPLICATION.
24 WHY DO YOU THINK YOU GET TO HEAR IT ON ESSENTIALLY NO NOTICE
25 AT ALL?

26 MS. CUMMINS: WELL, I DID GIVE NOTICE TO
27 MR. WATTS. AND ALSO, YOU HAD ASKED, AT THE LAST HEARING,
28 FOR THE MANDATE ON THE CASE. SO I INCLUDED THE DOCUMENT YOU

1 REQUESTED, WHICH IS THE MANDATE ON THE CASE.

2 THE COURT: OKAY. BUT YOU'RE TELLING ME YOU HAVE
3 AN AMENDED MOTION, WHICH APPARENTLY WAS FILED ONLY
4 YESTERDAY, ON THE 6TH. ONLY YESTERDAY.

5 I'M ASKING YOU: WHY IS IT APPROPRIATE TO HEAR
6 THAT? I THOUGHT THAT WE HAD A MOTION THAT WAS CONTINUED
7 FROM NOVEMBER 4. THAT'S WHAT I WAS PREPARED FOR; YOUR
8 MOTION FOR O.S.C. RE: VACATION OF SISTER STATE JUDGMENT.

9 MS. CUMMINS: YES. YOU ASKED TO HAVE THE FINAL
10 MANDATE IN THE CASE. AND IT WASN'T FINAL AT THAT TIME.
11 THEY FINALLY ISSUED THE MANDATORY, I BELIEVE, OCTOBER 16.

12 THE COURT: BUT THAT'S -- THAT'S A DIFFERENT --
13 OKAY. BUT IF I ASKED FOR THAT -- IF I ASKED FOR THAT AND IT
14 WAS ISSUED OCTOBER 2015, AND THE MOTION WAS CONTINUED FROM
15 NOVEMBER 4TH, WHY AM I GETTING IT THE NIGHT BEFORE?

16 MR. WATTS: YOUR HONOR, IF I MAY? THE MANDATE WAS
17 ALSO ATTACHED TO MY OPPOSITION.

18 THE COURT: I KNOW IT WAS. I KNOW IT WAS.

19 MR. WATTS: OKAY.

20 THE COURT: I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHY THERE'S
21 AN AMENDED MOTION HERE.

22 MS. CUMMINS: WELL, I THOUGHT YOU ASKED ME TO FILE
23 THE COPY OF THE MANDATE. I DIDN'T HAVE A COPY OF IT YET.

24 THE COURT: BUT YOU HAVE -- I HAVE SOMETHING THAT
25 PURPORTS TO BE AN AMENDED MOTION TO VACATE. ARE YOU ASKING
26 FOR ANYTHING DIFFERENT THAN WHAT WAS ASKED FOR WHEN -- ON
27 NOVEMBER 4?

28 MS. CUMMINS: I'M JUST BRINGING UP WHY IT SHOULD

1 BE VACATED, BECAUSE THEY DIDN'T HAVE PERSONAL OR SUBJECT
2 MATTER JURISDICTION.

3 THE COURT: WELL, I GOT TO TELL YOU. IF THEY
4 DIDN'T HAVE PERSONAL OR SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, THAT
5 WAS AN ISSUE FOR THE TEXAS COURTS. THAT COULD HAVE BEEN
6 RAISED NOTIONALLY ON YOUR APPEAL.

7 MS. CUMMINS: I WAS NOT ABLE TO RAISE THAT ON
8 APPEAL BECAUSE IT WAS IN THE OPINION WHEN THEY REVERSED THE
9 BREACH OF CONTRACT CLAIM, THE BREACH OF CONTRACT CLAIM HAD A
10 FORUM CLAUSE IN THERE WHICH MADE IT TEXAS. BUT SINCE THERE
11 WAS NO BREACH OF CONTRACT, TEXAS WASN'T THE PROPER FORUM. IT
12 SHOULD HAVE BEEN FEDERAL DISTRICT.

