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SPECIAL MASTER: Good morning, everyone. This is the time scheduled for the mandated meeting of the parties so we can set the ground rules for going forward and see what arrangements and agreements we can have on the issues that are present. I know that all the attorneys were notified to be here, and there's some attorneys who are peripherally in the case. If those attorneys want to stay for the whole hearing, it's fine. If not, they can at this time indicate to the Court, put their name on the record and indicate what issues the Master has to decide that involve them so we can address those first and then we get to the major issues.

Since we're now having a record at the request of the parties, when you speak, please identify yourself and the party you represent so that the record can be as complete as possible. If any one of the peripheral attorneys want to speak first, you may.

MR. MOORHEAD: Good morning, Judge. Jeffrey Moorhead for the record purposes, and Plessen

Enterprises in 370 of 12. My client was part of the caption for the status, but I think all of the issues have -- I'm pretty sure all the issues deal with the other major parties, so unless -- I don't think my presence is necessary, but I was here just in case. With Your Master's permission --

SPECIAL MASTER: If any of the other attorneys or parties disagree with the statement, please indicate such. If not, I'll excuse him. (No response.)

SPECIAL MASTER: And you'll be excused, Attorney Moorhead, and you should not respond to further meetings of the group, unless it's directly involving you.

MR. MOORHEAD: Thank you, Your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you. Anyone else?
(No response.)
Now, I issued an order based on the suggestion submitted by one of the parties, the Hameds in particular, as to some of the issues that were pending and some that were undecided, and I note that the Yusufs have filed a document, a memorandum, indicating that some of the items that were contemplated to be not disputed, as such, or limited dispute, is not correct.

Attorney Hodges?
MR. HODGES: Your Honor, would you like me to stand?

SPECIAL MASTER: You don't have to.
MR. HODGES: Thank you, Your Honor. We -effectively, all the issues are disputed. The issue was whether or not discovery was required for some of them. And based on Attorney Holt's response to our bench memo that was filed yesterday, it appears that we agree what should be briefed that requires no discovery and what does require discovery. So I think -- as I understand Items 1 and 5 of his response yesterday, he agrees with the statement in our bench memorandum in the concluding paragraph that Items 2, 3, 5, 10, and 12 listed on Page 1 of your order should be removed, and that items --

SPECIAL MASTER: Which items are those?

MR. HODGES: Okay. That would be -- Item 2 is past partnership withdrawals - receipts; Item 3 is Hamed partnership interest and sale of the Dorothea property; Item 5 is invoices from David Jackson, CPA, for tax work done for the partnership; Item 10 is Wally Hamed's payments of accounting and attorney's fees in the criminal case; and Item 12
is attorney and accounting fees paid by the partnership for the criminal case. Those matters, as I understand his response, we agree should be removed from the list in your order because further discovery is required. All the other items we agree we can brief and no further discovery is required.

SPECIAL MASTER: If I recall correctly, weren't the items listed in my order a review of the liquidating partner's decision that I approved and I permitted? MR. HOLT: Some. MR. HODGES: Some of those. Some of those. SPECIAL MASTER: Oh. All right. You're correct. So the ones that you don't dispute are the ones which is, in essence, a review of the liquidating partner's decision. MR. HODGES: And the additional rent from day one. We don't think that -SPECIAL MASTER: Yeah -- well -MR. HODGES: So, in other words, Your Honor, what we're -- I think we agree --

SPECIAL MASTER: Oh, I understand what you're saying.

MR. HODGES: -- is that items -- and I'm
referring to the items on Page 1 of your order -Items 1, 4, 6 through 9, and 11 should remain for briefing only, and the others should be removed, because discovery will be required.

SPECIAL MASTER: I had identified 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11 as the decisions of the liquidating partner.

MR. HODGES: Not 5, Your Honor. 5 had -we -- the liquidating partner did not retain David Jackson and did not authorize payment of David Jackson.

SPECIAL MASTER: Liquidating partner denied payment and I agreed with his decision, so I thought that's what --

MR. HODGES: Oh, I was not aware of that. I'm sorry, Your Honor.

MR. HOLT: I'm not aware of that either.
SPECIAL MASTER: Well, that's why it wasn't paid. The liquidating partner, having received the invoices from David Jackson, refused to pay them. That's how I know of the invoices.

MR. HOLT: All right. But --
SPECIAL MASTER: But if you want -- I
understand what you're saying. MR. HOLT: Okay.

