STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS PROVIDENCE, SC. SUPERIOR COURT

ST. JOSEPH'S RHODE ISLAND	HEALTH	SERVICE	S OI	r)))				
VS.)	C.A.	NO.	PC-2017-	3856
ST. JOSEPH'S RHODE ISLAND	HEALTH RETIREN			<i>)</i> (יז (

HEARD BEFORE

THE HONORABLE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE BRIAN P. STERN ON MARCH 29 2018

APPEARANCES:

STEPHEN DEL SESTO, ESQUIRE......THE RECEIVER MAX WISTOW, ESQUIRE......SPECIAL COUNSEL

GINA GIANFRANCESCO GOMES
COURT REPORTER

CERTIFICATION

I, Gina Gianfrancesco Gomes, hereby certify that the succeeding pages 1 through 27, inclusive, are a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes.

GINA GIANFRANCESCO GOMES COURT REPORTER

_

THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 2018

MORNING SESSION

THE COURT: Madam Clerk, I ask that you please call the case.

THE CLERK: Your Honor, the matter before the Court is Case Number PC-2017-3856, St. Joseph's Health Services of Rhode Island vs. St. Joseph's Health Services of Rhode Island Retirement Plan. This matter is on for the hearing on the Receiver's recommendation and the Receiver's second interim report. Would counsel please identify themselves for th record.

MR. DELSESTO: Good morning, your Honor. Stephen DelSesto, court appointed Receiver.

MR. WISTOW: Max Wistow, special counsel.

THE COURT: Thank you. This matter is with respect to the report that was on several weeks ago. My apologies for having to cancel it at the last minute, but we have rescheduled for today's date, and there has been an additional application by the Receiver in this case. So I think the best place to begin is with the Receiver and also special counsel may make such presentations to the Court.

MR. DELSESTO: Thank you, your Honor. If the Court does not have a preference on the order of presentation this morning, your Honor, I would just assume present in

the order they were filed and start with the recommendation.

THE COURT: That's fine, and I just ask that you speak into the microphone.

MR. DEISESTO: Okay. Thank you, your Honor. This morning, your Honor, I am here on my initial recommendation regarding monthly benefit modification as well as a release of the stay that this Court imposed relative to the processing of benefit payment applications. The reason I am referring to this as an initial recommendation, your Honor, is because as your Honor is aware this is a fluid situation and there may be a need to come back to the Court and ask for some type of a modification different than what I'm asking for today so this is an initial. This is not anything that is intended to be a permanent request, rather a temporary request at this time.

Your Honor, rather than going through the full details of the report, which I am sure the Court is well aware of. I will just briefly give some background. As the Court recalls, there was initially a hearing set down for permanent Receiver on October 11th. However, prior to that date the Court asked for an emergency hearing basically just seeking a status based on the significance of this matter on September 8th. At that hearing it was

discussed as to whether or not the modifications that had been proposed by the petitioners would be going forward on October 11th. At that time I indicated to the Court that I did not think I had enough time by October 11th to make such recommendation, and I asked this Court to allow that decision to be deferred until some time after February 1, 2018. The Court agreed to that. Since then, your Honor, I was appointed permanent Receiver. We did have a hearing on October 11th. I was not appointed on that day because I asked the Court to defer that as well while some administrative issues were dealt with and I was ultimately appointed thereafter.

Since September 8th, actually, since the beginning of this case, your Honor, I have been reviewing a lot of financial information, documents, trying to understand what may be the best way to deal with benefits here. As your Honor is aware, as your Honor approved, we put together an advisory committee, which up until very recently, had been meeting on a weekly basis. In addition to that, your Honor, I have been meeting with the pension holders as a group at the Rhodes on the Pawtuxet on a monthly basis giving updates but also trying to get a feel for the most appropriate thing to happen here. Based on the circumstances and the information that I have with me at this point, your

1

3

_

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Honor, as I stated in my recommendation, my recommendation is that no adjustment in benefits be made at this time and barring any significant event that would change my thought process between now and the next 90 days, to leave that no change or no adjustment in place for 90 days.

