IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DIVISION OF ST. CROIX

WALEED HAMED, as the Executor of the Estate of MOHAMMAD HAMED,	
Plaintiff/Counterclaim Deft.,	
vs.	Case No. SX-2012-CV-370
FATHI YUSUF and UNITED CORPORATION,	
Defendants/Counterclaimants,	
vs.	
WALEED HAMED, WAHEED HAMED, MUFEED HAMED, HISHAM HAMED, and PLESSEN ENTERPRISES, INC.,	
Counterclaim Defendants. WALEED HAMED, as Executor of the Estate of MOHAMMAD HAMED,	
Plaintiff,)) Consolidated with
VS.	Case No. SX-2014-CV-287
UNITED CORPORATION,	
Defendant.)
WALEED HAMED, as Executor of the Estate of MOHAMMAD HAMED,	
Plaintiff,	
VS.	Consolidated with Case No. SX-2014-CV-278
)
FATHI YUSUF,	
Defendant.	,)

ORAL DEPOSITION OF JOHN GAFFNEY AS TO HAMED REVISED CLAIM H-72

THE ORAL DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. GAFFNEY

was taken on the 24th day of September, 2018, at the Offices of Caribbean Scribes, Inc., 2132 Company Street, Suite 3, Christiansted, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, between the hours of 11:06 a.m. and 12:51 p.m., pursuant to Notice and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Reported by:

Susan C. Nissman RPR-RMR
Registered Merit Reporter
Caribbean Scribes, Inc.
2132 Company Street, Suite 3
Christiansted, St. Croix
U.S. Virgin Islands 00820
(340) 773-8161

APPEARANCES

A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S

For the Plaintiff:

Law Offices of Carl Hartmann, III 5000 Estate Coakley Bay, L-6 Christiansted, St. Croix U.S. Virgin Islands 00820

By: Carl Hartmann, III - Via Telephone Kimberly Japinga

For the Defendants:

Law Offices of Dudley, Topper & Feuerzeig P.O. Box 756 Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas U.S. Virgin Islands 00804

By: Gregory H. Hodges - Via Telephone

INDEX

E-X-A-M-I-N-A-T-I-O-N Description Counsel Page 5 Direct by Mr. Hartmann by Mr. Hodges 22 Cross Redirect by Mr. Hartmann 42 E-X-H-I-B-I-T-S Exhibit Description Page 7 G through Z

1	JOHN F. GAFFNEY,
2	called as a witness, having been first duly sworn,
3	testified on his oath as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. HARTMANN:
6	Q. Could you identify your full legal name for the
7	record, please?
8	A. John F. Gaffney.
9	Q. Okay. And Mr. Gaffney, did you cause an inventory
10	for the East and West stores to be prepared by RGIS in 2015?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Okay. And did RGIS provide you with the written
13	result of that inventory?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Okay. And what method of counting the inventory
16	was used by RGIS?
17	A. We I refer to them as RGIS. They have some
18	electronic equipment that scans barcodes. And then what
19	they do is, they take a physical count and they associate
20	that count with that barcode that also identifies the
21	location. And they bring in about 20 to 30 people, who are
22	each assigned in an area. And then they sort of have a map.
23	And and the process, everything automatically transmits
24	to a to a computer that they've also got on site.
25	O. Okav. And once that is done, does I will refer

1 to RGIS as RGIS as well.

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

- Q. Does RGIS then send you the cumulative inventory for both the East and West store?
- A. What they do is they send us a flash drive, or they actually leave us a flash drive at the completion of the inventory. And then that flash drive is -- is used to transmit the physical count on the server, on the retail POS server, and then what happens is Rich reads their files and it does a kind of a matching and then he generates -- he actually generates the valuation and then he sends that to --
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Go ahead.
 - Q. Okay. I'm sorry.

And by "Rich," you mean Mr. Ruggiere?

- A. Yeah. Yes, Rich Ruggiere, yeah.
- Q. Okay. And do we presently have either those two flash drives or two files from the server?
 - A. I'm not sure I heard your question correctly.
- Q. Okay. Do -- does the partnership presently have possession of either of those two flash drives or the two files that were placed on the server?
- A. We have the flash drives for Plaza East. And I was mistaken earlier when I said yes to the question,

1	because I realize that Shawn was the person who maintained
2	over at Plaza West. He was the one who maintained the
3	physical records.
4	Q. But do you have in your possession the inventory
5	for East?
6	A. Yes, I do.
7	Q. Okay. And you're going to supply that to us?
8	A. Yes, I can.
9	Q. Okay. Thank you.
LO	And if you would now turn you've been
L1	given a set of exhibits, G through Exhibit Z.
L2	Have you been supplied with those?
L3	A. Yes.
L 4	Q. Okay. And I'd like to make those exhibits, G
L5	through \mathbf{Z} , a part of the record, please.
L 6	(Deposition Exhibits G to Z were
L7	marked for identification.)
L8	If you turn over to Exhibit Y, which is the
L 9	second from the last.
20	A. Okay.
21	Q. And if you could tell me what Exhibit Y is?
22	A. I'm I had trouble finding it before, too.
23	Okay. I've got it.
24	Q. Okay. Could you just briefly explain what
25	Exhibit Y is?

1	A. Exhibit Y is my response to Claim Number H-72.
2	Q. Okay. By your "response," you mean it's a report
3	provided to counsel for both sides, which provided your
4	views as the fiduciary accountant for the partnership?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Okay. And I'd ask you to please turn over to the
7	document labeled HAMD663117, which is the end of year for
8	Plaza Extra East.
9	A. Okay. I've got it.
10	Q. Okay. And would it be correct to state this
11	document cumulates the information provided by RGIS?
12	A. Yes, it does.
13	Q. So, in other words, the inventory that RGIS did
14	was placed onto a spreadsheet in which all the grocery items
15	that were hand-counted were listed by the amount of
16	inventory beginning with that particular grouping.
17	Grocery
18	THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry.
19	Q et cetera.
20	THE COURT REPORTER: I'm so sorry, but it's
21	really mumbled. If you could
22	A. We've got some external noise coming through
23	somehow.
24	MR. HARTMANN: Is this any better?
25	THE COIDT DEDODTED. Vas

1	A. That sounds better.
2	THE COURT REPORTER: So "hand-counted were
3	listed by the amount of inventory"
4	Q. (Mr. Hartmann) Beginning with grocery.
5	A. Okay.
6	Q. Is that what this is?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Okay. Just briefly, can you explain what Items 1
9	through 35 are?
10	THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, explain what?
11	A. Explain what items
12	Q. (Mr. Hartmann) Items 1 through 35 are?
13	A. Well, we call them departments, but beginning with
14	the grocery department, then the meat, produce, and then
15	finally Department 35 is health and beauty value pack.
16	Q. Okay. And the final three items on the list, were
17	those supplied by Mr. Ruggiere and RGIS?
18	A. The final three items were I don't think those
19	were supplied by RGIS, no.
20	Q. Okay. Where were they supplied from?
21	A. They were lists that were done up internally.
22	Q. By who?
23	A. I want to say by Yusuf, but honestly, I think also
24	that one of them might have been done by Mafi.
25	Q. Okay. If you'd direct your attention to the last

1	says "expires," would you tell me where that comes from
2	and what that is?
3	A. Yeah. I would say that that's expired merchandise
4	that was found at or near the count. And my guess also is
5	that would have been supplied by by Yusuf. That's Yusuf
6	Yusuf.
7	Q. Okay. Now, if you would please turn over four
8	pages to Bates Number HAMD663120.
9	A. Okay.
10	Q. And is that the same listing for the West store?
11	A. Yes, it is.
12	Q. Okay. And I started to ask you about East, but if
13	you could look at the West, down at the bottom, it says,
14	Inventory Value as of February 18th, 2015, is that the
15	correct date for this?
16	A. Yes, it is.
17	Q. Okay. Now, you notice that it contains, again,
18	departments, so that information 1 through 24 was supplied
19	by RGIS; is that correct?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Okay. And you'll notice the final two items on
22	that list are store supplies and late adjustment; is that
23	correct?
24	A. Correct, yes.

