IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
GENERAL CIVIL DIVISION

NEIL J. GILLESPIE,
Plaintiff,

Case No. 05-CA-7205

-vs-

Division: "F"

BARKER, RODEMS & COOK, P.A. a Florida corporation; and WILLIAM J. COOK,

Defendants.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE:

HONORABLE JAMES M. BARTON, II

Circuit Judge

TAKEN AT:

In Chambers

George E. Edgecomb Courthouse

Tampa, Florida

DATE & TIME:

1 July 2008

REPORTED BY:

WILLIAM HERRMANN

Court Reporter Notary Public

STENOGRAPHICALLY RECORDED
COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

(ORIGINAL)

(COPY

ORIGINAL

Berryhill & Associates, Inc.
501 East Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 1225
Tampa, Florida 33602 (813) 229-8225

-		
	1	APPEARANCES:
	2	For the Plaintiff:
	3	ROBERT W. BAUER, ESQUIRE
		Robert W. Bauer, P.A.
	4	2815 NW 13th Street
		Gainesville, Florida 32609
	5	(352) 375-2518
	6	
	7	
		For the Defendants:
	8	
		RYAN C. RODEMS, ESQUIRE
	9	Barker, Rodems & Cook, P.A.
		400 North Ashley Drive
0	10	Suite 2100
		Tampa, Florida 33602
	11	(813) 489-1001
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
0	24	
	25	
		1

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: How are you-all this morning? MR. RODEMS: Good morning, Your Honor. MR. BAUER: How are you, Your Honor? 5 THE COURT: Good, good. All right, we're here 6 on a couple of matters in Gillespie versus Barker, 7 Rodems and Cook, PA. 8 MR. RODEMS: Yes. 9 THE COURT: First of all, there is a Motion 10 for Contempt against the plaintiff for not filling 11 out a Fact Information Sheet. 12 MR. RODEMS: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: Any progress on that? 14 MR. BAUER: Your Honor, we forwarded it to our 15 client to get him to fill it out. We have not 16 received it back as yet. 17 THE COURT: When did you forward it to him, 18 roughly? 19 MR. BAUER: Shortly after we received the 20 original order. And we forwarded it to him again.

We have also filed a Motion to Stay in light of the situation that we still have many issues pending. There may be awards that are granted to my client that will set off -- obviously, since it's appropriate for, you know, until all the judicial

21

22

23

24

work is done to determine exactly who owes what, it seems inappropriate to be passing back and forth money on different issues.

THE COURT: Well, this has nothing to do with money directly. It might lead to it, but it's just a simple two pages, three pages.

MR. BAUER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: That --

MR. RODEMS: Mr. Gillespie has not posted a bond. He could post a bond, also. He hasn't done that. So I mean, we just --

THE COURT: I mean, you know, that stays enforcement of the judgment, but even then, that -- it's a two page form that when somebody gets a judgment people are entitled to have it filled out, especially when I -- I believe I ordered it, did I not?

MR. RODEMS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So, I mean --

MR. BAUER: Your Honor, I'll request an additional 15 days. We'll again attempt to express to our client the importance of complying with the Court's mandate and, I mean, I don't have the information myself to be able to fill it out, otherwise of course, I would have.

```
I understand. You certainly can't
    THE COURT:
take charge of that business. Is Mr. Gillespie
local or is he --
    MR. BAUER: No, Your Honor, he's out of Ocala,
Gainesville.
    THE COURT: Within a couple hours of Tampa.
    MR. BAUER: Yes, sir.
    MR. RODEMS: We have attached a proposed
order, Your Honor, which basically makes a finding
that he hasn't complied with the Court's order and
directs him to have a certain amount of time to
comply or face --
    THE COURT: Dismissal of his complaint.
draft the order.
    MR. RODEMS: Okay.
    THE COURT: Let's make it clear.
    MR. BAUER: Understood.
    THE COURT:
                Ten days.
    MR. BAUER:
                Yes, sir.
    MR. RODEMS: Your Honor --
    THE COURT:
                Which, I mean, there might not be
that left of it anyway.
    MR. RODEMS: That's the point that I was going
to make is that that remedy of law may not carry
```

the day depending upon what happens with the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

remainder of this morning's hearing time, so that's why we sought incarceration. I know this is my --

MR. BAUER: I don't think there's -- I'm sorry for interrupting. I apologize.

MR. RODEMS: There is -- my partner just went through a similar situation in Pasco County and of course I'm not suggesting that you have to follow the basic -- but this was sort of the procedure that my partner told me the Court followed in that case. And so we would ask --

THE COURT: I mean, the normal -- and in

County Court I did this hundreds, if not thousands of times. It was actually much more common in

County Court than Circuit Court, for a lot of reasons. But in any event, normally it was in the context of a debt collection that was a one or two count complaint and no counterclaim. So the only thing you could do was try to get somebody's attention. Normally once you got their attention -- and out of those hundreds there were maybe a handful over the years that we actually had them picked up, taken to jail. We then had them brought over immediately, the same day they were arrested. And then, oh, all I have to do is do a ten minute deposition or fill out this form? Yes.

1 You know, when can we do it? Then we would 2 let them out. If it's a form we put them in a 3 room, give them, you know, 15 minutes or however long they needed to fill it out. But I don't know 5 that we're going to need to get to that point. I 6 would hope not in something like this. 7 And I don't know -- have you communicated with 8 your client orally at all? I'm not seeking for any 9 content, just I mean, are the lines of 10 communication open there or --11 MR. BAUER: Yes, Your Honor, my office has 12 communicated with him orally. I have not 13 personally, but I have directed members of my staff 14 to call him and tell him the importance of filling 15 this out, that it needs to be filled out. 16 THE COURT: Specifically that this was on the 17

table today?

MR. BAUER: Yes, Your Honor.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Again, so that -- we'll see, I might, depending on how I rule on your motion, and again, it's a motion for judgment on the pleadings.

MR. RODEMS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: As opposed to summary judgment, although looking through your memo on page 4,

8

on the allegations of the complaint and exhibits 3 attached thereto, there are several bases to grant 4 summary judgment in defendant's favor --MR. RODEMS: Yes. sir. 6 THE COURT: -- I guess that was a slip of 7 the --MR. RODEMS: The was the proverbial slip of 9 the word processer, it should have been to grant 10 judgment on the pleadings. THE COURT: And I suppose that, I don't know if that was a Freudian slip or not, but I mean, so 13 much of this as we have gone over in prior hearings is factually driven. And I know you're trying to 15 rely on a rule of law that says that if one 16 attaches exhibits to a complaint or any other 17 pleading, for that matter, then the attachments, 18 the exhibits become part and parcel of the pleading 19 itself. I know that's what you're relying on. 20 MR. RODEMS: Yes, sir. 21 But in any event, your position is THE COURT: 22 fairly clear in your motion. Anything else you 23 want to tell me this morning? MR. RODEMS: No, sir. If you have reviewed 25 the motion and you're satisfied that you understand

paragraph 7, at the very bottom of page 4: Based

1

2

5

11

12

14

my position, then I have nothing to add. I'll just reserve whatever I have to the conclusion.

THE COURT: Yeah, I usually find that to be more productive.

MR. RODEMS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So what would the plaintiff say about this?

MR. BAUER: Your Honor, we've also filed a motion in response. I don't know if the Court -- it was a long time ago, it was back in October. And I think clearly the key issues that we have -- the Court has already heard this once and raised the issues that there are different factual allegations, there have been statements made. We have to assume in proper pleading that any of the allegations that we make if you're going to rule in a motion for judgment on the pleadings, that they are true as alleged only for the purpose of judgment on the pleadings.

It clearly indicates that there is an issue of fact of whether or not there was any oral modifications to the contract that was made between the parties and whether there was any fraud that went on between the parties. It cannot be determined straightly from the pleadings whether or

not -- it can be -- also I'm still very concerned about the issue that these exact allegations were raised initially at the very beginning of this case in a motion to dismiss before a different Judge.

That Judge specifically ruled that excluding I believe four inflammatory sentences, that the pleading itself even though pro se, was properly -- perfectly proper, withstood the Motion to Dismiss, properly stated a cause of action. And the Court ruled.

This motion for judgment on the pleadings serves to be nothing more than appellate review within the Court itself because a new Judge has been assigned. We don't believe that's proper.