In my report, your Honor, in my recommendation, I set forth four primary reasons. There are many things that went into coming up with that recommendation. are four primary things. One, obviously, I viewed the market performance. I am happy to say that since August of 2017 when I was appointed, notwithstanding the fact that we have paid out benefits of approximately \$850,000 a month, we started this case with approximately \$86 million in assets with the plan and as of today we still have about \$85 million in assets with the plan. that's an indication that notwithstanding seven, eight months of payments at \$850,000 that the investment portion of the assets or the investment allocation of the assets have been performing relatively well, keeping pace with the amounts of money going out. Notwithstanding that, the market has become more volatile over the past So with that in mind, I contacted the few months. discretionary investment manager and I am having discussions with them. I had expected another call with

them. I had two thus far. I expect another call within the next week.

THE COURT: Is that Mercer?

MR. DELSESTO: That is Mercer, your Honor. To discuss the allocation of the investments to make sure that the allocation that we currently have is appropriate based on what the current market has been doing and what Mercer, as the investment professional, believes will happen both short term and long term. Based on those discussions, I think we are still -- our allocation currently is still in a place where it is appropriate for the market and appropriate for this plan. Obviously, if there is a change in that, I will bring that to the attention of the Court through some filing, but at this time everything seems to be that there is volatility but there is nothing yet to be concerned about.

In addition, your Honor, in my recommendation I also asked the Court to release the stay with benefit application. That is a consideration as to whether or not benefits should be adjusted because, obviously, the release on application processing will increase the monthly payments due to pension holders.

THE COURT: Can you just explain that a little bit?

MR. DELSESTO: As of right now, your Honor, or as of

August, 2017 we were paying out benefits on a monthly

basis of \$850,000. The Court stayed the application, meaning that anybody who had not yet applied and had gone through the application process approval, which takes approximately four weeks, was going to continue to get their monthly benefits, but any new applications would not be processed and they would not be receiving checks. We did, obviously, log those applications. People are still allowed to apply. We just weren't processing. Each application, your Honor, that is processed results in a benefit being paid out on a monthly basis once it has been processed.

As of the end of February, we had 139 applications that had been filed after the stay had been imposed. So if all of those were to be filed, I believe the estimated number -- because until we actually go through the application process, we don't won't have a hard number. It's estimated that if all 139 applications are processed and allowed, that will increase the monthly outlay of cash by \$65,000. So every application that is processed results in more money going out on a monthly basis because now a new pension holder is now collecting benefits that was not collecting benefits before.

THE COURT: Understood.

MR. DELSESTO: Obviously, that is consideration in whether or not an adjustment needs to be made because the

more benefits that are paid out, the greater the drain on the cash and the faster the drain on the plan's assets. Based on my recommendation, your Honor, and assuming all of those applications are processed and it does estimate approximately \$65,000 that would mean over the next 90 days the plan will pay out \$195,000 more than it has currently been paying out, which is approximately point 002 percent of the overall plan assets. While that certainly is a significant number, I do not believe that it is so significant that will require an adjustment down of the benefits beyond 100 percent. I think it's prudent to leave the benefits at 100 percent notwithstanding that additional draw.

I will note for the Court that as of the end of February, putting aside those 139 applications, there were another more than 600 plan participants who are eligible to apply. Obviously, that would be a significant event if all of those individuals apply. That would increase the monthly outlay by approximately \$175,000 over and above the 65 I just spoke about. If that were to happen, if everybody were to apply, then that may need me to come back and reconsider things and come back to the Court. As of right now I have the 139 applications and I don't believe that amount would require an adjustment.

24

25

The last two issues, your Honor, are the most critical in my analysis. One is the work that Attorney Wistow and his office have been doing with regard to the investigation, which goes to whether or not there are any funds to be recovered. Based on the investigation that Attorney Wistow and his office have been doing and it has been, as your Honor knows, a substantial undertaking with several hundred thousand documents. I think my last communication with Attorney Wistow's office was they are up to about 800,000 pages that have been reviewed thus They believe that -- well, based on the report that far. had been given to me, I believe that it's prudent at this point to not make an adjustment because we are very close to understanding what exactly there may be in terms of claims and I need to have a discussion with Attorney Wistow and his office regarding what potential recovery. Obviously, if there is a potential recovery that is a very high number, it's less likely that a benefit reduction needs to happen. If it's a low number, then we have to review it. At this point in time, your Honor, based on the discussions I had with the special counsel, I do not believe that it is prudent to make an adjustment because we are very close to understanding and that will give us more information to make that decision.