You see the -- the line there, the last item --

Q.

25

25

1	the last two items there, do they show a correction for
2	expired items?
3	A. There's no correction, no, not at West.
4	Q. Okay. Well, then, were you aware that in 2015 at
5	the time of the inventory that a communication from Shawn in
6	that \$54,592.08 in expired or spoiled inventory for West?
7	A. I can't say that I'm aware of anything exact about
8	it. I remember some subsequent conversation about expired
9	products, yes.
10	Q. Okay. And can you explain why that wasn't added
11	to the West inventory?
12	A. I really don't have I have no knowledge why
13	that didn't happen there.
14	Q. Okay. And Mr. Gaffney, what would be the effect
15	if \$54,000 were added to that correction for expired?
16	A. If 54,000 was added to the Plaza West inventory,
17	it obviously would have decreased the value of the
18	inventory.
19	Q. Okay. And that would, in effect, credited the
20	Hameds with that \$54,000; is that correct?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Okay. So if you turn over to if I understand
23	correctly, you created a matrix sheet, which you can see on
24	Page HAMD663114 and 115.

A. Okay. Okay. Go ahead. I found them.

Q.

1	Q. Okay. And would it be correct to say that 115 and
2	118 are the movement of those numbers on the summation
3	sheets for East and West?
4	MR. HODGES: Did you mean to say 118?
5	Q. (Mr. Hartmann) Yes. 115 and 118 are the
6	respective (unintelligible) for East and West and I believe
7	those totals are on 114.
8	A. Okay. 114, yeah.
9	Q. In other words, let's do it one at a time.
10	115 was your taking the information off the
11	sheets that we were just looking at and putting it on kind
12	of a summation sheet; is that correct?
13	A. Let me study this a little bit. And by the way,
14	just so that you I didn't prepare these. I didn't
15	prepare these. I reviewed them.
16	Q. Who prepared them, please?
17	A. It was probably Fathi Yusuf in conjunction with
18	our accounts payable person, who would have been Lissette at
19	the time.
20	Q. Okay. Now, I'm just going to make a statement to
21	try and summate, and you can tell me whether my statement is
22	correct or not, and if it's not correct, you can just tell
23	me what is correct, okay?
24	A. Okay.

Moved the East information -- someone moved the

2.4

East information to 115. Someone moved the Plaza West information to 118. And then accumulative information from those two was moved to 114; is that correct?

- A. That's correct, yes.
- Q. Okay. And then the way that the checks were -were calculated is that the East total was subtracted from
 the West total, and the difference between them, the million
 two hundred and eighty-eight thousand six hundred and two
 sixty-three was paid to Yusuf as a corrective amount in the
 form of two checks?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And then later, it was discovered that there had been an error in the calculations of \$77,335.62, so that amount was repaid by Yusuf back into the CRA account?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. So I have a couple of questions about those checks and that process, okay?

Okay. First of all, the leading off of the spoiled inventory for West created a -- you said would have created a credit in the amount of that spoiled inventory to Hamad; is that correct?

In other words, in the same way that 77,000 was corrected at one point, that difference would simply have been to subtract it from the amount that was paid to Yusuf, --

A. Correct.

2.4

- Q. -- correct?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. With regard to the -- to the West inventory that you say was used to do this, you don't believe at the moment that you or Mr. Yusuf have possession of that information; is that correct?
 - A. We don't have the detailed information, correct.
- Q. Right. And without that detailed information, is there any way to tell whether the rest of this information is correct?
- A. Well, the calculations that Mr. Yusuf performed were based upon information that we did have, which was purchases after the physical inventory and up to the date of March 8th, which was the date we separated the stores. And likewise, we also had the daily sales. So the answer is, is that it's a calculation that we had very specific records to support. I did review those.
- Q. Right. I guess what I'm asking is this: If right now I would simply subtract from the amounts that RGIS described, these checks that were written, going backwards, could I recreate those calculations going backwards without that West data?
- A. I'm not sure I completely understood the question. Something got lost there.

1	Q. Okay. We've agreed that a check was written to
2	Mr. Yusuf and it was corrected by \$77,000. We followed that
3	track back to the original RGIS inventories. And we've now
4	decided that we don't have the RGIS inventory for West.
5	So what I'm asking is, is there any way today
6	to track these numbers back to some original source? Is
7	there another document? Is there another database? Is
8	there somewhere else I can derive that initial number that
9	found its way out to this final spreadsheet?
10	A. If I understand your question correctly, the
11	answer is yes, because I'm assuming that Shawn still has
12	maintained the flash drive and the records that were given
13	to him on that inventory.
14	Q. Okay. Well, let me restate my question.
15	If Shawn doesn't have that, that isn't
16	available to us, could we track it back?
17	A. You know, I believe RGIS does keep a history file
18	on these. I believe they do. And the answer is, if
19	Q. Okay.
20	A they do, we can get it from them.
21	$oldsymbol{Q}$. Okay. Would you, then, being paid for this by the
22	partnership under this process that we're in now, please
23	contact RGIS, see if you can obtain such a file. And if you
24	can or you can't, could you please report that in writing?
25	A. Sure.

	JOHN F. GAFFNEY DIRECT
1	Q. Attorney Hodges and myself?
2	A. Sure.
3	Q. Thank you.
4	Okay. Now, also during this period of time,
5	were you aware that certain inventory was moved from Plaza
6	Extra West to Plaza Extra East after the inventory was done?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And in these pages that we've looked at, 114, 115,
9	118, where is that reflected?
10	A. It's not reflected on any of these. It was
11	reflected in the due-to-froms between the two stores,
12	because we used to invoice any transfers from West to East,
13	and that was customary. So the answer is that it is
14	reflected in the in the due-to-froms. And there were two
15	that there were two transfers. I think one was after,
16	one was right before the inventory, though. I've got a list
17	of the transfers, though, for that year.
18	Q. Okay. Well, I'm looking no, scratch that. I'm
19	sorry.
20	Are you aware that on June 12, 2015, there's
21	a notation from Shawn Hamed showing that \$123,207.25 in
22	inventory was moved from Plaza Extra West to Plaza Extra
23	East after the initial inventory, that's from February 26th,

East after the initial inventory, that's from February 26th, 2015 to March 5th, 2015?

And you said 123,000 and change? A.

24

25

25

inventory.

1	Q. That's the amount. This isn't a memory test.
2	A. Yeah.
3	Q. I'm not asking if you know the exact amount.
4	A. Well, I'm actually I did pull out a list of the
5	inventory transfers and the there was a transfer recorded
6	on actually, on March 8th for 51,245.11.
7	Q. And was that going West to East or East to West?
8	A. From West to East.
9	Q. Okay. And then on what date?
10	A. Well, actually the document that I recorded was
11	actually on March 8th, believe it or not.
12	Q. On March 8th.
13	So you saw an amount between the end of the
14	inventory and March 8th in the amount of how much?
15	A. \$51,245.
16	Q. Okay. And did you find any listing on the
17	
/	document you're looking at for a hundred twenty-three
18	document you're looking at for a hundred twenty-three thousand two hundred seven twenty-five?
18	thousand two hundred seven twenty-five?
18 19	thousand two hundred seven twenty-five? A. No, I don't. I prior transfer that I found is
18 19 20	thousand two hundred seven twenty-five? A. No, I don't. I prior transfer that I found is forty-five thousand eight nineteen, but that was on
18 19 20 21	thousand two hundred seven twenty-five? A. No, I don't. I prior transfer that I found is forty-five thousand eight nineteen, but that was on February 28th, before the well, actually, wait a minute.