Further, a review of the case law clearly shows that it's always the position of the Court to best Judge this on the facts and allege them and look at them, not move on summary judgments or motions on the pleading unless it's absolutely, unequivocally clear that the moving party's entitled to them. The Court much prefers to adjudicate these issues on the facts themselves, move forward on the merits.

We had discussed previously that if the Court wished to grant this motion on the pleadings it

would be appropriate to allow us to amend our complaint. And I apologize, somehow I missed the case that I have specifically on point on that issue. I'll be happy to forward that to the Court and opposing counsel after this hearing. Even if the Court grants the motion for judgment on the pleadings it is appropriate to allow us to amend our complaint, if it's nothing more than a failure to state a cause of action if we're capable of fixing those issues, we should be able to fix such issues. And as if the Court grants this motion we would request that it's granted with leave to amend in 20 days.

THE COURT: Clearly the exhibits show that the plaintiff signed a number of documents acknowledging -- whereby he acknowledged that this \$50,000 that was sent to the defendant, it would be going to the defendant, was for this that and the other. And I think -- how is it that the plaintiff seeks to get around those? And there are exhibits I think to the complaint about it.

MR. BAUER: Your Honor, our client will present evidence and testify to the fact that he was misled as to the meaning of those documents, specifically that he understood the \$50,000 was

going to the defendants in this action. But there was fraud committed in procuring those documents in the first place in that he was advised that the defendants must get the \$50,000, that it was pursuant to a court order, that the Court in the class action had approved this award, had moved it forward and said this is what must happen if this is going to settle. He thought that was wrong in the first place, but felt that because it was a court order that he must comply -- that the attorney's fees awarded was court ordered, he was advised by his attorney that this was the most he could get because an attorney was not entitled to split attorney's fees with -- which if it was a court order that would be true. However, in a settlement negotiation the attorney could have negotiated a higher return for his client and a lower agreement of what the attorney's fees would have been paid for.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I modify my attorney's fees all the time in the interest of making sure that a settlement goes through. And I believe my client will be able to proffer that testimony to the jury. The jury will determine whether or not they believe that testimony, whether fraud was committed in procuring

that document. And I think that's the crux of our argument and that's where there is a factual dispute. Did those discussions go on? Did that fraud happen?

THE COURT: What about on the pure breach of contract, Count 1? If you look at -- here is the contract. They're all kinds of written agreements and then again you got letters. I mean, wasn't there -- don't Exhibits 4 and 5 to the complaint show that the plaintiff authorized the defendant in writing to negotiate a settlement for him and that -- in that underlying case that party was going to pay the fees?

MR. BAUER: Your Honor, yes, he did negotiate and he authorized the defendant to negotiate fees for him. And that's the whole problem is — authorized him to, it was contractually provided for that he would negotiate for my client's settlement with my client's interests in mind. I think clearly from the settlement there was a breach of that contract, that he did not settle — or he did not enter negotiate — it was a failure of the agreement, which simply is if Your Honor was to contract for a house to be painted and for it to be properly painted and everything to be conducted

in the proper manner, if you painted the house and left huge spots of unpainted areas, that would be a breach of contract. It wouldn't be a negligence count because --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BAUER: And so in the same vein a failure to negotiate for an individual on a proper contractual basis, do that properly and come out with a good settlement, that's a breach of contract. There is places the paint brush didn't touch, things that didn't get -- otherwise, the 57.105 that awarded attorney's fees under the -- under my client's improper forwarding an Economic Loss Rule, barring him and negligence counts, then we should go, okay, fine.

If, if -- this isn't a breach of contract, it's a negligence count, it's one of two of those things. It's either -- it can be intentional fraud or it can be negligence or it can be intentional fraud and breach of contract. Which is it? And it's either going to -- and we've had arguments in the past that --

THE COURT: What? More precise breach or -MR. RODEMS: The breach of the contract is his
failure to negotiate in my client's interests.

THE COURT: Which would have what, in theory would have gotten him more than the \$2,000?

MR. BAUER: Yes, Your Honor. Because if they had breached -- if they had spoke with the other side and said: Look, you're willing to give us I believe some \$60,000 or plus more, that's what you're willing to settle for. You don't focus on who's getting attorney's fees paid or whether my clients getting paid, whether you're mad at them or whether you're mad at us, what's going on. Let's do this in a straight settlement negotiation.

Let's say it's \$60,000 is what we're settling for, I'll take my fees pursuant to the contract that I already have.

They slipped out of the contract that they had that was for 40 percent and they ended up with \$50,000 and my client only getting \$2,000. That's nowhere near -- and I'm roughly quoting the numbers. I'm a little off. But I think clearly that is a failure -- either a failure of a contract or it's a tort. It's one or the other. And if -- there was a motion to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action, there was Economic Loss Rules that were entered, and clearly we had an establishment at the beginning of this case that

this was a contract and it was a fraud issue by the motions to dismiss that were originally filed.

If we're going to go back and revisit that

Motion to Dismiss we need to go back to that time

and allow us then to say, fine, if we're going to

go back and revisit everything from the beginning

and say this is not a contract or a fraud case,

then it's going to be a fraud plus other torts. We

need to be given the opportunity to either assert

this is a contract or assert this as a tort,

because the fraud issue is a time, the fraud is in

the beginning, then it's either a breach of

contract at the time with the contract subsequent

or it's a tort at the same time as the breach of

contract. We need to know which it is. We'll be

happy to plead which one -- whichever one it is,

but we need a solid position.

The previous Court ruled there was a contract and a fraud issue. If this Court is going to rule it's not a breach of contract issue, we need to go back, amend this and say, okay fine, now this is a fraud and it's a tort.

THE COURT: He's claiming that he should have gotten a little over \$6,000 more than he actually got?

MR. BAUER: At the very least, Your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: Well, what about at the most? I think that's what you put in your memo that that's what he seems to be asking for, that he got two and he should have gotten -- in fact, there's a very specific amount, \$6,224 and 78 cents.

MR. BAUER: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. RODEMS: Yes, sir. He specifically said the breach was not in calculating the fee according to the contract. And he put a specific amount that he said he was owed. He did not allege that there was a breach by failing to negotiate in his client's best interest. That's something he just made up this morning. That's not part of the complaint.

THE COURT: I wondered about that. Because that could in theory, who knows what that number is? If you didn't negotiate in good faith, you know, of roughly 52,000 they paid total, the law firm should have gotten at most — let's throw some numbers out of the air — 20,000, and my client should have gotten 42,000, let's say. Or any other combination that would have to — I don't know if we did it right, but whatever adds up to \$52,000.

1 Well, I suppose again if that failure to negotiate 2 on behalf of the client in good faith is what is 3 now being claimed is a breach. 4 MR. RODEMS: Well, that's not in the 5 complaint. We're a long way down the road here and 6 to be honest, Judge, that's just a drowning man 7 reaching for a stick. The bottom line here is 8 this, Mr. Gillespie participated and directed the 9 negotiations. He told us what to ask for. He knew 10 that he had a claim for his damages. He knew that 11 there was also a claim for court ordered attorney's 12 fees --13 MR. BAUER: Objection, Your Honor, that's 14 issues -- we're talking about a motion for judgment 15 on the pleading. 16 THE COURT: Right. 17 MR. BAUER: These are facts being alleged way 18 outside --19 THE COURT: Well, I assume he'll -- now that 20 you called him on it, say, well, Judge, that's in 21 exhibit whatever, that's in the complaint or 22 whatever. 23 MR. RODEMS: That's exactly what I think --

MR. BAUER: Your Honor --

MR. RODEMS: Excuse me.

25

THE COURT: Well, let him try.

MR. RODEMS: That's Exhibit Number 4 and Exhibit Number 5. And these are the documents that Mr. Gillespie attached.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RODEMS: Exhibit 4: Dear Neil, this confirms that you authorized us to appeal the decision in the above referenced case. We will not be filing a new lawsuit in State Court. In addition, you authorized us to demand 1,000 to settle your claim plus 50,000 in attorney's fees and costs.

Exhibit 5 is a letter from Mr. Gillespie to Mr. Cook. And it's relating to that previous letter, Exhibit 4. And he says in terms of why the case hasn't settled, I believe the sticking point is your request for 50,000 in attorney's fees and costs. I do not believe that the request of a thousand dollars for myself and Mrs. Longfield is a very good settlement.

Then he goes on to say: Given your lack of success in this matter thus far I suggest you ask for 10,000 in attorney's fees and costs.