SPECIAL MASTER: Yeah. But it is those items that he affirmatively approved, that is, he agreed to pay, are the ones that can have limited briefing. The others require discovery.

MR. HODGES: Yes, Your Honor. And if I may, I note that $I$ didn't raise this in my bench memo, I didn't think it was that important, but in Attorney Holt's motion for hearing, he had suggested a five-page limit on the brief. Your Honor made it two pages. And although I haven't started on preparing it yet, just, you know, so that we don't have to come back and beg for another three pages, could we agree that it should be a five-page limit?

SPECIAL MASTER: Whatever you all agree upon, I have no objection. This is not for me to set the limits of the agreement. I want the parties to try to agree on what they want to do in terms of presenting the facts to me. I will do whatever the parties feel comfortable in doing.

But as you know from my past practices, when you tell me five days, you have five days. I don't extend it. Unless another hurricane or something like that comes. But $I$ don't intend to be here for the next two years in this case. And I want to see that we establish a timeline for all the issues so
that we can look from now and expect a final date or await decisions on the issues.

The purpose of calling you here today is to see if the parties can reach some agreement on all the issues and present it to the court. Before we had a reporter, I intended to ask the parties to submit to me what they believe to be the time frame for discoveries and addressing all the issues you may have, a stipulation that $I$ would approve. But we can put it in the record and I will incorporate it in an order.

So who wants to go first in identifying those issues we can agree upon, and their limited time frame, notwithstanding my order?

Go ahead.
MR. HOLT: Your Honor, Joel Holt for plaintiff. First off, when they say they want to do discovery on an item, we take the position that we don't have veto power over that, so that's why we just agreed to take them off the list. It isn't like we necessarily believe it's needed, but if they say it's needed, we can't veto that.

So it would seem to me that the items that we can brief by January 12 would be 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11, since those are the items that we suggested
you put on here and they have now agreed should be briefed.

I don't have a problem with five pages. Most of these will not take five pages to write, although some of them will have attachments because you'll have to show where the payment was made or something. I would think on Items 1 and 4, which are the rent payments, that they should file a brief and I should have five days to respond, because that's their burden. And on Issues 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11, I should file first and let them respond, just because those are items that we put on the list.

MR. HODGES: Did I hear you correctly, you only identified 1 for me?

MR. HOLT: 4.
MR. HODGES: 1 and 4? Okay. Yeah, I have no problem with that, Your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER: 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 11; right?
MR. HOLT: And he'll file first on 1 and 4, and I'll file first on 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11.

SPECIAL MASTER: How much time from today's date do you need? MR. HOLT: Excuse me? SPECIAL MASTER: How much time from today's
date? Are you going to use the same --
MR. HOLT: I was thinking the January 12th date, but I'm --

MR. HODGES: That would be appreciated, Your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER: So that the party with the burden shall file by the January 12 th date. And how many days to respond?

MR. HOLT: I said five, but why don't we say five working days, because there is a holiday in there, and we'll just figure that.

MR. HODGES: I think five working days is fine, Your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER: Is that fine?
MR. HODGES: Yes.
MR. HOLT: Your Honor, when you issued that order and you pulled these items out, I think we've kind of resolved that, but in our motion for the hearing, we actually listed a series of items that we thought could be argued without any briefing. And we think that those need to be addressed, and obviously we don't expect you to address them today, but, you know, on our part, we really felt like there were two claims for us that could be addressed and that there were a series of their
claims that were ready to be addressed.
And they dealt with, really, with the -- on our side, the two conceptual issues: the 2.7 million, and the 504,000 that we think Judge Brady already found were improperly taken. Obviously there's not going to be payment now, just there's no reason not to resolve those and then ultimately they will be processed all the way through.

And then for their claims, we felt that we identified as a list of their claims that were claimed by them which are barred under Judge Brady's order. And they have come back and disagreed with that, but we think that's a threshold question that needs to be addressed. We think that any claims that predate 2006, they have a series of claims that are barred, and they have come back and said they don't think they are. We think we need to figure out how that's going to work.

MR. HODGES: Short answer to that, Your Honor, is that what $I$ refer to in my bench memo or at least Exhibit $A$ to the bench memo is the limitation order, Judge Brady's July 21, 2017, order that limited accounting claims between the partners to transactions that occurred on or before September

17, 2006. That applies to the partners. They're attempting to transport that ruling onto a claim of United's for debt, and it's simply -- it doesn't apply. And what makes it so clear that it doesn't apply is what $I$ refer to as the rent order where Judge Brady expressly found that the statute of limitations on United's rent claim that dated back to 2004 was cold because of the acknowledgment of debt doctrine or the partial payment doctrine. So there's not much to be said. I mean, we can file a brief about that, but, you know, debt claims of third parties are not affected by the limitation order, period.

