

DRAFT

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA
FOURTH DISTRICT, 1525 PALM BEACH LAKES BLVD., WEST PALM
BEACH, FL 33401

CASE NO.: 4D16-0222
L.T. No.: 2011CP000653XXXXSB
2014CP003698XXXXNB

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN

v. TED BERNSTEIN, AS
TRUSTEE, ET AL.

Appellant / Petitioner(s)

Appellee / Respondent(s)

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

NOTICE: Appellant-Petitioner Eliot I. Bernstein, having raised and shown direct fraud upon the Court in the lower tribunal, and having notified this 4th District Court of Appeals the fraud in the case including but not limited to fraud in the Records of the lower tribunal, and having motioned this 4th District Court of Appeals to take corrective action in compliance with the Statewide Fraud Policy of the Courts, files this Initial Brief herein under protest and prejudiced by the failure of the fraud to be corrected below and further prejudiced by the failure of this 4th District Court of Appeals to Order Full Records and Indexes in all relevant cases, and repeats and renews this request for this District Court of Appeals to take all necessary and proper corrective action in compliance with said fraud policy including but not limited to reporting said case to the Inspector General.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CITATIONS.....	iii
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....	vi
STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	9
ARGUMENT.....	10
I. The lower tribunal acted illegally and in violation of Florida Rules of Civil Procedure by Ordering a Trial in a case not noticed to be heard, abusing its discretion and violating procedural and substantive due process.	10
A. The lower tribunal abused its discretion and abandoned the truth seeking policy of the Courts and law of the Florida Supreme Court by failing to determine outstanding Discovery and the need for pre-trial Depositions.	10
B. Pre-Trial Depositions in Trust and Will validity cases are proper.....	10
C. The lower tribunal abused its discretion and violated the Statewide Fraud policy of the Courts and Judicial Canons by failing to hold hearings to correct and eliminate the fraud in the cases and remove, sanction and report criminal misconduct of officers and fiduciaries of the court and protect the litigants that were injured by the fraud.....	10
II. The lower tribunal abused its discretion by failing to mandatorily Disqualify both pre-trial and at trial.....	10

III.	The lower tribunal abused its discretion by failing to grant a continuance for Appellant to have Texas counsel admitted pro hac vice for Trial denying counsel to minor children at the hearing.....	10
IV.	The Trial Record clearly shows the bias and prejudice of the lower tribunal toward the Appellant and the lower tribunal’s abandonment of the truth seeking process.....	10
V.	Even the limited Records and Indexes provided and certified by Sharon Bock demonstrate the error and abuse of discretion of the lower tribunal in improperly limiting the Trial to “one-day” in advance which was clearly inadequate for appropriate witnesses and evidence including but not limited to the testimony of Donald Tescher, Karen Moran, Traci Kratish, Lindsay Baxley, Alan Rose,	10
VI.	The facts and records show that Ted Bernstein and his attorney Alan Rose sued improper parties that do not exist and thus lack the capacity to be sued depriving the court of subject matter jurisdiction and denying improper Notice to Appellant, Appellant’s minor children and others in violation of procedural and substantive due process.....	10
VII.	The lower tribunal abused its discretion in failing to grant a new trial particularly where signed statements by the core attorneys involved in other fraud in the case, Tescher and Spallina, signed as attorneys at law and filed with the Court below in the Notice of Administration of the Estate of Simon Bernstein showed Appellant is a Beneficiary and where No Minor Children were ever Noticed as Beneficiaries and where Donald Tescher should have been allowed to be Deposed pre-trial but at minimum should have been a Witness at trial.	
	A. The lower tribunal committed reversible error by failing to hold a hearing to determine the fraud.....	10
	CONCLUSION.....	10
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	33