So Mr. Gillespie directed and participated in the settlement negotiations. He knew that we were

```
1
     asking for money for him and he knew that we were
2
     asking for money for the attorney's fees and costs.
3
          MR. BAUER: Objection, hearsay.
 4
          MR. RODEMS: Then when the settlement
5
     occurred --
6
          THE COURT:
                      What?
7
          MR. BAUER:
                      Objection, Your Honor, hearsay.
8
          THE COURT: I think he's trying to argue from
9
     an exhibit and not --
          MR. BAUER: Yes, Your Honor, but that would
10
11
     have to be some type of verified or sworn affidavit
12
     or something for the Court to be able to support a
13
     summary judgment or motion for judgment on the
14
     pleading type issue. Those aren't verified,
15
     thev're --
16
          THE COURT: The letters aren't?
17
          MR. BAUER:
                      No, Your Honor.
18
          THE COURT:
                      Well, they might not be, but if
19
     the party attaches an exhibit, particularly an
20
     exhibit that the party not only represented party
21
     but a pro se party says attaches an exhibit saying;
22
     here's a letter that I wrote; I'm going to feel
23
     fairly comfortable relying on that unless in the
24
     complaint the litigant either with or without
25
     counsel saying, Exhibit 4 has my name and purported
```

1 signature on it, but it's a forgery. Then I'll 2 draw that conclusion. But I don't see how I can 3 disregard an exhibit that a party has signed. I 4 mean, it might not give the movement here all of 5 the, you know, inferences that they want, but I 6 don't see how you can say that it's hearsay when 7 the party that wrote it says here's a letter that I 8 wrote, I'm attaching it as Exhibit 4 or 5. 9 MR. BAUER: Objection still. 10 THE COURT: Pardon? 11 MR. BAUER: Just I renew the objection. 12 THE COURT: Okay, that's fine. I'm overruling

MR. RODEMS: In addition, Your Honor, following the conclusion of the settlement
Mr. Gillespie signed a closing statement, which is required by the rules regulating the Florida Bar.
And that's Exhibit 2, which Mr. Gillespie attached.
He's also signed it, as did Mr. Cook. This is what

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it.

I acknowledge that Amscot Corporation separately paid my attorneys \$50,000 to compensate my

it says, quote: In signing this closing statement

attorneys for their claim against Amscot for Court awarded attorney's fees and costs.

And he signed that. He knew that Amscot paid

for Rodems and Cook \$50,000 for it's attorney's fees and costs. He knew that. He knew that he was getting \$2,000. This is what Mr. Gillespie agreed to, Your Honor. He agreed to this. Then he files a breach of contract action and says, yeah, I know I agreed to it, but I've come up with a different interpretation of the contract and I should get the benefit of this contract.

Well, the contract says clearly that the defendant may pay some or all of Mr. Gillespie's attorney's fees. And that's in fact what happened in this case. Mr. Gillespie's attorney's fees were paid entirely by the defendant. Entirely. And he knew it.

So when you look at the contract,

Mr. Gillespie paid zero percent for attorney's

fees, zero. The defendant paid all his attorney's

fees. Mr. Gillespie didn't have to dip into his

pocket to pay one penny of it. In fact, he got

\$2,000 out of settling the case.

Now, this lawsuit arose under the Truth in Lending Act which has a fee shifting provision.

That's how we were able to negotiate a separate amount for our attorney's fees and costs.

Mr. Gillespie's own letters and closing statement

affirmed that he understood that we were negotiating for our attorney's fees separately. So we have not charged Mr. Gillespie any fee in this case. And Mr. Gillespie expressly agreed to our law firm being paid \$50,000 for its claim for court ordered attorney's fees.

I mean, clearly Judge, there is no facts in dispute there. You have the documents in front of you that Mr. Gillespie filed with this exhibit. If you look at what we got paid for attorney's fees and costs and you compare that to what Mr. Gillespie paid out of his pocket for attorney's fees and costs, he paid zero. Amscot paid 100 percent of his attorney's fees and costs.

So in this case Mr. Gillespie ended up being better off than if there had been no fee shifting provision. If there had been no fee shifting provision we wouldn't have been able to get \$50,000 from Amscot, we would have gotten 2,000 for Mr. Gillespie and he would have paid 40 percent of that 2000 for attorney's fees.

The Truth in Lending Act is one of those laws, one of those laws, Your Honor, that exists with a fee shifting provision because otherwise the amounts at issue would be too small to retain

competent counsel. So there's been no breach of contract by Barker, Rodems and Cook, because we haven't charged Mr. Gillespie any fee.

As far as the claim against Mr. Cook individually, Mr. Cook was not a party to the contract. The contract was between Barker, Rodems and Cook and Mr. Gillespie. So Mr. Cook should be dismissed from this litigation.

Barker, Rodems and Cook should be dismissed from the breach of contract claim because it hasn't breached the contract, the documents Mr. Gillespie filed show that, along with a copy of the contract.

And then as far as the fraud claim is concerned, Mr. Gillespie's saying in his complaint they told me that this was for court ordered fees. But the documents show that Mr. Gillespie signed that he acknowledged that it was a 50,000-dollar settlement to compensate his attorneys for their claim against Amscot, their court ordered attorney's fees and costs, not in satisfaction of a court order.

Now when the documents attached to a lawsuit differ from the allegations in the lawsuit, the documents control. I have cited those cases in my motion, Your Honor. So Mr. Gillespie can say the

cow jumped over the moon; if the document says the cow did not jump over the moon you have to go with the document. And in this case Mr. Gillespie acknowledged that Barker, Rodems and Cook would be paid \$50,000 to settle their claim for Court awarded attorney's fees and costs.

So there has been no fraud. He cannot rely on a statement as he alleges. We have to take all of his factual allegations as true. He says he relied on the statement that the attorney's fees were for a Court awarded attorney's fee. So let's accept that as true. But now let's compare that to the closing statement that he signed and that he attached as Exhibit 2 and he acknowledges that it wasn't for court ordered attorney's fees, it was for a claim for court ordered attorney's fees.

So we have to go with the clear unequivocal document that Mr. Gillespie signed. And if that was the only thing that would be sufficient, but if you look at Exhibit 4 and 5, it's clear that Mr. Gillespie knew that we were negotiating a settlement. It's clear that he knew that. Exhibit 4 is a letter from Mr. Cook to him talking about the settlement negotiations. Exhibit 5 is Mr. Gillespie's letter telling us how to do the

settlement negotiations. He knew that we were trying to settle. He knew that when we did settle that they paid us \$50,000 for our claim for court ordered attorney's fees and costs. And there is -- therefore, he can't meet the reliance element of proving a fraud claim.

THE COURT: I don't understand your -- I mean,
I understand your rational of saying that there is
an allegation in the complaint that is then
essentially rebutted by an exhibit, then the
exhibit controls. That's certainly a general rule.

MR. RODEMS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: But if that were the case there would never be fraud complaints and fraud actions, because that's the essence of a fraud count. I allege, yes, I signed a document because the person that gave it to me said that he needed something for me to sign so I could get my roof fixed.

However, I did not sell my property to this person and so therefore attached to this complaint is Exhibit A, which is a warranty deed, which I did sign, but that the defendant said that they just needed that so they could show to somebody to do this, that or the other. I mean, you could think of any number of facts that are alleged in fraud

complaints. And those are never dismissed because the very essence of the complaint is to obviate the effectiveness of the written document, whether it's a deed or a mortgage or a note or whatever it is.

MR. RODEMS: Your Honor, may I point out to you that the Court in Taylor Woodrow Homes, 850 So.2d 536, stated, quote: The Courts have held that a party may not recover in fraud for an alleged false statement when proper disclosure of the truth is subsequently revealed in a written agreement between the parties.

That is exactly on point with this case, Your Honor. Mr. Gillespie is saying they told me this was for court ordered fees. A subsequent written agreement, Exhibit 2, is the closing statement.

And in that closing statement that Mr. Gillespie signed it says: I acknowledge that Amscot

Corporation separately paid my attorneys \$50,000 to compensate my attorneys for their claim against

Amscot for Court awarded fees and costs.

So subsequent written agreement, he's acknowledging that it was the settlement of a claim for fees. It's the whole premise of his fraud complaint is that we told him that the Court

awarded 50,000 in fees.