1	Q. And roughly what would the sum of those two
2	amounts be?
3	A. Well, that would be ninety roughly 97,000.
4	Just a little over 97,000.
5	Q. Okay. So we got that down to a discrepancy of
6	just \$26,000. Okay.
7	Final question in this grouping: I see a
8	correction. If you look at Page 3118 again, that's the
9	Plaza West summary sheet that you said Mr. Yusuf created.
LO	A. Yes.
L1	Q. You'll see a line there that says, "LESS 67% OF
L2	TOTAL SALES."
L3	A. Correct.
L 4	Q. What is that a correction for?
L5	A. That is actually basically all he did was he
L 6	estimated the cost of the inventory, based upon a margin of
L7	33 percent. So he took the total sales and he multiplied it
L8	by 67 percent to get the cost of inventory.
L 9	Q. Okay. Then how much did that come out to?
20	A. Came out to one million one hundred fifty-eight
21	thousand four hundred and thirty-nine -0- four.
22	Q. Okay. Now, if you turn over and look at the same
23	point on Page 3115.
24	A. Okay.

Q. Okay. What is the -- what is the amount credited

1	to East for less 67 percent of total sales?
2	A. One million three hundred and eighteen thousand
3	four seventy-eight fifty-one.
4	Q. And so would it be correct to say that you created
5	what was essentially a \$40,000 credit in the favor of Yusuf?
6	A. 40,000?
7	Q. By by those two numbers?
8	A. I'm not sure how you how you come up with
9	how do you calculate that? 40,000.
10	Q. The difference between what you credited East and
11	what he credited for West.
12	A. Well, by my count, it's closer to 250,000, looking
13	at the two numbers.
14	Q. Okay. So you came to a \$250,000 credit to West by
15	that maneuver?
16	A. Okay. What he did was, he reduced West's
17	inventory by 1,158,000 and he reduced East's inventory by
18	1,318,000.
19	Q. Right. And so he created a net effect of about a
20	\$250,000 credit in favor of Yusuf?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Okay. And the net effect would be that if that
23	credit weren't there in favor of Yusuf, the total amount of
24	the adjustment would be reduced by \$250,000?
25	A. Correct.

1.3

2.4

Q. Okay. But you, as fiduciary accountant, I'm going to ask you to go back and do some research on this specific question, but as you sit here now, this is not a memory test, so I'm not binding you to the answer.

I'm not asking you -- I'm not asking you for a final answer on this. I'm going to ask you to go back and do some research and report to us in the same way you're going to go to RGIS, but as you sit here now, is it -- do you know of any place in the Court's order, or in the accounting orders in this case, where Mr. Yusuf was -- was given permission to create that particular correction, that 67-percent correction?

- A. No, I don't.
- Q. Okay. Okay. And is that a -- is that a correction that if you, as an accountant, would have made in doing an inventory and reporting it to the Court if you were the accountant doing that correction? That inventory?
 - A. Not unless I was asked to.
- Q. Okay. So will you, as part of your duties as the fiduciary accountant -- and Greg and I will supply these to you -- go back through the orders that apply to this accounting and determine whether the Court had directed or approved any such 67-percent correction?
- A. I'm not sure exactly what you're asking me. Will you --

25

1	Q. We're going to we'll supply you with
2	appropriate documentation. Whatever Greg thinks is
3	appropriate to this and whatever I think is appropriate to
4	this, will you go back and look and see if you can find a
5	direction for that 67-percent correction?
6	A. In the Court records, you mean?
7	Q. Yes. In the orders that apply to how this
8	accounting needs to be done.
9	A. Well, I stated, of course, that I don't know of
LO	any direction in the Court records.
L1	Are you asking me to go back and see if I can
L2	find some?
L3	Q. Yes. We're going we will supply you with the
L 4	Court record applicable to this and we want to see if you
L5	think that there's something in the orders that would let an
L 6	accountant to make such a correction.
L7	A. Okay. I mean, I could
L8	Q. Your opinion as an accountant.
L9	A. I can certainly go through, you know, the Court
20	records, sure.
21	Q. Okay. That's great.
22	Greg, do you have questions?
23	MR. HODGES: I do. Were you finished?
24	MR. HARTMANN: Yes, I think I am.

MR. HODGES: Okay. Thank you.

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. HODGES:
3	Q. Good morning, Mr. Gaffney.
4	A. Hi, Greg.
5	Q. I assume you guys can hear me okay?
6	A. Yeah. Your voice is loud and clear.
7	Q. What my wife tells me all the time.
8	Let's turn to your report that is Exhibit Y.
9	If you would turn to Page HAMD 663110.
-0	A. 110? Okay. I got these confused a little bit.
.1	Hold on. Got it. Okay.
_2	Q. And at the top, it says, "Claim H-72:" and then
_3	you have some verbiage; is that correct?
_4	A. Yes.
.5	Q. Okay. And the very first sentence says, "The
.6	following 4 journal entries settle the excess value of Plaza
_7	West assets acquired by the Hameds versus the value of
-8	assets acquired by the Yusufs."
9	A. Yes.
20	Q. Is that right?
21	A. That's correct.
22	Q. Now, when you use the word "assets," do you
23	include the equipment in those assets?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Okay. So when you were talking about the \$644,000

2.4

25

conclusion?

1 checks, two checks that were written to Mr. Yusuf, that 2 644,000 amount included equipment? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Ο. And can you explain to me how the -- where that 5 equipment was included in that 644,000? 6 Sure. On the -- there's a -- let me find the 7 summary page. Here we go. Equipment value. 8 If you look at Document 63115 and 63 --9 663 -- yeah, 663118, you see the equipment value for East as 10 150,000 and the equipment value for West is 350,000. 11 Okay. 0. 12 And then the totals from both of those documents flow into the document that is 63114. And the difference 13 14 between that total is, of course, is the one million two eighty-eight that gave rise to the two \$600,000 checks. 15 16 Okay. Okay. All right. I understand. Thank you. Q. 17 Α. Okay. All right. So turning back to the page that I 18 Q. directed you to at the outset, the 63110, if you look down 19 20 in the third paragraph, you -- at the very last sentence of 21 the third paragraph, "The net effect of the adjustments cost the Yusuf family \$340,118.93." 22 23 Can you explain what you mean by that

> And this is -- not everybody understands Α. Yes.

2.4

this easily, but we measured inventory, year-end/year-out by physical inventory and that's called periodic physical -- periodic inventory method. And it is customary when a company uses the periodic inventory method, to not adjust inventory throughout the year. They only -- you only adjust it at the time that the inventory is taken.

And -- and we have many, many years of consistent application. And I say many, many years. I did see, you know, I did see some years prior to even when I arrived in 2012, that physical inventory adjustments were posted once each year, which -- and I didn't see inventory records, but as soon as I got there, I did see these Excel schedules, and the answer is, is that we used to post the physical inventory and adjustment for the physical inventory once each year after the physical was taken.

- Q. Okay.
- A. And to -- to explain the difference, what happened was -- yeah, to explain the difference of \$340,000, after Fathi Yusuf did all the calculations, what he did was, he closed the gap between those numbers that I felt would have probably -- that would have been the numbers. There could have been a couple of minor adjustments, but the \$340,000, Mr. Yusuf closed the gap between Plaza West and Plaza East by \$340,000. And it cost him that. I proved it to him and he accepted that, you know, that cost of \$340,000.