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....33

TABLE OF CITATIONS

CASES

<i>Vollmer v. Key Dev. Props.,</i> 966 So.2d 1022 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2007).....	
<i>Brinkley v. County of Flagler,</i> 769 So.2d 468 (Fla. 5th DCA 2000).....	
<i>K.G. v. Fla. Dep’t of Children & Families,</i> 66 So. 3d 366 (Fla. 1st DCA 2011).....	
<i>Minakan v. Husted,</i> 27 So. 3d 695 (Fla. 4th DCA 2010).....	
<i>Fleming v. Fleming,</i> 710 So.2d 601 (Fla. 4th DCA 1998).....	
<i>Strader v. Zeide,</i> 796 So.2d 591 (Fla. 4th DCA 2001).....	
<i>Rice v. NITV, LLC,</i> 19 So.3d 1095 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2009).....	
<i>Baron v. Baron,</i> 941 So.2d 1233 at 1236 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2006).....	
<i>Bainter v. League of Women Voters of Fla.,</i> 150 So. 3d 1115, 1129 (Fla. 2014).....	
<i>Central Square Tarragon LLC v. Great Divide Insurance Company,</i>	
<i>Binger v. King Pest Control,</i> 401 So.2d 1310 (1981).....	
<i>Toomey v. the Northern Trust Co., Etc.,</i> 15-2813 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2016).....	

STATUTES:

RULES:

Florida Rules of Civil Procedure 1.200

September 27, 2012 - Office of the State Courts Administrator - State Courts

System Fraud Policy¹

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

Nature of the Appeal and Standard of Review

This is an appeal from a final judgment

Factual Background

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

ARGUMENT

- I. The lower tribunal acted illegally and in violation of Florida Rules of Civil Procedure by Ordering a Trial in a case not noticed to be heard,

¹<http://www.jud6.org/News/StateCourtsSystemFraudPolicy.pdf>

abusing its discretion and violating procedural and substantive due process including but not limited to denying Appellant the fair right and opportunity to be heard at a Case-Management Conference.

Florida Rules of Civil Procedure 1.200 provides in part that, “**PRETRIAL PROCEDURE** (a) Case Management Conference. At any time after responsive pleadings or motions are due, the court may order, or a party, by serving a notice, may convene, a case management conference. *The matter to be considered shall be specified in the order or notice setting the conference.*” (emphasis added).

Procedural due process is a constitutional guarantee. See, e.g., Vollmer v. Key Dev. Props., 966 So.2d 1022 (Fla. 2 nd DCA 2007).

In this case, the lower tribunal clearly Ordered a Trial in a case that was not noticed for Case-Management in violation of the Rules of Procedure, procedural due process and then denying Appellant a fair opportunity to be heard to clarify the matter violating substantive due process.

“Fundamental to the concept of due process is the right to be heard. The right to be heard assures a full hearing before a court having jurisdiction of the matter, the right to introduce evidence at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner, and judicial findings based upon that evidence. It includes also an opportunity to cross-examine witnesses, to be heard on questions of law, and the right to have judgment rendered after trial.” (citations omitted) Brinkley v. County of Flagler, 769 So.2d

468 (Fla. 5th DCA 2000).

The right to be heard is so instrumental that error need not be preserved. “[T]he denial of a party's right to be heard — even if unpreserved — constitutes per se reversible error and, therefore, can be raised at any time.” *K.G. v. Fla. Dep’t of Children & Families*, 66 So. 3d 366 (Fla. 1st DCA 2011), citing *Vollmer v. Key Dev. Props., Inc.*, 966 So. 2d 1022, 1027 (Fla. 2d DCA 2007).

"The constitutional guarantee of due process requires that each litigant be given a full and fair opportunity to be heard... The violation of a litigant’s due process right to be heard requires reversal.” *Vollmer v. Key Dev. Props.*, 966 So.2d 1022, 1027 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2007). See also, *Minakan v. Husted*, 27 So. 3d 695 (Fla. 4th DCA 2010)”).