Now, we could tell you, Judge, that's not what happened, but on a motion for judgment on the pleadings we have to accept that as true. Unless it's directly contradicted by a written document, which it is in this case. He clearly signed a document saying that he understood we were being paid \$50,000 for our claim for court awarded fees. And because that is a subsequently revealed written agreement between the parties that shows that the 50,000 was for a claim for fees and not for a court awarded fee any statements he makes --

THE COURT: But again, drawing all inferences in favor of the plaintiff here, you could sign a closing statement that says, yeah, they settled that claim for Court awarded fees because it could have been a whole lot more than that and that's what they settled for. I mean, I don't know what the ultimate facts are going to be determined here, but to me that's not one that totally rebuts the best case scenario by this plaintiff.

Now, the question is, because I do with your other point, if this is fraud, and if it's established as fraud, this is not fraud in the inducement, this is fraud in the performance.

Because I don't even think that either the plaintiff or the plaintiff's counsel, you correct me if I have an erroneous impression, believes that that's what they intended to do when they entered into this contract, because I don't think they had any idea they were going to be this successful in terms of getting this amount of fees or any fees at all. So that has to be fraud in the performance, which I think the case law is clear, you don't have a separate fraud count for that, that's folded into any breach of contract action that you have. Seems to me.

So I'm going to -- I am going to grant the motion for Count -- as to Count 2, the fraud count. But would be ruling that the allegations in the fraud count will be -- if they're not -- are they arguably part of your Count 1, the breach of contract count?

MR. BAUER: Your Honor, Count 1-7 references paragraphs 1 through 6. Paragraph 6 -- paragraph 6 alleges the law firm -- referencing Barker, Rodems and Cook, and I believe all individually Mr. Cook was the intent. That was not satisfied with the contractual entitlement, 45 percent of the total recovery for attorney's fees and wanted more money.

So I believe that arguably it does incorporate those allegations of fraud entered to the contract count.

But if Your Honor -- to clarify things, so is the Court just making a ruling that we're incorporated, we'll be happy to amend the complaint so that there is a clear pleading record to show that everything is contained in the breach of contract count.

THE COURT: And wasn't the contract between the plaintiff and the defendant law firm as opposed to Cook individually?

MR. BAUER: No, Your Honor. Actually, because there was a predecessor law firm that originally had this contract and the predecessor law firm broke up. It went into a secondary law firm.

There was an attempt to forward a new contract to the client. That contract was never entered into, it was never signed.

Previously counsel has alleged that there actually -- in this Court has alleged that there actually was an assigned contract. However, an attempt to file discovery and request those documents all we have received back are -- we have not received a proper response as far as pleadings.

We received an e-mail that e-mailed us everything that we already had and stated that there was no further documents that existed.

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

We would request that prior to the Court entering a dismissal individually that the Court either make a determination that there was automatically some assignment and there was a corporate veil established, which I don't think there's an argument out there that exists. were two potential entities that were working the contract. After the dissolution of the first entity that was the professional, Mr. Cook himself, who's personally liable. And then he was working with the corporation. And I'm sure their resources were used on this. They're libel for everything that goes on with this. I think we're going to need either some factual findings that show some type of separation on those two, or their failure to properly issue a new contract after the other one was dissolved or not properly assigned open them up to liability. I mean, that's why we have all of our corporate shields, that's why we all have our very specific steps. I think unless they can produce a signed contract --

THE COURT: Well, we're here on the judgment

1 on the pleadings, so I'm not --2 MR. BAUER: Well, Your Honor, I believe there 3 is actually -- this issue was dealt with on the 4 first motion and opposing has brought this up. 5 the Court issued an order on that dismissing -- am 6 I not correct? Dismissing Mr. Cook individually. 7 MR. RODEMS: Correct. 8 MR. BAUER: I don't believe that --9 MR. RODEMS: That's not an issue. 10 MR. BAUER: Well, it was brought up by 11 opposing counsel --12 THE COURT: Yeah, I just heard you --13 MR. BAUER: Yes, I was going to file a motion 14 for relief from judgment due to mistake or error. 15 Well, since it's been brought up --16 THE COURT: You need to move to have the Court 17 readdress it. 18 MR. RODEMS: Your Honor, if I understand your 19 ruling correctly, you're granting the motion for 20 judgment on the pleadings as to Count 2, the fraud 21 count? 22 THE COURT: Yes. 23 MR. RODEMS: Okay. 24 THE COURT: But with the understanding that 25 the allegations, again, they're either expressly or

```
1
     implicitly a part of Count 1, could be part of the
2
     evidence of Count 1 breach, unless there is a need
3
     or a desire to amend Count 1.
4
          MR. BAUER: There's -- if the Court doesn't
5
     want that I'll be happy to leave --
6
          THE COURT: I mean, I don't want to -- again
7
     counsel, you're perfectly aware of these
8
     allegations and the alleged statements that were
9
     either made or not made, but --
10
          MR. RODEMS: Yes, sir. So Count 1, the breach
11
     of contract claim as to Barker, Rodems and Cook, PA
12
     survives?
13
          THE COURT: Yes.
14
          MR. RODEMS: And Count 2 --
15
          THE COURT: Temporarily.
16
          MR. RODEMS: Yes.
17
          THE COURT: You have ten days.
18
          MR. RODEMS: Yes. Judgment on the pleadings
19
     has been granted as to Count 2 --
20
                      Oh, I understand.
          MR. BAUER:
21
          MR. RODEMS: And then as far as the motion for
22
     contempt, you would like me to redraft that order
23
     so that it provides that if compliance is not met
24
     within ten days that Mr. Gillespie's complaint
```

25

shall be dismissed.

1 THE COURT: Yeah. And also, I'm going to 2 reserve ruling to impose additional sanctions, 3 because all this is intended to get his attention to fill out this two page form. While I understand 5 that the case is being appealed or is that --6 MR. BAUER: Yes, Your Honor. The award of 7 attorney's fees is being appealed. 8 THE COURT: Not the judgment itself. 9 MR. BAUER: Yes. Well, Your Honor, the 10 judgment and the award were incorporated together. 11 THE COURT: All right. So again, they're 12 entitled to have him fill out this form even while 13 the appeal is going on. I would say even with a 14 stay order. I mean, they can't just try to execute 15 on a judgment that has been stayed, but 16 nevertheless, they could still set him down even 17 for a deposition in aide of execution. 18 deposition in aide. They just can't flat out use 19 the information they got to garnish wages or 20 execute or levy on property or -- see what I'm 21 saying? 22 MR. BAUER: Are you saying, Your Honor, that 23 you have granted -- I admit it has not been noticed 24 for today, but if we can just get rid of this as

opposing counsel is we will comply with the ten

```
day, get it filled out, but the Court is granting
the motion to stay?
     THE COURT: No. I'm saying if -- I'm saying
even if a judgment has been stayed --
    MR. BAUER: My apologies.
     THE COURT: -- a party can depose people in
aide of execution or have him fill out this form.
    MR. RODEMS: We want to be on record as saying
that we do oppose a stay. I know it's not brought
up for hearing today but --
    MR. BAUER: I just misunderstood what the
Court was saving.
     THE COURT: Okay.
    MR. RODEMS: I'll circulate a proposed order
to Mr. Bauer and then send them on to you --
                Is that ten days as of today or of
    MR. BAUER:
the signing of the order?
    THE COURT:
                Today.
    MR. BAUER:
                Thank you.
     THE COURT: If you can get it over, but, you
know, don't delay in getting it over.
    MR. RODEMS: Yes, sir. I will have one on
Mr. Barton's -- or on Mr. Bauer's e-mail before he
even arrives back in Gainesville.
```

THE COURT: Great. All right, thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E
2	STATE OF FLORIDA
3	COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH
4	
5	I, WILLIAM HERRMANN, Court Reporter for the
6	Circuit Court of the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit of
7	the State of Florida, in and for Hillsborough County,
8	DO HEREBY CERTIFY, that I was authorized to
9	and did, report in shorthand the proceedings and
10	evidence in the above-styled cause, as stated in
11	the caption hereto, and that the foregoing pages
12	constitute a true and correct transcription of my
13	shorthand report of said proceedings and evidence.
14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
15	in the City of Tampa, County of Hillsborough, State
16	of Florida, this 4 July 2008.
17	WILLIAM HERRMANN, Court Reporter.
18	
19	s/William Herrmann
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

