### SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY CHANCERY DIVISION, GENERAL EQUITY ATLANTIC COUNTY, NEW JERSEY DOCKET NO. ATL-C-43-13

RATIONAL GROUP US HOLDINGS, INC. and OLDFORD GROUP LTD.,

RESORTS INTERNATIONAL HOLDINGS, LLC, *et als*,

v.

Defendants.

Plaintiffs,

)

)

Transcript of Hearing On Order To Show Cause Seeking Preliminary Injunction

Place: Atlantic County Criminal Courthouse 4997 Unami Boulevard Mays Landing, NJ 08330

Date: May 17, 2013

## **BEFORE:**

THE HONORABLE RAYMOND A. BATTEN, P.J. Ch.

# TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:

NOAH J. GOLD, ESQ., (Lum Drasco & Positan, LLC)

# **APPEARANCES:**

WAYNE J. POSITAN, ESQ.; STEVEN J. EISENSTEIN, ESQ.; and SCOTT REISER, ESQ. (Lum Drasco & Positan, LLC) Attorneys for Plaintiffs

THOMAS R. CURTIN, ESQ., (Graham Curtin) GILBERT L. BROOKS, ESQ. (Duane Morris - Cherry Hill) TARIQ MUNDIYA, ESQ. and DAN C. KOZUSKO, ESQ. (Willkie Farr & Gallagher) Attorneys for Defendants

> CHERYL A. BRYSON, C.E.T., AD/T CB TRIALSCRIPT SERVICE 1606 Adams Avenue – Linwood, NJ 08221 PHONE/FAX: 609-653-1971 DIGITAL RECORDING BY: (UNKNOWN)

					Page 1
1		<u>I N I</u>	) <u>e x</u>		
2	<u>Witnesses</u> :	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Cross</u>	<u>Redir</u>	<u>Recross</u>
3	(None this date)				
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	<u>Evidence</u> :				
9	(None this date)				
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15	<u>Argument/Summation</u> :				
16	Mr. Curtin				11/50
17	Mr. Mundiya				31/40/76
18	Mr. Brooks				35/48
19	Mr. Positan				54/79
20					
21					
22					
23	<u>Ruling/Decision</u> :				
24	The Court				79
25					

(May 17, 2013. Digital recording at Time Index 1 2 1:33:01 as follows:) 3 THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone. Good afternoon and welcome. 4 5 MR. CURTIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. MR. POSITAN: Good afternoon. 6 THE COURT: We're on the record? 7 8 THE CLERK: Yes. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Bear with - Let me get organized here for just a moment. 10 We convene in the matter of Rational Group 11 US Holdings, Incorporated and Oldford Group Limited v. 12 13 Resorts International Holdings, LLC; Eric Matejevich -14 Am I pronouncing that correctly? 15 MR. CURTIN: Matich (sic) - Matejevich, Your 16 Honor. 17 THE COURT: Matejevich? Thank you. Irwin 18 Apartment Trust, et al, and it is docket ATL-C-43-13. 19 Counsel, your appearances, please. 20 MR. POSITAN: For the plaintiffs Rational 21 Group Holdings and Oldford Group Limited, Wayne J. 22 Positan, Steven Eisenstein, and Scott Reiser of the 23 firm of Lum Drasco & Positan. 24 MR. CURTIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Tom Curtin. I'm from Graham Curtin of 25

2

Page 4

Morristown, and I represent the defendants together 1 with my colleagues who I will introduce to you, who 2 3 have been admitted pro hac vice. At least their application is pending. 4 5 THE COURT: I have it right here, and we'll do that in first order. 6 7 MR. CURTIN: And my adversary graciously has consented to their admission from Wilkie Farr & 8 9 Gallagher, Tariq Mundiya and Dan Kozusko. THE COURT: Welcome. 10 MR. MUNDIYA: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 MR. BROOKS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 12 13 Gil Brooks of the firm of Duane Morris appearing on behalf of the defendants. 14 THE COURT: The Gil Brooks of the 15 16 certification, I gather? 17 MR. BROOKS: Correct, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. POSITAN: Your Honor, if I may please, 20 if Mr. Brooks is going to speak I'm going to have an 21 objection to that given his factual affidavit filed. 22 I think he's made himself a fact witness in the case. 23 THE COURT: Was there any inclination to 24 have Mr. Brooks speaking, Mr. Curtin? 25 MR. CURTIN: My inclination, Judge, is that

Page 5

1	given this is the first opportunity we've had to
2	respond to the allegations made by the plaintiffs in
3	this case that the Court - there are others, there are
4	people other than me that might have information that
5	the Court might inquire, and if there are issues that
6	are a concern to the Court of Mr. Positan and his
7	client, he is - Mr he is available to speak. I
8	don't anticipate him making a presentation.
9	THE COURT: So noted. Mr. Positan, your
10	objection is noted and we'll see where we go.
11	Let us first address that, that motion. I
12	have the motion. I have it with me here at the bench.
13	Mr. Positan, there is no objection to the
14	motion for admission of Mr. Mundiya and Mr. Kozusko
15	pro hac vice?
16	MR. POSITAN: No, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: I sign the order, and we'll get
18	that filed, counsel, in due course and get everyone
19	copies. The order is filed - signed.
20	Counsel, a few other preliminary matters
21	that won't take long. First, I want to share with all
22	of you that on May 13th when I entered the initial
23	restraints and scheduled the return for today at 1:30
24	it was certainly not my intention then, nor is it now,
25	to pull or have pulled two past presidents of the New

Colloguy

Page 6

Jersey State Bar Association from the last afternoon 1 2 of the New Jersey State Bar Association convention. 3 That is extremely fortuitous. I acknowledge that 4 you're here. I also want to acknowledge to you that I 5 know what you just left, I assume. MR. POSITAN: Yes, Your Honor. In fact, Tom 6 7 Curtin and I spent lunch yesterday at the past 8 presidents lunch and dinner last night at the 9 installation dinner, and we were both together at the 10 cocktail party the night before; and also I succeeded 11 Tom as the New Jersey delegate to the ABA, and he 12 succeeded me as the Board of Governors representative 13 from the Third Circuit. So we've worked very closely 14 together on things that are good for the profession. 15 THE COURT: May I ask -16 MR. POSITAN: But that's the greatness of 17 the adversarial system. 18 THE COURT: May I ask whether, as a result 19 of those discussions, any matters have been resolved? 20 (Laughter) MR. POSITAN: Well, we can't bring 21 22 settlement discussions before the Court, Your Honor. 23 MR. CURTAIN: Well, I did agree to pay the 24 bar tab, Your Honor. 25 MR. POSITAN: That's because they gave us

free tokens though, Tom. 1 2 THE COURT: In any event, I acknowledge that 3 you are here under that circumstance. 4 First, I also want to acknowledge Mr. 5 Positan's objection to what he characterized as late submissions by the defendants, and I believe they took 6 the form of certifications if I'm not mistaken, and 7 8 I've not had the opportunity -9 MR. POSITAN: Contracts actually, Your Honor, that were referred to -10 THE COURT: Two other -11 12 MR. POSITAN: - in their other papers, which 13 I have also objected to as being irrelevant and 14 extraneous. So that's part of my argument. 15 THE COURT: I understand. As is typically my habit, I read everything. So I've read them. 16 Ι 17 will also share with counsel that it is my view, at 18 least at the moment, that the content of those 19 contracts is not dispositive here today, and I'm 20 satisfied that as the oral argument goes forward and I 21 make my findings you'll be satisfied to that effect. 22 I also note that there are objections to the 23 four certifications provided by Messrs. Perskie, 24 Hurley, Auriemma, and Catania and, again, I've read 25 those as well. Counsel can be free to comment upon

those as you choose, but I'm also relatively certain -1 2 my mind may change, but I don't envision any such 3 change - I'm relatively certain that while those affidavits or certifications are certainly interesting 4 5 to read and they are arguably relevant, they are also not dispositive as relates to the decision that I 6 7 perceive needs to be made here today. 8 So to the extent of those objections I don't 9 perceive prejudice visiting, visiting anyone. I don't 10 know that - Well, I'll probably hear from Mr. Curtin in that regard, but I don't know that this Court is 11 necessarily bound by the content of those 12 13 certifications. And we've already addressed the contracts. 14 15 Counsel, I believe that covers at least the 16 preliminary matters that I wanted to address. Before 17 we actually get into the oral argument, do any of you 18 have anything else preliminarily? 19 MR. CURTIN: I don't, Your Honor. 20 MR. POSITAN: No, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: I have one more matter, and it actually relates to the contract and pertains to two 22 23 matters that neither of you have raised in your 24 pleadings. And if you'll indulge me, I'd like to 25 direct your attention to the contract and specifically

Page 9

page 47, and it pertains to Article 7, specifically 1 2 section 7.1, termination - and I gather we'll be 3 discussing that section quite a bit this afternoon -4 and specifically 7.1, its introductory sentence and 5 then down to section (c). And reading the introductory language of 7.1 with section (c) it 6 7 reads, and I'll quote, (reading:) 8 "This agreement may be terminated at any time 9 prior to closing." And then down to (c), 10 "By seller's representative or buyer. If any 11 gaming authority has made a final determination 12 13 that such gaming authority will not issue to 14 buyer all gaming approvals or if buyer withdraws 15 unless subsequent to the termination of this agreement pursuant to section, " - this section -16 17 "7.1, its application for gaming approval;" 18 Is there a clause or a phrase missing there? Do you 19 perceive? 20 MR. CURTIN: I think we'll get you at least 21 a response, Your Honor. I'm not sure an answer, but a 22 response at least. We'll have the lawyer who did the 23 contract itself -24 THE COURT: In any event, let me share with 25 counsel as I read that, and I have read it and reread

Coll	oquy
------	------

it, I am consistently left with the sense that there 1 2 was likely at some point in time a clause that 3 followed, and I'm wondering what that may have been, and I would appreciate your thoughts in that regard. 4 5 Next, if we turn the page to page 48, section 7.1(f), same introductory language as begins 6 7 section 7.1 on page 47, but after the colon we flip to 8 page 48 under (f), (reading:) 9 "By the seller's representative if buyer has 10 breached any representation, warranty, covenant, 11 or agreement on the part of the buyer set forth in the agreement which, one, would result in the 12 13 failure of a condition set forth in section 14 6.3(a), (b), or (c) hereof," 15 and if you flip back to section 6.3(a), (b), or (c), 16 my copy at least, and I would trust that your copy, 17 does not contain a section 6.3(c). I'll say it again 18 if you'd like. 19 MR. MUNDIYA: No, I - Your Honor, I think 20 that probably should read 6.1(c). It may be a typographical error. We'll confirm that. That's 21 22 probably a typo. 23 THE COURT: In any event, I'll appreciate 24 your thoughts. And it may be of no moment, but -25 MR. MUNDIYA: Right. But we, we will get

back to you on that. 1

2

3

4

17

THE COURT: That's fine.

With that, this is the return on the order to show cause. Mr. Curtin, I'm happy to hear from you 5 first.

MR. CURTIN: Judge, thank you for this 6 7 opportunity to present information to you on behalf of 8 my clients. With your permission what I'd like to do 9 is to be able to address, have me the address the 10 issues that relate to the issuance of the temporary restraining order and the return of the order to show 11 cause for today, and to the extent that there are 12 13 other issues my colleagues will either respond to them 14 or present with regard to any issue that may arise 15 either raised by the Court or in response to Mr. 16 Positan's argument if that's okay.

THE COURT: That's fine.

18 MR. CURTIN: So let me start first by 19 hopefully - although Your Honor has just corrected 20 what may be an error or mistake unnoticed by both 21 sides - that before you you have a series - you have a 22 complaint, a verified complaint on an order to show 23 cause, briefs, exhibits, and a variety of documents 24 including the certifications to which you earlier 25 referred, which we filed, those of Steven P. Perskie,

Thomas N. Auriemma, Frank Catania, Sr., Louis R. 1 2 Hurley, Eric Matejevich, and Gilbert Brooks. 3 I want to begin where I think we should. 4 That is I understand that it's not my responsibility 5 today, I don't have the burden today to show that the plaintiffs have satisfied their obligations under the 6 7 four-prong test, but that I do have the obligation to 8 come forward and to present information to you that 9 would permit you to make a decision with regard to 10 whether or not the plaintiffs have satisfied the 11 obligations of Crowe v. DeGioia. And I thought while we're caught up to a large degree in a big world 12 13 picture, a big argument between casino stars - excuse 14 me, PokerStars and our client, that maybe we ought to 15 see what others perhaps more informed would say about what we see are issues that the Court should look at 16 17 today with regard to all of the issues on the order to 18 show cause and temporary restraints. And I point the Court - aware of the fact that there's been an 19 20 objection to the Perskie and other certifications - to 21 paragraph 12 of the Mr. Perskie's certification. 22 THE COURT: So the record is complete, a 23 former colleague of mine here in Vicinage I. 24 MR. CURTIN: I'm aware of that, Your Honor. 25 MR. POSITAN: Well, Your Honor, I - and I do

object to that. I think for a retired judge of this 1 2 vicinage to introduce the kind of affidavit he did, 3 telling you how you should rule on statutory 4 construction, raises some serious questions. And, you 5 know, we have had no opportunity to get into his affidavit or any other affidavits about conflicts of 6 7 interest. Mr. Catania, for example, I am told this 8 morning, represented my client PokerStars at one time, 9 provided legal advice to them. So we have two 10 questionable affidavits. Where we go from there and 11 what these respective interests are, but to have a 12 retired judge - and he has his retired judge 13 information prominently displayed here from his web site - to offer that in this vicinage -14 15 THE COURT: Even, even with that -16 MR. POSITAN: - raises some serious 17 questions. 18 THE COURT: But even without that, in this 19 region that name is not unknown to very many people. I wanted to offer the comment so that the record is 20 21 complete. 22 MR. CURTIN: Judge, with regard to that let 23 me proceed. I understand Mr. Positan has made his 24 objection. 25 Mr. Perskie has outlined, I think, for us on Oral Argument

Page 14

our behalf and for the Court's information and 1 2 persuasion, I hope, several provisions, but I want to 3 point specifically for what we're doing today that Mr. Perskie says, beginning with paragraph 12, and I'm 4 5 reading, (reading:) "In my experience it is common and, in fact, the 6 7 norm for an agreement involving the purchase and 8 sale of interests in Atlantic City casinos to 9 include a closing date that provides for closing to occur after the issuance of an Interim Casino 10 Authorization by the Commission such as the 11 12 provision in the agreement that is currently 13 before the Court. In my experience such a 14 closing date provision has always been considered 15 consistent with the waiting period requirements of N.J.S.A. 5:12-95.1(2)(a)." 16 17 And in paragraph 13 he says, (reading:) 18 "In my experience it is also common for an 19 agreement involving the purchase and sale of an 20 interest in an Atlantic City casino to include a separate termination provision such as is 21 22 included in the agreement before the Court that 23 would limit the time period during which the 24 proposed buyer must complete the regulatory 25 process and thus providing for a termination of

1	the agreement within a specified time or a
2	specified date. As long as such provision would
3	not purport to afford any buyer the opportunity
4	to 'close' or 'settle' on the purchase before the
5	121-day regulatory review period had expired,
6	such a termination provision is neither
7	inconsistent with any of the interests of the
8	regulatory agencies nor violative of the
9	provisions of the ICA statute. Rather, such a
10	provision merely reflects the negotiated
11	positions of the buyer and seller, a mutually
12	acceptable determination that is beyond the
13	interests of the regulatory process."
14	And finally in paragraph 14, (reading:)
15	"While I have no information and would not
16	speculate with regard to the perceived interests
17	of the respective parties in the instant
18	transaction, including a termination date in
19	their agreement, I would observe for the Court's
20	attention that the economics of the casino
21	industry in New Jersey have definite 'calendar
22	rhythm' in the sense that the summer season,
23	which is, of course, the busiest time of year,
24	frequently mandates the schedule for transfers of
25	interests in casino licenses and other

1	transactions in order to preserve for all
2	concerned the advantages and summer businesses
3	and full attention of the operator during that
4	period."
5	So says the author of the Casino Control statute that
6	has been working quite well for a number of years.
7	Finally, —
8	MR. POSITAN: May I address that, Your
9	Honor?
10	THE COURT: I'm sorry?
11	MR. POSITAN: Could I address the
12	qualifications of this testimony on somebody who is
13	not a fact witness, who is not - What is he? An
14	expert witness? Has he been paid for this testimony?
15	And what are we doing here? We don't have an
16	Appellate Division ruling here. Is he speaking as a
17	retired judge? Is he speaking — What is he speaking
18	as? He's not involved in this case.
19	THE COURT: I think those questions, Mr.
20	Curtain, are directed to you more than the Court.
21	MR. CURTIN: We - This is our first
22	opportunity to respond to an ex parte application made
23	to you last week when we had no opportunity to respond
24	to the allegations made by the plaintiff. We were not
25	given notice. We had to present to you as much

factual information that we possibly could in a 1 2 relatively short period of time in which we sought to 3 inform the Court with as much information as we could 4 find. We went, selected a number of experts who have 5 more knowledge on the subject than I do and, respectfully, probably more knowledge on the subject 6 7 than the Court has or Mr. Positan or his colleagues 8 have. 9 THE COURT: No doubt. 10 MR. CURTIN: So we are, we are at this 11 stage, on the return of an order to show cause seeking 12 to restrain us from operating our business, pulling 13 out all the stops, and I think that -14 THE COURT: I don't know that the restraint 15 seeks to prevent you from operating the business. MR. POSITAN: It does not. 16 17 THE COURT: In any event -18 MR. CURTIN: In any event, put that in the 19 column of an exercised Irishman trying to make a 20 point. 21 The selection of the experts that we 22 selected - and this is the first, the first - I23 shouldn't say that. This is an unexpected objection 24 to the qualifications of somebody. I know that there 25 was an objection written by Mr. Positan to the use of

### Oral Argument

Page 18

1	these, but I think you need information that's
2	sensible, that's reliable, that's dependable that the
3	Court can rely on in terms of hearing my argument.
4	Whether or not you choose to regard or disregard that
5	argument, the qualifications of the individual, you
6	know who it is, you know what his reputation is, and
7	you can use that, ignore it, or use it or otherwise.
8	But I think it's important for you to know that at
9	least the expert in this area has said that what we
10	have done, what this contract says is the typical
11	standard agreement that is utilized in the casino
12	industry and has been for some time in his experience.
13	THE COURT: You would acknowledge, I gather
14	- and I think this goes more to Mr. Positan's
15	objection — that whatever the practice of the Casino
16	Control Commission with regard to the substantive
17	content of agreements to purchase casino interests is
18	or may be, it's not binding upon this court here.
19	MR. CURTIN: I wasn't suggesting it was
20	binding, but it certainly is informative, and I would
21	hope that the Court would utilize that in other
22	arguments and other evidence to come to a
23	determination that today you are not - you're going to
24	dissolve these restraints and permit us to move
25	forward.

THE COURT: Again, I understand that this is 1 2 your client's first opportunity to be here, and I am 3 going to extend to both sides, but certainly you and your client, Mr. Curtin, the time that you want and 4 5 I'll hear your arguments. I will not cramp your style, so to speak, in developing a record. 6 I did 7 indicate a little bit earlier, and it remains my 8 sense, that the four certifications to which the 9 objection was made, I've read them. They are interesting. They are arguably relevant. To this 10 point they're not dispositive and should that change 11 I'm certainly going to share the point at which I 12 13 sense that may be the case with Mr. Positan so that he 14 can build his record. 15 MR. POSITAN: Your Honor, if I also can 16 correct the record here? This is not an *ex parte* 17 proceeding. There was an original ex parte order, and 18 that was - Then they were immediately notified. We

19 had a second telephonic conference hearing, which is a 20 matter of record, -

THE COURT: One day later.

21

MR. POSITAN: - and in the papers. So this not *ex parte* anymore, and then he wanted it moved it up until Tuesday, and we consented. Then he wanted it moved back to Friday, and we consented. So to say

this is ex parte today is incorrect. 1 2 THE COURT: But in fairness it is first 3 opportunity for Mr. Curtin and his colleagues to 4 appear here, stand on their feet and represent their 5 client, and I recognize that. MR. CURTIN: Thank you, Judge. 6 7 The second thing to see if I can get us back 8 to where, the real world discussion that I think is 9 important to my clients today, if I could point Your 10 Honor's attention and counsels' attention to Mr. Matejevich's certification dated May 13th of 2013 and 11 12 in particular paragraph 17. 13 THE COURT: Seven? 14 MR. CURTIN: Paragraph 17. And I, the 15 reason I want you to consider this and to focus your, 16 the Court's attention to this is there is a 17 significant impact on the imposition of the temporary 18 restraining order and any restraint that may follow. 19 And the words that Mr. Makovitch - Matejevich, excuse 20 me - utilizes here I think are helpful and will help 21 shape my argument, and if you will permit me I will 22 read, briefly read paragraph 17 because it depicts 23 the climate in which this, these circumstances are 24 occurring. He says, (reading:) 25 "At present the temporary restraining order is

preventing RIH from fulfilling its 1 2 responsibilities to its constituents, including 3 owners, management, 1,743 employees, vendors and 4 patrons of The Atlantic Club. Seller's 5 responsibilities to its stakeholders is to review all options available and seek the best 6 7 alternative. Seeking alternative buyers or 8 partners will not cause chaos. It will be an 9 orderly process with full disclosure of Rational's asserted claims. The sellers are 10 11 prevented from taking steps to prepare The Atlantic Club for the advent of on-line gaming. 12 13 RIH and The Atlantic Club are at a standstill 14 while its competition is busy pursing the 15 economic opportunity that RHI (sic) helped to 16 bring to Atlantic City by being the primary 17 casino advocate for legalized on-line gaming in 18 New Jersey. Time is short, and every day of 19 delay is harmful. Rational is also waging a 20 public relations campaign by filing its lawsuit 21 and trumpeting the ex parte TRO secured last 22 week. The press has caused significant employee, 23 vendor, and customer uncertainty. Such 24 uncertainty is the last thing The Atlantic Club 25 needs as we head into the summer season."

And he asks in the concluding paragraph that you
 eliminate or vacate the order which you previously
 entered.

So that's sort of where we are today, Your Honor, and we are - it's really a very critical time for Atlantic City. It's really a very critical time for our client, and it wants to be in a position where it remains viable and can compete.

9 What's happening in my view, Your Honor, and 10 the view of my clients is what the plaintiffs are 11 asking you to do is to require us to comply with - or 12 requiring you or asking you to enforce a contract that 13 we did not sign. We want to enforce the contract 14 which we did sign, and it contains provisions that 15 authorize us to do what we have done.

16 More particularly with regard to the events 17 that have occurred over the last several days, they've 18 asked you for an extraordinary remedy which arises out 19 of an ordinary standard contract that was negotiated 20 by sophisticated parties with powerhouse lawyers knowing the full import of the contents of those 21 22 agreements, knowing what the provisions they wanted, 23 what the provisions that they did not want. You're 24 being asked in my view, Your Honor, and in the view of 25 my clients to rewrite a contract that these parties

negotiated, the terms that they negotiated, the giveand-takes that they negotiated because the plaintiffs are unhappy with the contract that they have; and that's not your job, to reform or to rewrite agreements that sophisticated parties with sophisticated counsel experienced in this field are, are involved with.

8 The pleadings that we are dealing with here, 9 Judge, as I read them at least, don't claim that there 10 was a breach of the agreement. They don't claim that there's an ambiguity. They don't claim that there's 11 12 fraud. They don't claim that - they don't actually 13 claim that there's any dispute with the terms of the 14 contract. There's a bunch of subjective arguments 15 about how they, what they feel and how they feel 16 they've been treated, but there are no allegations in 17 my view, at least in my reading, that claim that we 18 have breached this agreement, and without a breach 19 there's no basis, despite their argument, for the -20 for an injunction to occur without a breach of the agreement. We think the injunction provision limits -21 22 is limited to that argument by agreement of the 23 parties, not by a substituted agreement or judgment of 24 the Court. In fact, -

25

THE COURT: If I may, if I may interrupt?

MR. CURTIN: Sure.
THE COURT: Just my sense is you and I are
about to hear from Mr. Positan with regard to the
events of March 26th and the letter by Mr. Matejevich
or an email by Matejevich and the language contained
in the email and what that means. You don't have to
address that now, but you raised the issue of breach,
and I'm listening. So go ahead.
MR. CURTIN: Essentially what you're being
asked to do is to rewrite this agreement to give the
plaintiffs an exclusive option to purchase The
Atlantic Club and asking The Atlantic Club to bear the
risk and the uncertainty of the issuance of an ICA,
the risk that we didn't bargain for. They bargained
for, that PokerStars agreed, not Atlantic Club, to get

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 their license in the required period of time. There 17 is in our view, Judge, based upon what we've seen, 18 particularly the certifications and the information that's, that is put forth in our pleadings, there is 19 little or no likelihood of success here. 20

21 One of the questions we think you - we would 22 hope that you will address today is whether or not the 23 contract sets forth and specifies a date earlier than 24 the 121st day after a completed application. It does 25 not. That issue, I think the Court must look at in

connection with the request that's being made by the 1 2 plaintiffs. 3 The closing date as defined in the agreement is specific and says that the closing date will be set 4 5 after all approvals, not just the regulatory approvals but all approvals are made, and it sets forth a method 6 7 for - a process for those approvals. 8 THE COURT: Three days. 9 MR. CURTIN: The closing -10 THE COURT: Three business days. MR. CURTIN: Excuse me. 11 12 THE COURT: Three business days. 13 MR. CURTIN: Yes, three business days. 14 And, Judge, some of this is responsive to 15 things that we have read. So if -I'm not making them 16 up, but there's some suggestion that this, there's a 17 fixed closing date. This closing date floats. It's 18 not a fixed day. It wasn't set in the contract. It 19 now - it's now set - There's a format, and you've just 20 seized on it, that is three days after their 21 regulatory approval is met. 22 So the plaintiff claims in addition to this 23 that the inclusion of a termination date establishes a 24 closing date in violation of statute. It doesn't. 25 I've indicated to you from the certifications of Mr.