“The goals of these procedural rules are "to eliminate surprise, to encourage settlement, and to assist in arriving at the truth." *Spencer v. Beverly*, [307 So.2d 461](#), 462 (Fla. 4th DCA 1975) (Downey, J., concurring), *cert. denied*, [314 So.2d 590](#) (Fla. 1975). We recently reiterated those goals. “*A search for truth and justice can be accomplished only when all relevant facts are before the judicial tribunal. Those relevant facts should be the determining factor rather than gamesmanship, surprise, or superior trial tactics.*

Dodson v. Persell, [390 So.2d 704](#), 707 (Fla. 1980).”,

See, *BINGER v. KING PEST CONTROL*, 401 So.2d 1310 (1981).

A. The lower tribunal abused its discretion and abandoned the truth

seeking policy of the Courts and law of the Florida Supreme Court by

**failing to determine outstanding Discovery and the need for pre-trial
Depositions.**

Full and fair discovery is essential to the truth-finding function of our justice system, and parties and non-parties alike must comply not only with the technical provisions of the discovery rules, but also with the purpose and spirit of those rules.

The search for truth and justice as our court system and constitution demand can be accomplished only when all relevant facts are before the judicial tribunal. Those relevant facts should be the determining factor rather than gamesmanship, surprise or superior trial tactics.

Courts should not countenance or tolerate actions during litigation that are not forthright and that are designed to delay and obfuscate the discovery process. See, *Bainter v. League of Women Voters of Fla.*, 150 So. 3d 1115, 1129 (Fla. 2014).

An orderly trial is most likely to occur when the judge enforces discovery and pretrial orders strictly and requires each party to make full and proper disclosure before trial.

The Fourth District Court of Appeal in *Central Square Tarragon LLC v. Great Divide Insurance Company*, reiterated the need to “strictly enforce” provisions of pretrial stipulations. This prevents last minute gamesmanship, and makes disruption of the trial and error on appeal less likely. Generally, last-minute

additions of witnesses and substantial changes to testimony should not be admissible at trial. Failure to exclude such testimony prejudices the opposing party and constitutes reversible error.

In this case, there was no Orderly pre-trial procedures which were abandoned in their entirety by the lower tribunal who Ordered a Trial in a case not even Noticed for Case Management.

B. Pre-Trial Depositions in Trust and Will validity cases are proper.

Pre-trial depositions in Trust and Will construction and validity cases are proper and the lower tribunal abused its discretion by denying these pre-trial Discovery procedures. Although in the following case there existed the additional factor of witnesses in jeopardy of passing away before trial to also support the pre-trial deposition request, the Court noted, “The depositions were plainly within the general scope of discovery relating to the allegations in the second amended complaint. Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.280(b).” See, *Toomey v. the Northern Trust Co., Etc.*, 15-2813 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2016).

II. The lower tribunal abused its discretion by failing to grant a continuance for Appellant to have Texas counsel admitted pro hac vice for Trial denying counsel to minor children at the hearing...

“Factors to be considered in determining whether the trial court abused its discretion in denying the motion for continuance include whether the denial of the

continuance creates an injustice for the movant; whether the cause of the request for continuance was unforeseeable by the movant and not the result of dilatory practices; and whether the opposing party would suffer any prejudice or inconvenience as a result of a continuance.” *Fleming v. Fleming*, 710 So.2d 601 (Fla. 4th DCA 1998).

In *Strader v. Zeide*, 796 So.2d 591 (Fla. 4th DCA 2001) although the trial court granted Plaintiff’s attorney’s motion to withdraw, it denied the request to stay the proceedings until the Plaintiff could obtain new counsel. The Appellate Court found that the “Plaintiff was prejudiced as a result of the trial court’s refusal to grant a continuance or allow the Plaintiff additional time to retain new counsel.” *Id* at 593.

