JULY 23, 2018

GINA GOMES, COURT REPORTER PROVIDENCE SUPERIOR COURT OFFICE OF COURT REPORTERS 250 BENEFIT STREET PROVIDENCE, RI 02903

TO: Grepien Ser SesTO, ESQ.

A transcript request in the matter of St. Joseph's Health Services vs. St. Joseph's Health Services of R.I., PC-2017-3856, heard before the Honorable Justice Brian Stern on May 24, 2018.

5/24/2018 8 pages @ \$3.00 per page \$24.00

ADMINISTRATOR

AMOUNT DUE \$24.00

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND A	IND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
PROVIDENCE, SC.	SUPERIOR COURT
ST. JOSEPH'S HEALTH SERVICES RHODE ISLAND	S OF)))
VS.)) C.A. NO. PC-2017-3856
ST. JOSEPH'S HEALTH SERVICES RHODE ISLAND RETIREMENT PLAN	

HEARD BEFORE

THE HONORABLE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE BRIAN P. STERN ON MAY 24, 2018

APPEARANCES:

> GINA GIANFRANCESCO GOMES COURT REPORTER

CERTIFICATION

I, Gina Gianfrancesco Gomes, hereby certify that the succeeding pages 1 through 6, inclusive, are a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes.

GINA GIANFRANCESCO GOMES COURT REPORTER

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2018

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. Clerk, would you please call the THE COURT: case.

Certainly, your Honor. We have THE CLERK: PC-2017-3856, St. Joseph's Health Services of Rhode Island, Inc. vs. St. Joseph's Health Services Retirement Plan, et al. Counsel identify themselves for the record please.

MR. MORRIS: Steve Morris, Rhode Island Department of Health.

MR. DEL SESTO: Stephen Del Sesto, Court-Appointed Receiver.

MR. WISTOW: Max Wistow, counsel for the Receiver.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

The Court has before it a motion to THE COURT: compel documents from the Department of Health. Court has reviewed the memorandum and the exhibits. The Court notes that it received no papers from the Department of Health. Counsel, you may proceed.

MR. WISTOW: As your Honor well knows, we have been involved for months trying to agree to a conclusion and an investigation with probable litigation following it. There were some areas that we still felt were open, so in March we filed a subpoena duces tecum on the Department

25

of Health and with roughly the expiration of the return date Mr. Morris contacted us and in writing requested 30 days additional for compliance and expressly said that, "We anticipate being complete with our search within 30 That was April 13th. Having heard nothing from him at the end of the 30 days, we contacted him and asked him, "Where do we stand?" His response on the 16th of May was he asked for an additional 30 days. We wrote back to him and we said, "We can't agree to any further continuance without some idea of what efforts you have been making in these past roughly 45 days." For example, and the exhibits show, we expressly asked when the Department initiated retrieval of the documents from storage, when you received these documents, how many pages have not yet been retrieved, how many pages of potentially responsive -- and so forth and so on. concluded by saying, "Whatever documents you already have, at least send us those." And his only response was, "We received ten boxes of documents from storage. With limited staff and a lot of agency activity at this time, we will require more time to respond to your subpoena. What compelling reasons prevent you from agreeing to an extension?" Of course our response was with 2,700 pensioners, 2,700 reasons really, and also the fact that he responded not at all to any of the questions

1.0

1.3

about where we are. So we advised him that we would be filing a motion this morning. We will file the motion and here we are this afternoon. I spoke to him a little earlier. We never met before. He seems to be a fine gentleman. I asked him, "Where are we? Can we get anything?" And the answer is, "Really we haven't even begun to go through any of the materials," and I leave it in your Honor's hand.

THE COURT: Counsel, I guess as I take from your e-mail, what are the compelling reasons that would prevent this Court from holding the Department of Health in contempt?

MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, my purpose in responding to counsel in that fashion was that was there something that would really be in the way of us having a little more time. We have no reason not to go through all the documents and provide them to counsel. We don't even anticipate that there will be an objection once we go through them given the fact that the Attorney General has been asked for all of these documents and beyond. Having been in contact with them, it appears that anything that we have probably has already been given over. That is not absolute. I understand that. That once we get through all the documents we will be able to know whether or not there is something beyond that. But we don't

Ιt

That's not

It's simply a matter of having the time to provided. take staff and be able to go through. There is actually eleven boxes. By the time we realized that we didn't have all the information and retrieved the documents, the ten boxes that we got from storage, we didn't really have enough time to meet the deadline just based on staff. doesn't mean that it can't be done and I'm not asking the Court not to hold the Department in contempt. what my purpose is. My purpose is to try to get to a place where the subpoena is satisfied but at the same time not promising something that there isn't anybody to actually go through the documents other than taking somebody off another task and putting them on that task. That's really what it comes down to. It's not that we don't want to do it.

anticipate any objection to any of the documents being

Take me through for a minute. THE COURT: received the subpoena on March 28th. When were the boxes ordered?

I think it was I'm not exactly sure. MR. MORRIS: about two or three weeks later that they were requested and then probably another couple of weeks before we got That would put us to some time in April.

THE COURT: You don't really know because, you know, the Court has dealt with the Iron Mountain Contract and I

24

25

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2

4

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will take judicial notice the next day delivery was three hours. So it wasn't three weeks for Iron Mountain to deliver the documents. Do you have any personal knowledge of this?

MR. MORRIS: I don't.

I'm sure you know the procedure if you THE COURT: receive a subpoena in terms of what you need to do. There was no filing with this Court. There was no filing with the request to compel here today. I don't know what to tell you, if you've got to bring the director down here, but this is going to happen. And whoever in the Department of Health just lost their Memorial Day weekend because this Court is requiring by next Thursday the Court wants every document produced to the Receiver and special counsel and if there is a privilege log, get the privilege log to him as well. Next Thursday at 2:00 the Court is going to conduct a hearing, and if all the documents are done at that point, otherwise the Court will have a contempt hearing. This Court has been through, and I'm sure the Attorney General's office may have passed on to you the strict production deadline the Court put them on, put St. Joseph's Hospital on, put the Catholic Diocese on, and for you to come to Court and tell me that you have no personal knowledge of what went on, that there are other things that are more pressing, I

can imagine if the board of medical licensing and disciple if they sent out a subpoena and somebody just ignored it as this is being ignored today. I understand there are other priorities. You are under court order at this point. It will be produced by 2:00 next Thursday and I want you back in court. Every document that is not produced, I want the Director of Department of Health here with you and we will take it up at that point. Counsel please submit the appropriate ordered. The Court is in recess.

(ADJOURNED.)