Perskie and others our view that in fact there is no violation of any statute in connection with the inclusion of a termination date. The statute is there to protect the public, to give the regulatory authorities sufficient time to be able to do their inquiry to determine whether or not the candidate, the applicant is, is a suitable applicant for licensing in New Jersey.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 The termination date, which seems to have created a significant dust-up in this case, was a 10 right that we had. It was an outside date. It wasn't 11 12 a date pulled from a hat. The parties negotiated that 13 date. April 26th was not a date - it's not my 14 birthday, it's not somebody else's birthday, it was a 15 negotiated date. It was negotiated because it - the 16 belief, as I would suggest to the Court, was that it 17 provided a sufficient amount of time for the 18 regulation process to begin. It gave the buyer an 19 opportunity to be able to make its application, to 20 pursue its application, and it gave either side the 21 right to terminate after April 26th, an agreed upon 22 date. For I - for any reason, any or no reason either 23 side could have, after that date, separated themselves 24 from one another. Didn't like us, didn't like what 25 they saw, wasn't moving well enough in New Jersey,

weren't getting a good feeling. It wasn't an 1 2 automatic termination. 3 THE COURT: Didn't get IGaming. MR. CURTIN: Pardon me? 4 5 THE COURT: Did not get iGaming. MR. CURTIN: Right. Did not get it. It was 6 7 not an automatic. It was, it had - there had to be an 8 action on our part if we were going to take, take that 9 step and we, in fact, do that. And it didn't in any 10 way - there's no suggestion that it's limited the 11 inquiry of the DEG (sic). The process continues even 12 as we speak. And these, as I've suggested to you and 13 the certifications have pointed up, that those 14 termination provisions are common. You can see from the certification of Mr. Perskie and others how, how 15 16 those provisions are standard provisions in operating 17 agreements involving casinos regularly in New Jersey 18 and certainly in Atlantic City. It doesn't - the 19 inclusion of the termination provision doesn't limit 20 or doesn't require the regulators to act prematurely. 21 If it did why would sophisticated powerhouse lawyers 22 permit - representing the plaintiffs permit that 23 provision to be in the agreement? Their argument is 24 that for some - on some basis that that provision is 25 inappropriate, unlawful, illegal, immoral, and not

1	really very good. Well, why put it in if you didn't
2	want that provision in there? They negotiated for
3	that provision, for it, and they did so because both
4	sides wanted to allocate the risk. It gave the
5	plaintiff and defendant the walk-away right, excuse
6	me, if they wanted it. It gave them time to get
7	approval, and it gave us — importantly, when you're
8	balancing things, Judge, it gave us an opportunity if
9	it doesn't work, if it doesn't work out to get another
10	player involved - excuse me, shouldn't use the word
11	player — another entity involved in our business.
12	So if, if you accept the argument that's
13	been made by the plaintiffs that the termination
14	provision couldn't be included and shouldn't be
15	included, it would suggest that you could never
16	terminate one of these agreements no matter what
17	happened.
18	THE COURT: Which is the point that you make
19	at page 17 of your brief.
20	MR. CURTIN: Yes, sir. So I'm getting
21	there.
22	I'm asking you please on my clients' behalf,
23	let's try to look at the balance of the equities here.
24	You don't have a contract with an ambiguity in it.
25	You don't have a breach. There are no surprises here.

There's no unfair conduct. There's no, no issue that suggests that the relief that they've requested is in fact warranted. These were, again, sophisticated folks, as were we, and negotiated a contract that they could live with, and now they don't like the contract they've negotiated and they've asked you to rewrite it and to revise it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 Now I read a certification earlier about 9 whv. Why is this important to us currently? You know 10 from that certification and from the, from the earlier 11 argument that we need to take steps to protect our employees, our vendors, our contracts during this 12 13 period of time in the summer. We can't wait until August. We can't wait to find out when and if there 14 is approval. We can't do that. We, the board has 15 16 fiduciary responsibilities to protect its 17 shareholders, protect business, the business 18 interests, and we have a responsibility as well to 19 protect the community interest here. On-line gaming 20 is coming. Everybody knows it's coming. We need to 21 be geared up and get ready to go for that on-line gaming. We're at a standstill, as you've been told, 22 23 and we need to move on if we're unable to - if we're 24 not able to move forward from this day and - because 25 we will never get our on-line gaming planning

completed. There is an uncertainty. There's an uncertainty in the community. There's an uncertainty with our employees. There's an uncertainty with our vendors. There's an uncertainty with our landlords as to whether or not we - they should continue in business with us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 If you do what you're being asked to do, 8 Your Honor, by the plaintiffs in this case your ruling 9 will be unique. To our knowledge there is no precedent for asking for what you've been asked here. 10 There is a - You are dealing with a principle here 11 12 that this is a - there are settled contract rights. 13 These contract rights are enforceable. We're seeking to enforce the contract that we entered into, not -14 and not enforce a contract that we didn't enter into 15 16 and we're now being asked to by asking you to revise 17 the provisions of the agreement to eliminate critical 18 provisions that were bargained for and significant to 19 us.

Thank you for permitting me to address the issues on the TRO, and obviously my ask here is that you dissolve the temporary restraining order which you entered and not enter an injunction on a going-forward basis and permit us to do what we contracted to do and what we're expected to do as good citizens of this

community. 1 2 THE COURT: I have many questions of both 3 sides. I don't know whether you would have me pose 4 them to you or to -5 MR. CURTIN: I think if you pose them, Judge, we're -6 7 THE COURT: - or to the bank of attorneys 8 seated at the defense table. 9 First question. Do you take the position that this contract is clear and unambiguous? 10 MR. MUNDIYA: Yes, Your Honor, we do. We 11 take that position. We think it's clear and 12 13 unambiguous with respect to the termination 14 provisions. 15 THE COURT: And the math is straightforward and undeniable? 16 17 MR. MUNDIYA: That's right, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Executed December 21. 19 MR. MUNDIYA: That's right. THE COURT: The day after the Senate passes 20 iGaming. 21 22 MR. MUNDIYA: That's right. THE COURT: Requires the plaintiff to file 23 24 with DGE within three days. 25 MR. MUNDIYA: Within three business days I

thought it was, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: I stand corrected. 3 MR. MUNDIYA: Right, yes. 4 THE COURT: Three business days. 5 MR. MUNDIYA: Yes. THE COURT: But the filing actually occurs 6 7 within three days, on -8 MR. MUNDIYA: Right. 9 THE COURT: - the 24th. MR. MUNDIYA: That's correct, I understand. 10 11 Yes. 12 THE COURT: The 120th day subsequent to 13 December 24 is? 14 MR. MUNDIYA: It's close enough to -15 THE COURT: It's April 23rd. 16 MR. MUNDIYA: Right. Right. 17 THE COURT: And three days later, which is 18 the three-day closing date calculus, is April 26th? 19 MR. MUNDIYA: Well, the three days is three 20 business days. But - I don't have a calendar. But you're right, Your Honor. It is three days from 21 22 April 23rd. That's correct, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: April 23rd was Tuesday. 24 MR. MUNDIYA: Right. So -25 THE COURT: The 26th was Friday.

Oral Argument Page 33 MR. MUNDIYA: That's right. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. MUNDIYA: So April 26th is three days 4 thereafter. 5 THE COURT: So in terms of drafting that contract, if those dates were the dates intentionally 6 7 negotiated there is virtually no room for plaintiff to 8 secure an ICA absent DGE deeming the filing, the first 9 filing complete on Christmas Eve. MR. MUNDIYA: Well, you know, that was the, 10 that was the date that was negotiated by both sides. 11 That was a date that was negotiated -12 THE COURT: No. I understand. 13 14 MR. MUNDIYA: Yes. 15 THE COURT: I'm accepting your argument that 16 these are the negotiated dates. 17 MR. MUNDIYA: That's right. 18 THE COURT: I'm just -19 MR. MUNDIYA: Yes. 20 THE COURT: - filling the math in between the dates. 21 22 MR. MUNDIYA: That's right. 23 THE COURT: This was an agreement, if you're 24 correct, that the parties negotiated allowing zero 25 room for DGE taking anything more than the date of

filing, if they chose. They could have accelerated 1 2 the 90-day turnaround if they wanted. MR. MUNDIYA: They could, and - but there is 3 precedent, Your Honor, for ICA approval being done in 4 5 less than that time, and the parties knew that. Thev knew it, and we knew it, and we came to a 6 7 determination that April 26 was the date that would 8 allow them time to get their approval, and if they 9 didn't get that approval would give us enough time to go out and find somebody else to be in a position to 10 give on-line - provide on-line gaming in November. 11 THE COURT: I understand the argument. And 12 13 then I read section 5.5 of the agreement, and I 14 believe I cited this when we spoke on the 14th. 15 MR. POSITAN: 5.5(b), I believe it is, Your 16 Honor. 17 THE COURT: It is. And it states in 18 pertinent part, and I'll quote, (reading:) 19 "Not withstanding any determination from the 20 Division that an application is incomplete or a 21 failure by the Division to deem an application 22 complete, any application referenced herein, 23 including the application for an ICA 24 determination, will be considered complete for 25 purposes of compliance with this agreement even

though there may be supplemental or revised 1 2 information and filings including but not limited 3 to," and then it goes on. (Reading:) 4 5 "... unless, after requested, the buyer fails to make the additional or revised filings within the 6 7 time frame required by statute or applicable 8 regulation otherwise imposed by NJ CCC and/or NJ 9 DGE." That section of 5.5(b) suggests to me that 10 the prospect of DGE deeming an initial filing 11 incomplete was well within the contemplations of the 12 13 party, and if that's the case how consistent is that 14 contemplation with the tightest conceivable time line 15 between filing and outside date absent report by DGE 16 prior to the 90-day deadline or relaxation either 17 through a negotiated modification or waiver of the 18 outside date? And I ask that question because it's my 19 sense that's the plaintiff's point. 20 MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, if I may -THE COURT: And if that's wrong I want to 21 22 hear it. 23 MR. BROOKS: No. I think you're right. Ι 24 think you're right, Your Honor. I want to acknowledge 25 that. If you look at just the plain time frames that

are applicable -1 2 MR. POSITAN: This is where I have a problem with Mr. Brooks. He said he wasn't going to speak 3 4 before. 5 THE COURT: Well, I note the objection. I'm going to overrule the objection. I'm going to allow 6 7 him to speak. Again, this is defendant's first 8 opportunity to be in this court physically and present 9 their, their position. 10 MR. BROOKS: I would -THE COURT: So I'm inclined to be somewhat 11 12 less formal than otherwise might be the case. Go 13 ahead. MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, thank you. The 14 outside time frames, if you're looking at strictly the 15 16 outside time frames then the time - then it is a very 17 tight time frame as you described. The application, 18 initial application on the 24th, and then about a 120-19 day block of time for a ruling by the Division. But 20 the statute provides that the Commission - the 21 Division can report sooner. They can report sooner 22 than a full 90 days after they deem an application 23 complete. 24 THE COURT: Mmhmm. 25 MR. BROOKS: In fact, in practice, in

1	practice there has never been an ICA that I'm aware of
2	where they ruled the full 90 days after they deem an
3	application complete. Typically there's a back-and-
4	forth. There's a point in time when they deem an
5	application complete and, per the rule, if they deem
6	the application — if their report issues sooner, they
7	can issue a report sooner. They're allowed, per the
8	rule, to issue a report sooner, and as soon as they
9	issue the report the Commission can conduct a hearing.
10	So the - Yes, the time frame in the
11	contract, if you look at just the outside possible
12	dates if they took the full time and that 24th was
13	initial — you know, was initially a filing that would
14	be complete, yes, it would fit in that time frame.
15	But that's not what the parties were contemplating.
16	They, the parties were not contemplating that and, in
17	fact, the law provides that there could be a much
18	sooner date. The law itself -
19	THE COURT: Right.
20	MR. BROOKS: $-$ provides that the Division
21	can issue a report. It doesn't need the full 90 days.
22	THE COURT: Right.
23	MR. BROOKS: It doesn't even have to deem
24	the application complete to issue its report, and
25	after the report is issued the Commission can conduct

1 a hearing, which, as we pointed out in a lot of the 2 submissions we made to the Court, has been the 3 practice.

The intent of section 5.5(b) was not, it 4 5 wasn't contemplated that there would be an elongated ICA determination process. The intent of 5.5(b) was 6 7 to address the situation dealing with when the 8 plaintiff had an obligation to complete its 9 application. The contract says you have three 10 business days basically to complete your application to file a completed application, recognizing that 11 often the Division will want more information and that 12 13 that was a possibility. It also provided that if the 14 Division did request more information it wouldn't be a 15 breach of the contract - a breach of the requirement 16 to file a completed application. That's what 5.5(b) 17 was meant to intend - to address rather. It wasn't 18 meant to be a situation, Your Honor, where the parties 19 were contemplating some elongated ICA determination 20 process. Just as you noted by the dates, they 21 weren't. They were contemplating at that time an ICA 22 process that would not be that long, that would be 23 done in a fairly prompt time frame.

THE COURT: Then my next question becomes who would reasonably anticipate even a 90-day report by DGE given the history of some of the principals of the plaintiff entities, depending upon whose brief I read and find the more credible, as to which everyone knew something.

1

2

3

4

5 MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, can I - if I could answer? Counsel - counsel for the plaintiffs, Your 6 7 Honor. Counsel for the plaintiffs. They didn't - It 8 wasn't like we were surprising them. Counsel for the 9 plaintiffs, who are experienced gaming attorneys, 10 experienced large law firms with very sophisticated 11 attorneys, agreed to that date, agreed to that outside 12 date. They were the ones handling the process. They are the ones that made a determination that that was 13 14 an acceptable outside date. So the answer to that is, 15 Your Honor, they did, counsel for the plaintiffs. 16 MR. POSITAN: Now we're testifying, Your 17 Honor. 18 MR. BROOKS: No, we're not, Your Honor. 19 That's what the contract says.

THE COURT: Well, to a degree we are.
MR. MUNDIYA: It's –
THE COURT: Yes, sir?
MR. MUNDIYA: Your Honor, it's simply a
matter of risk allocation. Experienced counsel on one
side, experienced counsel on another side. They took

the risk, given all of their history, that they could 1 2 get it done; and we agreed to that date because if 3 they couldn't get it done we would have several months 4 to go out and find somebody who could get it done. 5 They couldn't get it done, and now they want to rewrite the contract. That's our position, Judge. 6 7 THE COURT: I understand that position. 8 There is reference, counsel, in plaintiffs' 9 complaint to - Well, section 5.7, further assurances. 10 I'm about to hear, I gather, that the language of 5.7 contemplates, if not its black-letter language but if 11 it - in its spirit, a degree of cooperation for lack 12 13 of a better term. Is that an incorrect reading of 5.7? 14 MR. MUNDIYA: Your Honor, section -15 16 THE COURT: Particularly given plaintiffs' 17 argument that they make with regard to the March 26, 18 2013 letter by Matejevich in which he pledges, "best 19 efforts as promptly as practicable." Does that 20 section correlate to that quoted section of that 21 letter or email? 22 MR. MUNDIYA: Section 5.7 is - as it says, 23 is, (reading:) 24 "Subject to the terms and conditions hereof each 25 of the parties hereto agree to use reasonable

best efforts to take or cause to be taken all 1 2 appropriate action and to do or cause to be done 3 all things reasonably necessary, proper, and advisable under applicable laws." 4 5 That was the obligation of both sides, and all the March 26th letter was doing was suggesting 6 7 that. But the important thing, Your Honor, is - is 8 the lead-in to that, "Subject to the terms and 9 conditions herein." So there's nothing in 5.7(a) that 10 would suggest that the termination provision is not 11 applicable or that the outside date is not applicable. 12 The outside date was fixed. It was clear. And so 13 regardless of what the obligation was in 5.7(a), as 14 soon as April 26th came and went that event triggered 15 an obligation - or a right rather under 7.1(b). So 16 all 5.7(a) does is simply oblige the parties to 17 negotiate - to do all things necessary and reasonable 18 up and through April 26th. But once that date came 19 and went, Your Honor, all bets were off.

THE COURT: You argue in your brief at pages 4 through 5 that post filing "significant information emerged publicly." And I gather that's a reference to the March 4, 2013 AGA "unprecedented objection." While it's interesting reading, do you take the position that that filing constitutes any basis for

any action or inaction, decision or indecision 1 2 undertaken by the defendants here? MR. MUNDIYA: No, Your Honor. It was just 3 4 part of the mix. March came along. We got that 5 information. It caused concern. March 26th came along, and we had a conversation with the DGE. It's 6 7 in the record. That caused concern. April 1 came 8 along, and we asked for information which they refused 9 to provide unless we signed an NDA. That caused concern. When we got the information without 10 disclosing anything in the information, that caused 11 concern. It was a continued development of events, 12 13 which by the time we got to the end, caused us real 14 concern about their prospects of licensing. So it was 15 really a gradual process up until and through, through 16 April 26th. 17 THE COURT: I expect to hear soon that upon

18 your client being advised - I believe on April 11 -19 that the filing, the application for the ICA had been 20 deemed complete as of April 10, that the new outside 21 date, at least in terms of the 120-day - 90-day 22 reporting by DGE and 30-day decision by the Casino 23 Control Commission, would have brought you to 24 August 9th and that the interceding marginal delay of 25 three months was a relatively minor consideration.

Before you hear that from Mr. Positan, as long as 1 2 you're on your feet what's your response to that? 3 MR. MUNDIYA: The response is in Mr. Matejevich's affidavit. If we cannot between the time 4 5 - between today and August 10th get out ahead and get this iGaming show on the road there's going to be 6 7 untold harm to the defendants. In order to have 8 iGaming ready in November we have to get a partner 9 who, unlike them, has a shot at getting licensed. We 10 need to get the software ready for on-line gaming, and that's technical and it takes a lot of time. We need 11 to do the marketing for on-line gaming. So the months 12 13 between now and August are, in some ways, the most 14 critical, and when we have potential partners in there 15 it's important to have the summer season be with us. 16 You don't sell your house in the middle of winter. 17 You sell your house when the flowers are blooming and 18 the sun is shining. It's very, very important for us 19 to be able to move on, to terminate this disagreement, 20 be done, and get somebody who can help us be in line 21 for on-line gaming in November; and that's not going 22 to start in August because if we start in August, Your 23 Honor, it's way too late, way too late. We have to 24 start today. THE COURT: Page 5 of your brief. Top of

25

the page, first full sentence, "The delays plaintiffs have encountered in the regulatory process were inevitable." Were they?

4 MR. MUNDIYA: There were some things we 5 thought might be inevitable given the history, but they assured us - as you see in the certifications, 6 7 they assured us that they could get it done. There 8 was, there was a lot of negotiation on this provision. 9 We thought that there would be, there would be delays. 10 They told us we're done - we think we can get it done. In fact, we were hearing that from Mr. Isai Scheinberg 11 calling in from wherever. He had a - he says he has a 12 13 90 percent chance of getting approval.

Your Honor, at this point we shouldn't have to take the risk. That's the point. Whether we thought it was inevitable or not inevitable, the point is that we are now here on May 17th and they don't have it, and the clock is running.

19 THE COURT: Given the tight time line on the 20 agreement, the recent history by some principals 21 affiliated with plaintiffs and some degree of 22 familiarity with that history, I'm about to hear, I 23 gather, that the structure of this contract, not just 24 as relates to the time line, but the advance payment 25 against operating loss up to the 11 million, which was

reached by February 1, constitutes a self-fulfilling 1 2 prophecy of non-compliance with the ICA. Do you 3 follow me? 4 MR. MUNDIYA: Not really, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: That the deal was structured to get their money, apply it against operating losses 6 7 under the prospect of credits against the purchase 8 price all within a time frame that, given the history 9 of some of those principals with plaintiffs, was unrealistic. 10 11 MR. MUNDIYA: Okay. 12 THE COURT: Your response would be they're 13 big boys and girls, -MR. MUNDIYA: Risk allocation. 14 15 THE COURT: - sophisticated counsel, -16 MR. MUNDIYA: It's more than that, Your 17 Honor. THE COURT: - buy a casino for 15 million 18 19 although there's the two million in conditional 20 payments to your two principals. There's the 32 21 million to reconstitute the unfunded pension 22 obligations, the four million dollar - Well, that's 23 part of the 15. Ultimately, had this agreement been 24 fully completed or should it at some point, the 25 purchase price really is more than 15 million dollars.

1	MR. MUNDIYA: You know, the purchase price
2	is, is what it is in the contract. The important
3	point for this Court, I think, is not only are they
4	big boys and girls, the fact is that there is a
5	provision in this agreement that says that all of the
6	advances that they provide which went to operation,
7	operating costs, that if this agreement is terminated
8	those payments, those - that money shall not be
9	refunded, and the reason for that is that in December
10	we wanted this transaction to be as economically
11	neutral as possible. We did not want to be in a worse
12	position in April than we were in, in December. So we
13	and they agreed that they would fund the casino that
14	went not to the, not to the sellers but to the
15	operations, to pay payroll, to pay expenses, and that
16	come April, if there was no, no agreement, that that
17	money, expressly in section 7.2(c), would stay with
18	the company. That was the deal, Your Honor. And if
19	we terminated pursuant to the lack of an outside date
20	<ul> <li>or closing by the outside date, they agreed that</li> </ul>
21	they would pay a termination payment. Plain and
22	simple.
23	Your Honor, on the contract Your Honor had

Your Honor, on the contract Your Honor had two, two questions on the – at the beginning. Could I – May I address those?

THE COURT: Sure. 1 2 MR. MUNDIYA: The typographical error, I 3 think is -4 THE COURT: Does there appear to be a phrase 5 or a clause missing in that paragraph? MR. MUNDIYA: Oh, on that one? Yes. I 6 7 think the phrase is "unless subsequently approved" or 8 words along those lines. I mean I'd have to go back 9 and -THE COURT: Would that be rather significant 10 in this case? 11 MR. MUNDIYA: Well, Your Honor, we have to -12 13 I have to sit with my corporate counsel. Maybe we can 14 go through this at a break or something because I need 15 to figure out exactly what it is, but we're - we're 16 still working with that. 17 THE COURT: All right. 18 MR. MUNDIYA: But it may be words, may be 19 something along those lines, but we just need to sit 20 down and go through that. And in terms of 6.3 -THE COURT: Well, if that's the missing 21 22 phrase -23 MR. MUNDIYA: Yeah. Well, it's not, it's 24 not sig - Maybe we'll take a break and we'll try to 25 figure out what that's supposed to say. But in terms

2	of 7. – or 6.3, I think it was 6.3(c) was missing.
	6.3 - there's no, there should be no, no (c). So
3	that, I think, is the, the typo. But we will, we'll
4	get back to you on 7.1(c), Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: For now that's all I have. For
6	now.
7	MR. MUNDIYA: Thank you.
8	THE COURT: Anything else from the defense?
9	MR. CURTIN: No, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Positan, would counsel
11	prefer maybe a ten-minute break before we continue?
12	MR. CURTIN: We'll give you — maybe we'll
13	get a response on that, Judge.
14	THE COURT: We've been under way a little
15	bit over an hour, and it is mid-afternoon. Let's,
16	let's stand in recess for ten minutes.
	COURT ATTENDANT: All rise.
17	
17 18	(Off the record at 2:33:08. Back on the record
18	(Off the record at 2:33:08. Back on the record
18 19	(Off the record at 2:33:08. Back on the record at 2:44:25 as follows:)
18 19 20	(Off the record at 2:33:08. Back on the record at 2:44:25 as follows:) THE COURT: Thank you, everyone. Again,
18 19 20 21	(Off the record at 2:33:08. Back on the record at 2:44:25 as follows:) THE COURT: Thank you, everyone. Again, please be seated and make yourselves comfortable.
18 19 20 21 22	(Off the record at 2:33:08. Back on the record at 2:44:25 as follows:) THE COURT: Thank you, everyone. Again, please be seated and make yourselves comfortable. MR. BROOKS: We have - Are we good?

MR. CURTIN: We have an answer to your 1 2 question, Judge. 3 THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, if I may, there is 4 5 no missing language in 7.1(c). The provision that you're looking at, that clause, "its application for 6 7 gaming approval" is meant to modify withdrawals above 8 or meant to relate to withdrawals above, and it deals 9 with -10 THE COURT: Say, say that again. I'm there 11 now. MR. BROOKS: "Its application for gaming 12 13 approval," the clause that you were focusing on, Your 14 Honor, you thought there was language missing after 15 that. There's no language missing, Your Honor. That clause relates to the withdrawals above it. What was 16 17 contemplated there, Your Honor, is that after a 18 termination they may - we don't know what they're 19 going to do with their application. They had a right 20 to withdraw it, continue with it, and that's really 21 what it addresses. But the clause itself, there's no 22 missing language. That clause relates to withdrawals. 23 So if you took out "unless subsequent to the 24 termination of the agreement pursuant to section 7.1," 25 it would simply say "or if buyer withdraws its

application for gaming approval." 1 2 THE COURT: I follow your interpretation. 3 I'll share with you that I probably read and re-read 4 that provision more times than I want to share. I 5 didn't see that. MR. BROOKS: But that's what it was intended 6 7 to be, Your Honor. 8 MR. CURTIN: Judge, you were nice enough to 9 ask me if I had anything else. I do have one more 10 thing. We have a demonstrative put together by us. Ι gave Mr. Positan a copy of it in advance of the 11 argument today. It's on the board, and I have a hand-12 13 up copy that addresses one of the questions. During 14 our break we thought it wise in response to the 15 Court's question when you asked about how long things 16 took, we've compiled public information the length of 17 time to the granting of the ICA from the execution 18 date, and we have a demonstrative that we could use to 19 talk to you about that subject if you would like to 20 see it. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Positan, any -22 MR. CURTIN: I've reversed it because I 23 didn't want to have it - you look at it -24 THE COURT: Does it, does it visualize my 25 math?

	Oral Argument Page 51
1	MR. CURTIN: It visualizes your math.
2	MR. POSITAN: Well, Your Honor, I didn't get
3	it in advance. It was as I walked through the door
4	there actually.
5	MR. CURTIN: It was after he sat down.
6	MR. POSITAN: Yeah. After we sat down. So
7	I haven't even had a chance to look at it. We don't
8	need demonstrative evidence.
9	First of all, and I $-$ We were told there are
10	25 contracts. Nobody filed a certification. Nobody
11	gave them to us. We can't even look at them. We just
12	got their little chart. I don't know if it's accurate
13	or not. I don't even, I can't even compare their
14	demonstrative evidence to what would be the evidence
15	except it's not in evidence. So we don't have them.
16	I don't know what they're talking about. What we're
17	able to glean from their chart, it has a glaring bunch
18	of inconsistencies. Like Colony Capital themselves,
19	which closed and got their license outside, after the
20	outside closing date. I don't know if that one's on
21	the chart or not, but that's what they did. They did
22	exactly what they said we shouldn't do in this case.
23	But that's, you know, how much testimony are we going
24	to have from the sophisticated bunch of lawyers who
25	have all the mistakes in their contract that took them

Oral Argument

Page 52

five to figure out whether it should have been in 1 2 there or not? That's what happens, I guess, when you 3 have all these sophisticated lawyers from all over the place doing contracts. 4 5 THE COURT: Are you testifying now? MR. POSITAN: Well, I figure if everybody 6 7 else can I might as well. 8 MR. CURTIN: Well, I haven't had my, I 9 haven't had my turn yet though. 10 MR. POSITAN: I'm just one of these country 11 lawyers from up in Roseland, New Jersey, Your Honor. I'm not one of these 700 firm guys, you know? 12 13 THE COURT: Mr. Curtin, go ahead. 14 MR. CURTIN: Neither am I. 15 MR. POSITAN: We're just a rose among 16 thorns, I guess, Tom. 17 THE COURT: Put it this way. To the extent 18 that you've brought visual aids, while I appreciate 19 it, I don't know that I need it. I've read - I hope if nothing else, I hope it's apparent that I've read 20 your submissions. 21 MR. CURTIN: Very much so, Judge. 22 23 THE COURT: And I'm familiar. I'm satisfied 24 with your arguments. Mr. - Go ahead. 25 MR. CURTIN: The reason that - what prompted

it, Judge, I mean we brought it obviously to use as 1 part of the presentation, but what prompted it was the 2 3 Court seemed to be focused on dates and whether these were tight time frames or not such tight time frames, 4 5 and we could - these are illustrative of the fact that the times are all over the map. 6 7 THE COURT: Well, but -8 MR. CURTIN: And if the Court will draw that 9 conclusion from our argument, then we need not show 10 you the billboards. MR. POSITAN: And here's another problem, 11 Your Honor. We don't know what the terms of those 12 13 contracts were. That's the real problem. THE COURT: But here's what I'm satisfied in 14 15 a general sense, and perhaps these are suppositions. 16 That each contract to purchase a casino interest is 17 unique. It stands on its own. The parties are 18 different, their resources are different, their 19 priorities are different, and as a result the time 20 period within which DGE deems itself comfortable to 21 submit its final report to the Commission, they 22 probably vary. They probably run within a range. 23 There may be a so-called beaten path of an average, 24 but I don't know that that helps me from a standpoint of this return on the order to show cause. I am 25

satisfied that I have a handle on the outside dates, 1 2 90 plus 30; that this agreement from the date of the 3 filing ran 120 plus 3 to the 26th. 4 MR. POSITAN: Actually you have to correct 5 that as well, Your Honor, because it didn't take into account the Christmas holiday. Mr. Eisenstein can 6 7 give you the actual count on that. 8 THE COURT: Well, if I'm within a day. I'm 9 a lawyer, not a mathematician. If I'm within a day 10 I'm happy. I'm satisfied I have the tight time line.