Without the benefit of counsel, the court found that the Plaintiff was unable to conduct a meaningful cross-examination. “This Court has noted that there are special circumstances which exist where the denial of a motion for continuance creates an injustice for the moving party and in such cases, it is the court’s obligation to rectify the injustice.” *Strader* at 593.

“While trial courts necessarily enjoy broad discretion in deciding whether to grant or deny a motion for continuance, the exercise of that discretion is not absolute.” *Rice v. NITV, LLC*, 19 So.3d 1095 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2009); *Baron v. Baron*, 941 So.2d 1233 at 1236 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2006).

In determining whether the trial court has abused this broad discretion, the appellate courts consider the following three factors stated previously:

“1) whether the movant suffers injustice from the denial of the motion; 2) whether the underlying cause for the motion was unforeseen by the movant and whether the motion is based on dilatory tactics; and 3) whether prejudice and injustice will befall the opposing party if the motion is granted. *Baron v. Baron*, 941 So.2d 1233, 1235-36 (Fla. 2d DCA 2006) (quoting *Myers v. Seigel*, 920 So.2d 1241, 1242 (Fla. 5 th DCA 2006)).”

In this case, not only did the lower tribunal abuse its discretion and act outside and in violation of established Florida Civil Procedure law by Ordering a Trial in a case which was not noticed to be heard, the Trial Court further abused it’s discretion in denying a Continuance where Appellant had outside counsel attempting to come into the case pro hac vice denying Appellant counsel and more importantly, denying counsel to Appellant’s minor children.

This is particularly true in a case where over 2 years had gone by from the time Appellant first notified the lower Court, then Judge Martin Colin, of direct fraud upon the Court involving the very attorneys and fiduciaries who allegedly prepared the documents sought to be validated until the time that Judge Martin Colin “suddenly” and “mysteriously” “Recused” within 24 hours of denying a Mandatory Disqualification motion.

Clearly there had been no “rush” to validate the alleged testamentary and trust documents for that 2 year period and the brief delay of a 30 day continuance to allow counsel to be admitted pro hac vice would not have caused any undue delay or prejudice to the other parties.

The Trial transcript is clear that Appellant was prejudiced by the denial of the continuance in being a non-attorney acting pro se during the complexities of a trial and there is nothing in the record to show Appellant had engaged in any dilatory tactics nor that any of the other parties would be prejudiced.

Under these circumstances, the denial of the motion for continuance was an abuse of discretion that must now be reversed and a new trial ordered.

**III. The lower tribunal abused its discretion by failing to mandatorily
Disqualify both pre-trial and at trial.**

Judicial neutrality is critical to our legal system. Florida judges have the obligation to voluntarily recuse themselves for a variety of reasons, including bias or prejudice regarding a party or an economic interest in the matter. Canon 3E of the Florida Judicial Conduct Code applies to all.

**IV. The lower tribunal abused its discretion in failing to grant a new trial
particularly where signed statements by the core attorneys involved in
other fraud in the case, Tescher and Spallina, signed as attorneys at
law and filed with the Court below in the Notice of Administration of**

the Estate of Simon Bernstein showed Appellant is a Beneficiary and where No Minor Children were ever Noticed as Beneficiaries and where Donald Tescher should have been allowed to be Deposed pre-trial but at minimum should have been a Witness at trial.

A. The lower tribunal committed reversible error by failing to hold a hearing to determine the fraud.

Factors the trial court should consider in determining whether to reopen the case to allow presentation of additional evidence include whether the opposing party will be unfairly prejudiced and whether it will serve the best interests of justice.

Amador v. Amador, 796 So. 2d 1212 (Fla. 3d DCA 2001); *Hernandez v.*

Cacciamani Dev. Co., 698 So. 2d 927 (Fla. 3d DCA 1997); *Silber*; *Bieley v.*

Bieley, 398 So. 2d 932 (Fla. 3d DCA), review denied, 411 So. 2d 380 (Fla. 1981);

Akins v. Taylor, 314 So. 2d 13 (Fla. 1st DCA 1975); see also *Register v. State*, 718 So. 2d 350 (Fla. 5th DCA 1998).