13 THE COURT: JUST A MINUTE. THAT DOESN'T IMPACT
14 LOLLAR. HOW DOES THAT IMPACT LOLLAR? THE JUDGMENT IN FAVOR
15 OF LOLLAR WAS NOT A CONTRACT CLAIM.

16 MS. CUMMINS: IT'S DEFAMATION.

17 THE COURT: THAT'S RIGHT.

18 MS. CUMMINS: IN CALIFORNIA.

19 THE COURT: BUT WHAT?

20 MS. CUMMINS: ALL OF THE ALLEGED DEFAMATION CLAIMS
21 STATED UNDER OATH ALL HAPPENED AFTER I LEFT TEXAS AND WENT
22 BACK TO CALIFORNIA. THAT HAVE BEEN THE JURISDICTION

23 THE COURT: NO. THAT'S GOES TO -- YOU KNOW, THE
24 CLAIM AGAINST LOLLAR WAS AFFIRMED. THE CLAIM BY LOLLAR WAS
25 AFFIRMED. AND THAT IS NOT AFFECTED BY A CONTRACTUAL FORUM
26 CLAUSE HERE, AS FAR AS I CAN SEE.

27 MS. CUMMINS: THE CLAIM FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT WAS
28 REVERSED. THERE WAS NO BREACH OF CONTRACT. THEY NEVER HAD

1 A BREACH OF CONTRACT CLAIM BETWEEN -- IT NEVER SHOULD HAVE
2 BEEN --

3 THE COURT: AND THAT JUDGMENT HAS NOW BEEN
4 VACATED, OKAY? THAT'S GONE. AND IT WILL BE GONE FROM HERE,
5 TOO. WE'RE GOING TO VACATE AND DISMISS THAT AS TO BAT
6 WORLD.

7 BUT THERE'S STILL A SUBSISTING JUDGMENT IN THE
8 AMOUNT OF SIX MILLION DOLLARS, PLUS, AGAINST YOU BY -- FROM
9 LOLLAR, WHICH IS -- AND I HAVE NOT HEARD ANYTHING THAT CALLS
10 THAT JUDGMENT INTO QUESTION.

11 IN FACT, THE HIGHEST COURT IN TEXAS HAVE -- OR THE
12 TEXAS INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURT AFFIRMED THAT. AND YOU
13 DIDN'T GET REVIEW OUT OF THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT. SO THAT
14 -- YOU KNOW, I THINK THAT'S GONE.

15 I THINK THAT'S WATER UNDER THE BRIDGE,
16 MS. CUMMINS.

17 MS. CUMMINS: WELL, THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT HAD
18 NO JURISDICTION OVER THE CASE BECAUSE IT WAS -- THE BREACH
19 OF CONTRACT WAS REVERSED.

20 THE COURT: NO. NO. THE PROBLEM -- YOUR PROBLEM
21 IS THAT THE TEXAS COURT, THE SAME TEXAS COURT THAT REVERSED
22 THE BREACH OF CONTRACT JUDGMENT, AFFIRMED THE JUDGMENT IN
23 FAVOR OF LOLLAR.

24 MS. CUMMINS: NO. THEY ONLY AFFIRMED THE
25 DEFAMATION CLAIM.

26 THE COURT: THEY AFFIRMED THE JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF
27 LOLLAR FOR SIX MILLION DOLLARS. THEY REVERSED THE \$187,000
28 IN FAVOR OF BAT WORLD.

1 MS. CUMMINS: YES, BUT THEY REVERSED THE BREACH OF
2 CONTRACT CLAIM. THAT WAS THE ONLY CLAIM THAT TEXAS
3 INTENTIONALLY FILED TO KEEP THE CASE IN TEXAS. IT SHOULDN'T
4 HAVE BEEN THERE. THEY ADMITTED IT. EVERYTHING HAPPENED IN
5 CALIFORNIA.