And that raises many questions. We're discussing those questions or counsel are offering your sense of the appropriate answer, and I'm about to hear from Mr. Positan. So go ahead.

MR. POSITAN: Your Honor, the time line actually runs from December 27th and it goes past the date. Right?

18 MR. EISENSTEIN: That's correct, Your Honor.
19 We in good faith filed our license application
20 immediately -

THE COURT: On the 24th.

21

22 MR. EISENSTEIN: - on the 24th, but it was 23 the third business day after that we were obligated 24 to. The 21st was a Friday, 21st of December, and we 25 had the Christmas holiday on the 25th. So our

1 obligation was the 27th, and if you carried that out 2 it brings the third business day after the 120-day 3 period -

4

5

6

7

8

THE COURT: Which was the outside date. MR. EISENSTEIN: - beyond the outside date. MR. POSITAN: That goes to the question of the validity of the contract obviously.

THE COURT: The floor is yours.

9 MR. POSITAN: Your Honor, I heard the words 10 from my good friend Tom Curtin, who said this is all about the balancing of the equities; and I heard his 11 counsel from New York, from Wilkie Farr say, you know, 12 13 an impassioned plea about how summer is upon us and 14 this is the time, because otherwise winter is coming. 15 I don't know if you watch the game like me, winter is 16 coming. Well, winter came last December. And does 17 everybody remember what was going on last December at 18 that casino? They were on the verge of filing 19 bankruptcy, 1,800 jobs lost, and the only thing that 20 stopped that was my client. My client agreed to that 21 deal. It infused weekly pay. All those people, 22 that's how those people kept working. And through the 23 winter when the times were bad, through Hurricane 24 Sandy and the recovery, would that hotel have even 25 opened up again after Hurricane Sandy without my

client? You want to talk about equities? So they lay 1 2 out \$11,000,000. \$750,000 a week. There's a clause 3 in there that we furnished in our brief. 4 THE COURT: By February 1. 5 MR. POSITAN: Pardon me? THE COURT: By February 1. 6 7 MR. POSITAN: By February 1. But there's a 8 clause right after that that says if further funds are 9 needed and they're going to go into bankruptcy they 10 give us notice first, and we pony up as an advance. They didn't have to do that, did they? That's because 11 their COO is releasing things saying, oh, now we're, 12 13 now we're okay. This is the same COO who, on 14 March 13th, Mr. Frawley - you know, we read all about 15 this, this smear campaign on my, on my client - who 16 talks about the AGA, and it says - and he - this is on 17 March 13th. 18 MR. CURTIN: What is this? 19 MR. POSITAN: This is Mr. Frawley's 20 transcription from his interview, which was attached 21 to the papers and transcribed by Schulman Wiegmann 22 Court Reporters, and he talks about he'd like to see 23 it happen as soon as possible. (Reading:) 24 "Q. There have been those who say that The 25 Atlantic Club would be in very serious

1		trouble that its future would be imporiled
		trouble, that its future would be imperiled
2		were it not for internet gaming, were it not
3		for the possibility as well of sports
4		betting being actually implemented. Is that
5		true?
6	Α.	Yes. It is certainly a possibility. Our
7		possibility and our future has been
8		brightened by the foresight of the lawmakers
9		in New Jersey. Internet gaming has been a
10		great help to us, and it helped bring us
11		together with PokerStars.
12	Q.	What would that mean to your bottom line?
13	Α.	Right now we are not a profitable casino.
14		With PokerStars and with internet gaming and
15		the capital investment they're prepared to
16		make in the property we expect to be more
17		than profitable.
18	Q.	How much is that capital investment that
19		they expect to make?
20	Α.	Right now it's about 20 million the first
21		year and will probably approach over 40
22		million over the next five years, and that
23		only includes our property. I know there
24		are plans to invest in other places in the
25		state. We are also going to have to build a

Oral	Argument
------	----------

data center on the property, which is a very 1 2 significant capital investment. 3 Ο. There are those who have said that there have been tremendous resistance from various 4 5 elements within the gaming community and the gaming industry, and we've heard 6 7 conversations and accusations lately that 8 Caesar's is behind a good deal of that. Do 9 you believe that to be the case? I believe the AGA, which certainly Caesar's 10 Α. is a part of, probably has a little bit more 11 12 of an agenda. PokerStars is the largest 13 internet gaming company in the world. 14 They're a great company. Their customers 15 are absolutely loyal to them. I think it's 16 an issue before anybody makes a judgment 17 they should look at what ulterior motive 18 could be behind it. 19 Q. The poll we referred to just before we did 20 this interview, even though there's obviously a smaller and smaller number of 21 New Jerseyans who are opposed to internet 22 23 gaming, there are still more than that 24 opposed that are in favor of it, and many of 25 them say they're just worried about it being

1		too easy for people to either gamble when
2		they shouldn't perhaps or for people to
3		develop gambling problems. What do you say
4		to that?
5	Α.	I think one of the things the governor
6		addressed, and rightfully so, is the problem
7		gaming issue. The other issue would be
8		security. If you look at some of the
9		security measures that I've been privy to
10		I'm amazed at how they're able to keep
11		under-aged gamers, people — there is an
12		exclusion list, a sizeable - PokerStars is
13		prepared to put a sizeable amount of funding
14		into the problem gaming fund. I think there
15		needs to be a little bit more education on
16		it in a lot of ways before people make a
17		snap judgment."
18	It talks	then about - Oh, and it says, (reading:)
19	"Q.	And last question for you, there's been much
20		talk about trying to transform Atlantic City
21		once again to turn it more into a family
22		destination than a gambling destination. Do
23		you believe that would be an advisable move?
24	Α.	I think that it needs to have a broader
25		appeal beyond gaming. I think gaming will

1	be our core business. I think we're a
2	little ways from making it the family
3	destination that it should be, but we're
4	making progress. I am very pleased with the
5	things I'm hearing from the governor's
6	office. I'm very pleased with the things
7	I'm hearing from PokerStars. I think that
8	if you look at more capital investment, the
9	more the casinos are profitable the more
10	capital investment they make, the more
11	people are apt to come, the more we're able
12	to build our properties up to where we want
13	them to be.
14	Q. Thank you, Mr. Frawley."
15	So PokerStars is pretty good, Mr. Frawley's
16	view on March 13th, wasn't it? And then they put all
17	this stuff in about PokerStars. We've brought all
18	their blogs in, like Mr. Brooks' blog on his firm's -
19	not his blog, his firm's blog talking about PokerStars

and the problems that they're going to encounter.
This in July of 2012, six months before. But
PokerStars was okay then. And, and you look at some
of the other things they've put out with the papers in
this suit, and everything they say, you look at their
blog and you get a different story. They clearly knew

about the legal problems that PokerStars have had. Everybody knew that going into there, and everybody knew it was going to be the province of the people who were charged to make that determination whether or not an ICA should issue, and that is what should happen here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 The State of New Jersey in addition to my 8 client has put a lot of effort, funding, and 9 absolutely proceeding to this day with this application despite all of this stuff that's before 10 11 you and is put out in the paper. Who started the public relations? They did. The fact of the matter 12 13 is the DGA (sic) is proceeding. There's a bunch of 14 interviews still set up, as we set forth in our 15 papers. It hasn't stopped. That licensing approval 16 is proceeding. They will be finished with it in about 17 less than two months.

18 We made this deal. This contract, the way 19 it's stated and the way they're trying to say it now, 20 they have one hand behind their back to say we're going to fail, but you give us the money. You keep us 21 22 going through the dog days of winter, and then when 23 the blossoms of spring come, hey, forget about it. 24 We're done. Ha-ha, we cancel. You guys are a bunch 25 of bad guys. We don't think you're ever going to get

a license. Well, guess what? That's what the DGA 1 2 (sic) decides, the DGE, not them. 3 Sophisticated buyers? Yeah. We saved their butts. That's what sophisticated buyers are doing 4 5 here. And what do we get? We're getting the end of the stick. So give us the 11 million. Oh, by the 6 7 way, you - we terminate. Give us another four 8 million. The equities? How about the pension 9 funding? How about that 32 million dollars? All his 10 employees are going to get that? How about the resources that the State of New Jersey has put into 11 12 this to go through this license application? Daily 13 basis five, six people. How come the State of New 14 Jersey hasn't listened to, you know, the former judge 15 here that, oh, forget about it? What's the point? 16 They didn't do that. They're going on it today. That 17 process goes on. Let them do their job. 18 A couple things happened in this case. We 19 put up the investment. As you heard from their COO, 20 we're going to put up another twenty-, forty million 21 dollars to turn that property around, but now they 22 just want to say, you know what, let's take that 15 23 million, and the heck with those guys. Ha-ha-ha. 24 We're very sophisticated. They're - you know, they're

25

bad guys anyway, even though we thought they were

great guys before. But now, you know what, how about 1 2 if we put all this stuff out, and maybe we'll, we'll 3 mess up the whole process. Maybe we'll convince the 4 DGE that they really are bad guys. So we'll take the 5 money, and you're good guys. Once you give them the money, well, now they're bad guys. And now let's make 6 7 sure that we do everything we can to make this go down the tubes because we get to keep the money and now, 8 9 hey, summer's here again. Time to make some money. 10 That's what's going on here. Bad faith. Really insidious terrible 11 12 conduct. This deal was structured to go through with 13 that license approval. We don't get the approval, we 14 lose. We get the approval, close. That's this deal. 15 THE COURT: Where does the contract language 16 say that? 17 MR. POSITAN: The contract, that can only be 18 read in one way, Your Honor. Those two clauses have 19 to be read together because, again, I don't know what 20 those other 25 contracts say. And, once again, we 21 have these so-called experts opining here. I don't 22 know how much they got paid to opine, but we'll find 23 that out someday, I guess. But the Superior Court, it 24 is unique. It hasn't ruled on it. Nobody's ruled on 25 this issue before. You know, it's kind of like a

## Oral Argument

Page 64

1	house closing. Everybody's got the form contract.
2	They say, "Okay, we're going to sign the contract.
3	This is going to close on April 30th." "Oh, wait a
4	minute, can't close on April 20th. The plumber
5	couldn't get there to check wires," and we all know
6	that sometimes the house contract doesn't close on the
7	date in the original contract, does it? And you say,
8	"Oh, okay. Let's close on another date." And then
9	about five times later you say, "Okay. The contract's
10	got to close by that date," and the house closes.
11	Well, you know, it's hard to apply that
12	logic to all these sophisticated casino contracts
13	because that's the way it's been going on in Atlantic
14	City. But maybe if some time somebody said to
15	everybody, "You know what, why don't you guys comply
16	with the law? Why don't you comply with 5:12-
17	95.1(2)(a) because that really is a part of the
18	contract by a matter of law?" You know, and this
19	references in the agreement when you read 7.1(b),
20	which permits the parties to terminate, quote,
21	(reading:)
22	"If the transactions contemplated hereby shall
23	not have been consummated on or prior to the
24	outside date."
25	What's that mean? Same thing as the definition back

1	in 1.4(a). The transactions are all tied together
2	here. The contemplation in order to comply with that
3	statute is that it's the statutory date from the
4	completion of that license, and we all know in this
5	room that that's July 9th for the DGE and August 9th
6	for the CCC.
7	THE COURT: Where in the contract is there
8	language that precludes the closing date from
9	occurring subsequent in time, or from maturing
10	subsequent in time to the outside date?
11	MR. POSITAN: As a matter of law it's part
12	of the, part of the same structure. When you, when it
13	refers to transactions, the actual clause in this case
14	I'm talking about referring to the transactions
15	contemplated hereby. It doesn't say herein, hereby.
16	THE COURT: I'm referring now to page 17 of
17	the defendants' brief, and I believe I made the point
18	in our teleconference on May 14th, but I'll quote from
19	the defendants' brief. (Reading:)
20	"If the plaintiffs are correct, then the contract
21	could never be terminated, and the parties forced
22	to continue in a relationship forever depending
23	on when the regulators deemed the application to
24	be complete."
25	If you're correct, that extension of that

premise is accurate. 1 2 MR. POSITAN: If we didn't complete by 3 April 26th they had a right to cancel. Once we 4 completed the statute goes in effect. We close per 5 the statute. We have three days after that double level of regulatory approval is made. If we don't get 6 7 approved we're done. 8 THE COURT: Let me ask this, and I hope I'm 9 not -10 MR. POSITAN: They, they get the money. THE COURT: And I hope I'm not -11 MR. POSITAN: That was the risk we took. 12 13 THE COURT: Let me ask this question, and I 14 hope I'm not turning any, any counsel at the table 15 into potential fact witnesses, and you're talking to a 16 judge who is a former South Jersey, Cape May County 17 real estate lawyer who used to stay up all night 18 worrying about the results in termite certifications. 19 Who - and there may well be reasons with 20 which I'm just not familiar, but who would undertake, 21 not a 15-million-dollar transaction, the contingent to 22 at 17, the 32 million to fund the pension fund. Now 23 you're up close to 40 - 50. 24 MR. POSITAN: 48. THE COURT: A 40-million-dollar transaction 25

1	in the most highly regulated industry in New Jersey, I
2	gather, and box yourself in to these time constraints
3	given what I'll characterize — and not to be
4	disrespectful; I think I'm actually cleaning it up a
5	little bit — the history of some of the principals
6	affiliated with plaintiffs? Who, who would do that as
7	a business person? What lawyer would allow a client
8	to do that and go home and be able to sleep that night
9	knowing that each weekly advance to cover operating
10	losses is gone whether you ultimately close or not? I
11	mean I absolutely follow your argument —
12	MR. POSITAN: My client is not stupid, Your
13	Honor.
14	THE COURT: Oh, I'm - Well, -
15	MR. POSITAN: Nobody ever accused him of
16	being that.
17	THE COURT: I'm not suggesting that. But
18	that is part of the response.
19	MR. POSITAN: And the answer is no. You
20	know why? Because it's convenience. It's an argument
21	of convenience, it's an argument of greed, and it's an
22	argument of disingenuous conduct because somebody at
23	one point in time decided that last week of April
24	that, you know what, I think we could read that this
25	way and let's keep the money. Oh, we'll get another

1	buyer. Hey, the statute passed now, and then we'll go
2	on a campaign to try to make it as bad as possible and
3	make sure these guys don't get their license.
4	THE COURT: And you may be right, yet
5	plaintiff didn't execute the agreement until the day
6	after the state senate passed the bill out of the
7	senate. So to that extent plaintiff -
8	MR. POSITAN: Governor vetoed it once
9	before.
10	THE COURT: Well, businessmen are
11	opportunists. Businessmen and women are opportunists.
12	They all follow the money.
13	MR. POSITAN: Meet me tonight in Atlantic
14	City, right?
15	THE COURT: Not, not lost on the Court that
16	this contract was executed after the months of
17	negotiation, the term sheet, the amended term sheet,
18	December 20 the legislation passes out of the senate.
19	December 21 the agreement is signed. Tight time
20	constraints. Buyers with, again, a history, and while
21	I don't pretend to know all things with regard to the
22	process, it's just my general knee-jerk reaction if I
23	were advising a client for the first time who was
24	considering applying even for a casino license to be a
25	waiter/waitress, anything, bartender, if they had an

## Oral Argument

Page 69

1	expunged disorderly persons conviction my instinct
2	would be, "You've got a problem. It's going to delay
3	the process. Build it into the contract. Protect
4	yourself, protect your investment."
5	This is far different from that on a far
6	greater magnitude, and as I read and re-read all
7	that's before me, it's fascinating reading I'll share
8	with you. Unfortunately it's reality, and there's
9	appeal to your argument. The difficulty that I have
10	is I then go back to the contract, and it may well be
11	that the only explanation for why plaintiff agreed to
12	these terms is that as attributed by the defendants.
13	MR. POSITAN: Then why 5.5(b)? Why the
14	other provisions about -
15	THE COURT: Well, I've, I've -
16	MR. POSITAN: - cooperating?
17	THE COURT: I've - I've, I've -
18	MR. POSITAN: Because it was contemplated.
19	It was contemplated that there would be those
20	problems. And why on March 26th the letter from them
21	saying we're with you, we're going to get this done?
22	What changed between -
23	THE COURT: As, as -
24	MR. POSITAN: - March 26th and April 26th?
25	THE COURT: As, as promptly as practicable

and depending upon which dictionary you read -1 2 MR. POSITAN: If that's not a waiver I don't 3 know what is after you took all our money. 4 THE COURT: Depending upon which dictionary 5 you read, Random House, Kennerman, Webster's College Dictionary defines practicable as "capable of being 6 7 done or put into practice with available means." The 8 thesaurus printed by my alma mater, Princeton 9 University, "Practicable: capable of being done with means at hand and circumstances as they are." 10 Practicable. Could have real significant 11 12 meaning. 13 MR. POSITAN: Like the legal theory of 14 practicability for example. That's after all the 15 money is taken. Everything is fine on March 26th, and 16 everybody knew on March 26th that the application 17 wasn't complete and there was no way that a closing 18 could occur before April 26th. Everybody knew that. 19 The application got completed on April 10th. 20 THE COURT: Here's my next question. Do you acknowledge that the disclosure or non-disclosure 21 22 agreement - please turn the phone off - sought by your 23 client as relates to the defendants on April 15th was 24 not a contractual provision? 25 MR. POSITAN: It was part of cooperating in

terms of sharing information. A question came up. 1 My 2 client believed it was confidential. They asked for a 3 confidentiality agreement. It was given. 4 THE COURT: Would you acknowledge that the 5 execution of the confidentiality agreement on April 17 was not a specific affirmative obligation of the 6 7 defendants in the contract? 8 MR. POSITAN: No. I think it's part of the 9 cooperation clause that we've already been talking about. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Then let me ask this. 11 Ιf 12 plaintiffs know by, by March 26th, one month prior to 13 the outside date, that DGE is of the position that it 14 will likely take another 90 days for its report to get 15 to the Commission, why wait until April 23rd to 16 formally propose an extension of the outside date? 17 MR. POSITAN: And ask for six million 18 dollars in ten days, right? 19 THE COURT: No, that was -20 MR. POSITAN: That was in good faith. THE COURT: No. That came later. 21 22 MR. POSITAN: Okay. 23 THE COURT: But why wait - I mean a month 24 almost passes. From March 26th, DGE needs another 90, 25 to April 23rd, at which point plaintiffs communicate a

proposed formal extension of the outside date. If you 1 2 know it's coming that far in advance why continue to 3 address the fringe issues as opposed to the giant in the room, the most important term in that contract? 4 5 MR. POSITAN: At any time point in time after December 28th everybody knew that that couldn't 6 7 be done by April 26th. 8 THE COURT: Well, if that's the case -9 MR. POSITAN: So everything that happened in the interim -10 THE COURT: If, if that -11 12 MR. POSITAN: - was done with eyes open. 13 Take the money, don't say a word, and then on 14 April 23rd you change your mind for the first time? 15 THE COURT: Well, it -20/20 hindsight is a 16 wonderful thing, and I confess to engaging in it at 17 the moment. But if you knew it December 28th, or if I 18 knew it December 28th, I'm getting something in 19 writing before I start writing checks for 11 million 20 dollars by February 1 knowing that it's not, it's not 21 coming back to me. 22 MR. POSITAN: Because we thought we had a deal. And on the other side I think their conduct 23 24 shows you what they thought, too. 25 THE COURT: But in, but in a contract that

1 is – 2 MR. POSITAN: And here saying today that we 3 thought it was, it was something different when it was 4 negotiated. But that, what did they do? 5 THE COURT: But in a con -MR. POSITAN: That's called estoppel. 6 7 THE COURT: But in a contract that is time 8 of the essence and which can be either modified or 9 waived only in a writing signed by both sides. This 10 contract is, I believe, 70-some pages, relatively 11 lengthy, but its clarity is apparent, the clarity of its terms, and I'm just - I'm trying to correspond 12 13 your equitable arguments, they enjoy such appeal with, 14 with the language in the contract. 15 MR. POSITAN: Well, mine match up with the 16 statute. That's what hap - that's what's supposed to 17 happen in these applications. Otherwise, why would we 18 go through that process? Why would the State of New 19 Jersey DGE go through that process if somebody was 20 going to say, "Oh, sorry. You're wasting your time. Ha-ha. We're - you know, we're done." Why would we 21 22 put the State through that process? 23 THE COURT: Well, I gather the stat -24 MR. POSITAN: That's why the statutes are 25 there, -

THE COURT: But I -1 2 MR. POSITAN: - is to stop that from 3 happening. 4 THE COURT: But I gather the statutes were 5 adopted in their present form because the Legislature wanted to make sure that it - or that the regulatory 6 7 agencies never lost control of the process of 8 oversight of the purchase and sale of casino 9 interests, is my sense, because by that statute they, 10 they - they run that show. MR. POSITAN: Well, if you rule their way 11 12 that's exactly what happens, they lost control, 13 because they're out there still trying to do what's 14 supposed to happen in this deal. Why would they do that if they thought this deal was over? 15 16 THE COURT: Well, that's, that's one of my 17 questions, but I'm deliberately not asking that 18 question because what may or may not be happening 19 administratively is really not binding upon this 20 court. My sense is that individuals involved in that 21 process probably have some passing interest at least 22 in terms of this matter -23 MR. POSITAN: Well, if you want to talk 24 about the public interest, how about we get all the 25 funding that comes from the resource actually going

through here? How about, how about my client actually 1 2 gets approved and is up and running in November? As 3 they said, maybe we're the only one who can do that. And how about the financial effect on the employees of 4 5 that casino, getting their pensions funded for 32 million dollars? And how about the revenue it's going 6 7 to bring to the state budget? So is there a public 8 interest involved here? Absolutely. And my client is 9 in position to make that happen. Nobody else is. And we were there in the dog days of winter saving all 10 this. If we thought that that thing was going to get 11 12 pulled out for us on April 26th, nah, no way. There's 13 a statute that says process happens, then closing. 14 You've got to read those two things together, with all 15 due respect, with all the cooperation clauses with 16 their conduct. Accepting the money. March 26th, 17 we're with you, let's get this done. Right up until 18 April 23rd and then all of a sudden, oops, sorry guys. 19 Hey, we got the money. We're done. 20 THE COURT: But if that's the correct 21 construction then why is the contract silent as to it? 22 It's the most important term in that contract. How can the contract be silent if you're correct. 23 24 MR. POSITAN: Statute applies.

25 THE COURT: Statute's not even -

MR. POSITAN: We thought, we thought we had 1 2 a deal -3 THE COURT: Statute's not even cited in that. 4 5 MR. POSITAN: - that - If we didn't get, the risk was if we don't get licensed we lose the money. 6 7 So if we're the bad guys that they say we are, then 8 the DGE will decide that we're not given them a 9 license, and we lose -THE COURT: Yeah. 10 MR. POSITAN: - and you keep the money. 11 12 That was the deal. On the other side, if we get 13 approval then we're supposed to get the deal and pay 14 our 48 million dollars, save the pension fund. Put another 40 million dollars into it, like their COO 15 16 says, and then you've got a nice operating piece of 17 property. You want to improve Atlantic City? There 18 it is. But no, no, somebody decides on April 26th, 19 April 27th, nah, you know what? Statute passed now. 20 We'll throw these guys under the bus. We'll keep the money. We'll get another buyer. We'll make more 21 money. Greed. That's what this is all about. 22 23 THE COURT: Do defendants care to be heard? 24 MR. CURTIN: Yes. Response, please, Judge. 25 THE COURT: By the way, counsel, everybody

gets two rounds. 1 2 MR. MUNDIYA: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 3 This will be very, very brief. This was a termination clause that was 4 5 mutual. Not just us. They could have terminated as well. So I think Your Honor should keep that in mind 6 7 as you -8 THE COURT: But you have their 11 million 9 dollars, in fairness. MR. MUNDIYA: Yes, we do. Something that 10 11 they agreed to do. THE COURT: I understand. 12 13 MR. MUNDIYA: Right. The next -THE COURT: You're probably less, you're 14 15 probably less inclined to walk away from a deal near the end if you're out eleven of the 15 million. 16 17 MR. MUNDIYA: Understood. 18 THE COURT: And the swing is walking away 19 with nothing if you terminate or having an Atlantic 20 City casino. That's a huge swing. 21 MR. MUNDIYA: It is a huge swing. But, 22 again, they came in with their eyes open. The other 23 thing that they could have done, and you see this in 24 other agreements, is they could have negotiated a 25 right to an extension. That happens all the time,

that if - if they had negotiated for that right in 1 2 December, then we wouldn't be standing here. But they 3 didn't do that. And there are other agreements in 4 which their regulatory counsel has negotiated 5 extension rights. So they know how to negotiate for an extension, and they didn't do it. That, Your 6 7 Honor, we think speaks volumes about the plain and 8 unambiguous terms of the contract.

9 The next thing Mr. - my adversary says is 10 you've got to tie the two things together. New Jersey law is clear that every provision of a contract has to 11 12 be given a meaning, and contracts should be harmonized 13 to give every clause a meaning. If he's right, you 14 are writing out the word outside date out of the 15 contract, you're writing out section 7.1(b). It has 16 no meaning if he's right. Why would we put it in? 17 What does it mean? It's there throughout this 18 contract. Section 5.5(c), a provision he didn't speak 19 about, talks about having to get to a closing but no 20 later than the outside date. In the same provision 21 they talk about a closing and an outside date. So his 22 argument is completely inconsistent with the plain 23 unambiguous language of this contract, and every 24 provision has to be given meaning. And if you accept 25 that principle of New Jersey law, we win.

Ruling — The Court

Page 79

MR. POSITAN: In pari materia. 1 MR. MUNDIYA: I don't know what that means. 2 3 THE COURT: Equal footing. 4 MR. POSITAN: I think ... 5 THE COURT: Mr. Positan, anything further? 6 Anything further, sir? 7 MR. POSITAN: Your Honor, we rely upon our 8 papers, and we thought your initial decision in this 9 matter was right on line, and you do have to read it 10 in pari materia, this contract, despite some of its 11 shortcomings and missing - or misnumbered things. We 12 think it was clear. We think the parties' intentions 13 were very clear from the beginning, and we think they 14 should be given their full intent, which, as we all know, we're not going on a long time frame here. We 15 16 have a statutory period which is ongoing as we sit 17 here today, which will be completed in about six weeks, seven weeks, and obviously there's been a lot 18 19 of resources devoted to this and we just want the benefit of what we thought we negotiated. 20 The equities I believe are very clear. 21 22 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 23 MR. CURTIN: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: I'm going to thank counsel for 25 your submissions. I also want to acknowledge and

1 thank you for your civility toward one another. It's 2 appreciated.