_	
1	Q. So you're saying that the calculations that he
2	prepared that led to the payment of two checks for \$644,000
3	and change resulted in a net detriment to Mr. Yusuf of
4	\$340,000?
5	A. That's correct.
6	Q. Okay. Looking at the next paragraph of HAMD63110,
7	you indicate the paragraph where you talked about the
8	equipment values and the legal agreement mistakenly reducing
9	it by 50 percent. And then you conclude with a sentence,
10	"Had these actual valuations been considered, the Yusufs
11	would have been entitled to still another \$150,000," is that
12	correct?
13	A. Yeah. Actually, I made a mistake there. It's
14	200,000.
15	Q. Okay. And so what you did is, to get the 200, you
16	simply subtract one fifty from the three fifty?
17	A. Correct, yes.
18	Q. Okay.
19	(Respite.)
20	Okay. Turning to HAMD63117, the adjusted
21	inventory for Plaza Extra East.
22	A. Okay.
23	Q. All right. If you look at the this, the 3117,
24	and compare it to the similar inventory, adjusted inventory
25	for West at six three one two zero, the inventory for Plaza

2.4

Extra East starts with groceries at Number 1, or grocery at Number 1, and ends with HBA value pack at thirty-five, right?

- A. Correct, yeah.
- Q. At least the numbered parts.

And -- but the -- the Plaza Extra West inventory starts with Number 1, grocery, and ends with Number 24, VP-Dairy.

Can you explain the -- why there's a difference in the numbers for the categories of goods for those two inventories?

- A. You know, there's no -- there's no rationale, other than it would probably be the evolution of the database at East versus the evolution of the database at West, because they weren't, in any way, connected to one another.
- Q. Okay. So that the skipped numbers don't have any significance in your -- in your mind?

The skipped numbers. The skipped numbers in respect to inventories, because obviously, there's -there's not 35 categories listed in the Plaza Extra East inventory at 63117, and there's about 24 categories in the -- in the similar inventory for West.

A. Yeah, it didn't have any import, or, you know, significance to me.

2.4

Since these -- since the time of these inventories, I have learned that there are departments that are no longer used. I wouldn't have known it at the time of these inventories, but, you know, since then, I got a little bit more involved in the physical inventory and I did discover -- I discovered that.

- Q. Okay. Now, turning back to the Plaza Extra East inventory, 63117, the adjustments, what's referred to in parentheticals as "late adjustments," there are three of them, right?
 - A. Correct, yeah.
- Q. The store supplies at 57,000 and change, do you know where that adjustment came from?
- A. I -- basically, I got a manual sheet that had some detailed listings, and I made a copy of it to bring here.

 Let me see if I can find it. I probably have it here. I got a stack of papers, but I did -- I did make a point of copying that -- that sheet, so -- but all it is is basically a list of numbers. I mean, it could literally be hundreds of numbers, \$111, \$98, et cetera, that adds up to \$57,000.
- Q. Do you know whether the Hameds or their counsel agreed to that adjustment, 57,000 and change, adjustment?
 - A. Offhand, no.

I do know there was some communication. And it seemed as though -- it seemed as though both parties were

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

interested in counting some things that they felt had never been counted in years past, and it seems that in the --Ο. Okay. -- in the communications that I remember, there was an interest on both sides to count things that had never been counted in the past. Okay. So you don't know whether the Hameds agreed to that \$57,000 adjustment? No, I don't. Α. Okay. What about the next adjustment, the one Ο. that's described as "Mafi Email" for \$31,000 and change? I believe that was a number that was either supplied to me by Mafi, or it was one that he agreed to. Okay. And then the -- when you say you believe that it was either supplied to you by Mafi or what he agreed to, are there documents that would reflect that, that you have? I think I've got some e-mail correspondence that probably would have been between him and Yusuf, or -- but they did agree to certain adjustments. And I believe this -- I believe I'm the one who would have put that "Mafi Email." I would have put that there.

> Q. Okay.

Well, actually, I say -- I say I put that there. Α. I probably -- I don't know. I'm -- you know, sometimes I

2.4

look at things to see whether or not it has my thumbprint.

I know I do certain things unique from other people.

Whether or not I would have explained it "Mafi Email," so it's possible that I -- that wasn't my thumbprint, but it is definitely something that I recall there was communication about, and I do remember specifically that Yusuf and Mafi agreed on some adjustments, and I believe this was one of them.

- Q. Okay. When you say "this," you're talking about the \$31,000-and-change adjustment?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, the last adjustment, which is described as "Expired - See List" for \$1,600 and change, do you know where that came from?
- A. I believe that was actually merchandise identified during the physical inventory that was then supplied to Yusuf.

So, in other words, the RGIS people, that was -- that was, you know, in their inventory count. They just noticed expiration dates that had passed and they identified it for them.

- Q. Okay. So this is -- when it says "Expired," it doesn't necessarily mean spoiled, it means it's a sale date code that expired?
 - A. Yes.

_	
1	Q. Okay. Turning to the similar inventory for Plaza
2	West at 63120.
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. The the last two entries, "Store Supplies" and
5	"Late Adjustment," you see those?
6	A. Yes, I do.
7	Q. Do you know where the store supplies, was that an
8	adjustment, or was that an addition, or was that included
9	by in the RGIS inventory?
10	A. Those those would have been additions.
11	$oldsymbol{Q}$. All right. So the store supplies was not a part
12	of the RGIS inventory, is that what you're saying?
13	A. Yes, correct.
14	Q. Do you know where that store supplies figure came
15	from?
16	A. I really don't. It had to be either added by
17	by Shawn or by Mike Yusuf.
18	In other words, one of them would have had
19	tell me, you know, to add that.
20	Q. Okay. And did Mr. Yusuf agree to this addition?
21	A. You mean Fathi Yusuf?
22	Q. Yes.
23	A. I would say that if he was aware of it, that's a
24	question. I mean, I think that it's highly likely. He
25	didn't get into the detail to necessarily question it.

- Q. Okay. And then we're talking about -- we just finished talking about store supplies adjustment of 72,000 and change. The last adjustment is late adjustment for \$66,000 and change; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.

2.4

- Q. Do you know the source of that adjustment?
- A. I don't have any specific -- I don't have any
 specific recall on it.

When I looked at it, when I first looked at it, I assumed it was pretty similar to the non-scannable. You know, it was the non-scannable. Sometimes what happens is, during physical inventories, they'll actually have an order that they've got on the dock that they haven't received in yet. It might — it might be in a — in a container. And — and then what happens is they — instead of even counting it, they just simply take the invoice that covers the container. But I don't have specific recall on that exact 66,000 figure.

- Q. Would you be able to obtain information, either that you have in your files or the files maintained for the West store and the East store with respect to all of the adjustments that we've just been talking about?
 - A. It is possible that I could find some things.

You know, when this was all happening, I was trying to capture everything and supply it to all sides.

1.3

2.4

And it is possible that I do have some notes and/or e-mails on these. I can go back and look in my records back in that time frame.

- Q. Would you look in your records of -- regarding the three adjustments we discussed for Plaza Extra East inventory and two adjustments we discussed for the Plaza West inventory, and let Attorney Hartmann and me know whether you have any information regarding those adjustments? And if not, where you think the information might be if the -- you know, if, for example, you think that the information regarding West might be in the possession of Shawn or Mafi or any of the Hameds, let us know and Mr. Hartmann can ask his client to -- to provide that.
 - A. Very good. Yes, I can.
- MR. HODGES: All right. Is that okay with you, Carl?
 - MR. HARTMANN: Certainly.
- Q. (Mr. Hodges) Now, we -- I note that there's no listing for expired goods for the West store.

Does that mean that RGIS did not identify any expired inventory?

A. You know, there's two things I suppose that can happen, and that is that when they're doing a fiscal inventory, if they encountered something that is known to be expired, they can leave it out of the count. I don't know

2.4

what their specific instructions are. I would -- I would love to go back and ask them that question, whether or not they were ever instructed to leave out expired product that was found.

I do know that the fiscal inventories, a lot of the inventory had -- did include expired product, though.

I do know that for a fact. And it might have simply been the case that they didn't recognize it when they were counting it.