A	allegation 26:9	14:21	19:7,10 37:8	behalf 18:2
able 4:24 11:10	allegations 8:2	arose 22:21	automatically	believe 4:16
12:22 20:12	9:14,16 10:2	arrested 6:24	31:7	10:6,14 12:22
22:23 23:18	24:23 25:9	arrives 35:24	award 12:6	12:24 15:6
above-styled	29:15 30:2	Ashley 2:9	34:6,10	19:16,18
37:10	32:25 33:8	asking 17:5	awarded 12:11	29:22 30:1
absolutely	allege 10:17	20:1,2	14:12 21:24	32:2,8
10:19	17:12 26:16	assert 16:9,10	25:6,11 27:21	believes 29:3
accept 25:11	alleged 9:18	assigned 10:14	28:1,8,12,16	benefit 22:8
28:4	18:17 26:25	30:22 31:20	awards 3:23	Berryhill 1:23
acknowledge	27:10 30:20	assignment	aware 33:7	best 10:17
21:21 27:18	30:21 33:8	31:7		17:14 28:21
acknowledged	alleges 25:8	Associates 1:23	B	better 23:16
11:16 24:17	29:21	assume 9:15	back 3:16 4:2	bond 4:10,10
25:4	allow 11:1,7	18:19	9:10 16:3,4,6	bottom 8:1 18:
acknowledges	16:5	attached 5:8 8:3	16:21 30:24	Boulevard 1:2
25:14	amend 11:1,7	19:4 21:18	35:24	breach 13:5,21
acknowledging	11:12 16:21	24:22 25:14	Bar 21:17	14:3,9,16,20
11:16 27:23	30:6 33:3	26:20	Barker 1:6 2:9	14:23,24
Act 22:22 23:22	amount 5:11	attaches 8:16	3:6 24:2,6,9	16:12,14,20
action 10:9 11:9	17:7,11 22:24	20:19,21	25:4 29:21	17:10,13 18:
12:1,6 15:23	29:7	attaching 21:8	33:11	22:5 24:1,10
22:5 29:11	amounts 23:25	attachments	barring 14:14	29:11,17 30:
actions 26:14	Amscot 21:21	8:17	BARTON 1:12	33:2,10
add 9:1	21:23,25	attempt 4:21	Barton's 35:23	breached 15:4
addition 19:10	23:13,19	30:17,23	Based 8:1	24:11
21:14	24:19 27:18	attention 6:19	bases 8:3	broke 30:16
additional 4:21	27:21	6:20 34:3	basic 6:8	brought 6:23
34:2	anyway 5:22	attorney 12:12	basically 5:9	32:4,10,15
34:2 adds 17:25	apologies 35:5	12:13,16	basis 14:8	35:9
adus 17:23 adjudicate	apologize 6:4	attorneys 21:22	Bauer 2:3,3 3:4	brush 14:10
3	11:2	21:23 24:18	3:14,19 4:7,20	business 5:2
10:22	appeal 19:7	27:19,20	5:4,7,17,19	
admit 34:23 advised 12:3,12	34:13	attorney's	6:3 7:11,18	C
,	appealed 34:5,7	12:11,14,18	9:8 11:22	C 2:8 3:1
affidavit 20:11	APPEARAN	12:20 14:12	13:14 14:6	calculating
affirmed 23:1	2:1	15:8 18:11	15:3 17:1,8	17:10
ago 9:10	appellate 10:12	19:11,17,23	18:13,17,24	call 7:14
agreed 22:3,4,6	appropriate	20:2 21:24	20:3,7,10,17	called 18:20
23:4	3:25 11:1,7	22:1,11,12,16	21:9,11 29:19	capable 11:9
agreement	approved 12:6	22:17,24 23:2	30:13 32:2,8	caption 37:11
12:18 13:23	areas 14:2	23:6,10,12,14	32:10,13 33:4	carry 5:24
27:12,16,22	arguably 29:17	23:21 24:20	33:20 34:6,9	case 1:5 6:10
28:10	30:1	25:6,10,11,15	34:22 35:5,11	10:3,15 11:3
agreements	argue 20:8	25:16 26:4	35:15,16,19	13:12 15:25
	_	29:25 34:7	Bauer's 35:23	16:7 19:8,16
13:7	armirant 12.0			
aide 34:17,18	argument 13:2			1
aide 34:17,18 35:7 air 17:22	31:9 arguments	29:23 34:7 authorized 13:10,15,17	beginning 10:3 15:25 16:6,12	22:12,20 23:4 23:15 25:3

26:13 27:13	client's 13:18	21:2,15	32:6,7 37:12	21:10,12,23
28:6,21 29:9	13:19 14:13	conducted	correctly 32:19	23:5 24:15,19
34:5	14:25 17:14	13:25	costs 19:12,18	24:21 25:5,11
cases 24:24	closing 21:16,20	confirms 19:7	19:23 20:2	25:15,16 26:3
cause 10:9 11:9	22:25 25:13	constitute 37:12	21:24 22:2,24	26:7,13 27:7
15:23 37:10	27:16,17	contained 30:8	23:11,13,14	27:15,21,25
cents 17:7	28:15	contempt 3:10	24:20 25:6	28:8,11,13,16
certain 5:11	collection 6:16	33:22	26:4 27:21	30:5,10,21
certainly 5:1	combination	content 7:9	counsel 11:5	31:4,5,25 32:5
26:11	17:24	context 6:16	20:25 24:1	32:12,16,16
CERTIFY 37:8	come 14:8 22:6	contract 9:22	29:2 30:20	32:22,24 33:4
Chambers 1:13	comfortable	13:6,7,21,24	32:11 33:7	33:6,13,15,17
charge 5:2	20:23	14:3,10,16,20	34:25	34:1,8,11 35:1
charged 23:3	committed 12:2	14:24 15:13	count 6:17 13:6	35:3,6,12,13
24:3	12:25	15:15,20 16:1	14:4,17 26:15	35:18,20,25
Circuit 1:1,1,12	common 6:13	16:7,10,13,13	29:10,14,14	36:2 37:5,6,17
6:14 37:6,6	communicated	16:15,18,20	29:14,16,17	Courthouse
circulate 35:14	7:7,12	17:11 22:5,7,8	29:18,19 30:3	1:14
cited 24:24	communication	22:9,15 24:2,6	30:9 32:20,21	Courts 27:8
City 37:15	7:10	24:6,10,11,12	33:1,2,3,10,14	Court's 4:23
CIVIL 1:2	compare 23:11	29:5,11,18	33:19	5:10
claim 18:10,11	25:12	30:2,9,10,15	counterclaim	cow 25:1,2
19:11 21:23	compensate	30:17,18,22	6:17	crux 13:1
23:5 24:4,10	21:22 24:18	31:11,19,24	counts 14:14	C-E-R-T-I-F
24:13,19 25:5	27:20	33:11	County 1:1 6:6	37:1
25:16 26:3,6	competent 24:1	contractual	6:12,14 37:3,7	
27:20,23 28:8	complaint 5:13	14:8 29:24	37:15	<u>D</u>
28:11,16	6:17 8:2,16	contractually	couple 3:6 5:6	D 3:1
33:11	11:2,8,21 13:9	13:17	course 4:25 6:7	damages 18:10
claimed 18:3	17:16 18:5,21	contradicted	court 1:1,17 3:2	DATE 1:15
claiming 16:23	20:24 24:14	28:5	3:5,9,13,17	day 5:25 6:23
clarify 30:4	26:9,20 27:2	control 24:24	4:4,8,12,19	35:1
class 12:6	27:25 30:6	controls 26:11	5:1,6,13,16,18	days 4:21 5:18
clear 5:16 8:22	33:24	Cook 1:6,7 2:9	5:21 6:9,11,12	11:13 33:17
10:20 25:17	complaints	3:7 19:14	6:14,14 7:16	33:24 35:16
25:20,22 29:9	26:14 27:1	21:19 22:1	7:19,24 8:6,11	dealt 32:3
30:7	compliance	24:2,4,5,7,7,9	8:21 9:3,6,9	Dear 19:6
clearly 9:11,20	33:23	25:4,23 29:22	9:12 10:9,13	debt 6:16
10:15 11:14	complied 5:10	29:22 30:12	10:16,21,24	decision 19:8
13:20 15:19	comply 5:12	31:12 32:6	11:4,6,11,14	deed 26:21 27:4
15:24 22:9	12:10 34:25	33:11	12:5,5,10,11	defendant
23:7 28:6	complying 4:22	copy 1:22 24:12	12:15 13:5	11:17,18 13:10,15
client 3:15,23	COMPUTER	corporate 31:8	14:5,23 15:1	22:10,13,17
4:22 7:8 11:22	1:22	31:22	16:18,19,23	26:22 30:11
12:17,22	concerned 10:1	corporation 1:7	17:3,17 18:11	defendants 1:8
15:17 17:22	24:14	21:21 27:19	18:16,19 19:1	2:7 12:1,4
18:2 30:18	concluded 36:4	31:14	19:5,9 20:6,8	defendant's 8:4
clients 15:9	conclusion 9:2	correct 29:2	20:12,16,18	delendant 50.7
		I	I	l