I noted in reading your pleadings, specifically the verified complaint and defendants' responsive brief in support of this application to vacate restraints, that the, the time line, the dates do not appear to be factually contested; but in that regard a brief recital of the time line is appropriate before I enter my findings.

10 And the Court learns from reading all of the 11 submissions that in or about September of 2012 a 12 defendant entity, RIH Management, became interested in 13 the prospect apparently of on-line gaming presented at 14 The Atlantic Club in Atlantic City, and apparently 15 representatives of RIH agreed and RIH Management as 16 well to retain a lobby hired for the purpose of 17 seeking passage of legislation in New Jersey that would permit on-line gaming, that per paragraph 2 of 18 19 the Matejevich certification. And at some point thereafter, meaning thereafter in September of 2012, 20 21 RIH Management became aware that PokerStars was an 22 entity which operated international on-line poker 23 rooms and tournaments, was interested in entering the 24 Atlantic City gaming market, and there occurred at 25 some point in October of 2012 apparently an initial

discussion between Mr. Matejevich and one Ira (sic) 1 Scheinberg, who is certainly referenced in the AGA 2 3 brief and in some of the other submissions as well, 4 apparently Mr. Scheinberg, a founder of PokerStars or 5 various interests affiliated with it; and in October 6 of 2012 Mr. Scheinberg expressed an interest in a 7 potential acquisition of the entity that owned and 8 operated The Atlantic Club - see the Matejevich 9 certification, paragraph 3. At the time Matejevich 10 was seemingly aware that PokerStars had some legal 11 issue - and I'm referencing the language in the 12 defense brief - with the United States government, 13 although it is asserted by the defense that PokerStars 14 affirmatively represented to Matejevich that it had 15 paid a large settlement to the United States 16 government that resolved many of the legal issues that 17 PokerStars faced.

18 Matejevich claims, at least in his 19 certification, paragraph 3, that he was not fully 20 aware of the extent of criminal problems that 21 Scheinberg and other senior officials at PokerStars 22 allegedly faced. Matejevich claimed, for example, to 23 not know that Scheinberg and another officer of 24 PokerStars, one Paul Tate, were fugitives from the 25 American courts. Now that's the defendants'

1 assertion. It's contested by the plaintiff. I don't 2 need to adjudicate the status of Mr. Tate or 3 Scheinberg for purposes of this proceeding.

4 What is clear is that on or about November 7 5 of 2012 and after more than a month of negotiations 6 the sellers - by that I mean the entities owning The 7 Atlantic Club - and an entity known as Rational 8 Entertainment Ventures Limited, hereinafter Rational -9 excuse me, I heard it pronounced - a company formed by 10 PokerStars, executed a term sheet providing for the 11 sale of 100 percent of the membership interests in 12 RIH, the company that owns and operates The Atlantic 13 Club, to Rational.

14 The term sheet called for Rational to pay 15 cash advances to be used to fund operations while due 16 diligence and negotiations toward a final purchase 17 agreement continued. Under the term sheet were a purchase agreement to be executed advances were to be 18 19 applied against the purchase price. Sellers were willing to attempt to complete a sale of the company 20 21 to a PokerStars affiliate presumably because, at least 22 in part, PokerStars represented, claims defense, that 23 its legal problems were largely resolved and expressed 24 a willingness not only to commit to cash advances to 25 fund operating deficits, but also agreed to an

expeditious time table for consummating the transaction, parenthetically a most expeditious time table.

1

2

3

Importantly, claims the defendants, during negotiations of the term sheet and the membership purchase agreement both sides were represented by sophisticated and experienced corporate and regulatory counsel, that according to Matejevich certification, paragraph 7, and the Brooks certification, paragraphs 19 through 21.

The allocation of risk relating to the receipt of required regulatory approval was very much a subject of the negotiation. That per paragraph 6 of the Matejevich certification, but also per counsels' arguments here today on behalf of defendants.

16 As a result of the financial condition of 17 The Atlantic Club at the time, which was not seemingly sound, and the impending onset of on-line gaming, the 18 termination provision which set a date after which the 19 agreement could be terminated by either party were the 20 21 transaction to yet be incomplete was critical. Such a provision would allow the seller sufficient time to 22 23 pursue other alternatives if PokerStars was unable to 24 get licensed in a timely manner per the defense brief. 25 The same pertains in this Court's view to that clause

1 as related to the plaintiff.

The term sheet was executed November 7. 2 3 Negotiations toward a definitive purchase agreement 4 drug into December of 2012 and, as I've earlier 5 discussed with counsel, the New Jersey Senate passed 6 the pending bill to legalize on-line gaming on 7 December 20, and on the very next day sellers executed 8 the agreement with Rational; and section 1.4(a) of 9 that agreement defines the closing date, and it has 10 been noted and quoted by counsel and the Court 11 throughout this proceeding, but suffice it to say "not 12 later than the third business day following satisfaction or waiver of all the conditions set forth 13 14 in article 6, which contains a number of conditions, 15 but the most significant of which is procurement, 16 timely procurement of - and prior to the outside date 17 of a valid and then effective ICA, Interim Casino Authorization, from the Casino Control Commission. 18 19 It is asserted that as part of the agreement 20 and consistent with one of the sellers' primary 21 objectives the parties agreed to that expeditious 22 transaction, and the time line counsel and I have 23 reviewed in detail - I'll just incorporate that 24 discussion by reference - but it is difficult for this

Court to imagine a time line from execution of the

25

2

agreement to the filing of the first submission three 1 2 days thereafter to the expiration of the 120-day review period for the entire transaction to have been 3 4 negotiated to occur more, more quickly. And the 5 outside date, of course, was April 26 of 2013. The 6 parties agreed that Rational would not be refunded 7 advances it had made and would be required to pay a 8 termination fee in the event the transaction was terminated for reasons other than a breach of the 9 10 agreement by the sellers. 11 Furthermore, an entity related in some 12 fashion to the plaintiffs, Oldford, unconditionally 13 and irrevocably guaranteed the obligation, and section 14 7.2(c) of the agreement provided that, (reading:) 15 "If the agreement is terminated for any reason pursuant to section 7.1 buyer shall pay the 16 17 sellers representative for further distribution to the sellers within two business days of such 18 19 termination an amount in cash equal to \$4,000,000, and the company shall be entitled to 20 21 retain all advances paid by buyer to the company 22 pursuant to this agreement and the binding term 23 sheet as of such termination." 24 The agreement incorporated a provision providing each party the right to walk away if the

25

transaction took longer to complete than the mutually agreed upon date of April 26, the so-called outside date.

1

2

3

4 The agreement in a general sense 5 memorialized the parties' agreement that Rational 6 would assume all the licensing risk. It's argued here 7 today, and the contract is fairly construed to that 8 effect. Rational, plaintiffs, kept their part of the 9 bargain through certainly May 1, 2013, by which date 10 they had advanced \$11,000,000. That was the advance 11 cap per the contract. And plaintiffs also negotiated 12 the cooperation by defendants to allow plaintiffs to 13 begin the construction of a new poker facility inside 14 the casino, and Rational agreed to pre-fund all 15 related costs and expenses. As of the date of the 16 notice of termination there apparently was a balance 17 of \$94,927.91. That, that has been paid as I understand the pleadings. 18

19 Rational did satisfy the three-day post-20 execution filing requirement as relates to the 21 application for the ICA, and defendants claim through 22 the Matejevich certification, paragraph 11, that it, 23 they, Matejevich were made aware by DEG (sic) that 24 Rational was not providing information to the DEG 25 (sic) in a timely manner. That's a contested fact,

but that's a position indicated by the parties. 1 In any event, all seemed to concede that in 2 3 March of 2013, specifically on March 4, the American 4 Gaming Association undertook something which 5 apparently had not earlier been undertaken and that is 6 that it filed a brief with the DGE seeking to 7 intervene in the application of Rational for the ICA, 8 and a copy of that brief has been provided to the 9 Court. I've read it. It is not dispositive to this 10 particular application, and actually I'm not entirely 11 certain that it's relevant and, if relevant, only to a 12 minimal degree. Assuming for the moment everything 13 asserted by AGA against Rational in that brief to be 14 true, nonetheless the parties had an existing and 15 valid and clearly written contract between the two of 16 them, and their duties and rights were not adversely 17 affected in this Court's view as a matter of law to any extent. Each continued to owe to the other good 18 19 faith, due diligence, and fair dealing in their contractual relations. 20

It is somewhat acknowledged by defendants that the filing of the intervention petition nonetheless was unsettling. And then on March 26th Matejevich claims to have received a phone call from representatives of DEG (sic) advising that Rational

still had not satisfied DEG's (sic) information 1 2 request. See the Matejevich certification at 3 paragraph 13. DGE also specifically stated apparently 4 that after Rational's application was deemed complete 5 it would need yet another 90 days to issue its expert 6 - to issue its report on the application, and 7 Matejevich conveyed sellers' concerns, defendants' 8 concerns to Rational in a letter dated March 26, 2013 9 and during a call to a Mr. Templar, a representative 10 of the plaintiffs. Matejevich advised Templar that it 11 was Matejevich's impression that the DGE might not 12 issue its report until July or August of 2013, not 13 June as plaintiffs had earlier supposed. 14 There also occurred in the month of March other events per the pleadings, and they do not appear 15 16 to be contested. March 26th the DGE again did contact 17 plaintiff and requested the additional information in the form of documents and this, claims plaintiff, its 18 19 first instance of information that suggested there

20 might be additional delay. Matejevich in a letter to 21 plaintiff, specifically Exhibit B I believe to 22 plaintiffs' complaint, indicated that he and 23 defendants remained "fully committed to comply, 24 including cooperating with buyer and using their best 25 efforts to obtain all applicable governmental

approvals as promptly as practicable." And he also 2 indicates that the ICA application was "reasonably likely not to be timely satisfied." 3

1

4 On March 27, 2013 plaintiffs' attorney 5 undertook a telephone conversation with defendants' 6 counsel regarding new information needed within several days. On March 29 of 2013 Matejevich 7 8 requested payment for past and future work on the 9 poker room. On March 31 of 2013 Mr. Templar undertook 10 a telephone conversation with one Richard Welch, a 11 representative of Colony, a defendant affiliated 12 entity, and sought assurances from Welch that nothing significant had changed. Defendants indicated at that 13 14 point that they would independently approach DGE to 15 separately inquire as to the status of the 16 application.

17 On April 1 of 2013 another request from DGE 18 for additional information was received, and the 19 response deadline was indicated to be April 22 of 20 The next day, April 2 of '13, the parties' 2013. 21 attorneys spoke with one another in a conference call. 22 In that call there was no indication of a claim of 23 breach, no intention to - no indication of any 24 intention to terminate, at least asserts plaintiff. 25 On the same day Mr. Templar and Mr. Matejevich spoke

telephonically with regard to various projects.
Plaintiffs assert there was therein no indication of termination.

4 On April 8 of 2013 plaintiffs' counsel met 5 with DGE Director Rebuck, who updated defendants with 6 regard to the meeting, the status of the ICA 7 application, and assured defendants of continuing 8 belief of ICA by June 24. Three days later, on 9 April 11, the DGE apparently confirmed to plaintiffs' 10 counsel that the ICA application was deemed "complete" as of the prior day, April 10, and the new outside 11 12 date, at least as far plaintiffs were concerned, April 13 - excuse me - August 9th, 2013.

14 On the very next day, a Friday, April 12, 15 Mr. Templar undertook a telephone call with Mr. Welch 16 regarding the application status. Welch indicated no 17 discussion or offered no discussion about - absent the information request copy. On April 15 of 2000 (sic), 18 19 a Monday night - this was the next business day plaintiffs agreed to provide the requested information 20 or copies of it to defendants but only upon defendants 21 22 execution of a non-disclosure agreement, not 23 specifically required per the agreement, arguably 24 required within the more general language as pertains 25 to assurances and good faith participation.

1	Two days later, on April 17, the defendants
2	signed the non-disclosure agreement, again, not
3	specifically required by the contract but arguably
4	impliedly part of the assurances language and good
5	faith obligation to participate. On April 18th the
6	defendants did receive the non-disclosure agreement.
7	On April 22nd plaintiffs had fully responded — by
8	April 22nd plaintiffs had fully responded to the
9	defendants' information request.
10	On April 23 of 2013 Mr. Templar emailed Mr.
11	Welch — that is Exhibit C to the complaint. On
12	April 24th defense counsel requested confirmation that
13	plaintiff had responded timely to DGE's April 22
14	deadline for additional information, and that timely
15	response was confirmed. On April 25 Mr. Welch emailed
16	Mr. Templar refusing Mr. Templar's outreach or request
17	for a written amendment to extend the outside date.
18	On April 25 plaintiffs' counsel met with the
19	DGE and updated Mr. Frawley with regard to the details
20	pertaining to that meeting. On the same date Mr.
21	Templar emailed Mr. Welch stating, "This is what I was
22	hoping you'd come back with." I found that to be an
23	interesting component to that communication.
24	On the next day, April 26, plaintiffs'

25 counsel contacted defense counsel, offered to have a

conference call with DGE. On the same date Mr. Welch emailed Mr. Templar "in an effort to be constructive, \$6,000,000 for ten days defendant released from obligation regarding the solicitation of other bids."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

On April 27 plaintiffs received the notice to terminate. That's Exhibit E. On May 1 another letter reiterating termination. That's Exhibit F.

8 And they are ostensibly the facts at least 9 as substantially agreed upon that bring us here, and 10 of course the Court now is duty bound to consider that 11 record; and to the extent that other facts have been 12 discussed between the Court and counsel, counsel with 13 each other, today and are not contested the aggregate 14 record before the Court and apply the four-prong criteria of Crowe v. DeGioia, and I begin with 15 16 immediate and irreparable harm.

17 And of course both counsel have acknowledged the inclusion in the subject agreement of a provision 18 19 which by its terms stipulates that the subject matter 20 of this agreement involves a casino and the unique 21 nature of the real estate, the casino licensure, the 22 real property, the financial interests as so unique 23 that a violation as to -a material violation as to 24 provisions of the agreement would entitle the victim 25 of any such violation to injunctive relief. Counsel

have also briefed, correctly, the extent to which that 1 2 language to the extent included in a contract is always interesting, and it tends, at least at first 3 4 blush, to make any judge presiding over a related 5 dispute feel somewhat better in the beginning. It is 6 not binding upon any court, and the court really has 7 an affirmative obligation to consider the nature of 8 the subject matter of the contract and reach an 9 independent determination.

10 This Court has no difficulty finding 11 anything other than the interests that are the subject 12 of this contract are immeasurably unique. It involves 13 one of limited casino licenses in New Jersey. The 14 only casino gaming site is in New Jersey. It is 15 oceanfront property. I am sufficiently familiar with 16 the oceanfront in Atlantic City to know that. Again, 17 there are just a limited number of casino licenses 18 here in New Jersey, and this transaction was 19 negotiated and consummated mid-sea change in the state of New Jersey as relates to the advent of eGaming, on-20 21 line poker, and the parties to this transaction 22 included, as relates to defendants, ownership interest 23 in a casino that at best was struggling financially at 24 the time. Also included what the pleadings suggest to 25 the Court is, if not the leading on-line poker entity

in the world, certainly one of the leading on-line 1 2 poker entities, successful at that, in the world. And 3 to the extent that there approaches that sea chain in 4 lawful casino gaming in New Jersey, iGaming, and to 5 the extent that that uniquely successful plaintiff 6 enjoys opportunity to secure an ownership interest 7 lawfully in one of New Jersey's limited casino 8 licenses, the prospect of attempting to measure 9 damages at any point down the road is seemingly 10 difficult if not impossible. I'm not sure how anyone 11 with whatever credentials would be able to sit in this 12 courtroom today, next month, next year and achieve 13 some economic model to attempt to calculate 14 compensatory damages that might be sustained by 15 plaintiffs were they to lose the benefits of their 16 negotiated bargain in this particular contract. I may 17 be wrong, but that's my, that's my instinct at the 18 moment. As a result the defendants claim that the 19 deal is the deal and consequential damages remain 20

22 instance, but in the latter regard I'm not as certain.23 In fact, I have severe doubts.

available. They're probably correct in the first

21

24 So I do find that the plaintiff faces a very 25 real prospect of immediate and irreparable harm were

the concerns which it has articulated, effectively the sale or attempted sale of this casino interest to a 2 3 third party were to occur.

1

4 Next, are there genuine issues of material 5 fact? If there are, there are not many. The, again, 6 time line of the contract is uncontested. The dates 7 of emails sent and telephonic communications and 8 teleconferences between counsel, not in dispute, and somewhat remarkably so in this Court's view, and I 9 10 incorporate by reference my factual findings of just a moment ago and, of course, those factual findings are 11 12 limited to this record as is the entirety of my 13 decision here today.

14 The balancing of the equities. I have not 15 only heard your arguments today, counsel, but I have also reviewed on several occasions your pleadings, and 16 17 I am satisfied that I understand your particular positions. The plaintiffs assert that the hardship to 18 19 be suffered by it should restraints not be continued, 20 substantially more severe than any hardship or harm that would be suffered by defendant consequent to any 21 continuation of the restraints. Plaintiff cites the 22 23 need for their ongoing ability to conclude 24 administrative review, the survival of the contract if 25 you will and their predictable ability to perform

1 should the ICA issue. Plaintiffs note that the 2 contract is silent with regard to any negotiated 3 extensions absent a writing signed by all. They 4 express concerns with regard to any uncertainty on the 5 part of the DGE and the Casino Commission should its 6 equitable interest in the casino premises not be 7 preserved by way of restraints.

8 Defendants also assert that should the 9 restraints continue managerial and financial 10 instability will threaten the viability of the casino 11 itself. They assert a need to market the asset. Thev 12 note the approach of the summer tourist season. They 13 note the approaching commencement of legalized iGaming 14 in Atlantic City. They assert consequent harm to the 15 public interests. They also raise and articulate the 16 basis for their concern about any likelihood of 17 plaintiffs actually receiving an ICA. It has 18 characterized that prospect as "highly questionable" in plaintiffs' brief. And they claim that any 19 assertion by plaintiffs that continuation of temporary 20 21 restraints maintains the status quo is "illusory and misleading." Defendants will continue to seek 22 23 reputational harm should the restraints be continued, and all of the foregoing risk actual destruction to 24 25 the very subject of the controversy. Continued

restraints would constitute a "devastating blow, almost certainly miss the opportunity to pursue other options prior to the November 13 launch of on-line gaming in New Jersey."

1

2

3

4

5 Each argument enjoys merit. Each argument -6 each of the arguments on each side enjoys appeal. The 7 issue, however, is whether or not the benefit that 8 would enure to the plaintiff through continuation of 9 restraints is sufficiently offset or countermanded by 10 the detriment that would predictably visit the 11 defendants, and that is a difficult call for this 12 Court to make, and I share, as I have reviewed the 13 relevant portions of the record in this regard, 14 counsel, it's my sense that whatever the Court's 15 decision on this particular issue, one party suffers 16 harm likely immediate, short- and long-term. I am 17 unable to find any objectively identifiable advantage 18 that would enure to either party. The Court senses 19 that the parties really stand in equipoise here. That's not intended to be a pass on the analysis. 20 That's just the Court's read of the record. 21

Which then brings us, lastly, to the likelihood of success on the merits, and I've indicated on a couple occasions in oral argument today that I understand the plaintiffs' equitable arguments.

This is a court of equity. And I confess that on 1 May 13th, when I was able to carve a couple hours out 2 of my day upon receipt of the verified complaint and 3 4 moving papers and I began to read the contract and the 5 terms of the contract, with each page it seemed I had 6 more questions in my own mind than the pleadings and 7 the contract were answering, and I still have some. 8 Please turn the phone off.

The difficulty with the plaintiffs' position 9 10 at the moment, however, as this Court views it, is 11 that the equitable arguments which do bear such appeal 12 do not find corresponding authority in the agreement. 13 For example, the notion of paying \$11,000,000 on 14 account of a purchase price on a contract that's executed December 21 by February 1, and facing the 15 prospect of not only losing the 11 million, but 16 17 potentially having to pay the addition \$4,000,000 as a termination fee, I've never read anything like it, 18 19 which really means nothing in terms of legal analysis.

The prospect of missing an outside deadline by three months due to the unpredictable - lack of any other adjective - administrative review process, the Court has its own general sense about that as well. On the other hand, this is an exhaustive detailed contract. It is clearly written to this Court, and

the provisions to that contract about which plaintiff 1 2 now complains, they're just that, they're the 3 provisions of the contract. The parties negotiated 4 the most brief period of time from execution to first 5 filing to closing date to outside date that state law 6 provides. Does the closing date necessarily 7 correspond to the outside date such that should the 8 administrative process not secure the issuance of the 9 ICA prior to the outside date, that the outside date 10 as a matter of law must be moved? That notion enjoyed 11 real appeal here on May 13th. Unrelated to the four 12 certifications and unrelated to anything other than the Court reading counsels' briefs and the Court's re-13 14 review of the very statute, I am satisfied that the 15 construction given that section of our statute, Title 16 5, by defendant is the legally correct one because 17 otherwise as - I've cited this portion of defense counsels' brief probably twice already. (Reading:) 18 19 "If plaintiffs are correct and the contract could never be terminated, the parties would be forced 20

to continue in a relationship forever depending on when the regulators deemed the application to be complete."

DGE could deem an application to be incomplete for two years, and that would have the effect of essentially

21

22

23

Ruling — The Court

Page 100

extending the termination date for a corresponding 1 2 period of time or even longer. So for all of those reasons I am not able to 3 4 find, again, on this record - and I understand it's a 5 limited record - I am not able to find that the 6 plaintiffs on that issue face - enjoy a probability or likelihood of success on the merits; and that analysis 7 8 on that fourth and final criterion of Crowe v. DeGioia 9 is, in this Court's view, the determinative 10 consideration, and as a result I am compelled to dissolve the restraints, and I'll ask Mr. Curtin to 11 12 submit an order to that effect. And I would like to 13 have it in language that is mutually agreeable to 14 opposing counsel on Monday morning. I want to get 15 counsel a filed copy of that order as quickly as can 16 be, and it's four minutes before four this afternoon. 17 So I know that today is not a likelihood. Now there is a complaint that's yet filed, 18 19 although I understand that defense counsel have yet to 20 file either an answer or a dispositive pleading. So 21 the rules apply in that regard, and I assume we'll

22 hear from - from everyone in due course and timely 23 fashion with that.

I again want to thank counsel for your submissions. I again want to acknowledge that I Ruling - The Court Page 101

realize I pulled you away from your colleagues for the 1 2 last afternoon of the bar convention. 3 I also want to acknowledge the people in the 4 courtroom, if you will. We're now approaching two and 5 a half hours on the record in this matter, and you 6 have been wonderfully patient and quiet, and that contributes to the quality of a proceeding beyond what 7 8 I can tell you. 9 So with that, to whence ever you now go, 10 travel safely, enjoy the weekend, and I gather we'll 11 see counsel back here -12 MR. BROOKS: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: - at some point in the near 14 future. We stand adjourned. 15 MR. MUNDIYA: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 COURT ATTENDANT: All rise. 17 THE COURT: Thank you, Sheriff. You can please be at ease if you will. It's going to take me 18 19 a moment to gather my thoughts here. 20 (Off the record) 21 \* \* \* \* \* \* \* 22 23 24 25

1	I, Cheryl A. Bryson (CB Trialscript					
2	Service), the assigned transcriber, do hereby certify					
3	the foregoing transcript of proceedings digitally					
4	recorded on May 17, 2013, Time Index 1:33:01 to					
5	3:56:47 is prepared in full compliance with the					
6	current Transcript Format for Judicial Proceedings and					
7	is a true and accurate non-compressed transcript of					
8	the proceedings as recorded.					