- Q. Okay. Now, did you have a meeting with Attorney Holt regarding this inventory adjustment at any point in time?
- A. Yes, I have. I've had meetings with him about this.
 - Q. Okay. Do you recall the date of that meeting?
- A. Oh, boy, no, I wouldn't recall the date, but I know these calculations were done about -- sometime probably in July. Well, that's right. The distribution list would show it.
- Q. All right. So if I asked you whether if the meeting was on Tuesday, July 28th, 2015, would you be able to confirm that, based on your records?
 - A. I might be able to with -- if I can --
 - MR. HARTMANN: We'll stipulate to that.
 - MR. HODGES: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you,

1	Carl.
2	MR. HARTMANN: I said we will stipulate that
3	that meeting occurred on that date.
4	Q. (Mr. Hodges) Okay. Fair enough. Thank you.
5	So with the understanding that there was a
6	meeting on July 28, do you recall who else was at that
7	meeting?
8	A. If it's the meeting I'm thinking of right now
9	July 28th. That seems a little bit early to be having a
10	meeting about it with Judge Ross, but it seems to me that we
11	had a meeting in Joel Holt's office in that time frame that
12	involved Judge Ross, myself, Joel Holt, and, gosh, I can't
13	even remember who else was there, but there were other
14	there was somebody else there, too. I'm sorry, I can't. I
15	can't remember right now. I'd have to go back and look at
16	e-mails.
17	Q. There was nobody Mr. Yusuf wasn't there, or no
18	Yusuf was in that meeting; is that correct?
19	A. Yes, that's correct.
20	Q. And no attorney for the Yusufs or United was in
21	that meeting; is that correct?
22	A. That might have been the person. It might have
23	been that Nizar was there, Nizar DeWood.
24	Q. But you don't know?
25	A. I don't know right offhand, no, I'm sorry.

1	Q. Okay. You don't recall me asking you to find out
2	whether Judge Ross would allow Nizar and Mr. Yusuf to
3	attend, and you being told that, no, they shouldn't attend?
4	MR. HARTMANN: Greg, if you were at the
5	meeting, you can say so, and we'll stipulate.
6	MR. HODGES: I wasn't at the meeting.
7	MR. HARTMANN: Oh, okay.
8	A. Yeah, unfortunately my my memory's usually
9	pretty good, but sometimes I miss with people. I don't
10	recall those specifics, I'm sorry.
11	Q. (Mr. Hodges) Okay. Do you know whether, in
12	advance of that meeting on July 28, 2015, or at the meeting,
13	you provided Attorney Holt with accounting or financial
14	information supporting the the payment of the two checks
15	to Mr. Yusuf in the amount 644,000 and change?
16	A. The answer is I was supplying Joel Holt every
17	month
18	MR. HODGES: Hold on. Hold on. I believe
19	hold on.
20	Did you say something, Carl?
21	MR. HARTMANN: We'll stipulate to Exhibit X
22	is the supplying of these same financials to to Joel,
23	either before, during, or immediately after that meeting.
24	Q. (Mr. Hodges) All right. You see Exhibit X,
25	Mr. Gaffney?

1.3

2.4

- A. Let me find it. X? X, yes.
- Q. Okay. And this is an e-mail from Attorney Holt dated July 28, 2015 to some unknown individual since the e-mail is blacked out. And apparently the subject is something blacked out, received from Gaffney, July 28, 2015; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. You didn't -- you didn't receive this e-mail, did you?
 - A. I don't believe so, no.
- Q. Okay. Now, do you know whether you -- this says, Received from Gaffney, July 28, 2015.

Do you know whether you had previously supplied Attorney Holt with financial or accounting information regarding the -- the two checks that were -- that are the subject of H-72 via a zip drive?

A. You know, I don't have specific knowledge of this, and I did say that I didn't receive this e-mail. You know, because it's so heavily blacked out, it's impossible for me to say that with 100-percent certainty. But I was supplying Joel Holt with information continuously at not just monthly intervals, literally I would supply them as part of our monthly reporting and then bimonthly reporting. He would ask questions and then I would supply him more information, information in the days following. So, I mean, there was

1 continuous communication going on between Joel Holt and I. 2 And it is -- I do specifically remember 3 supplying him with copies of all of these -- these items, 4 the copies of the checks, the copies of the schedules. They 5 were probably even included in my bimonthly reports, but 6 sometimes I gave information even in advance of that when 7 there were questions, when there were specific questions 8 about, you know, cash movement or whatever. 9 Okay. If you look at Exhibit X, that exhibit, 0. 10 when you look through all the blackout, let's see, one, two, 11 three pages that are blacked out, you get to the summary 12 sheet that we were talking about earlier with Attorney Hartmann; is that correct? 13 14 Α. Yes, correct. 15 Summary sheets? Q. 16 Yes. Okay. Α. 17 Q. Okay. 18 Α. Are those part of this same e-mail? And -- I'm sorry? 19 Q. 20 Α. I'm just asking, is that -- these summaries 21 sheets, were they attached to this e-mail that we were just 22 discussing? 23 Ο. That's my understanding. Attorney Hartmann can 2.4 confirm that. 25 Α. Okay.

JOHN F. GAFFNEY -- CROSS 1 MR. HARTMANN: Yes, we'll stipulate to that. 2 Α. Okay. 3 (Mr. Hodges) Okay. Now turning back to that 4 meeting that you recall having with Attorney Holt and Judge 5 Ross at a minimum on July 28, 2015, do you know how long 6 that meeting lasted? 7 Well, two meetings are coming to mind: 8 which I walked out with Judge Ross afterwards; and then the other one where I remained with Joel Holt afterwards. You 9 10 know, I don't think there was -- I would think that I spent 11 two hours in that meeting. 12 Q. Okay. And the subject of the meeting was to 13 provide you with an opportunity to explain why the checks 14 for \$644,000 were appropriate; is that fair to say? Oh, boy. I don't recall a meeting where we were 15 just confined to this subject, because some other subjects 16 17 came up, came into my mind right away as soon as we started talking about this meeting, because I remember, you know, 18 there was a lot of discussion. 19 20 There was the one meeting with Judge Ross 21 there where Joel was objecting to a number of items, 22 including the compressor purchase, the shopping carts. 23

I think that I might be talking about two separate meetings, but, oh, boy. I wish I had --

2.4

25

The meeting that led to the issuance or delivery Q.

2.4

of the check for -- in the amount of \$183,000 and change?

- A. Yeah. That was -- that was -- I'm trying to connect this inventory, this inventory thing with that one that led to the hundred and eighty-three. I'd have to look back. I would probably have to go back and kind of scan through my e-mails again and get my -- my timeline correct, but -- because I'm -- I just don't have any certainty that we're talking about the -- that I'm talking about the same meeting. I'm sorry.
- Q. Okay. Well, since we are only talking, at least at this point in time, about Hamad Claim H-72, if you would go back in your records and determine whether, you know, when there was a meeting, assuming there was a meeting, and I believe we have a stipulation that there's a meeting on July 28, 2015, what I'd like for you to share with counsel is what information you actually provided to Attorney Holt and/or Judge Ross in connection with the explanation of the two checks that have led to Claim H-72.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. Okay? So you understand what I'm looking for?
 - A. Yeah, I do. I've noted it down.
- Q. E-mail from you or some -- some indication that, you know, on such and such date, you delivered, you know, information -- accounting or financial information to Attorney Holt or Judge Ross in connection with that claim.