The last one, your Honor, is, quite frankly, the

most critical. It is our discussions with the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation, which is the federal agency that insures ERISA-based plans. This is a case, your Honor, as you know, the plan had been treated as a There are arguments that special counsel church plan. has formulated that would say that this plan actually should be or should have been treated as an ERISA plan. I am very aware of the potential penalties that ERISA would impose on a plan if I were to make some changes. So although there has not been any decision on that, there are ongoing discussions with the P.B.G.C. my concern would be if the plan is determined to be or had been an ERISA plan and I recommend a cut to this Court and the Court approves it that we might be in violation of ERISA and that may result in penalties and a result that would not be beneficial to this plan.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So while we continue those discussions and they are continuing, special counsel has produced a large number of documents to the P.B.G.C. we are going to be making additional documents. They are in a discovery phase. I know they subpoenaed other parties as well. While we are continuing with those discussions with the P.B.G.C., I don't want to ask this Court to approve anything that would ultimately possibly prove to be a misstep with regard to ERISA. That, quite frankly, your Honor, is the

most critical because even if I believe that a cut might be appropriate at this time, I would probably still be recommending not doing it based on that reason alone.

All in all, your Honor, my recommendation with regard to benefits, is that at this time we continue to maintain the status quo, no reduction in benefits at this time at least for another 90 days, unless there is some substantial event that takes place that would alter the decision and that would have to be an event either with regard to the finances, the market, something like that where we had to revisit.

In addition, and I did touch on it, your Honor, with regard to the benefit reduction, I am asking the Court to release the stay with regard to the processing of applications. Quite simply, your Honor on September 1st the Court clarified the order appointing Receiver saying that the stayed provision of that order applied to the processing of applications. That in my opinion was necessary at the time because I was evaluating the plan, I was evaluating its assets, and I was evaluating its performance and I felt if there were constant movement in the plan based on applications being processed and approved that it might make my task a little more difficult. I am beyond that at this point, your Honor. I have reviewed. I am here with a recommendation

1.0

recommending no cuts, and I believe the time to hold those applications is no longer necessary.

In addition, going back to the comments that I made earlier about the P.B.G.C. and running afoul of ERISA, similarly, I believe that the application should be processed so that we are -- if ultimately this plan is deemed to be an ERISA plan that we don't run afoul of any of its requirements or regulations, both because I have done my analysis and I am here recommending no cut to benefits as well as the fact I want to make sure we don't make any missteps that would unintentionally compromise the plan and our ability to recover in that scenario. I am recommending to the Court no cut in benefits and that the Court release the stay with regard to applications so those applications that we currently have in hand can be processed and those individuals can begin receiving monthly benefits.

THE COURT: Just to kind of sum up, you used more acronyms than anything else. Originally there was an application when the receivership was filed for a potential benefit cut that could be as much as 40 percent.

MR. DELSESTO: That's correct.

THE COURT: The Court then put that on hold and said we would take it up after I believe it was February 1st

25

or so. Also, at the beginning there was some clarification of what would happen with those people that had filed application but they have not been processed at that point, and the Court, in accordance with its initial order, stayed those and said we are going to put those on What I'm hearing is really three reasons why at this point you believe the Court should not entertain a cut and the Court should allow applications that have been filed that are on hold and possibly new applications to be filed with the state. One, over a short period of time, and I wished we engaged the market over six months or so, we have about the same amount of money even with benefit payments. But, more importantly it sounds like, and I would like to hear from the special counsel at some point in terms of what he can or cannot share, but we're getting to the point where we progressed with the investigation. It probably makes sense if we're getting there to come to some conclusions before we start cutting benefits. And the third, most importantly, is there is this ERISA out there and something called the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation that provides that there is insurance provided for a certain type of pension plan that historically this plan has not been part of, but there are discussions with the Federal Pension Benefit Guarantee or at least a possibility that we may make a

_ _

claim that there is entitlement to benefits. And if we make a reduction in benefits or if we stop people from applying, that may have a negative affect on what the recovery will be.

MR. DELSESTO: That's a perfect summary.

THE COURT: Very good. I can use all those big words too.

MR. DELSESTO: Had I done that, my presentation would have been a lot shorter.

THE COURT: That's the good thing about sitting up here. So would either the -- would special counsel like to be heard at this point or later on in this hearing and then the Court hasn't received any objections, but, certainly, if there is, counsel will let me know.

MR. DELSESTO: I will mention, obviously, I do want special counsel and special counsel does want to address the Court whether it be now or during the reporting portion. It's up to the special counsel. I do want to let the Court know that all counsel that have been involved in the advisory committee are aware and this recommendation has been discussed, a point that everybody wanted the Court to be aware of and I do not have any objection to, I think it's appropriate, is the fact there was no objection filed with regard to this recommendation should not be construed as anything other than we agree

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that we should wait a little bit longer before anything So there is a complete reservation of rights that a party's silence today should not held against them if they want to take a position.