6 THE COURT: IT WAS HEARD IN TEXAS. IT WENT ALL
7 THE WAY THROUGH THE TEXAS COURTS. AND IT'S BEEN AFFIRMED BY
8 THE TEXAS COURT, REGARDLESS, OF WHETHER UNDER OTHER
9 CIRCUMSTANCES IT COULD HAVE BEEN BROUGHT THROUGH IN
10 CALIFORNIA INITIALLY. IT WAS ADJUDICATED THROUGH TEXAS AND
11 THE TEXAS COURTS HAVE SAID, "YES. THIS IS A VALID AND
12 SUBSISTING JUDGMENT, NOTWITHSTANDING THAT WE REVERSED THE
13 OTHER PART."

14 THE TEXAS COURTS HAVE ALREADY SPOKEN ON THIS. THE
15 TEXAS COURTS HAVE SAID, "EVEN IF WE REVERSED THE JUDGMENT IN
16 FAVOR OF BAT WORLD, NEVERTHELESS, THE JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF
17 LOLLAR STANDS."

18 MS. CUMMINS: YES. THE DEFAMATION CLAIM STANDS.

19 THE COURT: AND THAT'S THE SIX MILLION DOLLARS,
20 PLUS.

21 MS. CUMMINS: YES.

22 THE COURT: AND THE LEVY -- LEVY WAS ON BEHALF OF
23 BOTH. AND SO LET'S ASSUME THE LEVY WAS ON BEHALF OF BOTH.
24 ALL THE MONEY GOES TO LOLLAR. NONE OF IT GOES TO BAT WORLD.

25 WHY SHOULD IT BE ANY DIFFERENT THAN THAT? WE'VE
26 ALREADY HAD THE CLAIM OF EXEMPTION ISSUE. THAT'S ALREADY
27 BEEN DETERMINED. YOUR OBJECTIONS TO THE LEVY HAVE ALREADY
28 BEEN HEARD MONTHS AND MONTHS AGO.

1 SO, I THINK, MS. CUMMINS, YOU'RE OUT OF LUCK.
2 YOU'VE GOT A JUDGMENT AGAINST YOU NOW FOR IN EXCESS OF SIX
3 MILLION DOLLARS ON BEHALF OF MS. LOLLAR. THERE'S NO STAY OF
4 ANY KIND IN EFFECT AS TO ANYTHING. I THINK LOLLAR GETS THE
5 \$4,300 OR WHATEVER IT WAS THAT THEY LEVIED ON, ON THAT BANK
6 ACCOUNT.

7 I'M NOT QUITE SURE WHAT YOU THINK THERE'S LEFT TO
8 DISCUSS, IF ANYTHING.

9 MS. CUMMINS: I DON'T BELIEVE TEXAS JUDGMENT IS
10 VALID. THE ISSUE I RAISED IN MY AMENDED MOTION --

11 THE COURT: WHAT? WHAT YOU FILED YESTERDAY?

12 MS. CUMMINS: THAT WAS THE SOONEST I COULD FILE
13 IT.

14 THE COURT: OKAY. BUT WE'RE NOT DEALING WITH THE
15 AMENDED MOTION YESTERDAY BECAUSE THERE'S INSUFFICIENT NOTICE
16 TO THE OTHER SIDE. YOU HAVE NOT GOT A MOTION. THE AMENDED
17 MOTION IS NOT PROPERLY ON CALENDAR FOR IT.

18 MS. CUMMINS: THEN I WILL TALK TO THE CLERK IN
19 CHARGE OF SCHEDULING A HEARING ON THAT AMENDED MOTION.

20 THE COURT: WELL, FRANKLY, I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOUR
21 ISSUE IS. YOU'VE GOT A LITTLE -- ANOTHER PROBLEM HERE AND
22 THAT IS THAT ORDINARILY, MOTIONS TO CHALLENGE -- MOTION TO
23 VACATE A SISTER STATE JUDGMENT IS SUPPOSED TO BE FILED NOT
24 LATER THAN 30 DAYS AFTER SERVICE THE NOTICE OF ENTRY OF
25 JUDGMENT UNDER CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 1710.40, SUBDIVISION
26 (B).