1	A. Got it. Got it. Who was present. What was
2	delivered. Okay.
3	Q. Right. And then finally, if you would take a look
4	at Exhibit Z?
5	A. Let's see here. Is it marked Z?
6	Q. I don't know. It would be your last exhibit and
7	it's only like five or six pages.
8	A. Okay. Well, I think what happened was, I okay.
9	Yeah, oh, it is marked Z. Yes, I'm sorry. Yes, I got it.
10	MR. HARTMANN: What's the first Bates number
11	on that, please?
12	A. What's what?
13	MR. HODGES: The first page number?
14	MR. HARTMANN: John, just for the record,
15	would you read the Bates number in the lower left hand?
16	A. It says 2015 balance sheets, and it's sheets
17	abbreviated.
18	MR. HODGES: Yeah, there's at least I
19	don't believe that it was Bates Stamped.
20	I would ask if we would stipulate, Carl, that
21	this is the financial information that was produced on
22	November 16, 2015 as the, quote, "Partnership Accounting,"
23	end quote?
24	MR. HARTMANN: Stipulated.
25	Q. (Mr. Hodges) Okay. Now, Mr. Gaffney, Exhibit Z is

1	a document that you prepared; is that right?
2	A. Yes, correct.
3	Q. Okay. And it was produced, as we've stipulated,
4	on November 16, 2015 as the official, quote, "Partnership
5	Accounting," that was required by the plan?
6	A. Correct.
7	Q. Is that your understanding?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Okay. Now, turn to note 10 and tell us how that
10	relates to the summary sheets that we've been discussing
11	this morning with you on Claim H-72?
12	A. Well, Note 10 is basically it defines the
13	distribution that was a result of this inventory calculation
14	done by Mr. Yusuf.
15	Q. Okay. So what it did correct me if I'm
16	wrong is it, without expressly accounting for that
17	\$77,000 payback, so to speak, it it effectively
18	incorporated that payback and reduced the \$644,000 payments
19	to payments of \$605,000 and change; isn't that right?
20	A. Correct, correct.
21	MR. HODGES: Okay. I think I'm
22	finished. Let me just check real quickly.
23	(Respite.)
24	Okay. That is the extent of my questioning
25	this morning, Mr. Gaffney. Thank you for your time.

1	A. Thank you.
2	MR. HARTMANN: Okay. Just, I have a couple
3	more questions about what Greg asked you.
4	And if you could if the court reporter
5	could simply note the time on the record at this point.
6	THE COURT REPORTER: 12:18.
7	MR. HARTMANN: Thank you.
8	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. HARTMANN:
10	Q. Mr. Gaffney, if you go to Exhibit Y, it says 3110.
11	That's the one that (unintelligible)
12	THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I'm sorry,
13	Carl. You're really muffled again. I don't know what
14	happened.
15	MR. HARTMANN: Okay. I'm sorry. Let me move
16	it.
17	THE COURT REPORTER: There you go.
18	THE WITNESS: See, that's perfect right
19	there.
20	Q. (Mr. Hartmann) Turn to Page turn to Page 3110
21	in Exhibit Y. That's the page where you had the additional
22	information that you put in in text.
23	A. Yes, I'm there.
24	Q. Okay. Now, the third paragraph down, the one that
25	Greg directed your attention to, you say you remember this

1.3

2.4

transaction well, because of your attempts to prevent, or at least delay the special distribution.

Okay. What -- could you explain what you meant by that?

A. I had referred to it in my previous answer, and basically I referred to periodic method of physical inventory. And with the periodic method of physical inventory, in our case, that means once annually.

What happens is, we make an adjustment to inventory only once annually. And when I say periodic method, that's as opposed to perpetual inventory where your system reduces inventory every time an item is sold.

In our case -- in our case, our records were never to the point of being able to do that, so we relied on a periodic physical inventory.

Now, the way that works simply is that it just -- if you value \$3 million inventory on -- and you say that's what the inventory is December 31st, it remains that until the next December 31st.

In this case, what happened was Mr. Yusuf's adjustments had the effect of closing the gap. They closed the gap. And right or wrong, and accountants certainly know the frailties of periodic inventory, but right or wrong, they stick to the consistency. The consistency of methodology. And if we had stuck to the consistency --

1	Q. Okay.
2	A. Yeah. Go ahead.
3	Q. I'm sorry. So would it be correct to say that
4	Mr. Yusuf used the actual count done by RGIS, and you were
5	suggesting that some other number, some other correction
6	should be applied; is that correct?
7	A. I was suggesting that we just simply leave the
8	counts alone. In other words and that's consistency of
9	methodology. That's a very important that's a very
10	important aspect in the the accounting world,
11	consistency. And had we left
12	Q. I guess what I'm asking is, was Mr. Yusuf asking
13	you to change the numbers that came from RGIS?
14	A. No.
15	Q. He wanted to leave the numbers?
16	A. He did not. He did not ask me to change the
17	numbers from RGIS.
18	Q. Okay. So what were actually used in the final
19	calculation, the actual real numbers from RGIS; is that
20	correct?
21	A. Correct.
22	Q. Okay. And you say in that same sentence that you
23	are trying to prevent or delay a special distribution.
24	Who are you trying to prevent or delay from
25	asking? Was it Hamed? Was it the special master? Was it

1 the accountants? Was it RGIS? 2 No, I was attempting to --3 Ο. Who were you trying to stop? Α. I was just simply trying to stop Mr. Yusuf from --4 5 from going through the exercise. 6 Okay. And was it Mr. Yusuf that insisted on going 7 through the exercise at that time and submitting the distribution at that time? 8 9 He -- yes, it was him who insisted upon doing Α. 10 the -- doing the calculation and to justify the distribution 11 at that time, yes. 12 Q. And if that was to his detriment, why would he be 13 insisting on doing it at that time? Why not wait until the 14 process ends? Because he doesn't understand accounting so well. 15 Α. And would there be a benefit from his doing the 16 Q. 17 accounting at that time and insisting that the payments be made at that time? 18 The only benefit really was, you know, basically 19 Α. 20 getting rid of an item that was going to eventually have to 21 be gotten rid of. You know, we had balance sheet items that 22 had to --23 Ο. Didn't he also --2.4 Α. Go ahead. 25 Didn't, by forcing this at that time, by insisting Q.

2.4

on doing it his way, didn't he get a check for \$1,200,000?

Two checks for a million two hundred thousand?

- A. Yeah, the net effect was -- actually, four transactions was a million two hundred thousand, correct.
- Q. So instead of waiting for the end of the accounting process that had been ordered by the Court, and against your advice, and against what you said was standard accounting methods, Mr. Yusuf insisted on doing it this way, and he did so, and the effect of that was him receiving \$1,200,000 at that time in a floor transaction; is that correct?
- A. Well, you know, now that -- now that we're discussing it, it seems to me that there was some communication, and I'm not sure where, exactly, but there was some communication about needing to even up, you know, the disparity between East and West inventory and the equipment, because the equipment meeting obviously preceded this. And as I understood the equipment meeting, that the -- the valuation of Plaza West inventory was meant to be 700,000 and the valuation of Plaza East -- not inventory, I'm sorry, equipment, was meant to be 300,000. So the acknowledgment was that -- go ahead.
- Q. I guess the point I'm making is -- the point that I'm making is this: He proceeded to write himself a check.

 And when was that check written?

- A. It was written in July of 2015. July 10th, I think.
- Q. And that check was already written before you had the meeting with Joel Holt, wasn't it?
 - A. Yes.

2.4

- Q. And the reason you had the meeting with Joel Holt, wasn't it, because Joel Holt specifically was objecting to things in that check? That he objected to the 67 percent of total sales being used as a correction, and he objected to the fact that only East had expired inventory credit to it? Wasn't that why the meeting took place with Judge Ross?
- A. You mentioned -- you said something about only East had expired merchandise in it? Oh, okay, you're talking about that \$1,500 adjustment.
- Q. Yes. But weren't those the points that Joel Holt was meeting, because that check had just been issued out of time and against everybody's objections?
- A. Well, you are correct in stating that Joel Holt expressed an objection to, you know, those checks being issued.
- Q. Okay. And the reason he was objecting to the checks being issued is because Mafi Yusuf had created a 67-percent credit that meant \$250,000 to him and because Fathi Yusuf had credited expired items to himself, but not to the West store, would that be a characterization of Joel

Holt's objections?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

- A. No, I can't -- I can't say that that would be a characterization of his objection. I don't recall that he --
 - Q. What was he objecting to?
 - A. What's that?
- Q. What was he objecting to? Why were you having a 2-hour meeting?