THE COURT: I think it's appropriate to just include a reservation of rights paragraph in any order. I agree we're talking about a little bit of a moving target at this point.

MR. DELSESTO: Exactly, your Honor.

THE COURT: So you let me know if you want to move forward or if you want to turn it over to the Special Master?

MR. DELSESTO: I am happy to turn it over to anybody who wishes to speak on the recommendation, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. WISTOW: Good morning, your Honor. I am very mindful how concerned the participants in the pension plan are as to what's going on and how confusing this whole situation is. I just want to speak very, very briefly on the issue of the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation as it has been brought up. The investigation has been proceeding in a sense on two parallel tracks. One is can we get the insurance coverage, and the other is if we can't, are there are other sources, defendants really, to make the pension fund whole. We have been to

Washington. We met with the P.B.G.C. they have been furnished with request materials that we have been able to give them as a result of my investigation and the subpoenas that we've processed. As we go through the documents, which we continue to do, we are finding additional documents that we think will be relevant to the P.B.G.C's decision as to whether or not this is a covered plan and we intend to supplement our submissions.

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

I know everybody in this courtroom is saying, you know, when is this coming to an end. When are we going to know what exactly the plan is here. All I can say is the following: The materials that we're looking at are When we first started getting responses to our subpoena, the first 60 days, as your Honor knows, we were in the Court almost every week asking the Court's assistance, which we received, to force disclosure by In the first 60 days, that was from various components. November 8th to January 8th we received about 97,000 pages of documents. As a result of the subpoenas, the motions rather, which were heard before your Honor, in the next 60 days through around March 8th we received an additional 566,000 pages of documents, and this is an ongoing process. In the last roughly ten days we got another 43,000 pages of documents. So we're well over 700,000 pages to date. We're not finished going through

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

them. Some of them, of course, are duplicative, some are sort of perfunctory things, other are very, very dense documents that require extensive examination.

I can tell you that we're trying to set up a meeting with the Attorney General's Office for next week because, as your Honor knows, they filed privilege logs withholding information from us still. We're going to try to work that out I hope next week. If not, we will be back in court on that issue. I am just asking everybody to understand what a tremendous job it is to go through these documents. I anticipate that before we're finished with the subpoena process, I'm sure we're going to be getting at least another 200,000 documents because there has been a rolling production. St. Joseph's Hospital is still producing documents, Prospect CharterCare is still, and we're trying to move this as quickly as we can. I am delighted that at this point, at least, it looks promising enough that the participants can be kept getting their full pensions for the time being. With that, your Honor, unless you have some questions.

THE COURT: No. The only thing is I want to say I understand the amount of documents you're going through and the amount, you know, several months going through it seems to, I'm sure, all of the people collecting pensions

a long time. My direction very clearly to the Receiver and the special investigator is we're going to -- I want to do this right and if that means that it takes a little more time, I would rather get it right than rush to something especially because we are in the situation at least in the short term right now that we don't have to deal with a large cut across the board with the benefits, which certainly puts us in a very good position.

MR. WISTOW: I appreciate that, your Honor. I can say we have come to some tentative conclusions but because of the mass of documents that are unreviewed at this point and what is coming in, I want to make sure the conclusion I reach based on document A is not contradicted by further documents. That's the problem. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. You may continue.

MR. DELSESTO: Thank you, your Honor. Barring any further questions on the recommendation, I will move over to the first interim record. I'm sorry. I mean the second interim report.

THE COURT: I just want to address with respect to the recommendations on the stay because, certainly, in terms of the no benefits cut at this point, that's just advising the Court as far as releasing the stay itself. I already pointed out if there is any order, that would

contain a full reservation of rights. Is there any counsel who wishes to be heard on that issue? Hearing none. So the Court does approve that form of relief. Why don't we move on to the next matter.

MR. DELSESTO: Your Honor, the second matter on before the Court is the Receiver's second interim report and request for fees, costs, and expenses in this case. Rather than duplicate anything that I just said, your Honor, I will advise the Court that we continue to do much research. As I have stated, I continue to meet with the benefit participants, the pension participants on a monthly basis. Those meetings have gotten shorter as we have gone along. They continue to be recorded and posted to the website. That way people who live out of state do have an opportunity to at least see what was discussed and hear the answers to the questions that been asked.