“ Moreover, given the allegations of fraud made by Robinson to support her motion, we think an evidentiary hearing was essential for the trial court to properly determine whether to grant the request to present the testimony of Adams. See *Robinson v. Kalmanson*, 882 So. 2d 1086, 1088 (Fla. 5th DCA 2004) ("A court can seldom determine the presence or absence of fraud without a trial or evidentiary proceeding.")” See,

“This court and others have held that if a party files a motion pursuant to rule 1.540(b)(3), pleads fraud or misrepresentation with particularity, and shows how that fraud or misrepresentation affected the judgment, the trial court is required to conduct an evidentiary hearing to determine whether the motion should be granted.[7]See *Seal v. Brown*, 801 So. 2d 993, 994-95 (Fla. 1st DCA 2001); *St. Surin v. St. Surin*, 684 So. 2d 243, 244 (Fla. 2d DCA *782 1996); *Estate of Willis v. Gaffney*, 677 So. 2d 949 (Fla. 2d DCA 1996); *Dynasty Exp. Corp. v. Weiss*, 675 So. 2d 235, 239 (Fla. 4th DCA 1996); *Townsend v. Lane*, 659 So. 2d 720 (Fla. 5th DCA 1995); *S. Bell Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Welden*, 483 So. 2d 487, 489 (Fla. 1st DCA 1986) (“[W]here the moving party's allegations raise a colorable entitlement to rule 1.540(b)(3) relief, a formal evidentiary hearing on the motion, as well as permissible discovery prior to the hearing, is required.”); *Kidder v. Hess*, 481 So. 2d 984, 986 (Fla. 5th DCA 1986); *Stella v. Stella*, 418 So. 2d 1029 (Fla. 4th DCA 1982); see also *Robinson*. Moreover, the courts have held that the hearing requirement applies when fraud is asserted as a grounds for relief under either rule 1.530 or 1.540, Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. See *Stella*. The motion filed by *Robinson* sufficiently alleges fraud and demonstrates how it affected the judgment, thereby satisfying the requirement for an evidentiary hearing under either rule 1.530 or 1.540.”

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, this Court should reverse the Final Judgment dated December 16, 2015 and remand the proceedings to the lower tribunal Disqualifying Judge John Phillips and ensuring the case is assigned to a non-conflicted Judge or other venue and non conflicted jurisdiction consistent with fundamental due process and for such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this brief complies with the font requirements of Fla. R. App. P. 9.210(a)(2).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished to parties listed on attached Service List by E-mail Electronic Transmission; Court ECF; this 5th day of July, 2016.

/s/ Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Eliot Ivan Bernstein
2753 NW 34th St.
Boca Raton, FL 33434
561-245-8588
iviewit@iviewit.tv