Well, as I said, as I recall, we had a number of Α. issues discussed in that meeting. One that was kind of perpetual that started literally in March and just continued on for months was the payment for the compressors and the shopping carts that were ordered. And there were -- there was a lot of discussion about that. So the -- but the -those disbursements, I'm not even -- I can't even say with certainty that it was those disbursements that was the cause of the meeting. Those disbursements were probably found out about as we were, you know, going into that meeting, because, you know, since -- if the meeting occurred on July 28th -- I'm just going back and I'm -- and I'm not -unfortunately, I don't have specific recall on the sequence of events. But normally I would have, at the end of a month, or in the first days following the end of the month, I would -- I would actually notify Joel Holt what happened during that month. And since the checks were written on

1.3

2.4

July 10th, and since we had the meeting on July 28th, according to this e-mail, I'm not sure that I necessarily communicated that to him unless he asked me for an update mid-month.

Q. Okay. But we've already stipulated to it and you already testified that you supplied the documents in Exhibit Y to Joel Holt for that meeting; is that correct? And that those documents were in that meeting. And you testified that Greg Hodges, that they were discussed in that meeting. That all I'm asking is --

MR. HODGES: I object. I don't believe that is what his testimony was. And it wasn't Exhibit Y, it was Exhibit X.

Q. (Mr. Hartmann) I'm sorry. Exhibit X.

Exhibit X, you testified that Exhibit X was supplied to Joel Holt for that meeting; is that correct?

- A. I would say -- I'm just going to say yes. You know, it seems as though it follows the timeline and the fact that it would have been discussed in that meeting is a little earlier than the norm, but for some reason, maybe it was -- it came up. And I would say -- I mean, I had those documents at that time, so, yes.
 - Q. And how many days after the issuance of the check?
- A. Well, if the meeting was on July 28th and the checks were written on July 11th or 10th, you know, you're

2.4

talking about, what, two weeks. About 15 days or so.

Q. Okay. So two weeks after the checks were issued, you supplied documents showing the detail on those checks to Joel Holt and to the special master and had a 2-hour meeting in which you said Joel Holt objected to the issuance of those checks.

What do you recall about Joel Holt's objection to the issuance of those checks?

A. Well, first of all, of course, those checks were first -- or the calculations were first submitted to Judge Ross at a meeting on the day those checks would have been written, which if they were written on July 11th, we would have covered the calculations with Judge Ross.

The main objection that I recall Joel Holt was -- his main objection was the sense of not having better control of what was being disbursed out of the cash accounts. I'm not so sure -- I'm not so sure we -- I'm not so sure that we got that heavy into the inventory calculations, other than we knew that there was a disparity between the equipment valuations and we knew there was a disparity between the physical inventory count at Plaza West versus the physical inventory count at Plaza East, but I just don't --

Q. Just to -- just so I can correct -- just so I can be clear on the record, so the record is not muddled about

this, could you flip over the first page of the exhibit set, Exhibit G, which has its Bates Number HAMD654911?

A. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

- Q. Okay. And could you just read for the record the title of that document?
 - A. "Note of Entry of Judgment/Order."
- Q. Okay. And if you look over to the page -- the next page, which is Bates Number 4912.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And does the first paragraph of that stipulate that the parties are stipulating with the approval of the master to certain facts?
 - A. And say that question again.
- Q. Does the first sentence of that statement say the parties are stipulating to the consent and approval of the master to certain facts?
 - A. Correct, yes.
- Q. And is one of the facts of the parties specifically and expressly stipulated to in Paragraph 1, that the inventory -- excuse me, that the depreciated value of the equipment for the purposes of all calculations would be \$150,000 for Plaza East, and that the stipulated value for Plaza West would be \$350,000?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay. So at no point that you know of, from this

2.4

point on, until the checks were written up to this date, is there any dispute that the amount of money that was supposed to be added to the Plaza Extra East value was 150,000 and the amount that was supposed to be added to Plaza Extra West was 350,000?

- A. Yes. This order settled it. We knew that.
- Q. Okay. And in the calculations that we've gone over, is it not sure that those amounts were added, that \$150,000 was added to the value to Plaza Extra East and \$350,000 was added to the value of Plaza Extra West?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And so the issue of the valuation of equipment wasn't why Fathi Yusuf was trying to rush the checks for the inventory, was it?
 - A. No, I don't think that was really a factor.
 - Q. Inventory -- in an early -- I'm sorry?
- A. I don't think that was a factor. I don't think the equipment was as much a factor as the inventory. I think he -- I think Mr. Yusuf, he had -- he had a lot of attention on the -- the differences in the inventory. And I think the equipment was just -- that was something else tangible he could see.
- Q. Okay. And those sheets that we've been looking at, the ones you say were first supplied to Judge Ross, and that's supplied to Joel Holt for the meeting of the 28 --

1 July 28th, those sheets, you said, were prepared by Fathi 2 Yusuf; is that correct? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Ο. Okay. And against your advice, Fathi Yusuf was 5 rushing that process; is that correct? 6 I was trying to get him to -- to -- I was 7 definitely trying to get him to stop doing the calculation, 8 yes. 9 Okay. And so the numbers, the additional numbers 0. 10 that Greq Hodges has asked you to look up, the two or three 11 items at the end of those inventory lists, were items that 12 Mr. Yusuf was putting into his final sheets and submitting 13 them to Judge Ross; is that correct? 14 He was using the physical inventory summary sheets that we had gotten from Rich from International Retail, yes. 15 16 But the two sheets that we've looked at, the 118 Q. 17 and 115 that feed into the final sheet, RGIS didn't create those sheets, did it? 18 19 Which ones are you talking about again? I'm 20 sorry. 21 Items 115, 3115, the Plaza Extra East summary, and 22 3118, the Plaza Extra West summary, that fed into 3114, the 23 overall summary, none of those three sheets were created by

RGIS, were they?

No, they were not. Α. Correct.

2.4

25

2.4

Q. All of those sheets were created and rushed through this process by Mr. Yusuf; is that correct? MR. HODGES: Objection to the use of the word "rushed."

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I would say the answer --

- Q. (Mr. Hartmann) Go ahead and answer.
- A. The answer is yes, these sheets were created.

 He -- what happened was, and my memory at the time was, that I was up to my neck in accounting and issues. And when he was trying to do this, I was trying to prevent him from taking me off -- off of my -- my purpose. It wasn't that I was trying to prevent him from settling up the difference; it was just that I was trying to get him to not do it, because I was afraid that with the way he looked at it, he would -- he would not take into account standard accounting theory, and -- and I didn't want to stop what I was doing.
- Q. Okay. If you look at -- okay. And if you'd look again at 3115, to one for East.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And line says, "Less 67% of Total Sales," did you specifically try to stop him from submitting that line to Judge Ross in July?

In other words, did you say to him, Fathi
Yusuf, what is the reason that there's a 67-percent change
to the actual inventory? We shouldn't submit that to Judge

Ross?

2.4

A. I don't recall ever trying to specifically stop him from using that line. 33-percent margin, or 67 percent cost of sales, was -- was not completely arbitrary, but it is a little bit arbitrary, because we had, in recent years, we had -- we had actually had margins in 1 year that were as high as 36 percent and we had margins in two recent years that were down in about the 31 to 31-and-a-half percent. So, you know, that percentage could have been 67 percent, or it could have been 69 percent, or theoretically it could have even been 64 percent. Probably my only advice to him at the time was whatever percentage he used be consistent between the two stores.