New Jersey AOC #202

Cheryl A. Bryson, C.E.T., AD/T Agent For: CB Trialscript Service 1606 Adams Avenue Linwood, NJ 08221 Phone/Fax: 609-653-1971 Email: cabryson1427@aol.com

<u>May 23, 2013</u> (Date)

#### action (3) 42:18:88:10 27:8:41:2:42:1 advising (2) \$ 68:23:87:25 actual (3) 54:7:65:13:96:24 advocate (1) \$11,000,000 (3) actually (14) 21:17 56:2;86:10;98:13 7:9;8:17,22;23:12; affected (1) \$4,000,000 (2) 32:6;51:4;54:4,16; 87:17 85:20;98:17 57:4;67:4;74:25;75:1; affidavit (4) \$6,000,000 (1) 87:10;96:17 4:21;13:2,6;43:4 92:3 addition (3) affidavits (3) \$750,000 (1) 25:22;61:7;98:17 8:4;13:6,10 56:2 affiliate (1) additional (5) \$94,927.91 (1) 35:6;88:17,20;89:18; 82:21 86:17 91:14 affiliated (4) address (13) 44:21:67:6:81:5; Α 89:11 5:11;8:16;11:9,9; 16:8,11;24:7,22;30:20; affirmative (2) **ABA (1)** 38:7,17;46:25;72:3 71:6;93:7 6:11 affirmatively (1) addressed (2) ability (2) 8:14;59:6 81:14 95:23.25 addresses (2) afford (1) able (13) 49:21:50:13 15:3 11:9;26:5,19;29:24; adjective (1) afternoon (9) 43:19;51:17;59:10; 98:22 3:4,5,6,24;4:12;6:1; 60:11;67:8;94:11;98:2; adjourned (1) 9:3;100:16;101:2 100:3,5 101:14 **AGA (5)** above (3) adjudicate (1) 41:23;56:16;58:10; 49:7,8,16 82:2 81:2:87:13 absent (4) administrative (3) against (5) 33:8;35:15;90:17; 95:24;98:22;99:8 44:25;45:6,7;82:19; 96:3 administratively (1) 87:13 absolutely (4) 74:19 agencies (2) 58:15;61:9;67:11; admission (2) 15:8:74:7 75:8 4:8:5:14 agenda (1) accelerated (1) admitted (1) 58:12 34:1 4:3 aggregate (1) accept (2) adopted (1) 92:13 28:12;78:24 ago (1) 74:5 acceptable (2) advance (7) 95:11 15:12:39:14 44:24:50:11:51:3; agree (2) accepting (2) 56:10;67:9;72:2;86:10 6:23;40:25 33:15;75:16 agreeable (1) advanced (1) according (1) 86:10 100:13 83:8 advances (6) agreed (18) account (2) 46:6;82:15,18,24; 24:15;26:21;39:11, 54:6;98:14 85:7,21 11;40:2;46:13,20; accurate (2) advantage (1) 55:20;69:11;77:11; 51:12;66:1 97:17 80:15;82:25;84:21; accusations (1) advantages (1) 85:6;86:2,14;90:20; 58:7 16:2 92:9 accused (1) advent (2) agreement (60) 67:15 21:12:93:20 9:8.16:10:11.12: achieve (1) adversarial (1) 14:7,12,19,22;15:1,19; 94:12 18:11;23:10,18,21,22, 6:17 acknowledge (11) adversary (2) 23;24:10;25:3;27:23; 6:3,4:7:2,4:18:13; 4:7;78:9 30:17;33:23;34:13,25; 35:24:70:21:71:4: adversely (1) 44:20;45:23;46:5,7,16; 79:25;100:25;101:3 87:16 49:24;54:2;64:19;68:5, acknowledged (2) advice (1) 19;70:22;71:3,5;82:17, 87:21;92:17 13:9 18:83:6,20:84:3,8,9,19: acquisition (1) 85:1,10,14,15,22,24; advisable (2) 81:7 41:4;59:23 86:4,5;90:22,23;91:2, act (1) advised (2) 6;92:18,20,24;98:12

agreements (7) 18:17:22:22:23:5: 27:17;28:16;77:24; 78:3 ahead (7) 24:8;36:13;43:5; 49:3;52:13,24;54:14 aids (1) 52:18 al (1) 3:18 allegations (3) 5:2:16:24:23:16 allegedly (1) 81:22 allocate (1) 28:4 allocation (3) 39:24;45:14;83:11 allow (5) 34:8:36:6;67:7; 83:22:86:12 allowed (1) 37:7 allowing (1) 33:24 alma (1) 70:8 almost (2) 71:24;97:2 along (5) 42:4.6.8:47:8.19 alternative (2) 21:7.7 alternatives (1) 83:23 although (4) 11:19;45:19;81:13; 100:19 always (2) 14:14:93:3 amazed (1) 59:10 ambiguity (2) 23:11;28:24 amended (1) 68:17 amendment (1) 91:17 American (2) 81:25:87:3 among (1) 52:15 amount (3) 26:17;59:13;85:19 analysis (3) 97:20;98:19;100:7 and/or (1) 35:8 and-takes (1) 23:2 anticipate (2) 5:8;38:25

# May 17, 2013 anymore (1) Apartment (1) apparent (2) 52:20;73:11 apparently (8) 80:13,14,25;81:4;

19:23

3:18

86:16;87:5;88:3;90:9 appeal (6) 59:25;69:9;73:13; 97:6:98:11:99:11 appear (4) 20:4;47:4;80:7; 88:15 appearances (1) 3:19 appearing (1) 4:13 Appellate (1) 16:16 applicable (6) 35:7;36:1;41:4,11, 11:88:25 applicant (2) 26:7.7 application (45) 4:4:9:17:16:22; 24:24;26:19,20;34:20, 21,22,23;36:17,18,22; 37:3,5,6,24:38:9,10,11, 16:42:19:49:6.12.19: 50:1:54:19:61:10: 62:12:65:23:70:16.19: 80:5;86:21;87:7,10; 88:4,6;89:2,16;90:7,10, 16:99:22,24 applications (1) 73:17 applied (1) 82:19 applies (1) 75:24 apply (4) 45:6;64:11;92:14; 100:21 applying (1) 68:24 appreciate (3) 10:4,23;52:18 appreciated (1) 80:2 approach (3) 57:21;89:14;96:12 approaches (1) 94:3 approaching (2) 96:13:101:4 appropriate (3) 41:2;54:13;80:8 approval (18) 9:17:25:21:28:7;

27:20

29:15;34:4,8,9;44:13;

49:7,13:50:1:61:15; 63:13.13.14:66:6: 76:13:83:12 approvals (6) 9:14;25:5,5,6,7;89:1 approved (3) 47:7;66:7;75:2 April (55) 26:13,21;32:15,18, 22,23;33:3;34:7;41:14, 18;42:7,16,18,20; 46:12,16:64:3,4:66:3; 67:23;69:24;70:18,19, 23;71:5,15,25;72:7,14; 75:12,18;76:18,19; 85:5;86:2;89:17,19,20; 90:4,9,11,12,14,18; 91:1,5,7,8,10,12,13,15, 18,24;92:5 apt (1) 60:11 area (1) 18:9 arguably (4) 8:5;19:10;90:23; 91:3 argue (1) 41:20 argued (1) 86:6 argument (27) 7:14.20:8:17:11:16: 12:13;18:3,5;20:21; 23:19,22;27:23;28:12; 29:11;33:15;34:12; 40:17;50:12;53:9; 67:11,20,21,22;69:9; 78:22;97:5,5,24 arguments (10) 18:22:19:5:23:14; 52:24:73:13:83:15: 95:15;97:6,25;98:11 arise (1) 11:14 arises (1) 22:18 around (1) 62:21 Article (2) 9:1;84:14 articulate (1) 96:15 articulated (1) 95:1 assert (5) 90:2;95:18;96:8,11, 14 asserted (4) 21:10;81:13;84:19; 87:13 assertion (2) 82:1;96:20 asserts (1)

89:24 asset (1) 96:11 Association (3) 6:1,2;87:4 assume (3) 6:5;86:6;100:21 Assuming (1) 87:12 assurances (4) 40:9;89:12;90:25; 91:4 assured (3) 44:6,7;90:7 Atlantic (27) 14:8,20;21:4,12,13, 16,24;22:6;24:12,12, 15;27:18;56:25;59:20; 64:13;68:13;76:17; 77:19;80:14,14,24; 81:8:82:7,12:83:17: 93:16:96:14 ATL-C-43-13 (1) 3:18 attached (1) 56:20 attempt (2) 82:20;94:13 attempted (1) 95:2 attempting (1) 94:8 **ATTENDANT (2)** 48:17:101:16 attention (6) 8:25;15:20;16:3; 20:10,10,16 attorney (1) 89:4 attorneys (4) 31:7;39:9,11;89:21 attributed (1) 69:12 August (9) 29:14;42:24;43:5,13, 22,22;65:5;88:12; 90:13 Auriemma (2) 7:24;12:1 author (1) 16:5 authorities (1) 26:5 authority (3) 9:12,13;98:12 Authorization (2) 14:11;84:18 authorize (1) 22:15 automatic (2) 27:2.7 available (4) 5:7;21:6;70:7;94:21

average (1) 53:23 aware (7) 12:19,24;37:1;80:21; 81:10,20;86:23 away (4) 77:15,18;85:25; 101:1 B back (13) 10:15;11:1;19:25; 20:7;47:8;48:4,18; 61:20;64:25;69:10; 72:21;91:22;101:11 back-and-(1) 37:3 bad (8) 55:23;61:25;62:25; 63:4,6,11;68:2;76:7 balance (2) 28:23;86:16 balancing (3) 28:8;55:11;95:14 bank (1) 31:7 bankruptcy (2) 55:19;56:9 **Bar** (4) 6:1.2.24:101:2 bargain (3) 24:14:86:9:94:16 bargained (2) 24:14;30:18 bartender (1) 68:25 based (1) 24:17 basically (1) 38:10 basis (6) 23:19;27:24;30:24; 41:25;62:13;96:16 Bear (3) 3:9;24:12;98:11 beaten (1) 53:23 became (2) 80:12,21 becomes (1) 38:24 began (1) 98:4 begin (4) 12:3;26:18;86:13; 92:15 beginning (4) 14:4:46:24:79:13; 93:5 begins (1) 10:6 behalf (5)

4:14;11:7;14:1; 28:22:83:15 behind (3) 58:8.18:61:20 belief (2) 26:16:90:8 bench (1) 5:12 benefit (2) 79:20:97:7 benefits (1) 94:15 best (5) 21:6:40:18:41:1; 88:24;93:23 bets (1) 41:19 better (2) 40:13;93:5 betting (1) 57:4 beyond (4) 15:12;55:5;59:25; 101:7 bids (1) 92:4 big (4) 12:12,13;45:13;46:4 bill (2) 68:6;84:6 billboards (1) 53:10 binding (5) 18:18.20:74:19: 85:22;93:6 birthday (2) 26:14,14 bit (6) 9:3;19:7;48:15; 58:11:59:15:67:5 black-letter (1) 40:11 block (1) 36:19 blog (4) 60:18,19,19,25 blogs (1) 60:18 blooming (1) 43:17 blossoms (1) 61:23 blow (1) 97:1 blush (1) 93:4 Board (3) 6:12;29:15;50:12 both (10) 6:9:11:20:19:3:28:3; 31:2;33:11;41:5;73:9; 83:6;92:17 bottom (1)

May 17, 2013

57:12 bound (2)8:12:92:10 box (1) 67:2 boys (2) 45:13:46:4 breach (9) 23:10,18,20;24:7; 28:25;38:15,15;85:9; 89:23 breached (2) 10:10;23:18 break (4) 47:14,24;48:11; 50:14 brief (19) 28:19;39:2;41:20; 43:25;56:3;65:17,19; 77:3;80:5,8;81:3,12; 83:24;87:6,8,13;96:19; 99:4.18 briefed (1) 93:1 briefly (1) 20:22 briefs (2) 11:23;99:13 brightened (1) 57:8 bring (5) 6:21:21:16:57:10: 75:7:92:9 brings (2) 55:2;97:22 broader (1) 59:24 **BROOKS (23)** 4:12,13,15,17,20,24; 12:2:35:20,23:36:3,10, 14,25;37:20,23;39:5, 18;48:22;49:4,12;50:6; 83:9:101:12 Brooks' (1) 60:18 brought (4) 42:23;52:18;53:1; 60:17 budget (1) 75:7 build (4) 19:14;57:25;60:12; 69:3 bunch (5) 23:14;51:17,24; 61:13,24 burden (1) 12:5 bus (1) 76:20 busiest (1) 15:23 business (20)

55:1 17:12,15:25:10,12, 13:28:11:29:17.17: carve (1) 30:6;31:25;32:4,20; 98:2 38:10;54:23;55:2;60:1; case (14) 67:7;84:12;85:18; 90:19 businesses (1) 16:2 businessmen (2) 68:10,11 cash (3) busy (1) 21:14 casino (36) butts (1) 62:4 buy (1) 45:18 **buyer** (16) 9:11,14,14;10:9,11; 14:24;15:3,11;26:18; 35:5;49:25;68:1;76:21; 85:16,21;88:24 buyers (4) casinos (3) 21:7;62:3,4;68:20 Catania (3) С caught (1) 12:12 Caesar's (2) 58:8,10 cause (9) calculate (1) 94:13 calculus (1) 53:25 caused (6) 32:18 calendar (2) 15:21;32:20 CCC(2)call (7) 87:24;88:9;89:21,22; center (1) 90:15:92:1:97:11 58:1 called (2) certain (4) 73:6;82:14 calling (1) 44:12 came (10) 34:6;41:14,18;42:4, 5,7;55:16;71:1,21; 77:22 campaign (3) 21:20;56:15;68:2 cancel (2) 61:24;66:3 candidate (1) 26:6 cap (1) 86:11 capable (2) chain (1) 70:6,9 94:3 chance (2) Cape (1) 66:16 Capital (6) change (5) 51:18;57:15,18;58:2; 60:8.10 93:19 care (1) changed (2) 76:23 carried (1)

21:8 characterize (1) 67:3 characterized (2) 4:22;5:3;16:18; 7:5:96:18 19:13;26:10;30:8; charged (1) 35:13;36:12;47:11; 61:4 51:22:58:9:62:18: chart (3) 51:12,17,21 65:13;72:8 check (1) 82:15,24;85:19 64:5 checks (1) 12:13;14:10,20; 72:19 15:20,25;16:5;18:11, choose (2) 15,17;21:17;42:22; 8:1:18:4 45:18;46:13;53:16; chose (1) 55:18;57:13;64:12; 34:1 68:24;74:8;75:5;77:20; Christmas (3) 84:17,18;86:14;92:20, 33:9;54:6,25 21;93:13,14,17,23; Circuit (1) 94:4,7;95:2;96:5,6,10 6:13 circumstance (1) 14:8;27:17;60:9 7:3 circumstances (2) 7:24;12:1;13:7 20:23;70:10 cited (3) cites (1) 11:4,12,23;12:18; 95:22 17:11:21:8:41:1.2: citizens (1) 30:25 City (14) 21:22:42:5,7,9,11,13 35:8:65:6 civility (1) 80:1 8:1,3;87:11;94:22 claim (10) certainly (12) 5:24;8:4;18:20;19:3, 12:27:18:57:6:58:10; 96:19 81:2;86:9;94:1;97:2 claimed (1) certification (15) 81:22 4:16;12:21;20:11; claims (7) 27:15;29:8,10;51:10; 80:19;81:9,19;83:8,9, 14;86:22;88:2 88:18 certifications (13) clarity (2) 7:7,23;8:4,13;11:24; 73:11,11 12:20:19:8:24:18; clause (15) 25:25;27:13;44:6; 66:18:99:12 83:25 clauses (2) 44:13;51:7 63:18;75:15 cleaning (1) 8:2,3;19:11;72:14; 67:4 clear (8) 69:22:89:13 chaos (1) 82:4

clearly (3) CLERK (2) 3:8:48:24 client (19) 75:1.8 clients (4) clients' (1) 28:22 client's (1) 19:2 climate (1) 20:23 clock (1) 44:18 close (10) close' (1) 15:4 closed (1) 34:14;76:3;99:17 51:19 closely (1) 6:13 closes (1) 64:10 closing (22) 14:8,20;21:16;22:6; 27:18:59:20:64:14: 68:14;76:17;77:20; 80:14,24;93:16;96:14 84:9:99:5,6 Club (13) 23:9,10,11,12,13,17; 86:21:89:22:94:19: cocktail (1) 6:10 colleague (1) 12:23 21:10;25:22;81:18; colleagues (5) 82:22;83:4;87:24; 101:1 College (1) 70:5 colon (1) 9:18;10:2;47:5;49:6, 10:7 13,16,21,22;56:2,8; Colony (2) 65:13;71:9;77:4;78:13; 51:18;89:11 column (1) 17:19 comfortable (2) 48:21:53:20 coming (6) 31:10,12;41:12; 72:2.21 78:11;79:12,13,21; 96:13

comment (2) 60:25:87:15:98:25 7:25:13:20 **Commission** (10) 14:11:18:16:36:20: 37:9,25;42:23;53:21; 5:7;12:14;13:8;19:4; 71:15;84:18;96:5 commit (1) 20:5;22:7;42:18;55:20, 20;56:1,15;61:8;67:7, 82:24 committed (1) 12;68:23;70:23;71:2; 88:23 common (3) 11:8;20:9;22:10,25 14:6,18:27:14 communicate (1) 71:25 communication (1) 91:23 communications (1) 95:7 community (4) 29:19;30:2;31:1; 58:5 32:14;63:14;64:3,4, company (8) 6,8,10;66:4,23;67:10 46:18;58:13,14;82:9, 12,20;85:20,21 compare (1) 51:13 compelled (1) 100:10 compensatory (1) 94:14 compete (1) 22:89:9:14:9,9,14:25:3,4, competition (1) 9,17,17,24;32:18; 21:14 46:20;51:20;64:1;65:8; compiled (1) 70:17;75:13;78:19,21; 50:16 complains (1) 99:2 21:4,12,13,24;24:12, complaint (8) 12,15;56:25;80:14; 11:22,22;40:9;80:4; 81:8;82:7,13;83:17 88:22;91:11;98:3; 100:18 complete (22) 12:22;13:21;14:24; 33:9;34:22,24;36:23; 37:3,5,14,24;38:8,10; 4:2;11:13;17:7;20:3; 42:20;65:24;66:2; 70:17;82:20;86:1;88:4; 90:10:99:23 completed (8) 24:24:30:1:38:11.16; 45:24;66:4;70:19; 79:17 completely (1) 78:22 completion (1) 65:4 compliance (1) 34:25 29:20,20;55:14,16; comply (5) 22:11;64:15,16;65:2; commencement (1) 88:23 component (1)

Resol is filter national flore	-
91:23	,
con (1)	
73:5 concede (1)	•
87:2	,
conceivable (1) 35:14	
concern (7)	
5:6;42:5,7,10,12,14;	,
96:16 concerned (2)	,
16:2;90:12	
<b>concerns (4)</b> 88:7,8;95:1;96:4	
conclude (1)	
95:23 concluding (1)	•
22:1	,
conclusion (1) 53:9	
condition (2)	'
10:13;83:16	,
conditional (1) 45:19	,
conditions (4)	
40:24;41:9;84:13,14 conduct (7)	•
29:1;37:9,25;63:12;	,
67:22;72:23;75:16 conference (3)	
19:19;89:21;92:1	'
confess (2) 72:16:08:1	,
72:16;98:1 confidential (1)	
71:2	,
<b>confidentiality (2)</b> 71:3,5	,
confirm (1)	
10:21 <b>confirmation (1)</b>	'
91:12	,
<b>confirmed (2)</b> 90:9;91:15	,
conflicts (1)	
13:6 connection (2)	•
25:1;26:2	,
<b>consented (3)</b> 4:8;19:24,25	
consequent (2)	,
95:21;96:14 consequential (1)	
94:20	
<b>consider (3)</b> 20:15;92:10;93:7	,
consideration (2)	
42:25;100:10	
<b>considered (2)</b> 14:14;34:24	•
considering (1)	
68:24 consistent (3)	•
14:15;35:13;84:20	,

consistently (1) 10:1 constituents (1) 21:2 constitute (1) 97:1 constitutes (2) 41:25:45:1 constraints (2) 67:2:68:20 construction (4) 13:4;75:21;86:13; 99:15 constructive (1) 92:2 construed (1) 86:7 consummated (2) 64:23;93:19 consummating (1) 83:1 contact (1) 88:16 contacted (1) 91:25 contain (1) 10:17 contained (1) 24:5 contains (2) 22:14:84:14 contemplated (6) 38:5:49:17:64:22: 65:15:69:18.19 contemplates (1) 40:11 contemplating (4) 37:15,16;38:19,21 contemplation (2) 35:14:65:2 contemplations (1) 35:12 content (3) 7:18;8:12;18:17 contents (1) 22:21 contested (5) 80:7;82:1;86:25; 88:16;92:13 contingent (1) 66:21 continuation (3) 95:22:96:20:97:8 continue (8) 30:5;48:11;49:20; 65:22;72:2;96:9,22; 99:21 continued (6) 42:12;82:17;87:18; 95:19:96:23,25 continues (1) 27:11 continuing (1)

90:7 contract (79) 8:22,25;9:23;18:10; 22:12,13,19,25;23:3, 14;24:23;25:18;28:24; 29:4.5:30:12.13.14.15: 31:10;33:6;37:11;38:9, 15;39:19;40:6;44:23; 46:2,23;51:25;53:16; 55:7;61:18;63:15,17; 64:1,2,6,7,18;65:7,20; 68:16:69:3,10;71:7; 72:4,25;73:7,10,14; 75:21,22,23;78:8,11, 15,18,23;79:10;86:7, 11;87:15;91:3;93:2,8, 12;94:16;95:6,24;96:2; 98:4,5,7,14,25;99:1,3, 19 contracted (1) 30:24 Contracts (10) 7:9,19;8:14;29:12; 51:10;52:4;53:13; 63:20;64:12;78:12 contract's (1) 64:9 contractual (2) 70:24;87:20 contributes (1) 101:7 Control (6) 16:5:18:16:42:23: 74:7.12:84:18 controversy (1) 96:25 convene (1) 3:11 convenience (2) 67:20,21 convention (2) 6:2:101:2 conversation (3) 42:6;89:5,10 conversations (1) 58:7 conveyed (1) 88:7 conviction (1) 69:1 convince (1) 63:3 **COO**(4) 56:12,13;62:19; 76:15 cooperating (3) 69:16;70:25;88:24 cooperation (4) 40:12;71:9;75:15; 86:12 copies (2) 5:19;90:21 **copy** (7)

10:16,16:50:11,13; 87:8:90:18:100:15 core (1) 60:1 corporate (2) 47:13:83:7 corrected (2) 11:19:32:2 correctly (2) 3:14:93:1 correlate (1) 40:20 correspond (2) 73:12:99:7 corresponding (2) 98:12;100:1 costs (2) 46:7;86:15 Counsel (48) 3:19;5:18,20;7:17, 25;8:15;9:25;23:6; 39:6,6,7,8,15,24,25; 40:8;45:15;47:13; 48:10;54:12;55:12; 66:14;76:25;78:4; 79:24;83:8;84:5,10,22; 89:6;90:4,10;91:12,18, 25,25;92:12,12,17,25; 95:8,15;97:14;100:14, 15,19,24;101:11 counsels' (4) 20:10:83:14:99:13. 18 count (1) 54:7 countermanded (1) 97:9 country (1) 52:10 County (1) 66:16 couple (3) 62:18;97:24;98:2 course (7) 5:18;15:23;85:5; 92:10,17;95:11;100:22 **COURT** (211) 3:3,7,9,17;4:5,10,15, 18,23;5:3,5,6,9,17; 6:15,18,22;7:2,11,15; 8:11,21;9:24;10:23; 11:2.15.17:12:16.19. 22;13:15,18;14:13,22; 16:10,19,20;17:3,7,9, 14,17;18:3,13,18,21; 19:1,21;20:2,13;23:24, 25;24:2,25;25:8,10,12; 26:16;27:3,5;28:18; 31:2,7,15,18,20,23; 32:2,4,6,9,12,15,17,23, 25;33:2,5,13,15,18,20, 23;34:12,17;35:21; 36:5,8,11,24;37:19,22; CURTIN (52)

38:2,24:39:20,22:40:7, 16:41:20:42:17:43:25: 44:19:45:5,12,15,18; 46:3:47:1.4.10.17.21: 48:5,8,10,14,17,20,23, 25;49:3,10;50:2,21,24; 52:5,13,17,23;53:3,7,8, 14:54:8.21:55:4.8: 56:4,6,22;63:15,23; 65:7,16:66:8,11,13,25; 67:14,17;68:4,10,15, 15;69:15,17,23,25; 70:4,20;71:4,11,19,21, 23;72:8,11,15,25;73:5, 7,23;74:1,4,16,20; 75:20,25;76:3,10,23, 25;77:8,12,14,18;79:3, 5,22,24;80:10;84:10, 25;87:9;92:10,12,14; 93:6,6,10,25;97:12,18; 98:1,10,23,25;99:13; 101:13.16.17 courtroom (2) 94:12:101:4 courts (1) 81:25 Court's (11) 14:1;15:19;20:16; 50:15;83:25;87:17; 95:9;97:14,21;99:13; 100:9 covenant (1) 10:10cover (1) 67:9 covers (1) 8:15 cramp (1) 19:5 created (1) 26:10 credentials (1) 94:11 credible (1) 39:3 credits (1) 45:7 criminal (1) 81:20 criteria (1) 92:15 criterion (1) 100:8 critical (5) 22:5,6;30:17;43:14; 83:21 Crowe (3) 12:11;92:15;100:8 currently (2) 14:12:29:9 CURTAIN (2) 6:23;16:20

3:5,15,24,25,25;4:7, 24.25:6:7:8:10.19: 9:20;11:4,6,18;12:24; 13:22:16:21:17:10.18: 18:19;19:4;20:3,6,14; 24:1,9;25:9,11,13;27:4, 6;28:20;31:5;48:9,12; 49:1:50:8,22:51:1.5; 52:8,13,14,22,25;53:8; 55:10:56:18:76:24; 79:23;100:11 customer (1) 21:23 customers (1) 58:14 D Daily (1) 62:12 damages (3) 94:9,14,20 **Dan** (1) 4:9 data (1) 58:1 date (76) 14:9,14:15:2,18; 24:23;25:3,4,17,17,23, 24:26:3,9,11,12,13,13, 15.22.23:32:18:33:11. 12,25;34:7;35:15,18; 37:18:39:11.12.14: 40:2:41:11.12.18: 42:21;46:19,20;50:18; 51:20;54:2,17;55:4,5; 64:7.8,10,24:65:3.8,10: 71:13,16;72:1;78:14, 20,21;83:19;84:9,16; 85:5:86:2.3.9.15: 90:12;91:17,20;92:1; 99:5,5,6,7,9,9;100:1 dated (2) 20:11;88:8 dates (10) 33:6,6,16,21;37:12; 38:20;53:3;54:1;80:6; 95:6 day (23) 19:21:21:18:24:24; 25:18;29:24;31:20; 32:12:36:19:54:8.9.23: 55:2:61:9:68:5:84:7. 12;89:20,25;90:11,14, 19;91:24;98:3 days (31) 22:17;25:8,10,12,13, 20;31:24,25;32:4,7,17, 19,20,21;33:3;36:22; 37:2,21;38:10;61:22; 66:5;71:14,18;75:10; 85:2,18;88:5;89:7; 90:8;91:1;92:3

deadline (4) definite (1) 35:16:89:19:91:14: 15:21 98:20 deal (16) 64:25 45:5;46:18;55:21; definitive (1) 58:8;61:18;63:12,14; 84:3 72:23;74:14,15;76:2, **DEG** (4) 12,13;77:15;94:20,20 dealing (4) 87:25 23:8:30:11:38:7: DeGioia (3) 87:19 deals (1) degree (5) 49:8 December (17) 31:18:32:13:46:9.12; **DEG's** (1) 54:16,24;55:16,17; 88:1 68:18,19;72:6,17,18; delay (4) 78:2;84:4,7;98:15 decide (1) 88:20 76:8 delays (2) decided (1) 44:1,9 67:23 delegate (1) decides (2) 6:11 62:2;76:18 decision (7) 74:17 8:6;12:9;42:1,22; 79:8;95:13;97:15 deem (7) 34:21;36:22;37:2,4, 18:2 5,23;99:24 deemed (5) 42:20:65:23:88:4: 99:21 90:10:99:22 depicts (1) deeming (2) 20:2233:8;35:11 deems (1) 36:17 53:20 despite (3) defendant (6) 28:5;80:12;89:11; 92:3:95:21:99:16 defendants (27) 4:1,14:7:6:42:2: 96:24 43:7;69:12;70:23;71:7; detail (1) 76:23;83:4,15;86:12, 84:23 21;87:21;88:23;89:13; detailed (1) 98:24 90:5,7,21,21;91:1,6; 93:22;94:19;96:8,22; details (1) 97:11 91:19 defendants' (7) 65:17,19;80:4;81:25; 88:7:89:5:91:9 defendant's (1) 36:7 defense (10) 100:9 31:8;48:8;81:12,13; 82:22;83:24;91:12,25; 26:699:17;100:19 deficits (1) 97:10 82:25 defined (1) 97:1 25:3 develop (1) defines (2) 59:3 70:6:84:9

definition (1) 27:11:86:23,24; 12:11;92:15;100:8 12:12;39:20;40:12; 44:21;87:12 21:19;42:24;69:2; deliberately (1) demonstrative (4) 50:10,18;51:8,14 dependable (1) depending (5) 39:2:65:22:70:1.4: described (1) 23:19;61:10;79:10 destination (3) 59:22,22:60:3 destruction (1) determination (11) 9:12;15:12;18:23; 34:7.19.24:38:6.19: 39:13:61:4:93:9 determinative (1) determine (1) detriment (1) devastating (1) developing (1)

19:6 development (1) 42:12 devoted (1) 79:19 **DGA (2)** 61:13:62:1 DGE (29) 31:24;33:8,25;35:9, 11,15;39:1;42:6,22; 53:20;62:2;63:4;65:5; 71:13,24;73:19;76:8; 87:6;88:3,11,16;89:14, 17:90:5.9:91:19:92:1; 96:5;99:24 **DGE's** (1) 91:13 dictionary (3) 70:1,4,6 different (6) 53:18,18,19:60:25; 69:5:73:3 difficult (3) 84:24;94:10;97:11 difficulty (3) 69:9;93:10;98:9 Digital (1) 3:1 diligence (2) 82:16:87:19 dinner (2) 6:8.9 direct (1) 8:25 directed (1) 16:20 Director (1) 90:5 disagreement (1) 43:19 disclosing (1) 42:11 disclosure (2) 21:9;70:21 discussed (2) 84:5;92:12 discussing (2) 9:3;54:11 discussion (5) 20:8;81:1;84:24; 90:17,17 discussions (2) 6:19,22 disingenuous (1) 67:22 disorderly (1) 69:1 displayed (1) 13:13 dispositive (5) 7:19;8:6;19:11;87:9; 100:20 dispute (3)