**SERVICE LIST LOWER CASES DEFENDANTS, RESPONDENTS,
COUNTER DEFENDANTS**

<p>John P. Morrissey, Esq. 330 Clematis Street, Suite 213 West Palm Beach, FL 33401 (561) 833-0766-Telephone (561) 833-0867 -Facsimile Email: John P. Morrissey (iohn@jrnoiTisseylaw.com)</p>	<p>Lisa Friedstein 2142 Churchill Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 lisa@friedsteins.com</p>
<p>Peter M. Feaman, Esq. Peter M. Feaman, P.A. 3695 West Boynton Beach Blvd., Suite 9 Boynton Beach, FL 33436 (561) 734-5552 -Telephone (561) 734-5554 -Facsimile Email: service@feamanlaw.com: mkoskey@feamanlaw.com</p>	<p>Jill Iantoni 2101 Magnolia Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 jilliantoni@gmail.com</p>
<p>Gary R. Shendell, Esq. Kenneth S. Pollock, Esq. Shendell & Pollock, P.L. 2700 N. Military Trail, Suite 150 Boca Raton, FL 33431 (561)241-2323 - Telephone (561)241- 2330-Facsimile Email: gary@shendellpollock.com ken@shendellpollock.com estella@shendellpollock.com britt@shendellpollock.com grs@shendellpollock.com</p>	<p>Counter Defendant Robert Spallina, Esq. Donald Tescher, Esq. Tescher & Spallina 925 South Federal Hwy., Suite 500 Boca Raton, Florida 33432</p>
<p>Brian M. O'Connell, Esq. Joielle A. Foglietta, Esq. Ciklin Lubitz Martens & O'Connell 515 N. Flagler Dr., 20th Floor West Palm Beach, FL 33401 561-832-5900-Telephone 561-833-4209 - Facsimile</p>	<p>Counter Defendant John J. Pankauski, Esq. Pankauski Law Firm PLLC 120 South Olive Avenue 7th Floor West Palm Beach, FL 33401 courtfilings@pankauskilawfirm.com</p>

Email: boconnell@ciklinlubitz.com; ifoglietta@ciklinlubitz.com; service@ciklinlubitz.com; slobdell@ciklinliibitz.com	john@pankauskilawfirm.com
Counter Defendant Mark R. Manceri, Esq., and Mark R. Manceri, P.A., 2929 East Commercial Boulevard Suite 702 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308 mrmlaw@comcast.net	Counter Defendant Donald Tescher, Esq., Tescher & Spallina, P.A. Wells Fargo Plaza 925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500 Boca Raton, Florida 33432 dtescher@tescherspallina.com
Theodore Stuart Bernstein 880 Berkeley Boca Raton, FL 33487 tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com	Counter Defendant TESCHER & SPALLINA, P.A.. Wells Fargo Plaza 925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500 Boca Raton, Florida 33432 dtescher@tescherspallina.com
Theodore Stuart Bernstein Life Insurance Concepts, Inc. 950 Peninsula Corporate Circle Suite 3010 Boca Raton, FL 33487 tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com	Counter Defendant Alan B. Rose, Esq. PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD, ROSE, KONOPKA, THOMAS & WEISS, P.A. 505 South Flagler Drive, Suite 600 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401 561-355-6991 arose@pm-law.com arose@mrachek-law.com
Pamela Beth Simon 950 N. Michigan Avenue Apartment 2603 Chicago, IL 60611 psimon@stpcorp.com	Counter Defendant L. Louis Mrachek, Esq. PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD, ROSE, KONOPKA, THOMAS & WEISS, P.A. 505 South Flagler Drive, Suite 600 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401 561-355-6991 lmrachek@mrachek-law.com

<p>Jill Iantoni 2101 Magnolia Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 jilliantoni@gmail.com</p>	<p>Counter Defendant Pankauski Law Firm PLLC 120 South Olive Avenue 7th Floor West Palm Beach, FL 33401</p>
<p>Lisa Sue Friedstein 2142 Churchill Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 lisa.friedstein@gmail.com lisa@friedsteins.com</p>	<p>Dennis McNamara Executive Vice President and General Counsel Oppenheimer & Co. Inc. Corporate Headquarters 125 Broad Street New York, NY 10004 800-221-5588 Dennis.mcnamara@opco.com info@opco.com</p>
<p>Dennis G. Bedley Chairman of the Board, Director and Chief Executive Officer Legacy Bank of Florida Glades Twin Plaza 2300 Glades Road Suite 120 West – Executive Office Boca Raton, FL 33431 info@legacybankfl.com DBedley@LegacyBankFL.com</p>	<p>Hunt Worth, Esq. President Oppenheimer Trust Company of Delaware 405 Silverside Road Wilmington, DE 19809 302-792-3500 hunt.worth@opco.com</p>
<p>James Dimon Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer JP Morgan Chase & CO. 270 Park Ave. New York, NY 10017-2070 Jamie.dimon@jpmchase.com</p>	<p>Neil Wolfson President & Chief Executive Officer Wilmington Trust Company 1100 North Market Street Wilmington, DE 19890-0001 nwolfson@wilmingtontrust.com</p>
<p>William McCabe Oppenheimer & Co., Inc. 85 Broad St Fl 25 New York, NY 10004</p>	<p>STP Enterprises, Inc. 303 East Wacker Drive Suite 210 Chicago IL 60601-5210</p>