Q. But I'm asking you a specific question about what you recall.

You said that before Joel Holt saw these numbers, when the check was actually being written in the early part of the July, that -- that you and Fathi Yusuf approached Judge Ross with these numbers; is that correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. And did you represent to Judge Ross at that time that these were not your numbers; that these were not accounting numbers that -- that you had come up with from the record; that these were, in fact, arbitrary numbers that Fathi Yusuf had selected for that line, 67 percent? Did you

1	tell Judge Ross
2	MR. HODGES: Objection.
3	Q. (Mr. Hartmann) you, personally, tell Judge
4	Ross
5	MR. HODGES: Objection.
6	Q. (Mr. Hartmann) what the sheets were that he was
7	being given?
8	A. Okay. The answer is, is that, yes, I believe it
9	was made clear to Judge Ross that the 67 percent was a
10	was an estimated number. I believe he he had a clear
11	understanding of that when these numbers were presented to
12	him.
13	Q. And were you physically present when the numbers
14	were presented?
15	A. To Judge Ross?
16	Q. Yes.
17	A. Yes, I was.
18	Q. Before the check he approved the check being
19	issued?
20	A. Correct. Yes, I was.
21	Q. Okay. And did you tell him that these were
22	accounting sheets, or did you tell him that these this
23	was a number that Fathi Yusuf had made up himself and had
24	approximated?
25	A. Are you referring to

Q. I just want to know what you remember about the conversation.

- A. Are you referring again to the 67 percent of total sales?
 - Q. Yes.

1.3

2.4

A. Okay. Let me tell you -- let me just tell you a little bit more.

Fathi Yusuf and I discussed the 67 percent of sales, and we had a lengthy conversation about that. And I told him -- I told him at that time that the -- he could use 69 percent, but whatever percent that he used, he had to be consistent.

Now, having said that, I also reviewed all the numbers, because, for instance, the inventory received before March 9th, I actually had to explain to Lizette, who was running the report, exactly how to run the report in order to get that, what you're looking at there, one million three seventy-six two ninety-eight initially. And then I corrected it, because when I came back in and I reviewed it, I came back and made it one million three eighty-one six seventy-five eight. That's my writing. And the little double checkmark means that I validated it twice.

But the -- and the same thing with sales, 60 percent, 67 percent of total sales, you don't actually -- we don't actually have the sales figure here, but we had a --

1.3

2.4

we had the accounting report with a total figure. And I probably have those records. I probably have those records attached in with my bimonthly reports, because I'm sure those were part of the record I would have supplied to Joel Holt, also.

Q. Okay. So let me ask my question again. Please try to focus on my question, okay?

You were physically present when these numbers were presented to Judge Ross --

- A. Yes.
- Q. -- is that correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, the reason that these were being presented to Judge Ross was because Fathi Yusuf was trying to get himself issued a check for one point -- no, two checks, in the total of over \$1.2 million; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And at that time -- this is my question: At that time, did you tell Judge Ross that that 67 percent of sales was not a method that RGIS had come up with; it was not to do with the actual inventory; instead it was a corrective factor, which is approximated and added by Fathi Yusuf? Did he know that fact? Did you tell him, or did Fathi tell him?
- A. Did you hear all that? I'm having -- I had a hard time hearing exactly. You got a little muffled again.

I'll -- I'll -- I'll ask again. 1 Q. Okay. 2 As you and Fathi Yusuf sat in the meeting 3 with Judge Ross and proffered these three documents that 4 we've looked at, the East, the West, and the combined, did 5 either you or Fathi Yusuf state -- do you recall whether you 6 or Fathi Yusuf stated to Judge Ross that the 67-percent 7 correction was not part of the RGIS inventory; it had no 8 relation whatsoever to the RGIS inventory numbers; it was a 9 corrective factor that was being added; and that it had been 10 approximated by Fathi Yusuf? 11 Just yes or no. Did you tell him that? 12 Α. Yes. 1.3 Okay. Who told him, you or Fathi? Ο. 14 I would have. Α. You would have or you did? Do you recall or don't 15 Ο. 16 you recall? 17 Α. I did. I was -- I was the best one able to explain this. 18 19 Ο. Go ahead. 20 I was -- I would have told him. I would have told 21 him. I examined these. You know, I'm not going to say that 22 Fathi Yusuf didn't also go through the explanation, but Judge Ross and I were able to communicate more clearly. 23 2.4 And I feel very strongly that when I told him 25 that the 67 percent was basically an estimate of the cost of

2.4

inventory as a percentage of our sales. And, you know, if the 67 percent was used on West, and then another percent was used on East, well, you know, that would have been highly questionable. But the fact that it was used consistently in both, you know, is basically good accounting.

- Q. But you said that it -- sometimes that percentage would be as low as 34 percent?
- A. Well, what -- what -- no, actually, the margin, okay? So when I say -- like, for instance, it's not uncommon for our margins to run in the 31 to 32 percent, which would mean that that -- that percentage we're looking at here would read 68 or 69 percent. That's just a hundred percent less 32 percent is 68 percent. We did have some years --
- Q. So I'm clear -- I'm now clear on what you're saying happened in the conversation with Judge Ross.

Now I'm going to ask you a second question, which is, is it your understanding, is it your belief -- and I'm not trying to trap you. This isn't tricky. I'll tell you exactly what I'm going to do. I'm going to submit a brief to Judge Ross and I'm going to say in it, Judge Ross, the Court orders in this case say to use the inventory.

RGIS did the inventory. There's nothing in that order, there's nowhere in what was agreed to by the parties for the

1 math that would be applied to this inventory that said the 2 Fathi Yusuf can apply a corrective factor to the inventory, 3 and by doing so, net \$250,000. 4 What I'm trying to ask you is, when I say 5 that to Judge Ross, do you think that that will come as a 6 surprise to Judge Ross, or do you think Judge Ross knew that 7 what was being used was not the original inventory numbers, but was instead a corrective factor that Fathi Yusuf had 8 9 approximated? Do you think he understood that? I know he understands that. 10 Α. Yes, I do. 11 MR. HODGES: Objection. MR. HARTMANN: Okay. 12 1.3 (Respite.) 14 (Mr. Hartmann) Let me just check and see if I have 0. 15 anything else. 16 Oh, you said that the check -- that the 17 information for the check was supplied to Judge Ross in 18 early July before the check was written. 19 Was it a surprise to Joel Holt, or any of the 20 Hameds, before the check was written? Α. 21 No. 22 Q. Okay. Were the Hameds or Joel Holt told that the 23 check was going to be written --2.4 Α. No. 25 -- before it was written? Q.

1	A. No.
2	Q. Okay. And once it was written, did Joel Holt
3	specifically object to the having written it and having
4	not been giving the calculations or any motive?
5	A. I remember him objecting to it, yes.
6	MR. HARTMANN: Okay. I have no further
7	questions. Thank you.
8	Can we go off record?
9	MR. HODGES: No further questions.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	(Whereupon the deposition concluded
15	at 12:50 p.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

I, SUSAN C. NISSMAN, a Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public for the U.S. Virgin Islands, Christiansted, St. Croix, do hereby certify that the above and named witness, JOHN F. GAFFNEY, was first duly sworn to testify the truth; that said witness did thereupon testify as is set forth; that the answers of said witness to the oral interrogatories propounded by counsel were taken by me in stenotype and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my personal direction and supervision.

I further certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; and that all of the proceedings in the course of the hearing of said deposition are correctly and accurately set forth herein.

I further certify that I am not counsel, attorney or relative of either party, nor financially or otherwise interested in the event of this suit.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand as such Registered Merit Reporter on this the 12th day of December, 2018, at Christiansted, St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands.

My Commission Expires: July 18, 2019

Susan C. Nissman, RPR-RMR NP-70-15