delay 35:21	28:5,7	error 32:14	face 5:12	24:12
demand 19:10	documents	especially 4:16	fact 3:11 9:21	files 22:4
depending 5:25	11:15,24 12:2	ESQUIRE 2:3	11:23 17:6	filing 19:9
7:20	19:3 23:8	2:8	22:11,19	fill 3:15 4:24
depose 35:6		essence 26:15	·	6:25 7:4 34:4
_	24:11,16,22 24:24 30:24	27:2	facts 10:17,22	
deposition 6:25			18:17 23:7	34:12 35:7
34:17,18	31:3	essentially	26:25 28:19	filled 4:15 7:15
desire 33:3	dollars 19:19	26:10	factual 9:13	35:1
determination	draft 5:14	established	13:2 25:9	filling 3:10 7:14
31:6	draw 21:2	28:24 31:8	31:17	find 9:3
determine 4:1	drawing 28:13	establishment	factually 8:14	finding 5:9
12:24	Drive 2:9	15:25	failing 17:13	findings 31:17
determined	driven 8:14	event 6:15 8:21	failure 11:8	fine 14:15 16:5
9:25 28:19	drowning 18:6	evidence 11:23	13:22 14:6,25	16:21 21:12
differ 24:23	due 32:14	33:2 37:10,13	15:20,20,22	firm 17:21 23:5
different 4:3		exact 10:2	18:1 31:18	29:21 30:11
9:13 10:4 22:6	E	exactly 4:1	fairly 8:22	30:14,15,16
dip 22:18	E 1:14 3:1,1	18:23 27:13	20:23	first 3:9 12:3,9
directed 7:13	East 1:24	excluding 10:5	faith 17:19 18:2	31:11 32:4
18:8 19:24	Economic	Excuse 18:25	false 27:10	fix 11:10
directly 4:5	14:13 15:23	execute 34:14	far 19:22 24:4	fixed 26:18
28:5	Edgecomb 1:14	34:20	24:13 30:25	fixing 11:10
directs 5:11	effectiveness	execution 34:17	33:21	flat 34:18
disclosure	27:3	35:7	favor 8:4 28:14	Florida 1:1,7,14
27:10	either 14:18,21	exhibit 18:21	fee 17:10 22:22	1:25 2:4,10
discovery 30:23	15:20 16:9,12	19:2,3,6,13,15	23:3,16,17,24	21:17 37:2,7
discussed 10:24	20:24 29:1	20:9,19,20,21	24:3 25:11	37:16
discussions	31:6,17 32:25	20:25 21:3,8	28:12	focus 15:7
13:3	33:9	21:18 23:9	feel 20:22	folded 29:10
dismiss 10:4,8	element 26:5	25:14,20,22	fees 12:11,14,18	follow 6:7
15:22 16:2,4	ended 15:16	25:24 26:10	12:20 13:13	followed 6:9
dismissal 5:13	23:15	26:11,21	13:15 14:12	following 21:15
31:5	enforcement	27:16	15:8,13 18:12	foregoing 37:11
dismissed 24:8	4:13	exhibits 8:2,16	19:11,17,23	forgery 21:1
24:9 27:1	enter 13:22	8:18 11:14,20	20:2 21:24	form 4:14 6:25
33:25	entered 15:24	13:9	22:2,11,12,17	7:2 34:4,12
dismissing 32:5	29:4 30:2,18	existed 31:3	22:18,24 23:2	35:7
32:6	entering 31:5	exists 23:23	23:6,10,13,14	forth 4:2
dispute 13:3	entirely 22:13	31:9	23:21 24:15	forward 3:17
23:8	22:13	express 4:21	24:20 25:6,10	10:23 11:4
disregard 21:3	entities 31:10	expressly 23:4	25:15,16 26:4	12:7 30:17
dissolution	entitled 4:15	32:25	27:15,21,24	forwarded 3:14
31:11	10:21 12:13	e-mail 31:1	1 ' '	3:20
	34:12		28:1,8,11,16	
dissolved 31:20	entitlement	35:23	29:7,7,25 34:7	forwarding
Division 1:2,6	29:24	e-mailed 31:1	felt 12:9	14:13
document 13:1	entity 31:12	F	file 30:23 32:13	four 10:6
25:1,3,18	erroneous 29:3	F 1:6	filed 3:21 9:8	fraud 9:23 12:2
26:16 27:3	CITOMCOUS 27.5	1.0	16:2 23:9	12:25 13:4
			l	1

_				
14:18,20 16:1	goes 12:21	hereto 37:11	incorporate	Judge 1:12 10:4
16:7,8,11,11	19:21 31:16	hereunto 37:14	30:1	10:5,13,17
16:19,22	going 5:23 7:5	Herrmann 1:16	incorporated	18:6,20 23:7
24:13 25:7	9:16 11:18	37:5,17,19	30:6 34:10	28:2 36:1
26:6,14,14,15	12:1,8 13:13	he'll 18:19	indicates 9:20	judgment 4:13
26:25 27:9,24	14:21 15:10	higher 12:17	individual 14:7	4:15 7:22,24
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1	1
28:23,24,24	16:3,5,8,19 20:22 28:19	Hillsborough	individually 24:5 29:22	8:4,10 9:17,19 10:11 11:6
28:25 29:8,10 29:14,16 30:2		1:1 37:3,7,15	30:12 31:5	18:14 20:13
32:20	29:6,13,13 31:16 32:13	Homes 27:7 honest 18:6	30:12 31:3	20:13 28:3
Freudian 8:12	34:1,13	Honor 3:3,4,14	inducement	31:25 32:14
front 23:8	1 '	4:20 5:4,9,20	28:25	32:20 33:18
further 10:15	good 3:3,5,5 14:9 17:19	7:11,18 9:8	inferences 21:5	34:8,10,15
31:3	18:2 19:20	11:22 13:14	28:13	35:4
31.3	gotten 15:2	13:23 15:3	1	judgments
G	16:24 17:6,21	17:1,8 18:13	inflammatory 10:6	10:18
$\overline{\mathbf{G}}$ 3:1	17:23 23:19	18:24 20:7,10	information	judicial 1:1
Gainesville 2:4	grant 8:3,9	20:17 21:14	3:11 4:24	3:25 37:6
5:5 35:24	10:25 29:13	22:4 23:23	34:19	July 1:15 37:16
garnish 34:19	granted 3:23	24:25 27:6,14	initially 10:3	jump 25:2
general 1:2	11:12 33:19	29:19 30:4,13	intended 29:4	jump 25.2 jumped 25:1
26:11	34:23	32:2,18 34:6,9	34:3	jumpeu 23.1 jury 12:23,23
George 1:14	granting 32:19	34:22	intent 29:23	Jury 12.23,23
getting 15:8,9	35:1	HONORABLE	intentional	<u>K</u>
15:17 22:3		1:12	1	Kennedy 1:24
29:7 35:21	grants 11:6,11 Great 35:25	1	14:18,19 interest 12:21	key 9:11
Gillespie 1:4	guess 8:6	hope 7:6 hours 5:6	17:14	kinds 13:7
3:6 4:9 5:2	guess 8.0	house 13:24	interests 13:19	knew 18:9,10
18:8 19:4,13	<u> </u>	14:1	14:25	19:25 20:1
19:24 21:16	hand 37:14	huge 14:2	interpretation	21:25 22:2,2
21:18 22:3,16	bandful 6:21	hundreds 6:12	22:7	22:14 25:21
22:18 23:3,4,9	happen 12:7	6:20	,	25:22 26:1,2
23:12,15,20	13:4	0.20	interrupting 6:4	know 3:25 4:12
24:3,7,11,16	happened 22:11	I	issue 9:20 10:2	6:2 7:1,3,4,7
24:25 25:3,18	28:3	idea 29:6	11:4 16:1,11	8:11,14,19 9:9
25:21 27:14	happens 5:25	II 1:12	16:19,20	16:15 17:20
27:17	happy 11:4	immediately	20:14 23:25	17:24 21:5
Gillespie's	16:16 30:6	6:23	31:19 32:3,9	22:5 28:18
22:10,12,25	33:5	implicitly 33:1	issued 32:5	35:9,21
24:14 25:25	heard 9:12	importance	issues 3:22 4:3	knows 17:18
33:24	32:12	4:22 7:14	9:11,13 10:22	
give 7:3 15:5	hearing 6:1	impose 34:2	11:10,11	L
21:4	11:5 35:10	impression 29:3	18:14	lack 19:21
given 16:9	36:3	improper 14:13	16.17	law 5:24 8:15
19:21	hearings 8:13	inappropriate		10:15 17:20
go 13:3 14:15	hearsay 20:3,7	4:2	J 1:4,7	23:5 29:9,21
16:3,4,6,20	21:6	incarceration	jail 6:22	30:11,14,15
25:2,17	beld 27:8	6:2	JAMES 1:12	30:16
,				
	i	1	ı	ı