William.McCabe@opco.com	psimon@stpcorp.com
Charles D. Rubin Managing Partner Gutter Chaves Josepher Rubin Forman Fleisher Miller PA Boca Corporate Center 2101 NW Corporate Blvd., Suite 107 Boca Raton, FL 33431-7343 crubin@floridatax.com	Ralph S. Janvey Krage & Janvey, L.L.P. Federal Court Appointed Receiver Stanford Financial Group 2100 Ross Ave, Dallas, TX 75201 rjanvey@kjllp.com
Kimberly Moran Tescher & Spallina, P.A. Wells Fargo Plaza 925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500 Boca Raton, Florida 33432 kmoran@tescherspallina.com	Lindsay Baxley aka Lindsay Giles Life Insurance Concepts 950 Peninsula Corporate Circle Suite 3010 Boca Raton, FL 33487 lindsay@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com
Gerald R. Lewin CBIZ MHM, LLC 1675 N Military Trail Fifth Floor Boca Raton, FL 33486	CBIZ MHM, LLC General Counsel 6480 Rockside Woods Blvd. South Suite 330 Cleveland, OH 44131 ATTN: General Counsel generalcounsel@cbiz.com (216)447-9000
Albert Gortz, Esq. Proskauer Rose LLP One Boca Place 2255 Glades Road Suite 421 Atrium Boca Raton, FL 33431-7360 agortz@proskauer.com	Heritage Union Life Insurance Company A member of WiltonRe Group of Companies 187 Danbury Road Wilton, CT 06897 cstroup@wiltonre.com
Estate of Simon Bernstein Brian M O'Connell Pa 515 N Flagler Drive West Palm Beach, FL 33401 boconnell@ciklinlubitz.com	Counter Defendant Steven Lessne, Esq. Gray Robinson, PA 225 NE Mizner Blvd #500 Boca Raton, FL 33432 steven.lessne@gray-robinson.com

<p>Byrd F. "Biff" Marshall, Jr. President & Managing Director Gray Robinson, PA 225 NE Mizner Blvd #500 Boca Raton, FL 33432 biff.marshall@gray-robinson.com</p>	<p>Steven A. Lessne, Esq. Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A. 777 South Flagler Drive, Suite 500 East West Palm Beach, FL 33401 Telephone: (561) 650-0545 Facsimile: (561) 655-5677 E-Mail Designations: slessne@gunster.com jhoppel@gunster.com eservice@gunster.com</p>
<p>T&S Registered Agents, LLC Wells Fargo Plaza 925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500 Boca Raton, Florida 33432 dtescher@tescherspallina.com</p>	<p>David Lanciotti Executive VP and General Counsel LaSalle National Trust NA CHICAGO TITLE LAND TRUST COMPANY, as Successor 10 South LaSalle Street Suite 2750 Chicago, IL 60603 David.Lanciotti@ctt.com</p>
<p>Joseph M. Leccese Chairman Proskauer Rose LLP Eleven Times Square New York, NY 10036 jleccese@proskauer.com</p>	<p>Brian Moynihan Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer 100 N Tryon St #170, Charlotte, NC 28202 Phone:(980) 335-3561</p>
<p>ADR & MEDIATIONS SERVICES, LLC Diana Lewis 2765 Tecumseh Drive West Palm Beach, FL 33409 (561) 758-3017 Telephone Email: dzlewis@aol.com (Fla. Bar No. 351350)</p>	