The advisory committee, as I stated, up until recently we were meeting on a weekly basis. The only reason why we stopped meeting on a weekly basis is because we asked for some substantial information from the actuary, which is necessary to further some of the discussions that had come with the advisory committee. I can say that the meetings with the advisory committee have been very, very beneficial. It's a very good group. It's a thoughtful group.

Obviously, this is a very significant issue, both generally, but also personally to many of them, and as a result their meetings can get emotional, as you can expect that they would, but at the end of the day, everybody has been very professional and very thoughtful. Any ideas that have come out have been -- some are ideas that you would think about but some have been extremely creative. Luckily, we're not at the point we're asking the Court to entertain any of them but it has been a helpful process.

I continue to speak with the benefits administrator, which is Angell Pension, who is also the plan actuary, on a regular basis to understand better what's going on in terms of applications coming in and things of that nature, as well as general administrative issues, change of address, but also with regard to the information that may be helpful to the advisory committee as they continue down its path.

As I stated during the recommendation presentation, I've had numerous discussions with Mercer, who is the discretionary investment manager. They have recently provided me with multiple scenarios which range from maintaining the current allocation of the plan to one of the more conservative aspects of it. In an eye towards looking what this plan should look like in terms of

investment allocation as the market possibly continues to evolve. As I stated, as of now there has been no change to the allocation, but I am continuing with those discussions as well.

Beyond that, your Honor, and some research that I have been doing on various issues that may be presented to this Court at future periods, the majority of the work that's been done in this case has been through special counsel and their office. The report goes through some detail on those efforts, mostly the presentations to this Court with motions to compel and things of that nature. So with that, your Honor, before I address the fees, I would like special counsel to be here to answer any questions the Court may have with regard to that investigation beyond what he already stated.

THE COURT: And I believe, you know, counsel gave a sufficient overview. I understand the issue right now is that there is an investigation going on. I think we heard in terms of the number of documents kind of process, and, hopefully, special counsel will be coming to some conclusions. Certainly, if there is anything else he wishes to add, but the Court is satisfied based on the report that you just gave.

MR. DELSESTO: Thank you, your Honor. I do want to mention, your Honor, as your Honor knows, I did set up a

22

23

24

25

other plan documents and pieces of information have been posted so that any plan participant can access them at any time as often as they want to and they can print them all and things like that. That website appears to be very, very beneficial. I'm aware that many of the planned participants through their communications with me, because we also have the e-mail and phone lines set up, are visiting that website on a day-to-day basis to make sure things are not happening that they didn't know about vesterday. So that has been very, very beneficial. And I think it's important because as this Court stated, as your Honor stated right out of the game, one of the most important aspects of this case is transparency. Making sure that the people that are affected by what is going on here, understand what's going on at least as of August going forward and that website has been critical to maintaining that in addition to the meetings at Rhodes on the Pawtuxet and what not. I wanted the Court to know that is serving the purpose that I hoped that it would. Unless your Honor has any questions regarding the report

dedicated website where all court filings as well as

THE COURT: Yes, go right ahead.

of me, I will move to the fee portion.

MR. DELSESTO: As your Honor may recall. I was last before the Court on November 20th on my first interim

report and request for fees. At that time the Court 1 approved all the fees, costs, and expenses of both the 2 Receiver and special counsel but required a holdback, I 3 believe, of 20 percent from those fees. Today, your 4 Honor, I am here on the second report. The fees that I 5 am requesting approval from this Court span the timeframe 6 of November 1st through February 28th of this year, so 7 approximately four months. During that period of time, your Honor, and this includes costs and expenses, 9 obviously, as your Honor is aware, special counsel with 10 regard to its investigation has retained experts and 11 things like that. So there is a high amount of expense 12 associated with their bills. So special counsel's bill 13 through that timeframe, November 1st of 2017 through 14 February 28, 2018, including the holdback from the first 15 interim report, total \$262,175.37. The Receiver's fees 16 through that same period of time, costs and expenses, 17 including the holdback total \$151,395.67. I am asking 18 the Court to approve those fees, costs, and expenses 19 through that date in connection with this second interim 20 I will tell your Honor, as your Honor knows, the 21 report. fees, costs, and expenses to date that have been paid 22 have been paid from funds that were transferred over to 23 the receivership estate from the petitioner. 24

THE COURT: Just to be clear, the fees are not being

25

2

1

5

6

7

0

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

paid out of the corpus of what is with Mercer?