laws 23:22,23 lawsuit 19:9 22:21 24:22 24:23 lead 4:5	mandate 4:23 manner 14:1 matter 8:17 19:22 matters 3:6	move 10:18,23 32:16 moved 12:6 movement 21:4 moving 10:20	17:18 19:2,3 26:25 numbers 15:19 17:22 NW 2:4	outside 18:18 overruling 21:12 owed 17:12 owes 4:1
leave 11:12 33:5	mean 4:11,12	N	0	P
left 5:22 14:2	4:19,23 5:21	N 3:1	$\overline{\mathbf{O}_{3:1}}$	$\frac{1}{P3:1}$
Lending 22:22	6:11 7:9 8:12	name 20:25	objection 18:13	PA 3:7 33:11
23:22	13:8 21:4 23:7	near 15:18	20:3,7 21:9,11	page 4:14 7:25
letter 19:13,15	26:7,24 28:18	need 7:5 16:4,9	obviate 27:2	8:1 34:4
20:22 21:7	31:21 33:6	16:15,17,20		pages 4:6,6
25:23,25	34:14	31:17 32:16	obviously 3:24 Ocala 5:4	37:11
letters 13:8	meaning 11:24			
20:16 22:25	meet 26:5	33:2	occurred 20:5	paid 12:19 15:8
let's 5:16 15:10	members 7:13	needed 7:4	October 9:10	15:9 17:20
15:12 17:21	memo 7:25 17:4	26:17,23	office 7:11	21:22,25
17:23 25:11	merits 10:23	needs 7:15	oh 6:24 7:1	22:13,16,17
25:12	met 33:23	negligence 14:3	33:20	23:5,10,12,13
levy 34:20	mind 13:19	14:14,17,19	okay 5:15 7:19	23:13,20 25:5
liability 31:21	minute 6:25	negotiate 13:11	14:15 16:21	26:3 27:19
liable 31:13	minutes 7:3	13:14,15,18	19:5 21:12	28:8
libel 31:15	misled 11:24	13:22 14:7,25	32:23 35:13	paint 14:10
light 3:21	missed 11:2	17:13,19 18:1	once 6:19 9:12	painted 13:24
line 18:7	mistake 32:14	22:23	open 7:10 31:20	13:25 14:1
lines 7:9	misunderstood	negotiated	opportunity	paragraph 8:1
litigant 20:24	35:11	12:17	16:9	29:20,20
litigation 24:8	modifications	negotiating	oppose 35:9	paragraphs
little 15:19	9:22	23:2 25:21	opposed 7:24	29:20
16:24	modify 12:20	negotiation	30:11	parcel 8:18
local 5:3	money 4:3,5	12:16 15:11	opposing 11:5	Pardon 21:10
long 7:4 9:10	20:1,2 29:25	negotiations	32:4,11 34:25	part 8:18 17:15
18:5	moon 25:1,2	18:9 19:25	oral 9:21	29:17 33:1,1
Longfield 19:19	morning 3:2,3	25:24 26:1	orally 7:8,12	participated
look 10:18 13:6	8:23 17:15	Neil 1:4 19:6	order 3:20 5:9	18:8 19:24
15:5 22:15	morning's 6:1	never 26:14	5:10,14 12:5	particularly
23:10 25:20	mortgage 27:4	27:1 30:18,19	12:10,15	20:19
looking 7:25	motigage 27.4 motion 3:9,21	nevertheless	24:21 32:5	parties 9:23,24
Loss 14:14	7:21,21 8:22	34:16	33:22 34:14	27:12 28:10
15:23	8:25 9:9,17	new 10:13 19:9	35:14,17	partner 6:5,9
lot 6:14 28:17	10:4,8,11,25	30:17 31:19	ordered 4:16	party 13:12
lower 12:18	11:6,11 15:22	normal 6:11	12:11 18:11	20:19,20,20
10WC1 12.10	16:4 18:14	normally 6:15	23:6 24:15,19	20:21 21:3,7
M	20:13 24:25	6:19	25:15,16 26:4	24:5 27:9 35:6
M 1:12	28:3 29:14	North 2:9	27:15	party's 10:20
mad 15:9,10		Notary 1:17	original 1:21	Pasco 6:6
making 12:21	32:4,13,19	note 27:4	3:20	passing 4:2
_	33:21 35:2	noticed 34:23	originally 16:2	pay 13:13 22:10
30:5	motions 10:19	noticed (4.7) (Ariginaliv A. /	しわなひ しくしく ファーロ

pending 3:22	predecessor	P.A 1:6 2:3,9	Reporter 1:17	rule 7:20 8:15
penny 22:19	30:14,15		37:5,17	9:16 14:14
people 4:15	prefers 10:21	<u>Q</u>	represented	16:19 26:11
35:6	premise 27:24	question 28:22	20:20	ruled 10:5,10
percent 15:16	present 11:23	quote 21:20	request 4:20	16:18
22:16 23:14	previous 16:18	27:8	11:12 19:17	rules 15:23
23:20 29:24	19:14	quoting 15:18	19:18 30:23	21:17
perfectly 10:8	previously		31:4	ruling 29:15
33:7	10:24 30:20	$\frac{\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{R}}$ 3:1	required 21:17	30:5 32:19
performance	prior 8:13 31:4	raised 9:12 10:3	reserve 9:2 34:2	34:2
28:25 29:8	pro 10:7 20:21		resources 31:14	RYAN 2:8
person 26:16,19	problem 13:16	rational 26:8	response 9:9	
personally 7:13	procedure 6:8	reaching 18:7	30:25	<u> </u>
31:13	proceedings	readdress 32:17	retain 23:25	S 3:1
picked 6:22	1:10 37:9,13	reasons 6:15	return 12:17	sanctions 34:2
place 12:3,9	processer 8:9	rebuts 28:20	revealed 27:11	satisfaction
places 14:10	procuring 12:2	rebutted 26:10	28:9	24:20
plaintiff 1:4 2:2	12:25	received 3:16	review 10:12,15	satisfied 8:25
3:10 9:6 11:15	produce 31:24	3:19 30:24,25	reviewed 8:24	29:23
11:19 13:10	productive 9:4	31:1	revisit 16:3,6	saying 20:21,25
28:14,21 29:2	professional	recess 36:2	rid 34:24	24:14 26:8
30:11	31:12	record 30:7	right 3:5 7:19	27:14 28:7
plaintiff's 29:2	proffer 12:23	35:8	14:5 17:25	34:21,22 35:3
plead 16:16	progress 3:13	RECORDED	18:16 34:11	35:3,8,12
pleading 8:17	proper 9:15	1:21	35:25	says 8:15 19:15
8:18 9:15 10:7	10:8,14 14:1,7	recover 27:9	road 18:5	20:21 21:7,20
10:19 18:15	27:10 30:25	recovery 29:25	Robert 2:3,3	22:5,9 25:1,9
20:14 30:7	properly 10:7,9	redraft 33:22	Rodems 1:6 2:8	27:18 28:15
pleadings 7:22	13:25 14:8	referenced 19:8	2:9 3:3,7,8,12	scenario 28:21
8:10 9:17,19	31:19,20	references	4:9,18 5:8,15	se 10:7 20:21
9:25 10:11,25	property 26:19	29:19	5:20,23 6:5	secondary
11:7 28:4	34:20	referencing	7:23 8:5,8,20	30:16
30:25 32:1,20	proposed 5:8	29:21	8:24 9:5 14:24	see 7:20 21:2,6
33:18	35:14	regulating	17:9 18:4,23	34:20
plus 15:6 16:8	proverbial 8:8	21:17	18:25 19:2,6	seeking 7:8
19:11	provided 13:17	relating 19:14	20:4 21:14	seeks 11:20
pocket 22:19	provides 33:23	reliance 26:5	22:1 24:2,6,9	sell 26:19
23:12	proving 26:6	relied 25:9	25:4 26:12	send 35:15
point 5:23 7:5	provision 22:22	relief 32:14	27:6 29:21	sent 11:17
11:3 19:16	23:17,18,24	rely 8:15 25:7	32:7,9,18,23	sentences 10:6
27:6,13 28:23	Public 1:17	relying 8:19	33:10,11,14	separate 22:23
position 8:21	pure 13:5	20:23	33:16,18,21	29:10
•	purported	remainder 6:1	35:8,14,22	separately
9:1 10:16		remedy 5:24	36:1	21:21 23:2
9:1 10:16 16:17	20:25		JU.1	
16:17		renew 21:11	roof 26:18	27:19
16:17 post 4:10	purpose 9:18	renew 21:11 report 37:9,13	roof 26:18	
16:17		renew 21:11		27:19

