FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 01/14/2013 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 459

INDEX NO. 651786/2011

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 01/14/2013

# **EXHIBIT 1**

have some value, not precedential, but certainly some value. This is an Article 77. I keep looking at it because I never had one of those before. I imagine maybe none of you have.

It says, as we know, "that any party to the proceeding, shall have a right to examine the Trustees under oath, either before or after filing an answer to an answer or objection as to any matter relating to their administration of the Trust."

You have got a lot of these settlement negotiations. I think your first meeting here was almost a year ago, if not to the date, certainly to the week.

MR. REILLY: Roughly.

THE COURT: Why don't you have a deposition of one or two people from the Trustee and ask them some of these questions, and see what they say. Then, we can see if there is something that really is an issue that has come up that needs to be, that needs to be discovered.

I think just to ask for all these settlement communications, and as we know, they have already produced the three-way communications, and that's a lot of documentation, and I really think you have got all the documents they relied upon and expert reports and all that.

I think it would be, I would be interested, I would like to see what the Trustees would say about their

participation. What happened? Was it really the

Institutional Investors? Did they come in with all kinds of
guns blazing? Maybe they do it in Texas, let's go and --

MS. PATRICK: We do come in with guns blazing. You are exactly right, your Honor.

THE COURT: And let's negotiate and poor Mr. Ingber says oh, well, I better let her do this first. I don't know what went on.

But, I think you can ask some of those questions because you got enough to know what's going on here and some of the things that you might want may come out or they may not, but this, I just think that the request for all the settlement negotiations just -- I have listened to all of this. I have read it. I looked at the cases we talked about it. I can't write a decision on this because it will take too long and, I think, I think it's already a year. I am -- not my fault, but it's already a year.

I think you have to go to the next step. I really think that that would get us far along to doing that. If you come and decide, after you have one or two, and I am sure there could possibly be more than one person --

MR. REILLY: There could be more.

THE COURT: -- from Bank of New York, who has some knowledge, then you may come back and say there is some area where I think I really, really need more. You can ask them

was a much higher number talked about. I think that there is, in somebody's report, I don't remember the names of all the experts, there was an indication that there was a range, a higher range and lower range. It got to this range.

They were considering a lot of different things, but if there is some outrageously higher number that was talked about or something, I think you can explore that without having to go through all these settlement negotiations.

Just, there is a certain kind of privilege, certain kind of rules that you learn here from day one. I can't say oh, I learned that I always ruled that way, but forget it, I will rule this way today.

That is what I really think should be the next step. I don't need a motion, a written motion the next time to tell me well, Judge, we found this and this. What we want, because mostly you people bring up the important points, the important issues, and as I probably said to you once before, a lot of these discovery issues where am I going to go to get the answer for this exact thing. Can I look at different cases? Apparently, I have written a few of them. I know the issues. We can go on.

That's really how I feel you need to go here. I think you will get some of the things, but I just, I read these papers, and I was skeptical, but I want to listen to

everything you said, that you all said, and I really feel that's the next step, to get dates, to have some, pick the people. I don't know if you know who you want, or sit down with Mr. Ingber. I don't think he will, I don't think, could possibly know you can't depose a Trustee because that's the only thing that this Article 71 says certainly you can do that and see what you get from that. That's what I think should happen now.

I am not, I appreciate Mr. Madden speaking about the common interest privilege. I don't think we reach it at this point. We might, at some other point. The law, I am sure, won't change much between now and then.

What is the next thing you want to start talking about now?

The other people that flew in from the other part of the country are apparently going to fly back and are just not going to stick around, so what is the next, the next issue that you want to start with because we do have to close the courtroom at one.

MR. LOESER: The next issue --

THE COURT: But you could start.

MR. LOESER: First of all, I am Derrick Loeser. I represent the Federal Home Banks of Chicago and Boston and Indianapolis.

The next issue for the today is the fiduciary duty