23:13:93:5:95:8 disregard (1) 18:4 disrespectful (1) 67:4 dissolve (3) 18:24:30:22:100:11 distribution (1) 85:17 **Division (8)** 16:16;34:20,21; 36:19,21;37:20;38:12, 14 docket (1) 3:18 documents (2) 11:23;88:18 dog (2) 61:22;75:10 dollar (1) 45:22 dollars (9) 45:25;62:9,21;71:18; 72:20;75:6;76:14,15; 77:9 done (24) 18:10;22:15;34:4; 38:23;40:2,3,4,5;41:2; 43:20;44:7,10,10; 61:24;66:7;69:21;70:7, 9;72:7,12;73:21;75:17, 19:77:23 door (1) 51:3 double (1) 66:5 doubt (1) 17:9 doubts (1) 94:23 down (7) 9:5,10:47:20:51:5,6: 63:7;94:9 drafting (1) 33:5 Drasco (1) 3:23 draw (1) 53:8 drug (1) 84:4 Duane (1) 4:13 due (6) 5:18;75:15;82:15; 87:19;98:21;100:22 during (6) 14:23;16:3;29:12; 50:13;83:4;88:9 dust-up (1) 26:10 duties (1) 87:16

<b>duty (1)</b> 92:10	employees (5)			
92:10		98:1	31:18;68:16;82:10,	extremely (1)
	21:3;29:12;30:3;	Eric (2)	18;84:2,7;98:15	6:3
	62:10;75:4	3:13;12:2	execution (6)	eyes (2)
$\mathbf{E}$	encounter (1)	error (3)	50:17;71:5;84:25;	72:12;77:22
Ľ	60:20	10:21;11:20;47:2	86:20;90:22;99:4	12.12,11.22
earlier (8)	encountered (1)			F
	44:2	essence (1) 73:8	<b>exercised (1)</b> 17:19	F
11:24;19:7;24:23;				face (1)
29:8,10;84:4;87:5;	end (3)	Essentially (2)	exhaustive (1)	face (1)
88:13	42:13;62:5;77:16	24:9;99:25	98:24	100:6
ease (1)	enforce (4)	establishes (1)	Exhibit (4)	faced (2)
101:18	22:12,13;30:14,15	25:23	88:21;91:11;92:6,7	81:17,22
easy (1)	enforceable (1)	estate (2)	exhibits (1)	faces (1)
59:1	30:13	66:17;92:21	11:23	94:24
economic (2)	engaging (1)	estoppel (1)	existing (1)	facility (1)
21:15;94:13	72:16	73:6	87:14	86:13
economically (1)	enjoy (3)	et (1)	expect (3)	facing (1)
46:10	73:13;100:6;101:10	3:18	42:17;57:16,19	98:15
economics (1)	enjoyed (1)	Eve (1)	expected (1)	fact (19)
15:20	99:10	33:9	30:25	4:22;6:6;12:19;14:6;
education (1)	enjoys (3)	Even (18)	expeditious (3)	16:13;23:24;26:1;27:9;
59:15	94:6;97:5,6	13:15,15,18;27:11;	83:1,2;84:21	29:3;36:25;37:17;
effect (6)	enough (4)	34:25;37:23;38:25;	expenses (2)	44:11;46:4;53:5;61:12;
7:21;66:4;75:4;86:8;	26:25;32:14;34:9;	51:7,11,13,13;55:24;	46:15;86:15	66:15;86:25;94:23;
99:25;100:12	50:8	58:20;62:25;68:24;	experience (4)	95:5
effective (1)	enter (3)	75:25;76:3;100:2	14:6,13,18;18:12	facts (2)
84:17	30:15,23;80:9	event (8)	experienced (6)	92:8,11
effectively (1)	entered (4)	7:2;9:24;10:23;	23:6;39:9,10,24,25;	factual (4)
95:1	5:22;22:3;30:14,23	17:17,18;41:14;85:8;	83:7	4:21;17:1;95:10,11
effort (2)	entering (1)	87:2	expert (3)	factually (1)
61:8;92:2	80:23	events (4)	16:14;18:9;88:5	80:7
efforts (3)	Entertainment (1)	22:16;24:4;42:12;	experts (3)	fail (1)
40:19;41:1;88:25	82:8	88:15	17:4,21;63:21	61:21
eGaming (1)	entire (1)	Everybody (10)	expiration (1)	fails (1)
93:20	85:3	29:20;52:6;55:17;	85:2	35:5
Eisenstein (5)	entirely (1)	61:2,2;64:15;70:16,18;	expired (1)	failure (2)
3:22;54:6,18,22;55:5	87:10	72:6;76:25	15:5	10:13;34:21
either (10)	entirety (1)	Everybody's (1)	explanation (1)	fair (1)
11:13,15;26:20,22;	95:12	64:1	69:11	87:19
35:16;59:1;73:8;83:20;	entities (3)	everyone (5)	express (1)	fairly (2)
97:18;100:20	39:2;82:6;94:2	3:3;5:18;39:3;48:20;	96:4	38:23;86:7
elements (1)	entitle (1)	100:22	expressed (2)	fairness (2)
58:5	92:24	evidence (5)	81:6;82:23	20:2;77:9
eleven (1)	entitled (1)	18:22;51:8,14,14,15	expressly (1)	faith (6)
77:16	85:20	ex (6)	46:17	54:19;63:11;71:20;
eliminate (2)	entity (8)	16:22;19:16,17,23;	expunged (1)	87:19;90:25;91:5
22:2;30:17	28:11;80:12,22;81:7;	20:1;21:21	69:1	familiar (3)
elongated (2)	82:7;85:11;89:12;	exactly (3)	extend (2)	52:23;66:20;93:15
38:5,19	93:25	47:15;51:22;74:12	19:3;91:17	familiarity (1)
else (7)	enure (2)	example (4)	extending (1)	44:22
8:18;34:10;48:8;	97:8,18	13:7;70:14;81:22;	100:1	family (2)
50:9;52:7,20;75:9	envision (1)	98:13	extension (6)	59:21;60:2
else's (1)	8:2	except (1)	65:25;71:16;72:1;	far (4)
26:14	Equal (2)	51:15	77:25;78:5,6	69:5,5;72:2;90:12
email (3)	79:3;85:19	exclusion (1)	extensions (1)	Farr (2)
24:5,6;40:21	equipoise (1)	59:12	96:3	4:8;55:12
emailed (4)	97:19	exclusive (1)	extent (11)	fascinating (1)
	equitable (4)	24:11	8:8;11:12;52:17;	69:7
91:10,15,21;92:2	73:13;96:6;97:25;	excuse (7)	68:7;81:20;87:18;	fashion (2)
	, , ,	12:13;20:19;25:11;	92:11;93:1,2;94:3,5	85:12;100:23
91:10,15,21;92:2 emails (1) 95:7	98:11	12.13,20.19,23.11.	J2.11,JJ.1,2.JT.J.J	03:12:100:25
emails (1) 95:7				
emails (1) 95:7 emerged (1)	equities (6)	28:5,10;82:9;90:13	extraneous (1)	favor (1)
emails (1) 95:7				

(108) duty - February

Resorts International Hol	dings, LLC, et als			May 17, 2013
98:15	4.6.5.1 11 21.7.4.	forth (8)	50.12.61.9.62.0.	4.21.5.1.16.25.20.1.
	4:6;5:1,11,21;7:4;		59:13;61:8;62:9;	4:21;5:1;16:25;39:1;
fee (2)	11:5,18;16:21;17:22,	10:11,13;24:19,23;	74:25	40:1,16;44:5,19;45:8;
85:8;98:18	22;19:2;20:2;31:9;	25:6;37:4;61:14;84:13	funds (1)	67:3;71:3;76:8;78:12,
feel (3)	33:8;36:7;44:1;51:9;	fortuitous (1)	56:8	24;79:14;99:15
23:15,15;93:5	56:10;57:20;68:23;	6:3	furnished (1)	glaring (1)
feeling (1)	72:14;85:1;88:19;93:3;	forty (1)	56:3	51:17
27:1	94:21;99:4	62:20	further (5)	glean (1)
feet (2)	fit (1)	forward (4)	40:9;56:8;79:5,6;	51:17
20:4;43:2	37:14	7:20;12:8;18:25;	85:17	goes (7)
few (1)	five (4)	29:24	Furthermore (1)	7:20;18:14;35:4;
5:20	52:1;57:22;62:13;	found (1)	85:11	54:16;55:6;62:17;66:4
fiduciary (1)	64:9	91:22	future (4)	going-forward (1)
29:16	fixed (3)	founder (1)	57:1,7;89:8;101:14	30:23
field (1)	25:17,18;41:12	81:4	a	Good (20)
23:6	flip (2)	four (7)	G	3:4,5,6,24;4:12;6:14;
figure (4)	10:7,15	7:23;19:8;45:22;		27:1;28:1;30:25;48:22,
47:15,25;52:1,6	floats (1)	62:7;99:11;100:16,16	Gallagher (1)	25;54:19;55:10;58:8;
file (4)	25:17	four-prong (2)	4:9	60:15;63:5;71:20;
31:23;38:11,16;	floor (1)	12:7;92:14	gamble (1)	87:18;90:25;91:4
100:20	55:8	fourth (1)	59:1	government (2)
filed (9)	flowers (1)	100:8	gambling (2)	81:12,16
4:21;5:18,19;11:25;	43:17	frame (7)	59:3,22	governmental (1)
51:10;54:19;87:6;	focus (1)	35:7;36:17;37:10,14;	game (1)	88:25
100:15,18	20:15	38:23;45:8;79:15	55:15	governor (2)
filing (17)	focused (1)	frames (5)	gamers (1)	59:5;68:8
21:20;32:6;33:8,9;	53:3	35:25;36:15,16;53:4,	59:11	Governors (1)
34:1;35:11,15;37:13;	focusing (1)	4	gaming (37)	6:12
41:21,25;42:19;54:3;	49:13	Frank (1)	9:12,13,14,17;21:12,	governor's (1)
55:18;85:1;86:20;	folks (1)	12:1	17;29:19,22,25;34:11;	60:5
87:22;99:5	29:4	fraud (1)	39:9;43:10,12,21;49:7,	graciously (1)
filings (2)	follow (5)	23:12	12;50:1;57:2,9,14;	4:7
35:2,6	20:18;45:3;50:2;	Frawley (3)	58:5,6,13,23;59:7,14,	gradual (1)
filling (1)	67:11;68:12	56:14;60:14;91:19	25,25;80:13,18,24;	42:15
33:20	followed (1)	Frawley's (2)	83:18;84:6;87:4;93:14;	Graham (1)
final (4)	10:3	56:19;60:15	94:4;97:4	3:25
9:12;53:21;82:16;	following (1)	free (2)	gather (11)	granting (1)
100:8	84:12	7:1,25	4:16;9:2;18:13;	50:17
finally (2)	follows (2)	frequently (1)	40:10;41:22;44:23;	great (3)
15:14;16:7	3:2;48:19	15:24	67:2;73:23;74:4;	57:10;58:14;63:1
financial (4)	footing (1)	Friday (4)	101:10,19	greater (1)
75:4;83:16;92:22;	79:3	19:25;32:25;54:24;	gave (9)	69:6
96:9	forced (2)	90:14	6:25;26:18,20;28:4,	greatness (1)
financially (1)	65:21;99:20	friend (1)	6,7,8;50:11;51:11	6:16
93:23	foregoing (1)	55:10	geared (1)	greed (2)
find (11)	96:24	fringe (1)	29:21	67:21;76:22
17:4;29:14;34:10;	foresight (1)	72:3	general (5)	Group (4)
39:3;40:4;63:22;94:24;	57:8	fugitives (1)	53:15;68:22;86:4;	3:11,12,21,21
97:17;98:12;100:4,5	forever (2)	81:24	90:24;98:23	guaranteed (1)
finding (1)	65:22;99:21	fulfilling (1)	genuine (1)	85:13
93:10	forget (2)	21:1	95:4	guess (4)
findings (4)	61:23:62:15	full (9)	gets (2)	52:2,16;62:1;63:23
7:21;80:9;95:10,11	form (4)	16:3;21:9;22:21;	75:2;77:1	guys (14)
fine (3)	7:7;64:1;74:5;88:18	36:22;37:2,12,21;44:1;	giant (1)	52:12;61:24,25;
11:2,17;70:15	formal (2)	79:14	72:3	62:23,25;63:1,4,5,6;
finished (1)	36:12;72:1	fully (5)	Gil (2)	64:15;68:3;75:18;76:7,
61:16	formally (1)	45:24;81:19;88:23;	4:13,15	20
firm (3)	71:16	91:7,8	Gilbert (1)	
3:23;4:13;52:12	format (1)	fund (7)	12:2	Н
firms (1)	25:19	46:13;59:14;66:22,	girls (2)	
39:10	formed (1)	22;76:14;82:15,25	45:13;46:4	habit (1)
firm's (2)	82:9	funded (1)	<b>give- (1)</b>	7:16
60:18,19	62.9 former (3)	75:5	23:1	hac (2)
<b>first (26)</b>	12:23;62:14;66:16	<b>funding (4)</b>	<b>given (16)</b>	4:3;5:15
111 St ( <b>2</b> 0 <i>)</i>	12.23,02.14,00.10	Tullullig (4)	given (10)	4.5,5.15

Ha-ha(2)61:24:73:21 Ha-ha-ha (1) 62:23 half (1) 101:5 hand (3) 61:20;70:10;98:24 hand-(1)50:12 handle (1) 54:1 handling (1) 39:12 hap (1) 73:16 happen (5) 56:23;61:5;73:17; 74:14;75:9 happened (3) 28:17;62:18;72:9 happening (3) 22:9;74:3,18 happens (4) 52:2;74:12;75:13; 77:25 happy (2) 11:4;54:10 hard (1) 64:11 hardship (2) 95:18.20 harm (7)43:7:92:16:94:25: 95:20;96:14,23;97:16 harmful (1) 21:19 harmonized (1) 78:12 hat (1) 26:12 head (1) 21:25 hear (11) 8:10;11:4;19:5;24:3; 35:22;40:10;42:17; 43:1;44:22;54:13; 100:22 heard (7) 55:9,11;58:6;62:19; 76:23;82:9;95:15 hearing (7) 18:3;19:19;37:9; 38:1;44:11;60:5,7 heck (1) 62:23 help (3) 20:20;43:20;57:10 helped (2) 21:15:57:10 helpful (1) 20:20 helps (1)

53:24 hereby (3) 64:22;65:15,15 herein (3) 34:22;41:9;65:15 hereinafter (1) 82:8 hereof (2) 10:14;40:24 here's (3) 53:11,14;70:20 hereto (1) 40:25 hey (4) 61:23;63:9;68:1; 75:19 highly (2) 67:1;96:18 himself (1) 4:22 hindsight (1) 72:15 hired (1) 80:16 history (8) 39:1;40:1;44:5,20, 22;45:8;67:5;68:20 Holdings (3) 3:12,13,21 holiday (2) 54:6,25 home (1) 67:8 Honor (77) 3:5,16,24;4:11,12,17, 19;5:16;6:6,22,24; 7:10;8:19,20;9:21; 10:19;11:19;12:24,25; 16:9;19:15;22:5,9,24; 30:8:31:11,17:32:1,21, 22;34:4,16;35:20,24; 36:14:38:18:39:5.7.15, 17,18,23;40:15;41:7, 19;42:3;43:23;44:14; 45:4,17;46:18,23,23; 47:12;48:4,9;49:4,14, 15,17;50:7;51:2;52:11; 53:12;54:5,15,18;55:9; 63:18;67:13;77:2,6; 78:7;79:7,23;101:12, 15 Honor's (1) 20:10 hope (8) 14:2;18:21;24:22; 52:19,20;66:8,11,14 hopefully (1) 11:19 hoping (1) 91:22 hotel (1) 55:24 hour (1)

48:15 hours (2) 98:2;101:5 house (6) 43:16,17;64:1,6,10; 70:5 huge (2) 77:20,21 Hurley (2) 7:24;12:2 Hurricane (2) 55:23,25 Ι ICA (23) 15:9;24:13;33:8; 34:4,23;37:1;38:6,19, 21;42:19;45:2;50:17; 61:5;84:17;86:21;87:7; 89:2;90:6,8,10;96:1, 17;99:9 identifiable (1) 97:17 IGaming (7) 27:3,5;31:21;43:6,8; 94:4:96:13 ignore (1) 18:7 illegal (1) 27:25 illusory (1) 96:21 illustrative (1) 53:5 imagine (1) 84:25 immeasurably (1) 93:12 immediate (3) 92:16:94:25:97:16 immediately (2) 19:18:54:20 immoral (1) 27:25 impact (1) 20:17 impassioned (1) 55:13 impending (1) 83:18 imperiled (1) 57:1 implemented (1) 57:4 impliedly (1) 91:4 import (1) 22:21 important (9) 18:8;20:9;29:9;41:7: 43:15,18;46:2;72:4; 75:22

importantly (2) 28:7:83:4 imposed (1) 35:8 imposition (1) 20:17 impossible (1) 94:10 impression (1) 88:11 improve (1) 76:17 inaction (1) 42:1 inappropriate (1) 27:25 inclination (2) 4:23,25 inclined (2) 36:11;77:15 include (2) 14:9.20 included (6) 14:22;28:14,15;93:2, 22.24 includes (1) 57:23 including (6) 11:24;15:18;21:2; 34:23;35:2;88:24 inclusion (4) 25:23:26:3:27:19: 92:18 incomplete (4) 34:20:35:12:83:21; 99:24 inconsistencies (1) 51:18 inconsistent (2) 15:7:78:22 incorporate (2) 84:23:95:10 **Incorporated** (2) 3:12;85:24 incorrect (2) 20:1;40:13 indecision (1) 42:1 independent (1) 93:9 independently (1) 89:14 Index (1) 3:1 indicate (1) 19:7 indicated (7) 25:25;87:1;88:22; 89:13,19;90:16;97:24 indicates (1) 89:2 indication (3) 89:22,23;90:2

May 17, 2013

individual (1) 18:5 individuals (1) 74:20 indulge (1) 8:24 industry (4) 15:21:18:12:58:6; 67:1 inevitable (4) 44:3,5,16,16 inform (1) 17:3 information (30) 5:4;11:7;12:8;13:13; 14:1;15:15;17:1,3; 18:1;24:18;35:2;38:12, 14;41:21;42:5,8,10,11; 50:16;71:1;86:24;88:1, 17,19;89:6,18;90:18, 20;91:9,14 informative (1) 18:20 informed (1) 12:15 infused (1) 55:21 initial (6) 5:22;35:11;36:18; 37:13:79:8:80:25 initially (1) 37:13 iniunction (3) 23:20.21:30:23 injunctive (1) 92:25 inquire (2) 5:5;89:15 inquiry (2) 26:6;27:11 inside (1) 86:13 insidious (1) 63:11 instability (1) 96:10 installation (1) 6:9 instance (2) 88:19;94:22 instant (1) 15:17 instinct (2) 69:1;94:17 intend (1) 38:17 intended (2) 50:6;97:20 intent (3) 38:4,6:79:14 intention (3) 5:24;89:23,24 intentionally (1)

#### **Rational Group Resorts Internati**

Rational Group US Holdi Resorts International Hol		
33:6	17:19	67:25;76:11,20;77:6
intentions (1)	irrelevant (1)	Kennerman (1)
79:12	7:13	70:5
interceding (1)	irreparable (2)	<b>kept (2)</b>
42:24	92:16;94:25	55:22;86:8
<b>interest (12)</b>	irrevocably (1)	<b>kind (2)</b>
13:7;14:20;29:19;	85:13	13:2;63:25
53:16;74:21,24;75:8;	Irwin (1)	knee-jerk (1)
81:6;93:22;94:6;95:2;	3:17	68:22
96:6	Isai (1)	<b>knew (12)</b>
interested (2)	44:11	34:5,6,6;39:4;60:25;
80:12,23	issuance (4)	61:2,3;70:16,18;72:6,
interesting (5)	11:10;14:10;24:13;	17,18
8:4;19:10;41:24;	99:8	knowing (4)
91:23;93:3	<b>issue (23)</b>	22:21,22;67:9;72:20
interests (14)	9:13;11:14;24:7,25;	knowledge (3)
13:11;14:8;15:7,13,	29:1;37:7,8,9,21,24;	17:5,6;30:9
16,25;18:17;29:18;	58:16;59:7,7;61:5;	known (1)
74:9;81:5;82:11;92:22;	63:25;81:11;88:5,6,12;	82:7
93:11;96:15	96:1;97:7,15;100:6	knows (1)
Interim (3)	issued (1)	29:20
14:10;72:10;84:17	37:25	Kozusko (2)
International (2)	issues (10)	4:9;5:14
3:13;80:22 internet (5)	5:5;11:10,13;12:16, 17;30:21;37:6;72:3;	L
57:2,9,14;58:13,22 interpretation (1)	81:16;95:4	lack (3)
50:2 interrupt (1) 23:25	J Jersey (26)	40:12;46:19;98:21 landlords (1) 30:4
<b>intervene (1)</b>	6:1,2,11;15:21;	<b>language (18)</b>
87:7	21:18;26:8,25;27:17;	9:6;10:6;24:5;40:10,
intervention (1)	52:11;57:9;61:7;62:11,	11;49:5,14,15,22;
87:22	14;66:16;67:1;73:19;	63:15;65:8;73:14;
interview (2)	78:10,25;80:17;84:5;	78:23;81:11;90:24;
56:20;58:20	93:13,14,18,20;94:4;	91:4;93:2;100:13
interviews (1)	97:4	large (3)
61:14	Jerseyans (1)	12:12;39:10;81:15
into (16)	58:22	largely (1)
8:17;13:5;21:25;	Jersey's (1)	82:23
30:14,15;54:5;56:9;	94:7	largest (1)
59:14,21;61:2;62:11;	<b>job (2)</b>	58:12
66:15;69:3;70:7;76:15;	23:4;62:17	last (11)
84:4	jobs (1)	6:1,8;16:23;21:21,
introduce (2)	55:19	24;22:17;55:16,17;
4:2;13:2	Judge (23)	59:19;67:23;101:2
<b>introductory (3)</b>	4:25;11:6;13:1,12,	lastly (1)
9:4,6;10:6	12,22;16:17;20:6;23:9;	97:22
<b>invest (1)</b>	24:17;25:14;28:8;31:6;	late (3)
57:24	40:6;48:13;49:2;50:8;	7:5;43:23,23
<b>investment (7)</b>	52:22;53:1;62:14;	lately (1)
57:15,18;58:2;60:8,	66:16;76:24;93:4	58:7
10;62:19;69:4	judgment (3)	later (8)
<b>involved (6)</b>	23:23;58:16;59:17	19:21;32:17;64:9;
16:18;23:7;28:10,11;	July (3)	71:21;78:20;84:12;
74:20;75:8	60:21;65:5;88:12	90:8;91:1
involves (2)	June (2)	latter (1)
92:20;93:12 <b>involving (3)</b> 14:7 10:27:17	88:13;90:8	94:22 Laughter (1)
14:7,19;27:17 Ira (1) 81:1	к keep (7)	6:20 launch (1) 97:3
Irishman (1)	59:10;61:21;63:8;	law (11)
Min-U-Script®	CB Tr	ialscript Service (609-653

37:17,18;39:10; 64:16.18:65:11:78:11. 25;87:17;99:5,10 lawful (1) 94:4 lawfully (1) 94:7 lawmakers (1) 57:8 laws (1) 41:4 lawsuit (1) 21:20 lawyer (4) 9:22;54:9;66:17; 67:7 lawyers (5) 22:20;27:21;51:24; 52:3,11 lay (1) 56:1 lead-in (1) 41:8 leading (2) 93:25;94:1 learns (1) 80:10 least (17) 4:3;7:18;8:15;9:20, 22;10:16;18:9;23:9,17; 42:21;74:21;81:18; 82:21:89:24:90:12: 92:8:93:3 left (2) 6:5;10:1 legal (7) 13:9;61:1;70:13; 81:10,16;82:23;98:19 legalize (1) 84:6 legalized (2) 21:17:96:13 legally (1) 99:16 legislation (2) 68:18;80:17 Legislature (1) 74:5 length (1) 50:16 lengthy (1) 73:11 less (5) 34:5;36:12;61:17; 77:14,15 letter (8) 24:4;40:18,21;41:6; 69:20;88:8,20;92:7 level (1) 66:6 license (10) 24:16;51:19;54:19; 62:1,12;63:13;65:4;