MR. HOLT: Yeah, but the statute of limitations motion he's talking about dealt with the rent on the shopping -- on the store, and the Court expressly reserved ruling on all of the other rent claims. He didn't say they apply to them. So you've got the rent from Bays 5 and 8 which weren't part of the store, and then you've got the interest on -- we went through it -- on Bays 5 and 8 where they're claiming interest for time prior to that. And then you're talking about gross receipts taxes, the black book -- the black book was a partnership book. It wasn't a book between United
and them, it was a book between the partners. The ledger balances owed were loans between the partners. The water revenues, that was a partnership operation. And, you know, all of those are not claims of United, those are claims between the partners, and they're time-barred, and we think we need a ruling on that. And we think the rent claims are also barred. The judge found that the rent claims for the actual store weren't barred, and we're bound by that, and that's not even before you, although there's an interest component of that before you. But on all of these other claims, I mean, they're time-barred just under the normal statute, and we think they're also barred under the order because they aren't related to the rent for that store. And we need to get -- Judge Brady's order gave us some definition going forward. We need some clarity on that.

SPECIAL MASTER: Well, it's obvious that the parties don't agree on what the order meant or its -- its scope. So then I will give the parties a reasonable time in which to file whatever documents, whether a brief or other documents in support of their position. So if you can identify those issues, Attorney

Hodges, that you believe that the order doesn't apply to, you think they're outside the scope of the order, and Attorney Holt can respond. How much time would you need to do that? I mean, you have identified some of them already. Are there any more?

MR. HODGES: No. I mean, he's the one that's claiming that the limitation order affects the claims -- what I say are the claims of United. He says the water revenues are not a United claim, it's a partnership claim; I can't disagree with that more. He claims the water revenue is a partnership claim; $I$ can't disagree with that more. That's United's roof that collects that water. So, you know, the --

But he also has his claims. I think he's suggesting that there's no further -- nothing further needs to be done on the 2.7 million that he refers to, which is, you know -- respectfully, Your Honor, it's already on Mr. Yusuf's side of the ledger, so to speak, in the BDO report. We acknowledged he withdrew those funds. That's not in dispute. The accounting effect of that is what is in dispute, so that can't be ruled on without discovery. And they pretty much acknowledge it in
their response to our bench memo. The $\$ 504,000$, ask Joel -- or Attorney Holt to point you to a finding from Judge Brady that says Mr. Yusuf owes 504,591. He can't do it. I mean, it's just not there.

SPECIAL MASTER: I would suspect that if he has such a reference, he'll do it in the response brief or whatever documents he files. I don't intend to try to make a decision today.

MR. HODGES: I appreciate that.
SPECIAL MASTER: I'm just trying to get the parties to at least present in writing, for the record, their positions so a decision can be made.

MR. HOLT: But, Your Honor -- I'm sorry, are you finished?

MR. HODGES: Yeah.
MR. HOLT: If I may. For example, the 2.7, they admit it's owed, so it should be found as a claim. Now, they want to argue there's an offset through the BDO report, but that doesn't change the fact it's a claim submitted to be paid.

The BDO report, you know, Judge Brady basically said, you know, that because of all the missing documents, it had no effect, and he said that again in his motion for reconsideration. And
you've got to make some preliminary decisions about the BDO report and the Integra report because, otherwise, we'll be doing discovery more than the next two years. I mean, the BDO report is 60,000 entries, and the Integra has a whole evaluation of the west store.

And, you know, unless some of these threshold -- I mean, if you look at the Integra report, for example, and you say I'm going to let discovery go on, then we'll go do discovery. But as opposed to saying, well, the parties want to, I'm going to let them, unlike the other ones where we say we don't think there's a veto power on discovery, on the Integra report, we think that that's an issue you have to decide whether or not we all should spend time on discovery on the Integra report because it's valuing the west store as a going concern when there was never a lease. So on the Integra report and the BDO report, we would like a ruling as to whether or not you think we really have to go do further discovery, because that will take forever.

SPECIAL MASTER: How do you plan to present the issue to me so that I can make the decision?