27 MS. CUMMINS: YES, YOUR HONOR. AND I DID FILE THE
28 NOTICE TO VACATE THE JUDGMENT IN A TIMELY MANNER. AND AT

1 THE ORIGINAL HEARING, I BROUGHT UP THE --

2 THE COURT: BUT THIS MOTION, THIS MOTION WAS FILED
3 OVER TWO YEARS LATER. AND THAT'S THE NOVEMBER MOTION.

4 MS. CUMMINS: WHEN I HAD THE FIRST HEARING, I
5 INDICATED THAT -- LET ME FIND IT -- THAT THERE WAS AN APPEAL
6 IN TEXAS. AND THEN YOU STATED THAT THERE HAS TO BE A MOTION
7 OR HEARING IN THE ACTUAL COURT.

8 IF YOU TAKE A LOOK AT RULES OF PROCEDURE 1710.5,
9 IT STATES THAT, IT HAS TO BE APPEALED IN THE STATE.

10 THE COURT: MA'AM, YOU KEEP CITING IN YOUR PAPERS
11 TO SOMETHING CALLED CIVIL RULE 60. AND I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT
12 THAT IS SUPPOSED TO BE AS AUTHORITY FOR THIS STUFF.

13 MS. CUMMINS: THE CORRECT CODE IS CODE OF CIVIL
14 PROCEDURE 1710.50(A)(1): THE COURT SHALL GRANT A STAY OF
15 ENFORCEMENT WHERE: (1) AN APPEAL FROM THE SISTER STATE
16 JUDGMENT IS PENDING OR MAY BE TAKEN IN THE STATE WHICH
17 ORIGINALLY RENDERED THE JUDGMENT.

18 THAT'S WHAT I ARGUED EARLIER AND YOU SAID THERE
19 HAS TO BE SOMETHING PENDING IN THE ACTUAL DISTRICT COURT IN
20 TEXAS OR THE ORIGINAL JUDGEMENT WAS MADE.

21 THE COURT: WELL --

22 MR. WATTS: THIS ISSUE WAS ARGUED.

23 THE COURT: THIS ISSUE'S --

24 MR. WATTS: AND RULED ON.

25 THE COURT: THIS ISSUE WAS ARGUED AND DENIED. I
26 DON'T KNOW.

27 ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT,
28 MS. CUMMINS, IN TEXAS?

1 MS. CUMMINS: NO. YOU SAID -- I STATED THAT
2 THERE'S AN APPEAL IN THE STATE OF TEXAS. AND YOU SAID, NO,
3 THERE HAS TO BE A LEGAL ACTION IN THE ACTUAL DISTRICT COURT
4 IN TEXAS, WHICH IS LIKE OUR SUPERIOR COURT, WHERE THE
5 ORIGINAL JUDGMENT WAS MADE.

6 THE COURT: WELL, BUT THE POINT IS -- THE POINT
7 IS, MA'AM, THERE'S NOTHING PENDING ANYWHERE ELSE AT THIS
8 TIME. WHATEVER THAT ARGUMENT WAS, IS ACADEMIC NOW. YOUR
9 PROBLEM IS THAT THE LOLLAR JUDGMENT IS FINAL IN EVERY SENSE
10 OF FINALITY. AND THERE'S NO BAR TO ENFORCEMENT. THERE'S NO
11 STAY OF ANY TYPE.

12 MR. WATTS: YOUR HONOR, YOU DID AT THE LAST
13 HEARING ISSUE A STAY OF EXECUTION, AND I WOULD ASK THAT WE
14 REMOVE THAT STAY SO WE CAN PROCEED.