May 17, 2013

68:3,24:76:9 licensed (3) 43:9;76:6;83:24 licenses (4) 15:25;93:13,17;94:8 licensing (4) 26:7;42:14;61:15; 86:6 licensure (1) 92:21 likelihood (5) 24:20;96:16;97:23; 100:7,17 likely (4) 10:2;71:14;89:3; 97:16 limit (2) 14:23;27:19 Limited (11) 3:12,21;23:22;27:10; 35:2;82:8;93:13,17; 94:7;95:12;100:5 limits (1) 23:21 line (14) 35:14;43:20;44:19, 24;54:10,15;57:12; 79:9;80:6,8;84:22,25; 93:21;95:6 lines (2) 47:8,19 list (1) 59:12 listened (1) 62:14 listening (1) 24:8little (8) 19:7;24:20;48:14; 51:12:58:11:59:15; 60:2;67:5 live (1) 29:5 LLC (1) 3:13 lobby (1) 80:16 logic (1) 64:12 long (6) 5:21:15:2:38:22: 43:1;50:15;79:15 longer (2) 86:1;100:2 long-term (1) 97:16 look (13) 12:16;24:25;28:23; 35:25;37:11;50:23; 51:7,11;58:17;59:8; 60:8,22,24 looking (2) 36:15;49:6

	lulligs, LLC, et als		[	Wiay 17, 2013
lose (4)	20:19;24:4,5;40:18;	meeting (2)	mix (1)	59:19;63:22;79:22;
63:14;76:6,9;94:15	80:19;81:1,8,9,14,18,	90:6;91:20	42:4	83:12
	22;83:8,14;86:22,23;	membership (2)	42.4 Mmhmm (1)	Mundiya (51)
losing (1)				
98:16	87:24;88:2,7,10,20;	82:11;83:5	36:24	4:9,11;5:14;10:19,
loss (1)	89:7,25	memorialized (1)	model (1)	25;31:11,17,19,22,25;
44:25	Matejevich's (3)	86:5	94:13	32:3,5,8,10,14,16,19,
losses (2)	20:11;43:4;88:11	merely (1)	modification (1)	24;33:1,3,10,14,17,19,
45:6;67:10	mater (1)	15:10	35:17	22;34:3;39:21,23;
lost (4)	70:8	merit (1)	modified (1)	40:15,22;42:3;43:3;
55:19;68:15;74:7,12	materia (2)	97:5	73:8	44:4;45:4,11,14,16;
lot (6)	79:1,10	merits (2)	modify (1)	46:1;47:2,6,12,18,23;
38:1;43:11;44:8;	material (2)	97:23;100:7	49:7	48:7;77:2,10,13,17,21;
59:16;61:8;79:18	92:23;95:4	mess (1)	moment (9)	79:2;101:15
Louis (1)	math (4)	63:3	3:10;7:18;10:24;	must (3)
12:1	31:15;33:20;50:25;	Messrs (1)	72:17;87:12;94:18;	14:24;24:25;99:10
loyal (1)	51:1	7:23	95:11;98:10;101:19	mutual (1)
58:15	mathematician (1)	met (3)	Monday (2)	77:5
Lum (1)	54:9	25:21;90:4;91:18	90:19;100:14	mutually (3)
3:23	Matich (1)	method (1)	money (20)	15:11;86:1;100:13
lunch (2)	3:15	25:6	45:6;46:8,17;61:21;	
6:7,8	matter (15)	mid-afternoon (1)	63:5,6,8,9;66:10;	Ν
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3:11;8:21;19:20;	48:15	67:25;68:12;70:3,15;	
$\mathbf{M}$	28:16;39:24;61:12;	middle (1)	72:13;75:16,19;76:6,	nah (2)
	64:18;65:11;74:22;	43:16	11,21,22	75:12;76:19
magnitude (1)	79:9;87:17;92:19;93:8;	mid-sea (1)	month (5)	name (2)
69:6	99:10:101:5	93:19	71:12,23;82:5;88:14;	3:25;13:19
maintains (1)	matters (4)	might (8)	94:12	nature (2)
96:21	5:20;6:19;8:16,23	5:4,5;36:12;44:5;	months (7)	92:21;93:7
makes (1)	maturing (1)	52:7;88:11,20;94:14	40:3;42:25;43:12;	NDA (1)
58:16	65:9	million (22)	60:21;61:17;68:16;	42:9
making (4)	May (40)	44:25;45:18,19,21,	98:21	near (2)
5:8;25:15;60:2,4	3:1;4:19;5:22;6:15,	22,25;57:20,22;62:6,8,	more (32)	77:15;101:13
Makovitch (1)	18;8:2;9:8;10:3,20,24;	9,20,23;66:22;71:17;	8:21;12:15;16:20;	necessarily (2)
20:19	11:14,20;16:8;18:18;	72:19;75:6;76:14,15;	17:5,6;18:14;22:16;	8:12;99:6
management (4)	19:13;20:11,18;23:25,	77:8,16;98:16	33:25;38:12,14;39:3;	necessary (2)
21:3;80:12,15,21	25;35:1,20;44:17;	mind (4)	45:16,25;50:4,9;57:16;	41:3,17
managerial (1)	46:25;47:18,18;49:4,	8:2;72:14;77:6;98:6	58:11,23;59:15,21;	need (16)
96:9	18;53:23;65:18;66:16,	mine (2)	60:8,9,9,10,11;76:21;	18:1;29:11,20,23;
mandates (1)	19;68:4;69:10;74:18,	12:23;73:15	82:5;85:4,4;90:24;	37:21;43:10,11;47:14,
15:24	18;86:9;92:6;94:16;	minimal (1)	95:20;98:6	19;51:8;52:19;53:9;
manner (2)	98:2;99:11	87:12	morning (2)	82:2;88:5;95:23;96:11
83:24;86:25	maybe (9)	minor (1)	13:8;100:14	needed (2)
many (6)	12:14;47:13,24;	42:25	Morris (1)	56:9;89:6
13:19;31:2;54:11;	48:11,12;63:2,3;64:14;	42.23 minute (1)	4:13	needs (5)
58:24;81:16;95:5	75:3	64:4	4.15 Morristown (1)	8:7;21:25;59:15,24;
map (1)	mean (8)	minutes (2)	4:1	71:24
53:6	47:8;53:1;57:12;	48:16;100:16	most (7)	negotiate (2)
March (25)	64:25;67:11;71:23;	misleading (1)	43:13;67:1;72:4;	41:17;78:5
24:4;40:17;41:6,23;	78:17;82:6	96:22	75:22;83:2;84:15;99:4	negotiated (28)
42:4,5;56:14,17;60:16;	meaning (6)	misnumbered (1)	motion (3)	15:10;22:19;23:1,1,
69:20,24;70:15,16;	70:12;78:12,13,16,	79:11	5:11,12,14	2;26:12,15,15;28:2;
71:12,24;75:16;87:3,3,	24;80:20	miss (1)	motive (1)	29:4,6;33:7,11,12,16,
23;88:8,14,16;89:4,7,9	means (5)	97:2	58:17	24;35:17;73:4;77:24;
marginal (1)	24:6;70:7,10;79:2;	missing (10)	move (5)	78:1,4;79:20;85:4;
42:24		9:18;47:5,21;48:1;	18:24;29:23,24;	86:11;93:19;94:16;
	98:19 meant (4)	49:5,14,15,22;79:11;	43:19;59:23	96:2;99:3
market (2)	38:17,18;49:7,8	98:20	-	
80:24;96:11	<b>measure (1)</b>	98:20 mistake (1)	<b>moved (3)</b> 19:23,25;99:10	<b>negotiation (3)</b> 44:8;68:17;83:13
<b>marketing (1)</b> 43:12	94:8	11:20		
			<b>moving (2)</b> 26:25;98:4	negotiations (4)
<b>match (1)</b> 73:15	<b>measures (1)</b> 59:9	mistaken (1) 7:7		82:5,16;83:5;84:3 neither (3)
			<b>much (10)</b> 16:25;17:3;37:17;	
Matejevich (26)	Meet (1)	mistakes (1)		8:23;15:6;52:14
3:13,15,17;12:2;	68:13	51:25	51:23;52:22;57:18;	neutral (1)

Resol to International Ho	lungs, LLC, ct als	1		111ay 17, 2015
46:11	objection (13)	3:12,21;85:12	20:3;21:15;26:19;28:8;	36:6
New (32)	4:21;5:10,13;7:5;	on- (1)	36:8;94:6;97:2	oversight (1)
5:25;6:2,11;15:21;	12:20;13:24;17:23,25;	93:20	opposed (3)	74:8
21:18;26:8,25;27:17;	18:15;19:9;36:5,6;	once (6)	58:22,24;72:3	owe (1)
42:20;52:11;55:12;	41:23	41:18;59:21;63:5,20;	opposing (1)	87:18
57:9;58:22;61:7;62:11,	objections (2)	66:3;68:8	100:14	own (3)
13;67:1;73:18;78:10,	7:22;8:8	one (31)	option (1)	53:17;98:6,23
25;80:17;84:5;86:13;	objectively (1)	8:21;10:12;13:8;	24:11	owned (1)
89:6;90:11;93:13,14,	97:17	19:21;24:21;26:24;	options (2)	81:7
18,20;94:4,7;97:4	objectives (1)	28:16;39:24;47:6;50:9,	21:6;97:3	owners (1)
Next (14)	84:21	13;52:10,12;59:5;	oral (3)	21:3
10:5;38:24;57:22;	obligated (1)	61:20;63:18;67:23;	7:20;8:17;97:24	ownership (2)
70:20;77:13;78:9;84:7;	54:23	71:12;74:16;75:3;80:1;		93:22;94:6
89:20;90:14,19;91:24;	obligation (11)	81:1,24;84:20;89:10,	4:6;5:17,19;11:3,11,	owning (1)
94:12,12;95:4	12:7;38:8;41:5,13,	21;93:13;94:1,7;97:15;	11,22;12:17;16:1;	82:6
nice (2)	15;55:1;71:6;85:13;	99:16	17:11;19:17;20:18,25;	owns (1)
50:8;76:16	91:5;92:4;93:7	ones (2)	22:2;30:22;43:7;53:25;	82:12
night (5)	obligations (3)	39:12,13	65:2;100:12,15	
6:8,10;66:17;67:8;	12:6,11;45:22	one's (1)	orderly (1)	Р
90:19	oblige (1)	51:20	21:9	
NJ (2)	41:16	ongoing (2)	ordinary (1)	page (10)
35:8,8	observe (1)	79:16;95:23	22:19	9:1;10:5,5,7,8;28:19;
NJSA (1)	15:19	on-line (18)	organized (1)	43:25;44:1;65:16;98:5
14:16	obtain (1)	21:12,17;29:19,21,	3:10	pages (2)
Nobody (4)	88:25	25;34:11,11;43:10,12,	original (2)	41:20;73:10
51:10,10;67:15;75:9	obviously (5)	21;80:13,18,22;83:18;	19:17;64:7	paid (5)
Nobody's (1)	30:21;53:1;55:7;	84:6;93:25;94:1;97:3	ostensibly (1)	16:14;63:22;81:15;
63:24	58:21;79:18	only (13)	92:8	85:21;86:17
non-compliance (1)	occasions (2)	46:3;55:19;57:23;	others (4)	paper (1)
45:2	95:16;97:24	63:17;69:11;73:9;75:3;	5:3;12:15;26:1;	61:11
non-disclosure (4)	occur (5)	82:24;87:11;90:21;	27:15	papers (7)
70:21;90:22;91:2,6	14:10;23:20;70:18;	93:14;95:15;98:16	otherwise (6)	7:12;19:22;56:21;
nonetheless (2)	85:4;95:3	onset (1)	18:7;35:8;36:12;	60:23;61:15;79:8;98:4
87:14,23	occurred (3)	83:18	55:14;73:17;99:17	paragraph (16)
nor (2)	22:17;80:24;88:14	oops (1)	ought (1)	12:21;14:4,17;15:14;
5:24;15:8	occurring (2)	75:18	12:14	20:12,14,22;22:1;47:5;
norm (1)	20:24;65:9	open (2)	out (27)	80:18;81:9,19;83:9,13;
14:7	occurs (1)	72:12;77:22	17:13;22:18;28:9;	86:22;88:3
note (5)	32:6	opened (1)	29:14;34:10;38:1;40:4;	paragraphs (1)
7:22;36:5;96:1,12,13	oceanfront (2)	55:25	43:5;47:15,25;49:23;	83:9
noted (5)	93:15,16	operated (2)	52:1;55:1;56:2;60:23;	Pardon (2)
5:9,10;38:20;80:3;	October (2)	80:22;81:8	61:11;63:2,23;68:6,18;	27:4;56:5
84:10	80:25;81:5	operates (1)	74:13;75:12;77:16;	parenthetically (1)
notice (4)	off (5)	82:12	78:14,14,15;98:2	83:2
16:25;56:10;86:16;	41:19;48:18;70:22;	operating (9)	outlined (1)	pari (2)
92:5	98:8;101:20	17:12,15;27:16;	13:25	79:1,10
notified (1)	offer (2)	44:25;45:6;46:7;67:9;	outreach (1)	part (19)
19:18	13:14,20	76:16;82:25	91:16	7:14;10:11;27:8;
notion (2)	offered (2)	operation (1)	outside (36)	34:18;42:4;45:23;53:2;
98:13;99:10	90:17;91:25	46:6	26:11;35:15,18;	58:11;64:17;65:11,12;
November (7)	offering (1)	operations (2)	36:15,16;37:11;39:11,	67:18;70:25;71:8;
34:11;43:8,21;75:2;	54:12	46:15;82:15	14;41:11,12;42:20;	82:22;84:19;86:8;91:4;
82:4;84:2;97:3	office (1)	operator (1)	46:19,20;51:19,20;	96:5
number (5)	60:6	16:3	54:1;55:4,5;64:24;	parte (6)
16:6;17:4;58:21;	officer (1)	opine (1)	65:10;71:13,16;72:1;	16:22;19:16,17,23;
		63:22		
84:14;93:17	81:23		78:14,20,21;84:16;	20:1;21:21
0	officials (1)	opining (1)	85:5;86:2;90:11;91:17;	participate (1)
0	81:21	63:21	98:20;99:5,7,9,9	91:5
	offset (1)	opportunists (2)	over (8)	participation (1)
object (1)	97:9	68:11,11	22:17;48:15;52:3;	90:25
13:1	often (1)	opportunity (15)	53:6;57:21,22;74:15;	particular (5)
objected (1)	38:12	5:1;7:8;11:7;13:5;	93:4	20:12;87:10;94:16;
7:13	Oldford (3)	15:3;16:22,23;19:2;	overrule (1)	95:17;97:15
		····, ····, ····, ····, ·····, ···, ··, ···, ··,		

Resol ts Intel national 110	lungs, LLC, ct als	1	1	May 17, 201.
			02 21 25 04 2	70.14
particularly (3)	37:5,7;66:4;80:18;	plaintiff (22)	93:21,25;94:2	70:14
22:16;24:18;40:16	83:13,14,24;86:11;	16:24;25:22;28:5;	PokerStars (24)	practicable (6)
parties (24)	88:15;90:23	31:23;33:7;38:8;39:2;	12:14;13:8;24:15;	40:19;69:25;70:6,9,
15:17;22:20,25;23:5,	perceive (3)	68:5,7;69:11;82:1;	57:11,14;58:12;59:12;	11;89:1
23;26:12;33:24;34:5;	8:7,9;9:19	84:1;88:17,18,21;	60:7,15,17,19,22;61:1;	practice (5)
37:15,16;38:18;40:25;	perceived (1)	89:24;91:13;94:5,24;	80:21;81:4,10,13,17,	18:15;36:25;37:1;
41:16;53:17;64:20;	15:16	95:22;97:8;99:1	21,24;82:10,21,22;	38:3;70:7
65:21;84:21;85:6;87:1,	percent (2)	plaintiffs (41)	83:23	precedent (2)
14;93:21;97:19;99:3,	44:13;82:11	3:20;5:2;12:6,10;	poll (1)	30:10;34:4
20	perform (1)	22:10;23:2;24:11;25:2;	58:19	precludes (1)
parties' (3)	95:25	27:22;28:13;30:8;39:6,	pony (1)	65:8
79:12;86:5;89:20	perhaps (3)	7,9,15;44:1,21;45:9;	56:10	predictable (1)
partner (1)	12:15;53:15;59:2	65:20;67:6;71:12,25;	portion (1)	95:25
43:8	period (13)	85:12;86:8,11,12;	99:17	predictably (1)
partners (2)	14:15,23;15:5;16:4;	88:10,13;90:2,12,20;	portions (1)	97:10
21:8;43:14	17:2;24:16;29:13;	91:7,8;92:5;94:15;	97:13	prefer (1)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
party (7)	53:20;55:3;79:16;85:3;	95:18;96:1,17,20;	pose (2)	48:11
6:10;35:13;83:20;	99:4;100:2	99:19;100:6	31:3,5	pre-fund (1)
85:25;95:3;97:15,18	permission (1)	plaintiffs' (11)	POSITAN (90)	86:14
pass (1)	11:8	40:8,16;88:22;89:4;	3:6,20,22,23;4:19;	prejudice (1)
97:20	permit (7)	90:4,9;91:18,24;96:19;	5:6,9,13,16;6:6,16,21,	8:9
passage (1)	12:9;18:24;20:21;	97:25;98:9	25;7:9,12;8:20;12:25;	preliminarily (1)
80:17	27:22,22;30:24;80:18	plaintiff's (1)	13:16,23;16:8,11;17:7,	8:18
passed (4)	permits (1)	35:19	16,25;19:13,15,22;	preliminary (2)
68:1,6;76:19;84:5	64:20	planning (1)	24:3;34:15;36:2;39:16;	5:20;8:16
passes (3)	permitting (1)	29:25	43:1;48:10;50:11,21;	prematurely (1)
31:20;68:18;71:24	30:20	plans (1)	51:2,6;52:6,10,15;	27:20
passing (1)	Perskie (7)	57:24	53:11;54:4,14,15;55:6,	premise (1)
74:21	7:23;11:25;12:20;	player (2)	9;56:5,7,19;63:17;	66:1
past (4)	13:25;14:4;26:1;27:15	28:10,11	65:11;66:2,10,12,24;	premises (1)
5:25;6:7;54:16;89:8	Perskie's (1)	plea (1)	67:12,15,19;68:8,13;	96:6
path (1)	12:21	55:13	69:13,16,18,24;70:2,	prepare (1)
53:23	person (1)	pleading (1)	13,25;71:8,17,20,22;	21:11
patient (1)	67:7	100:20	72:5,9,12,22;73:2,6,15,	prepared (2)
101:6	persons (1)	pleadings (9)	24;74:2,11,23;75:24;	57:15;59:13
patrons (1)	69:1	8:24;23:8;24:19;	76:1,5,11;79:1,4,5,7	present (7)
21:4	persuasion (1)	80:3;86:18;88:15;	Positan's (3)	11:7,14;12:8;16:25;
Paul (1)	14:2	93:24;95:16;98:6	7:5;11:16;18:14	20:25;36:8;74:5
81:24	pertaining (1)	Please (9)	position (13)	presentation (2)
pay (10)	91:20	3:3,19;4:19;28:22;	22:7;31:9,12;34:10;	5:8;53:2
6:23;46:15,15,21;	pertains (4)	48:21;70:22;76:24;	36:9;40:6,7;41:25;	presented (1)
55:21;76:13;82:14;	8:22;9:1;83:25;	98:8;101:18	46:12;71:13;75:9;87:1;	80:13
85:7,16;98:17	90:24	pleased (2)	98:9	preserve (1)
paying (1)	pertinent (1)	60:4,6	positions (2)	16:1
	-			
98:13	34:18	pledges (1)	15:11;95:18	preserved (1)
payment (3)	petition (1)	40:18	possibility (4)	96:7
44:24;46:21;89:8	87:22	plumber (1)	38:13:57:3,6,7	presidents (2)
payments (2)	phone (3)	64:4	possible (4)	5:25;6:8
45:20;46:8	70:22;87:24;98:8	plus (2)	37:11;46:11;56:23;	presiding (1)
,				
payroll (1)	phrase (4)	54:2,3	68:2	93:4
46:15	9:18;47:4,7,22	point (25)	possibly (1)	press (1)
pending (2)	physically (1)	10:2;12:18;14:3;	17:1	21:22
	1 0 0 0			
4:4;84:6	36:8	17:20;19:11,12;20:9;	post (1)	presumably (1)
pension (4)	picture (1)	28:18;35:19;37:4;	41:21	82:21
45:21;62:8;66:22;	12:13	44:14,15,16;45:24;	post- (1)	pretend (1)
76:14	piece (1)	46:3;62:15;65:17;	86:19	68:21
pensions (1)	76:16	67:23;71:25;72:5;		
			potential (3)	pretty (1)
75:5	place (1)	80:19,25;89:14;94:9;	43:14;66:15;81:7	60:15
people (12)	52:4	101:13	potentially (1)	prevent (1)
5:4;13:19;55:21,22;	places (1)	pointed (2)	98:17	17:15
	57:24	27:13;38:1		prevented (1)
59:1,2,11,16;60:11;			powerhouse (2)	
61:3;62:13;101:3	plain (4)	poker (6)	22:20;27:21	21:11
per (10)	35:25;46:21;78:7,22	80:22;86:13;89:9;	practicability (1)	preventing (1)
				_

21:1 previously (1) 22:2 price (5) 45:8,25;46:1;82:19; 98:14 primary (2) 21:16:84:20 Princeton (1) 70:8 principals (5) 39:1;44:20;45:9,20; 67:5 principle (2) 30:11;78:25 printed (1) 70:8 prior (8) 9:9;35:16;64:23; 71:12;84:16;90:11; 97:3:99:9 priorities (1) 53:19 privy (1) 59:9 pro (2) 4:3;5:15 probability (1) 100:6 probably (14) 8:10:10:20,22:17:6; 50:3:53:22.22:57:21: 58:11:74:21:77:14.15; 94:21;99:18 problem (6) 36:2;53:11,13;59:6, 14:69:2 problems (6) 59:3;60:20;61:1; 69:20:81:20:82:23 proceed (1) 13:23 proceeding (7) 19:17;61:9,13,16; 82:3;84:11;101:7 process (24) 14:25;15:13;21:9; 25:7;26:18;27:11;38:6, 20,22;39:12;42:15; 44:2;62:17;63:3;68:22; 69:3;73:18,19,22;74:7, 21;75:13;98:22;99:8 procurement (2) 84:15,16 profession (1) 6:14 profitable (3) 57:13,17;60:9 progress (1) 60:4 projects (1)

13:13 prompt (1) 38:23 prompted (2) 52:25;53:2 promptly (3) 40:19;69:25;89:1 pronounced (1) 82:9 pronouncing (1) 3:14 proper (1) 41:3 properties (1) 60:12 property (7) 57:16,23;58:1;62:21; 76:17;92:22;93:15 prophecy (1) 45:2 propose (1) 71:16 proposed (2) 14:24;72:1 prospect (8) 35:11;45:7;80:13; 94:8,25;96:18;98:16, 20prospects (1) 42:14 protect (7) 26:4;29:11,16,17,19; 69:3.4 provide (4) 34:11:42:9:46:6: 90:20 provided (6) 7:23;13:9;26:17; 38:13:85:14:87:8 provides (5) 14:9:36:20:37:17.20: 99:6 providing (4) 14:25;82:10;85:25; 86:24 province (1) 61:3 provision (27) 14:12,14,21;15:2,6, 10;23:21;27:19,23,24; 28:2,3,14;41:10;44:8; 46:5:49:5:50:4:70:24: 78:11,18,20,24;83:19, 22:85:24:92:18 provisions (15) 14:2;15:9;22:14,22, 23;27:14,16,16;30:17, 18;31:14;69:14;92:24; 99:1.3 public (7) 21:20;26:4;50:16; 61:12:74:24:75:7; 96:15

publicly (1) 41:22 pull (1) 5:25 pulled (4) 5:25;26:12;75:12; 101:1 pulling (1) 17:12 purchase (16) 14:7,19;15:4;18:17; 24:11;45:7,25;46:1; 53:16;74:8;82:16,18, 19;83:6;84:3;98:14 purport (1) 15:3 purpose (1) 80:16 purposes (2) 34:25;82:3 pursing (1) 21:14 pursuant (5) 9:16;46:19;49:24; 85:16,22 pursue (3) 26:20;83:23;97:2 Q qualifications (3) 16:12:17:24:18:5 quality (1) 101:7 question (11) 31:9;35:18;38:24; 49:2:50:15:55:6:59:19; 66:13;70:20;71:1; 74:18 questionable (2) 13:10:96:18 questions (11) 13:4,17;16:19;24:21; 31:2;46:24;50:13; 54:11,12;74:17;98:6 quickly (2) 85:4;100:15 quiet (1) 101:6 quite (2) 9:3;16:6 quo (1) 96:21 quote (4) 9:7;34:18;64:20; 65:18 quoted (2) 40:20;84:10 R raise (1) 96:15

raised (3) 8:23:11:15:24:7 raises (3) 13:4.16:54:11 ran (1) 54:3 Random (1) 70:5 range (1) 53:22 Rather (4) 15:9;38:17;41:15; 47:10 Rational (18) 3:11,20;21:19;82:7, 8,13,14;84:8;85:6; 86:5,8,14,19,24;87:7, 13,25;88:8 Rational's (2) 21:10;88:4 re- (1) 99:13 reach (1) 93:8 reached (1) 45:1 reaction (1) 68:22 read (32) 7:16,16,24;8:5;9:25, 25;10:20;19:9;20:22, 22:23:9:25:15:29:8: 34:13:39:3:50:3:52:19. 20:56:14:63:18.19: 64:19;67:24;69:6;70:1, 5;75:14;79:9;87:9; 97:21:98:4,18 reading (24) 9:5,7;10:8;14:5,5,17; 15:14:20:24:23:17; 34:18;35:4;40:13,23; 41:24;56:23;59:18; 64:21;65:19;69:7;80:3, 10;85:14;99:13,18 reads (1) 9:7 ready (3) 29:21;43:8,10 real (9) 20:8;42:13;53:13; 66:17:70:11:92:21,22; 94:25:99:11 reality (1) 69:8 realize (1) 101:1really (14) 22:5,6;28:1;42:15; 45:4,25;49:20;63:4,11; 64:17:74:19:93:6; 97:19;98:19 reason (6) 20:15;26:22,22;46:9;

May 17, 2013

52:25:85:15 reasonable (2) 40:25:41:17 reasonably (3) 38:25;41:3;89:2 reasons (3) 66:19;85:9;100:3 Rebuck (1) 90:5 receipt (2) 83:12;98:3 receive (1) 91:6 received (3) 87:24;89:18;92:5 receiving (1) 96:17 recent (1) 44:20 recess (1) 48:16 recital (1) 80:8 recognize (1) 20:5 recognizing (1) 38:11 reconstitute (1) 45:21 record (21) 3:7:12:22:13:20; 19:6.14.16.20:42:7: 48:18,18,23,24;92:11, 14:95:12:97:13.21: 100:4.5;101:5.20 recording (1) 3:1 recovery (1) 55:24 reference (4) 40:8;41:22;84:24; 95:10 referenced (2) 34:22;81:2 references (1) 64:19 referencing (1) 81:11 referred (3) 7:10;11:25;58:19 referring (2) 65:14,16 refers (1) 65:13 reflects (1) 15:10 reform (1) 23:4 refunded (2) 46:9:85:6 refused (1) 42:8 refusing (1)

prominently (1)