MR. HOLT: Well, I guess having a hearing
today, that's a good point. I mean, maybe we should file a motion to strike the Integra claim and a motion to strike the BDO claim.

SPECIAL MASTER: That's what I'm suggesting.
MR. HOLT: And, you know, I don't mind taking a lead on the things that he says -- if I think it's barred by the order, I'll take the lead and say why I think it's barred by the order. I don't mind. If he wants to say it's not barred by the order, then he can respond. But I don't mind taking the lead on that.

But I do want to make one thing clear. You know, they talk about Plot 4 H is in the name of United. It is in the name of United, but when the Court did the windup order, it specifically held back any decision on Plot 4H. If something being in the name of United would end this case, then we would have never gotten this far, because Plaza, the store, was in the name of United. The store out west is in the name of United. Everything is in the name of United. What the Court found is the corporate form was really a partnership. So when you get to Plot 4 H , the fact that it's in the name of United doesn't mean it's not a partnership asset. The fact that there's a piece of property
in St. Thomas in the name of United doesn't mean it's not a partnership asset. You see, those are still claims, and you get to decide them, of course, but just because something is in the name of United Corporation doesn't mean that -- and it was in the name before 2006 -- doesn't mean it's not litigated, because that's what this whole thing is about is United Corporation is really the partnership.

SPECIAL MASTER: What I'm suggesting is that as to both parties, if you think that an issue needs to be decided by the Master preliminarily to determine the validity of what may be considered the claim, file the appropriate motion so a ruling can be had early enough so that the matter can proceed.

MR. HOLT: Okay.
MR. HODGES: May I just comment briefly to what Attorney Holt just said? SPECIAL MASTER: Yes.

MR. HODGES: I understand that a lot -- the partnership business was conducted under the name of United for many years. But Judge Brady, in Section 8, Subsection 1 of his plan, said, "For purposes of winding up the partnership, Plot 4H,

Estate Sion Farm, shall not be considered partnership property and is not subject to division under this plan without prejudice to any accounting claim that may be presented by Hamed." Okay. So the accounting claim, the limitation order says all accounting claims that predate September 17, 2006, are out. Who can tell me that a claim that the partnership really owns that property didn't arise before 2006, since the property was in the name of United since 1992?

SPECIAL MASTER: That is your position.
MR. HODGES: That's our position.
SPECIAL MASTER: And I think Attorney Holt has a different position. MR. HOLT: Right. SPECIAL MASTER: What I'm trying to suggest is that you file the appropriate motion before the Court so the issue can be decided.

MR. HODGES: Okay. So as I understand what Your Honor is suggesting, all of the -- he has 165 claims, whereas we have, if you put aside the debt claims, we have a handful of claims. What you're suggesting, I think, is we would move to strike whatever claims we submit are improper? Because when we talk about discovery, a lot of those claims
aren't even really claims, Your Honor.
And I'm happy to go through Exhibit 3 of his motion where you can -- it's just page after page, literally. I counted 125 of those 165 claims are what I call maybe claims. They're claims that -where he says unclear, need five- to ten-minute depo of John Gaffney. Those aren't claims. Those are requests for explanation of what Gaffney put on the general ledger.

And if a party is going to be entitled to discovery based on a maybe claim, that's going to be a serious problem here. Because, you know, the rules do say, unless the Court orders otherwise, that interrogatories are limited to 25. If we're -- if we take his 125 maybe claims and have only one interrogatory for those claims, and fiveto ten-minute deposition, as he suggests, for each claim, we're talking about 125 interrogatories and anywhere from 8 hours to 21 hours of deposition time. It will be mindboggling.

So I think it is important for us to, at least before we get -- you know, engage in the full panoply of discovery, determine what claims ought to be tossed out or not so that we can pare down that process.

SPECIAL MASTER: And that's why I'm suggesting that you file an appropriate motion before the Master so a decision can be had.

MR. HOLT: If I can just briefly respond.
SPECIAL MASTER: Yes.

MR. HOLT: Discovery may clear up some of those claims and they will be withdrawn, but, for example, there will be an accounting entry, 425,000 miscellaneous labor, and we don't want to accept that as a charge unless we know what it is. If it was labor used to build someone's house during the windup period, then it's not part of the charge. If it's -- if like there's a professional fee in there, if that was money paid to BDO, then that's not a proper charge. That's their accounting, not us. It may not be there, it may actually be a perfectly legitimate charge, in which case it goes away.