15 THE COURT: OKAY.

16 MR. WATTS: I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST -- THIS
17 IS OUR THIRD TIME IN FRONT OF YOU ARGUING THIS VACATION OF
18 SISTER STATE JUDGMENT. I'D ASK FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S
19 FEES.

20 THE COURT: I DON'T THINK THAT WAS IN YOUR PAPERS.
21 WAS IT IN YOUR OPPOSITION?

22 MR. WATTS: I --

23 THE COURT: IF YOU WISH TO SEEK AN AWARD OF
24 ATTORNEY'S FEES IN CONNECTION WITH THIS, GO AHEAD AND MAKE A
25 MOTION AND SUPPORT IT WITH THE APPROPRIATE DECLARATIONS.
26 AND WE'LL SEE WHERE WE ARE.

27 MR. WATTS: ONE OTHER ISSUE?

28 THE COURT: THE STATE PREVIOUSLY ORDERED, IN THIS

1 ACTION, IS VACATED. OKAY?

2 MR. WATTS: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.

3 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

4 MR. WATTS: I HAVE ANOTHER ISSUE, YOUR HONOR. THE
5 REMITTITUR WAS ISSUED ON THE APPEAL FOR THE BANK RECORDS. I
6 WOULD ASK THAT THE COURT ORDER THAT THE INITIAL SUBPOENA IS
7 VALID, AND ONE WEST BANK IS ORDERED TO PRODUCE THE DOCUMENTS
8 PURSUANT TO THAT SUBPOENA.

9 THE COURT: I THINK YOU NEED TO MAKE AN
10 APPLICATION.

11 I SEE AN ORDER DISMISSING OUT OF APPEAL, OUT OF
12 THE SECOND APPELLATE DIVISION -- SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT,
13 DIVISION EIGHT, AND --

14 MR. WATTS: I HAVE THE REMITTITUR ISSUED DECEMBER
15 9TH.

16 THE COURT: I HAVE NOT SEEN THAT YET. I HAVE THE
17 ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL. YOU CAN PACKAGE THAT UP IN ONE
18 THING, IF YOU WANT, OKAY? OR DIFFERENT PORTIONS OF THE SAME
19 MOTION, ALL RIGHT?

20 MR. WATTS: WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO SUBMIT --

21 THE COURT: OR YOU CAN MAKE IT MULTIPLE MOTIONS.
22 THESE ARE FAIRLY SIMPLE. AND GO ON THE COURT RESERVATION
23 SYSTEM AND GET A DATE FROM THEM. OKAY?

24 MR. WATTS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

25 THE COURT: THANK YOU, VERY MUCH.

26 (ADJOURNED AT 11:22 A.M.)

27

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPT 24 HON. ROBERT L. HESS, JUDGE

BAT WORLD SANCTUARY, ET AL,)
)
PLAINTIFF,)
VS) CASE NO.: BS140207
)
MARY CUMMINS,)
)
DEFENDANT.)
_____)

I, JANE HONG-ELSEY, C.S.R. NO. 11975, REPORTER OF THE
ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT, DO HEREBY CERTIFY:

THAT I AM A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER OF THE STATE
OF CALIFORNIA, DULY LICENSED TO PRACTICE; THAT I DID REPORT
IN STENOGRAPHY ORAL PROCEEDINGS, PAGES 1 TO 11 UPON HEARING OF
THE AFOREMENTIONED CAUSE AT THE TIME AND PLACE HEREIN BEFORE
SET FORTH; THAT THE FOREGOING CONSTITUTE TO THE BEST OF MY
KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, A FULL, TRUE, AND CORRECT
TRANSCRIPTION FROM MY SAID SHORTHAND NOTES SO TAKEN FOR THE
DATE JANUARY 7TH, 2016.

DATED AT RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA; JANUARY 9TH, 2016.



Jane Hong-Elsey

JANE HONG-ELSEY; C.S.R. , 11975