	set 3:24 34:16	8:5,20,24 9:5	straight 15:11	12:25	truth 22:21
	37:14	17:9 26:12	straightly 9:25	thank 35:19,25	23:22 27:11
	settle 12:8	33:10 35:22	Street 2:4	36:1	try 6:18 19:1
	13:21 15:7	situation 3:22	subsequent	theory 15:1	34:14
	19:11 25:5	6:6	16:13 27:15	17:18	trying 8:14 20:8
	26:2,2	slip 8:6,8,12	27:22	thereto 8:3	26:2
	settled 19:16	slipped 15:15	subsequently	thing 6:18	two 4:6,14 6:16
	28:15,18	small 23:25	27:11 28:9	25:19	14:17 17:5
	settlement	solid 16:17	success 19:22	things 14:11,18	31:10,18 34:4
	12:16,21	somebody 4:14	successful 29:6	30:4	type 20:11,14
	13:11,19,20	26:23	sufficient 25:19	think 6:3 9:11	31:18
	14:9 15:11	somebody's	suggest 19:22	11:19,21 13:1	
	19:20,25 20:4	6:18	suggesting 6:7	13:20 15:19	U
	21:15 24:18	sorry 6:3	Suite 1:24 2:10	17:4 18:23	ultimate 28:19
	25:22,24 26:1	sort 6:8	summary 7:24	20:8 26:24	underlying
	27:23	sought 6:2	8:4 10:18	29:1,5,9 31:8	13:12
	settling 15:12	So.2d 27:8	20:13	31:16,23	understand 5:1
	22:20	specific 17:7,11	support 20:12	Thirteenth 1:1	8:25 26:7,8
	Sheet 3:11	31:23	suppose 8:11	37:6	32:18 33:20
	shields 31:22	specifically	18:1	thought 12:8	34:4
	shifting 22:22	7:16 10:5 11:3	sure 12:21	thousand 19:19	understanding
	23:16,17,24	11:25 17:9	31:14	thousands 6:12	32:24
	shorthand 37:9	split 12:14	survives 33:12	three 4:6	understood
	37:13	spoke 15:4	sworn 20:11	throw 17:21	5:17 11:25
	Shortly 3:19	spots 14:2	s/William 37:19	time 1:15 5:11	23:1 28:7
	show 11:14	staff 7:13		6:1 9:10 12:20	unequivocal
	13:10 24:12	state 1:1 11:9	T	16:4,11,13,14	25:17
	24:16 26:23	15:22 19:9	table 7:17	times 6:13	unequivocally
	30:7 31:17	37:2,7,15	take 5:2 15:13	today 7:17	10:20
	shows 10:16	stated 10:9 27:8	25:8	34:24 35:10	unpainted 14:2
	28:10	31:2 37:10	taken 1:13 6:22	35:16,18	use 34:18
	side 15:5	statement 21:16	talking 18:14	told 6:9 18:9	usually 9:3
	sign 26:18,22	21:20 22:25	25:23	24:15 27:14	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$
	28:14	25:8,10,13	Tampa 1:14,25	27:25	veil 31:8
	signature 21:1	27:10,16,17	2:10 5:6 37:15	tort 15:21 16:10	vein 14:6
	signed 11:15	28:15	Taylor 27:7	16:14,22	verified 20:11
	21:3,16,19,25	statements 9:14	tell 7:14 8:23	torts 16:8	20:14
	24:16 25:13	28:12 33:8	28:2	total 17:20	versus 3:6
	25:18 26:16	stay 3:21 34:14	telling 25:25	29:24	vs 1:5
	27:18 28:6	35:2,9	Temporarily 33:15	totally 28:20	
	30:19 31:24	stayed 34:15	ten 5:18 6:25	touch 14:11	W
	signing 21:20	35:4	33:17,24	TRANSCRIPT	W 2:3,3
	35:17	stays 4:12	34:25 35:16	1:10	wages 34:19
	similar 6:6	STENOGRA	terms 19:15	transcription	want 8:23 21:5
	simple 4:6 simply 13:23	steps 31:23	29:7	1:22 37:12 true 9:18 12:15	33:5,6 35:8
	sir 3:12 4:7,18	steps 31:23 stick 18:7	testify 11:23	25:9,12 28:4	wanted 29:25
	5:7,19 7:23	stick 18.7	testimony 12:23	37:12	warranty 26:21
	3.1,17 1.23	Gueraug 17.10		37.12	wasn't 13:8
- 1					

25:15 30:10	23:13	375-2518 2:5	
way 18:5,17			
went 6:5 9:24		4	
30:16	\$2,000 15:2,17	4 7:25 8:1 13:9	
we'll 4:21 7:20	22:3,20	19:2,6,15	
16:15 30:6	\$50,000 11:17	20:25 21:8	
we're 3:5 7:5	11:25 12:4	25:20,23	
11:9 15:12	15:17 21:22	37:16	
16:3,5 18:5,14	22:1 23:5,18	40 15:16 23:20	
30:5 31:16,25	25:5 26:3	400 2:9	
we've 9:8 14:21	27:19 28:8	42,000 17:23	
WHEREOF	\$52,000 17:25	45 29:24	
37:14	\$6,000 16:24	489-1001 2:11	
whichever	\$6,224 17:7		
16:16	\$60,000 15:6,12	5	
WILLIAM 1:7		5 13:9 19:3,13	
1:16 37:5,17	0	21:8 25:20,24	
willing 15:5,7	05-CA-7205 1:5	50,000 19:11,17	
wished 10:25	1	28:1,11	
withstood 10:8	1 1:15 13:6	50,000-dollar	
WITNESS	29:17,20 33:1	24:17	
37:14	33:2,3,10	501 1:24	
wondered	1,000 19:10	52,000 17:20 536 27:8	
17:17	1-7 29:19		
Woodrow 27:7	10,000 19:23	57.105 14:12	
word 8:9	100 23:13	6	
work 4:1	1225 1:24	6 29:20,20,20	
working 31:10	13th 2:4		
31:13	15 4:21 7:3	7	
wouldn't 14:3		7 8:1	
23:18	2	78 17:7	
writing 13:11	2 21:18 25:14		
written 13:7	27:16 29:14	8	
27:3,11,15,22	32:20 33:14	813 1:25 2:11	
28:5,9	33:19	850 27:7	
wrong 12:8	2,000 23:19		
wrote 20:22	20 11:13		
21:7,8	20,000 17:22		
Y	2000 23:21		
yeah 9:3 22:5	2008 1:15 37:16		
28:15 32:12	2100 2:10		
34:1	229-8225 1:25		
years 6:21	2815 2:4		
you-all 3:2	3		
	32609 2:4		
<u>Z</u>	33602 1:25 2:10		
zero 22:16,17	352 2:5		