And that, of course, is why we tried early on to have that meeting with John Gaffney, because a lot of these may drop quickly. But that meeting didn't take place, so they've become claims. We don't -- we don't -- we contest them. But I will agree, of the 165, you might have 80 or 90 disappear once somebody says, no, that was spent on
this. Or it becomes clear, he says, well, that was spent on this and we don't like it, and therefore at least we can say, well, they paid $B D O$ so we think you got a signed document. In other words, it won't then track down to much larger discovery because now we'll just argue about whether or not that was a proper payment. So, yeah, a lot of them may disappear. We agree with that.

SPECIAL MASTER: It's up to the parties to move the case by filing the appropriate motion before the Master so that a decision can be had and we at least know where we stand as to all the different issues, and then you take a step after the ruling of the Master. But if we try to resolve it by discussion, we're not going to do it. We're not going to do it.

MR. HODGES: I think we can agree on that, Your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER: Well -- so therefore, file whatever you think is appropriate to bring the issue to a head.

MR. HODGES: Do I understand Attorney Holt's offer just a moment ago that, in effect, he'll take the lead on briefing all of the claims he wants to brief in Exhibit 1 to the motion for hearing?

MR. HOLT: In Exhibit 1?

MR. HODGES: Yeah. Those are all the debt claims that you claim are barred, and your 2.7 and 504, 000.

MR. HOLT: And we'll also do one as to Integra and BDO.

MR. HODGES: Okay. Well -- so you're going to take the lead on that and we'll respond. Okay.

SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Anything else?
MR. HOLT: And then -- so that's how that will handle. And then we know on the second two, we just went over these claims, on how we're going to brief that by January 12th, each party. So then the third thing comes back to discovery. I mean, how we going to deal with discovery on the claims that we now agree we need to discover? Do we wait until you set forth the scope of claims and begin discovery or do we begin some discovery now?

SPECIAL MASTER: What do the parties believe is the best course of conduct?

MR. HODGES: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that last part.

SPECIAL MASTER: My statement or his?
MR. HODGES: No. His statement.
MR. HOLT: I said we need to decide how to
proceed on discovery. We proposed a plan for each claim, so -- you objected to the plan, but -- I'm sorry, Yusuf objected to the plan, but they didn't come up with an accounting of their own. But I don't see why we don't try to begin some discovery.

MR. HODGES: I agree. I think --
SPECIAL MASTER: But some of the discovery would depend upon some preliminary motions. MR. HOLT: Some of it will.

SPECIAL MASTER: Yes.
MR. HODGES: That's true. Your Honor, I would suggest -- and Attorney Holt and our office have, I believe, actually at least in one case, maybe more, agreed on a discovery schedule. And if we can't agree on it, I would say that we submit our proposed discovery schedules to you. And that's exactly what we did in another case. And the judge -- I can't remember whether he mixed and matched or accepted one schedule over the other, but I think, you know, it makes better sense and better use of your time if we present you with something, either a stipulated discovery schedule or our competing discovery schedules so you can have something in writing to look at and decide for
yourself.
SPECIAL MASTER: Can you do it by the 12 th of January?

MR. HODGES: I don't see why not.
MR. HOLT: Sounds fine, Your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Either a joint stipulation or the parties' position on discovery and submit it by the 12 th .

MR. HOLT: Okay.
SPECIAL MASTER: Anything else?
MR. HOLT: This is really a housekeeping matter, but I would like to just have a standing request to always ask for the transcript and the parties will split the cost. That way we don't have to contact you after each one and ask for it.

SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Because all hearings may not be here.

MR. HOLT: Right.
SPECIAL MASTER: I did it today because of the number of people I expected to attend. But I don't plan to put on a suit and a tie every time we have to meet. You know, we can meet at someone's office or a neutral place. But we can always hire a reporter to take the -- once we set it up, we'll
just hire a reporter and the parties pay the cost.

MR. HOLT: All right.
SPECIAL MASTER: Anything else? The other attorneys here besides Holt and Hodges, you want to put your name on the record?

MR. ECKARD: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor. Mark Eckard for counterclaim defendants Waleed Hamed, Waheed Hamed, Mufeed Hamed, and Hisham Hamed.

SPECIAL MASTER: We're just putting the attorneys who are present names on the record, other than Holt and Hodges who have been introduced already.

MR. HERPEL: Good morning, Your Honor. Stefan Herpel on behalf of Yusuf.

MR. HODGES: You want the parties to be identified?