90:1

91:16 regard (22) 8:11:10:4:11:14; 12:9,17;13:22;15:16; 18:4,16;22:16;24:3; 40:17;68:21;80:8;90:1, 6;91:19;94:22;96:2,4; 97:13:100:21 regarding (3) 89:6;90:16;92:4 regardless (1) 41:13 region (1) 13:19 regularly (1) 27:17 regulated (1) 67:1 regulation (2) 26:18;35:8 regulators (3) 27:20;65:23;99:22 regulatory (13) 14:24;15:5,8,13; 25:5,21;26:4;44:2; 66:6;74:6;78:4;83:7,12 Reiser (1) 3:22 reiterating (1) 92:7 relate (2) 11:10:49:8 related (4) 84:1;85:11;86:15; 93:4 relates (9) 8:6,22;44:24;49:16, 22;70:23;86:20;93:20, 22 relating (1) 83:11 relations (3) 21:20:61:12:87:20 relationship (2) 65:22;99:21 relatively (5) 8:1,3;17:2;42:25; 73:10 relaxation (1) 35:16 released (1) 92:3 releasing (1) 56:12 relevant (5) 8:5;19:10;87:11,11; 97:13 reliable (1) 18:2 relief (2) 29:2:92:25 rely (2) 18:3:79:7

remain (1) 94:20 remained (1) 88:23 remains (2) 19:7:22:8 remarkably (1) 95:9 remedy (1) 22:18 remember (1) 55:17 report (15) 35:15;36:21,21;37:6, 7,8,9,21,24,25;38:25; 53:21;71:14;88:6,12 **Reporters** (1) 56:22 reporting (1) 42:22 represent (2) 4:1:20:4 representation (1) 10:10 representative (6) 6:12;9:11;10:9; 85:17;88:9;89:11 representatives (2) 80:15;87:25 represented (4) 13:8;81:14;82:22; 83:6 representing (1) 27:22reputation (1) 18:6 reputational (1) 96:23 request (7) 25:1:38:14:88:2: 89:17:90:18:91:9.16 requested (6) 29:2;35:5;88:17; 89:8;90:20;91:12 require (2) 22:11;27:20 required (7) 24:16;35:7;83:12; 85:7;90:23,24;91:3 requirement (2) 38:15:86:20 requirements (1) 14:15 **Requires** (1) 31:23 requiring (1) 22:12 reread (1) 9:25 re-read (2) 50:3:69:6 resistance (1) 58:4

resolved (3) 6:19:81:16:82:23 Resorts (1) 3:13 resource (1) 74:25 resources (3) 53:18:62:11:79:19 respect (2) 31:13:75:15 respectfully (1) 17:6 respective (2) 13:11:15:17 respond (4) 5:2;11:13;16:22,23 responded (3) 91:7,8,13 response (12) 9:21,22;11:15;43:2, 3;45:12;48:13;50:14; 67:18:76:24:89:19: 91:15 responsibilities (3) 21:2,5;29:16 responsibility (2) 12:4;29:18 responsive (2) 25:14;80:5 restrain (1) 17:12 restraining (4) 11:11:20:18.25; 30:22 restraint (2) 17:14;20:18 restraints (13) 5:23:12:18:18:24: 80:6;95:19,22;96:7,9, 21,23;97:1,9;100:11 result (6) 6:18:10:12:53:19; 83:16;94:19;100:10 results (1) 66:18 retain (2) 80:16;85:21 retired (4) 13:1,12,12;16:17 return (5) 5:23;11:3,11;17:11; 53:25 revenue (1) 75:6 reversed (1) 50:22 review (6) 15:5;21:5;85:3; 95:24;98:22;99:14 reviewed (3) 84:23;95:16;97:12 revise (2) 29:7;30:16

revised (2) 35:1.6 rewrite (5) 22:25;23:4;24:10; 29:6;40:6 **RHI** (1) 21:15 rhythm' (1) 15:22 Richard (1) 89:10 right (41) 4:5;10:25;26:11,21; 27:6;28:5;31:17,19,22; 32:3,8,16,16,21,24; 33:1,17,22;35:23,24; 37:19,22;41:15;47:17; 49:19;54:17;56:8; 57:13,20;66:3;68:4,14; 71:18;75:17;77:13,25; 78:1,13,16;79:9;85:25 rightfully (1) 59:6 rights (4) 30:12,13;78:5;87:16 **RIH** (7) 21:1,13;80:12,15,15, 21;82:12 rise (2) 48:17:101:16 risk (12) 24:13.14:28:4:39:24: 40:1:44:15:45:14: 66:12;76:6;83:11;86:6; 96:24 road (2) 43:6:94:9 room (5) 33:7,25;65:5;72:4; 89:9 rooms (1) 80:23 rose (1) 52:15 Roseland (1) 52:11 rounds (1) 77:1 rule (4) 13:3;37:5,8;74:11 ruled (3) 37:2;63:24,24 rules (1) 100:21 ruling (3) 16:16;30:8;36:19 run (2) 53:22;74:10 running (2) 44:18:75:2 runs (1) 54:16

May 17, 2013

S safely (1) 101:10 sale (7) 14:8,19;74:8;82:11, 20:95:2.2 same (9) 10:6:56:13:64:25; 65:12;78:20;83:25; 89:25:91:20:92:1 Sandy (2) 55:24,25 sat (2) 51:5,6 satisfaction (1) 84:13 satisfied (12) 7:20.21:12:6.10: 52:23:53:14:54:1.10; 88:1;89:3;95:17;99:14 satisfy (1) 86:19 save (1) 76:14 saved (1) 62:3 saving (1) 75:10 saw (1) 26:25 saying (3) 56:12;69:21;73:2 schedule (1) 15:24 scheduled (1) 5:23 Scheinberg (7) 44:11:81:2,4,6,21, 23:82:3 Schulman (1) 56:21 Scott (1) 3:22 sea (1) 94:3 season (4) 15:22;21:25;43:15; 96:12 seated (3) 3:3;31:8;48:21 second (2) 19:19;20:7 section (27) 9:2,3,5,6,16,16;10:6, 7.13.15.17:34:13: 35:10:38:4:40:9,15,20, 20,22;46:17;49:24; 78:15,18;84:8;85:13, 16;99:15 secure (3) 33:8;94:6;99:8

secured (1) 21:21 security (2) 59:8.9 seek (2) 21:6:96:22 seeking (5) 17:11:21:7:30:13; 80:17;87:6 seeks (1) 17:15 seemed (3) 53:3;87:2;98:5 seemingly (3) 81:10;83:17;94:9 seems (1) 26:9 seized (1) 25:20 selected (2) 17:4,22 selection (1) 17:21 self-fulfilling (1) 45:1 sell (2) 43:16,17 seller (2) 15:11;83:22 sellers (8) 21:10;46:14;82:6,19; 84:7:85:10.17.18 sellers' (2) 84:20:88:7 seller's (3) 9:11;10:9;21:4 Senate (5) 31:20;68:6,7,18;84:5 senior (1) 81:21 sense (13) 10:1;15:22;19:8,13; 24:2;35:19;53:15; 54:12;74:9,20;86:4; 97:14;98:23 senses (1) 97:18 sensible (1) 18:2 sent (1) 95:7 sentence (2) 9:4:44:1 separate (1) 14:21 separated (1) 26:23 separately (1) 89:15 September (2) 80:11.20 series (1) 11:21

serious (3) 13:4.16:56:25 set (9) 10:11.13:25:4.18.19: 61:14,14;83:19;84:13 sets (2) 24:23;25:6 settle' (1) 15:4 settled (1) 30:12 settlement (2) 6:22;81:15 Seven (2) 20:13:79:18 several (5) 14:2;22:17;40:3; 89:7;95:16 severe (2) 94:23;95:20 shape (1) 20:21 share (8) 5:21;7:17;9:24; 19:12;50:3,4;69:7; 97:12 shareholders (1) 29:17 sharing (1) 71:1 sheet (8) 68:17.17:82:10.14. 17:83:5:84:2:85:23 Sheriff (1) 101:17 shining (1) 43:18 short (2) 17:2;21:18 short-(1) 97:16 shortcomings (1) 79:11 shot (1) 43:9 show (10) 11:4,11,22;12:5,18; 17:11;43:6;53:9,25; 74:10 shows (1) 72:24 sic (11) 3:15;21:15;27:11; 61:13;62:2;81:1;86:23, 25;87:25;88:1;90:18 side (7) 26:20,23;39:25,25; 72:23;76:12;97:6 sides (8) 11:21:19:3:28:4; 31:3;33:11;41:5;73:9; 83:6 sig (1)

47:24 sign (4) 5:17:22:13,14:64:2 signed (6) 5:19;42:9;68:19; 73:9;91:2;96:3 significant (10) 20:17;21:22;26:10; 30:18;41:21;47:10; 58:2:70:11:84:15; 89:13 silent (3) 75:21,23;96:2 simple (1) 46:22 simply (3) 39:23;41:16;49:25 sit (4) 47:13,19;79:16; 94:11 site (2) 13:14;93:14 situation (2) 38:7.18 six (4) 60:21;62:13;71:17; 79:17 sizeable (2) 59:12,13 sleep (1) 67:8 smaller (2) 58:21.21 smear (1) 56:15 snap (1) 59:17 so-called (3) 53:23;63:21;86:2 software (1) 43:10 solicitation (1) 92:4 someday (1) 63:23 sometimes (1) 64:6 somewhat (4) 36:11;87:21;93:5; 95:9 soon (4) 37:8;41:14;42:17; 56:23 sooner (6) 36:21,21;37:6,7,8,18 sophisticated (14) 22:20;23:5,6;27:21; 29:3;39:10;45:15; 51:24;52:3;62:3,4,24; 64:12:83:7 sorry (3) 16:10;73:20;75:18 sort (1)

22:4sought (3) 17:2;70:22;89:12 sound (1) 83:18 South (1) 66:16 speak (7) 4:20;5:7;19:6;27:12; 36:3.7:78:18 speaking (4) 4:24;16:16,17,17 speaks (1) 78:7 specific (2) 25:4;71:6 specifically (10) 8:25;9:1,4;14:3; 80:4;87:3;88:3,21; 90:23:91:3 specified (2) 15:1.2 specifies (1) 24:23 speculate (1) 15:16 spent (1) 6:7 spirit (1) 40:12 spoke (3) 34:14:89:21.25 sports (1) 57:3 spring (1) 61:23 Sr (1) 12:1stage (1) 17:11 stakeholders (1) 21:5 stand (5) 20:4;32:2;48:16; 97:19;101:14 standard (3) 18:11;22:19;27:16 standing (1) 78:2 standpoint (1) 53:24 stands (1) 53:17 standstill (2) 21:13;29:22 stars (1) 12:13 start (5) 11:18;43:22,22,24; 72:19 started (1) 61:11 stat (1)

**State (12)** 6:1,2;57:25;61:7; 62:11,13;68:6;73:18, 22;75:7;93:19;99:5 stated (2) 61:19:88:3 states (3) 34:17;81:12,15 stating (1) 91:21 status (5) 82:2;89:15;90:6,16; 96:21 statute (18) 15:9;16:5;25:24; 26:2,3;35:7;36:20; 65:3;66:4,5;68:1; 73:16;74:9;75:13,24; 76:19;99:14,15 statutes (2) 73:24:74:4 Statute's (2) 75:25;76:3 statutory (3) 13:3;65:3;79:16 stay (2) 46:17;66:17 step (1) 27:9 steps (2) 21:11:29:11 Steven (2) 3:22:11:25 stick (1) 62:6 still (6) 47:16;58:23;61:14; 74:13:88:1:98:7 stipulates (1) 92:19 stop (1)74:2 stopped (2) 55:20;61:15 stops (1) 17:13 story (1) 60:25 straightforward (1) 31:15 strictly (1) 36:15 structure (2) 44:23;65:12 structured (2) 45:5;63:12 struggling (1) 93:23 stuff (3) 60:17;61:10;63:2 stupid (1) 67:12

73:23

style (1) 19:6 subject (11) 17:5,6;40:24;41:8; 50:19:83:13:92:18.19; 93:8,11;96:25 subjective (1) 23:14 submission (1) 85:1 submissions (7) 7:6:38:2:52:21; 79:25;80:11;81:3; 100:25 submit (2) 53:21;100:12 subsequent (5) 9:15;32:12;49:23; 65:9,10 subsequently (1) 47:7 substantially (2) 92:9;95:20 substantive (1) 18:16 substituted (1) 23:23 succeeded (2) 6:10.12 success (3) 24:20;97:23;100:7 successful (2) 94:2.5 sudden (1) 75:18 suffered (2) 95:19,21 suffers (1) 97:15 suffice (1) 84:11 sufficient (3) 26:5,17;83:22 sufficiently (2) 93:15;97:9 suggest (4) 26:16;28:15;41:10; 93:24 suggested (2) 27:12;88:19 suggesting (3) 18:19:41:6:67:17 suggestion (2) 25:16;27:10 suggests (2) 29:2;35:10 suit (1) 60:24 suitable (1) 26:7 summer (7) 15:22;16:2;21:25; 29:13;43:15;55:13;

96:12 summer's (1) 63:9 sun (1) 43:18 Superior (1) 63:23 supplemental (1) 35:1 support (1) 80:5 supposed (5) 47:25;73:16;74:14; 76:13:88:13 suppositions (1) 53:15 sure (7) 9:21;24:1;47:1;63:7; 68:3;74:6;94:10 surprises (1) 28:25 surprising (1) 39:8 survival (1) 95:24 sustained (1) 94:14 swing (3) 77:18,20,21 system (1) 6:17 Т tab (1) 6:24 table (4) 31:8;66:14;83:1,3 talk (5) 50:19:56:1:59:20: 74:23;78:21 talking (5) 51:16:60:19:65:14; 66:15;71:9 talks (4) 56:16,22;59:18; 78:19 Tariq (1) 4:9 Tate (2) 81:24;82:2 technical (1) 43:11 teleconference (1) 65:18 teleconferences (1) 95:8 telephone (3) 89:5,10;90:15 telephonic (2) 19:19:95:7 telephonically (1) 90:1

telling (1) 13:3 Templar (9) 88:9.10:89:9.25: 90:15;91:10,16,21; 92:2 Templar's (1) 91:16 temporary (6) 11:10:12:18:20:17. 25;30:22;96:20 ten (3) 48:16;71:18;92:3 tends (1) 93:3 ten-minute (1) 48:11 term (11) 40:13:68:17,17:72:4; 75:22;82:10,14,17; 83:5;84:2;85:22 terminate (8) 26:21;28:16;43:19; 62:7;64:20;77:19; 89:24;92:6 terminated (9) 9:8;46:7,19;65:21; 77:5;83:20;85:9,15; 99:20 termination (28) 9:2,15:14:21,25: 15:6.18:25:23:26:3.9: 27:2,14,19:28:13; 31:13:41:10:46:21: 49:18,24;77:4;83:19; 85:8,19,23;86:16;90:3; 92:7:98:18:100:1 termite (1) 66:18 terms (18) 18:3;23:1,13;33:5; 40:24;41:8;42:21; 47:20,25;53:12;69:12; 71:1;73:12;74:22;78:8; 92:19;98:5,19 terrible (1) 63:11 test (1) 12:7 testifying (2) 39:16:52:5 testimony (3) 16:12,14:51:23 theory (1) 70:13 thereafter (4) 33:4;80:20,20;85:2 therein (1) 90:2 thesaurus (1) 70:8 Third (5) 6:13;54:23;55:2;

84:12;95:3 Thomas (1) 12:1thorns (1) 52:16 though (5) 7:1;35:1;52:9;58:20; 62:25 thought (17) 12:11;32:1;44:5,9, 16;49:14;50:14;62:25; 72:22,24;73:3;74:15; 75:11;76:1,1;79:8,20 thoughts (3) 10:4,24;101:19 threaten (1) 96:10 Three (20) 25:8,10,12,13,20; 31:24,25;32:4,7,17,19, 19.21;33:3;38:9;42:25; 66:5;85:1;90:8;98:21 three-day (2) 32:18;86:19 throughout (2) 78:17;84:11 throw (1) 76:20 thus (1) 14:25 tie (1) 78:10 tied (1) 65:1 tight (6) 36:17;44:19;53:4,4; 54:10:68:19 tightest (1) 35:14 timely (7) 83:24:84:16:86:25: 89:3;91:13,14;100:22 times (4) 50:4;53:6;55:23; 64:9 Title (1) 99:15 today (27) 5:23;7:19;8:7;11:12; 12:5,5,17;14:3;18:23; 20:1,9:22:4:24:22; 43:5,24;50:12;62:16; 73:2;79:17;83:15;86:7; 92:13;94:12;95:13,15; 97:24;100:17 together (9) 4:1;6:9,14;50:10; 57:11;63:19;65:1; 75:14;78:10 tokens (1) 7:1 told (4) 13:7;29:22;44:10;

May 17, 2013 3:25;6:6,11;7:1; 52:16:55:10

51:9

Tom (6)

tonight (1)

68:13

took (9) 7:6:37:12:39:25: 49:23;50:16;51:25; 66:12:70:3:86:1 **Top** (1) 43:25 tourist (1) 96:12 tournaments (1) 80:23 toward (3) 80:1;82:16;84:3 transaction (12) 15:18;46:10;66:21, 25;83:2,21;84:22;85:3, 8:86:1:93:18.21 transactions (5) 16:1;64:22;65:1,13, 14 transcribed (1) 56:21 transcription (1) 56:20 transfers (1) 15:24 transform (1) 59:20 travel (1) 101:10 treated (1) 23:16 tremendous (1) 58:4 triggered (1) 41:14 **TRO (2)** 21:21:30:21 trouble (1) 57:1 true (2) 57:5;87:14 trumpeting (1) 21:21 Trust (2) 3:18:10:16 try (3) 28:23;47:24;68:2 trying (5) 17:19;59:20;61:19; 73:12;74:13 tubes (1) 63:8 Tuesday (2) 19:24;32:23 turn (6) 10:5;52:9;59:21; 62:21;70:22;98:8

turnaround (1)	unfu
34:2	45
turning (1)	unha
66:14	23:
twenty- (1)	<b>uniq</b>
62:20	30:
twice (1)	92:
99:18	uniq
two (18)	94
5:25;7:11;8:22;13:9;	Unite
45:19,20;46:24,24;	81
61:17;63:18;75:14;	Univ
77:1;78:10;85:18;	70:
87:15;91:1;99:24;	<b>unkn</b>
101:4	13:
<b>typical (1)</b>	<b>unla</b> v
18:10	27
<b>typically (2)</b>	unles
7:15;37:3	9:1
<b>typo (2)</b>	49)
10:22;48:3	<b>unlik</b>
typographical (2)	43
10:21;47:2	<b>unno</b> 11:
U	<b>unpr</b> 41
ulterior (1)	unpr
58:17	98:
Ultimately (2)	unre
45:23;67:10	45:
unable (3)	Unre
29:23;83:23;97:17	99:
unambiguous (4)	<b>unse</b> t
31:10,13;78:8,23	87
<b>uncertainty (9)</b>	<b>unto</b>
21:23,24;24:13;30:1,	43
2,2,3,4;96:4	<b>up (2</b>
unconditionally (1)	12
85:12	27
uncontested (1)	42
95:6	52
undeniable (1)	60:
31:16	63:
<b>under (9)</b> 7:3;10:8;12:6;41:4,	71
15;45:7;48:14;76:20;	upda 90
82:17	<b>upon</b>
under-aged (1)	7:2
59:11	26:
<b>Understood (1)</b>	55:
77:17	79
<b>undertake (1)</b>	93:
66:20	<b>use (</b> '
undertaken (2)	17:
42:2;87:5	40:
undertook (4)	used
87:4;89:5,9;90:15	66
unexpected (1)	using
17:23	88:
unfair (1)	utiliz
29:1	18:
Unfortunately (1)	utiliz
69:8	18

8, ,	
<b>unfunded (1)</b> 45:21	utilizes
unhappy (1) 23:3	
<b>unique (6)</b> 30:9;53:17;63:24;	vacate
92:20,22;93:12	22:2
uniquely (1)	valid (2
94:5	84:1
<b>United (2)</b>	<b>validit</b>
81:12,15	55:7
University (1)	<b>variety</b>
70:9 <b>unknown (1)</b> 13:19	11:2 variou
<b>unlawful (1)</b> 27:25	58:4 vary (1 53:2
<b>unless (5)</b>	vendor
9:15;35:5;42:9;47:7;	21:2
49:23	vendor
unlike (1)	21:3
43:9	Ventur
unnoticed (1)	82:8
11:20	<b>verge</b> (
unprecedented (1)	55:1
41:23	<b>verifie</b>
unpredictable (1)	11:2
98:21	<b>vetoed</b>
unrealistic (1)	68:8
45:10	<b>viabilit</b>
<b>Unrelated (2)</b>	96:1
99:11,12	viable
<b>unsettling (1)</b>	22:8
87:23	vice (2)
untold (1)	4:3;5
43:7	Vicina
up (24)	12:2
12:12;19:24;25:16; 27:13;29:21;41:18; 42:15;44:25;50:13;	victim 92:24
42:13,44:23,50:13,	view (1
52:11;55:25;56:10;	7:17
60:12;61:14;62:19,20;	23:1
63:3;66:17,23;67:4;	60:1
71:1;73:15;75:2,17	95:9
<b>updated (2)</b>	views (
90:5;91:19	98:1
<b>upon (16)</b> 7:25;18:18;24:17;	violatio
26:21;39:2;42:17;	25
55:13;70:1,4;74:19;	violativ
79:7;86:2;90:21;92:9;	15:8
93:6;98:3	<b>virtual</b>
<b>use (7)</b>	33:7
17:25;18:7,7;28:10;	visit (1
40:25;50:18;53:1	97:1
used (2)	<b>visiting</b>
66:17;82:15	8:9,9
using (1)	<b>visual</b>
88:24	52:1
88:24	52:1
utilize (1)	visuali
18:21	50:2
utilized (1)	<b>visuali</b>
18:11	51:1
	51.1

s (1) volumes (1) 0 V (2) :80:6 2) 7:87:15 ty (1) y (1) 3 **is (3)** ;81:5;90:1 1) 2 r (1) 3 rs (3) ;29:12;30:4 res (1) (1) 8 d (3) 2;80:4;98:3 (1) ty (1) 0 (1) 2 5:15 ge (3) 3:13:2.14 (1)4 13) ;22:9,10,24,24; 7;24:17;26:1; 6;83:25;87:17; ;100:9 (1)0 on (5) 4;26:2;92:23,23, ve (1) lly (1) ) 0 g (2) (1)8 ize (1) 4 izes (1)

78:7 W waging (1) 21:19 wait (5) 29:13,14;64:3;71:15, 23 waiter/waitress (1) 68:25 waiting (1) 14:15 waived (1) 73:9 waiver (3) 35:17;70:2;84:13 walk (2) 77:15;85:25 walk-away (1) 28:5 walked (1) 51:3 walking (1) 77:18 warranted (1) 29:3 warranty (1) 10:10 wasting (1) 73:20 watch (1) 55:15 way (16) 27:10;43:23,23; 48:14;52:17;61:18,19; 62:7;63:18;64:13; 67:25;70:17;74:11; 75:12;76:25;96:7 Wayne (1) 3:21 ways (3) 43:13;59:16;60:2 web (1) 13:13 Webster's (1) 70:5 week (4) 16:23;21:22;56:2; 67:23 weekend (1) 101:10 weekly (2) 55:21;67:9 weeks (2) 79:18,18 Welch (8) 89:10,12;90:15,16; 91:11,15,21;92:1 welcome (2) 3:4:4:10 What's (7)

whence (1) 101:9 wherever (1) 44:12 whole (1) 63:3 whose (1) 39:2 Wiegmann (1) 56:21 Wilkie (2) 4:8;55:12 willing (1) 82:20 willingness (1) 82:24 win (1) 78:25 winter (7) 43:16;55:14,15,16, 23;61:22;75:10 wires (1) 64:5 wise (1) 50:14 withdraw (1) 49:20 withdrawals (4) 49:7.8.16.22 withdraws (2) 9:14:49:25 within (15) 15:1;31:24,25;32:7; 35:6,12;45:8;53:20,22; 54:8,9;58:5;85:18; 89:6;90:24 without (5) 13:18;23:18,20; 42:10:55:25 withstanding (1) 34:19 witness (3) 4:22;16:13,14 witnesses (1) 66:15 women (1) 68:11 wonderful (1) 72:16 wonderfully (1) 101:6 wondering (1) 10:3 word (3) 28:10;72:13;78:14 words (4) 20:19:47:8,18:55:9 work (3) 28:9,9;89:8 worked (1)

22:9;43:2;62:15;

74:13

63:10:64:25:73:16:

Resol ts Intel national 110	lunigs, LLC, ct als			May 17, 2015
6:13	12 (3)	90:4,13;91:10		7.2c (2)
working (3)	12:21;14:4;90:14	<b>20th (1)</b>		46:17;85:14
			4	
16:6;47:16;55:22	120 (1)	64:4		700 (1)
world (5)	54:3	21 (4)	4 (3)	52:12
12:12;20:8;58:13;	120- (1)	31:18;68:19;83:10;	41:21,23;87:3	70-some (1)
94:1,2	36:18	98:15	40 (3)	73:10
worried (1)	120-day (3)	21st (2)	57:21;66:23;76:15	
58:25	42:21;55:2;85:2	54:24,24	40-million-dollar (1)	8
worrying (1)	120th (1)	22 (2)	66:25	
66:18	32:12	89:19;91:13	47 (2)	8 (1)
worse (1)	121-day (1)	22nd (2)	9:1;10:7	90:4
46:11	15:5	91:7,8	<b>48 (4)</b>	
writing (6)	121st (1)	23 (1)	10:5,8;66:24;76:14	9
72:19,19;73:9;78:14,	24:24	91:10	10.3,8,00.24,70.14	
15;96:3	13 (4)	23rd (7)	E	90 (8)
written (4)	14:17;88:3;89:20;	32:15,22,23;71:15,	5	36:22;37:2,21;44:13;
17:25;87:15;91:17;	97:3	25;72:14;75:18		
			5 (3)	54:2;71:14,24;88:5
98:25	13th (7)	24 (2)	41:21;43:25;99:16	<b>90-day</b> (4)
wrong (2)	5:22;20:11;56:14,17;	32:13;90:8	5.5 (1)	34:2;35:16;38:25;
35:21;94:17	60:16;98:2;99:11	24th (6)	34:13	42:21
**	14 (1)	32:9;36:18;37:12;	5.5b (6)	95.12a (1)
Y	15:14	54:21,22;91:12	34:15;35:10;38:4,6,	64:17
-	14th (2)	25 (4)	16;69:13	9th (4)
year (3)	34:14;65:18	51:10;63:20;91:15,	5.5c (1)	42:24;65:5,5;90:13
15:23;57:21;94:12	15 (6)	18	78:18	
years (3)	45:18,23,25;62:22;	25th (1)	5.7 (4)	
16:6;57:22;99:25	77:16;90:18	54:25	40:9,10,14,22	
yesterday (1)	15-million-dollar (1)	26 (6)		
6:7	66:21	34:7;40:17;85:5;	5.7a (3)	
York (1)	15th (1)	86:2;88:8;91:24	41:9,13,16	
55:12	70:23	26th (27)	5:12-(1)	
55.12	17 (9)	24:4;26:13,21;32:18,	64:16	
Ζ			5:12-95.12a (1)	
L	3:1;20:12,14,22;	25;33:3;41:6,14,18;	14:16	
	28:19;65:16;66:22;	42:5,16;54:3;66:3;	50 (1)	
zero (1)	71:5;91:1	69:20,24,24;70:15,16,	66:23	
33:24	17th (1)	18;71:12,24;72:7;		-
	44:17	75:12,16;76:18;87:23;	6	
1	18th (1)	88:16	-	-
	91:5	27 (2)	6 (2)	
1 (10)	19 (1)	89:4;92:5	83:13;84:14	
42:7;45:1;56:4,6,7;	83:10	27th (3)	6.1c (1)	
72:20;86:9;89:17;92:6;		54:16;55:1;76:19	10:20	
98:15	2	28th (3)	<b>6.3 (3)</b>	
1,743 (1)		72:6,17,18		
21:3	2 (2)	29 (1)	47:20;48:1,2	
<b>1,800</b> (1)	80:18;89:20	89:7	6.3a (2)	
55:19	<b>2:33:08</b> (1)	07.1	10:14,15	
	48:18	3	6.3c (2)	
1.4a(2)		5	10:17;48:1	
65:1;84:8	2:44:25 (1)	3 (3)	_	1
1:30 (1)	48:19	3 (3)	7	
5:23	20 (3)	54:3;81:9,19		1
1:33:01 (1)	57:20;68:18;84:7	30 (1)	7 (5)	
3:2	20/20 (1)	54:2	9:1;48:1;82:4;83:9;	
10 (2)	72:15	<b>30-day</b> (1)	84:2	
42:20;90:11	2000 (1)	42:22	7.1 (7)	
100 (1)	90:18	<b>30th (1)</b>	9:2,4,6,17;10:7;	
82:11	2012 (7)	64:3	49:24;85:16	
10th (2)	60:21;80:11,20,25;	31 (1)	<b>7.1b (3)</b>	
43:5;70:19	81:6;82:5;84:4	89:9		
11 (8)	2013 (17)	32 (4)	41:15;64:19;78:15	
42:18;44:25;62:6;	3:1;20:11;40:18;	45:20;62:9;66:22;	7.1c (2)	
72:19;77:8;86:22;90:9;	41:23;85:5;86:9;87:3;	75:5	48:4;49:5	
98:16	88:8,12;89:4,7,9,17,20;	10.0	7.1f (1)	
70.10	00.0,12,07.4,7,7,17,20,		10:6	
·	1		4	1