MR. DELSESTO: Correct. Exactly. So the \$85, \$86 million of plan assets that are invested and serve to pay the monthly benefits, the fees are not coming from that. They are coming from a request from the petitioner who is holding money that ultimately would be coming over to the plan. As of today, your Honor, I have approximately -they originally forwarded \$650,000. As of today, I have approximately \$317,000 left. Obviously, some quick math shows I do not have enough on hand to cover the fees, costs, and expenses. I have made a request of the petitioner through their counsel Attorney Land. He has discussed that request with the board. I was informed today that of the three board members that he has, he has received responses from two in the affirmative and then he is still waiting for a response from the other. may -- and I think Attorney Land is here, if he wants to speak to this more specifically. I believe I asked for a sum certain whereas I think the board is asking that rather than go with a flat sum that I asked for that they approve an amount that this Court approves for those fees and costs.

THE COURT: Yes, and I will allow that to work through. It certainly sounds like any fees and expenses approved by the Court you can draw down on what is left

in that reserve and it sounds like it's going through the 1 process right now and whether an arrangement is reached, 2 whether there is a further drawdown or whether there is 3 fees and expenses, certainly, you can review that and if 4 there is an issue, you can review that. MR. DELSESTO: Absolutely. And one thing I wanted 6 7 to make sure so the Court and everyone in the courtroom is aware of, those discussions with Attorney Land have 8 been happening and they will continue to happen. 9 there is an issue, obviously, we will bring it to the 10 Court's attention but that there is no portion of the 11 fees, costs, expenses that I would be seeking to pay from 12 of the corpus of the plan. With that, your Honor --13 MR. WISTOW: I think it's important to note on the 14 15 record the payments that have been made to date to the Receiver have been by Roger William's Hospital and not 16 17 St. Joseph's. That's correct, your Honor. The 18 MR. DELSESTO: actual funds were drawn on Roger Williams. 19 Right. And my understanding is the 20 MR. WISTOW: future funds coming in would similarly be from Roger 21 22 Williams. MR. DELSESTO: I won't know until I get the check. 23 I understand. THE COURT: 24 MR. WISTOW: So with that, your Honor, I would ask 25

that the Court approve, confirm, and ratify all the acts, doings of the Receiver and special counsel in connection with the second interim report, approve the fees, costs, and expenses presented to this Court. I have also asked that the Court, within its discretion, release the holdback from the first interim report and keep this matter open pending further order of the Court and the continued acts and doings of both the Receiver and special counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

First of all, the Court with respect to THE COURT: the interim report does approve the acts and deeds of the Receiver and counsel and finds that the services rendered -- and I will say for the record that I have had the opportunity in detail to review the special counsel's fees and expenses and invoices. I believe I got a little bit later yours. So I can comment that the fees and expenses of the special counsel, the Court finds is fair and reasonable and certainly for the benefit of the receivership estate. The Court, subject to a review, which I should be able to finish by the end of the day on Monday, again makes that representation subject to the Court's review that they're fair and reasonable and for the benefit of the receivership estate. I also understand after reviewing, especially with respect to the special counsel, is that the fees can be a little

deceiving because we have a lot of outside expenses and 1 other things that are part of that number. But based on 2 what I have seen and what I have heard on the record in 3 terms of what is going on, these fees are approved and 4 you can certainly draw down on what is left being held by 5 the Receiver to pay those fees, including the holdback 6 7 from the first report, and the balance will be subject to an arrangement being made of the St. Joe's and Roger 8 9 The Court does not permit any fees and expenses, and you're not asking at this point, to be 10 taken from the corpus of the estate. 11 MR. DELSESTO: That's correct. 12 13

THE COURT: Is there anything else?

MR. DELSESTO: Not unless the Court has any further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: And I know that we went by a fair amount of time especially since the Court cancelled the last hearing. I think it's important from a status point of view that certainly in the next 60 days or so we have another status report.

MR. WISTOW: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Thank you, your Honor. MR. DELSESTO:

The Court will also note for the record THE COURT: that it was given before it took the bench given a

2.0

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

proposal from, I believe, it was a planned participant as far as a solution to this issue. That is what is called ex parte. The Court hasn't reviewed it, but the Court will provide it to counsel and special counsel and will make it part of the court record. Thank you all very much. The Court will be in recess. (ADJOURNED.)