SPECIAL MASTER: No, not necessarily.
MR. HODGES: Okay.
SPECIAL MASTER: I just wanted the attorneys, because the attorneys represent the parties, so that if there's a question whether or not you were present at the hearing, at least the record will reflect that you were here.

MR. ECKARD: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. HODGES: Your Honor, there's going to be an issue, I think, that we probably ought to get you thinking about right now.

As you recall, back in $I$ think it was May or June of last year, there was this kind of dust up about whether or not Mr. Gaffney was going to respond to 125 questions or -- I can't remember the exact number, but a bunch of questions from -- that were prepared by the plaintiffs' CPAs.

Ultimately -- he answered some of them, but he didn't answer all of them. Basically, you know, the position taken was that the plan or the order approving the plan required access to information and didn't require Mr. Gaffney to spoon-feed the information to them, at least that was our position.

At the time, the partnership was paying him for doing whatever work was necessary to compile information, to answer questions and things like that. So Mr. Yusuf was paying 50 percent of the time he was spending working with their CPAs. And I don't know if you recall the declaration that Mr. Gaffney submitted in support of our opposition to the motion to terminate the Master, but he said
that he spent at least 50 times more time answering questions from their side and providing information than he did with us. And as Your Honor knows, I don't remember the month, but at some point in time the partnership stopped paying Mr. Gaffney, and it stopped paying Mr. Yusuf's salary as well.

So the idea that -- if there are -- you know, the idea is that they're going to submit an interrogatory to Mr. Yusuf about an accounting issue and it is clear that he's not going to be able to answer that, that Mr. Gaffney will have to answer that, and since the partnership is not paying him now, the question of the time he spends in compiling information and answering questions is going to be a serious question, because as he said in that declaration -- and the declaration, just for the record, let me identify it so you can find it if you want, or I can hand it up to Your Honor, if you want -- the declaration was Exhibit $C$ to the defendants' opposition to motion to terminate Master, which was filed on April 3, 2017.

But the issue that we're going to have to address is, you know, Mr. Gaffney is going to have to answer all these questions. There is no doubt about it. And so the issue is going to be who is
going to pay for the time he spends in answering those questions. And I would respectfully submit that the plaintiffs ought to have to pay that in full. But I'm -- unless they agree to that, that's going to be a decision that you're going to have to make at some point in time.

SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
MR. HOLT: I don't think plaintiff should have to pay. I think the partnership should pay. It's really clearing up this partnership account, which may or may not make it a claim. It may moot it.

SPECIAL MASTER: Well, see if you can agree on a course of conduct, if not, just file an objection or whatever and bring it before me at the appropriate time.

MR. HODGES: Okay.
SPECIAL MASTER: I'm in a different position now than when $I$ was supervising the liquidating partner. My job at the time was to look at the liquidating partner's conduct and approve or disapprove of his conduct. It wasn't an adversarial role as it is now. I'm in an adjudicatory position. So the issue should be brought to me with notice to the other parties.

And I would state for the record that one of
the reasons $I$ identified decisions of the liquidating partner that $I$ approved for discussions and gave the Hameds an opportunity to respond is because I believed that because they were not a part of the decision-making process at the time, in all fairness, they should be given an opportunity to present whatever evidence they have that would show that the liquidating partner was improper in its decisions. And that's one of the reasons I listed those items for the parties to submit additional evidence. And that's so that the Hameds would feel at least that they were heard fully and not that the liquidating partner, as happened, made a decision without consulting them. And he didn't have to consult them, under the rules. The liquidating partner does not have to consult the other partner in making decisions. But the other partner has a right to object.

Anything else?
MR. HOLT: No, Your Honor.
MR. HODGES: Thank you, Your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER: Gentlemen, I intend to wrap up this case as quickly as possible.

MR. HODGES: Thank you, Your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER: And I can promise you that
with your consent to have hired Ms. Kuo as the law clerk, she's no longer affiliated with the Court now, she's just working part time for us so that I think we can get out decisions quickly. And I don't intend to hold up the case. I don't like postponements. If you agree to do something in a certain period of time, do it. And I will try to be as speedy in my response as possible. And hopefully sometime in the near future, we can terminate -- or at least my role in this whole case, and let it go wherever it goes. Either to the records room or to some higher body. Thank you very much for coming here. MR. HODGES: Thank you, Your Honor. MR. ECKARD: Thank you, Your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER: And I'm glad to see my friends from St. Thomas are here bright and healthy. Thank you all.
(The proceedings concluded at 10:30 a.m.)
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