Condensed Transcript

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

INDUSTRIAL QUICK SEARCH, Inc., MICHAEL MEIRESONNE, MEIRESONNE & ASSOCIATES, Inc.,

Plaintiff(s),

VS.

Civil Action No. 1:09-cv-01340-SLT-JO

MILLER, ROSADO & ALGOIS, LLP, CHRIS ROSADO and NEIL A. MILLER, ESQ.,

Defendant(s).

DEPOSITION OF

CHRISTOPHER ROSADO

October 26, 2011 11:00 a.m.

Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP 77 Water Street New York, New York

Before Margaret Eustace, a Shorthand Reporter and notary public, within and for the State of New York.



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED INDUSTRIAL QUICK SEARCH, Inc., that all objections, except as to the form of MICHAEL MEIRESONNE, MEIRESONNE & the questions, shall be reserved to the time ASSOCIATES, Inc., 6 IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED 7 Plaintiffs, Civil Action No. that the within examination may be subscribed -against-1:09-cv-01340-SLT-JO and sworn to before any notary public with the 9 same force and effect as though subscribed and MILLER, ROSADO & ALGOIS, LLP. CHRIS ROSADO and NEIL A. MILLER, ESQ., sworn to before this court. 11 Defendants. 12 13 14 DEPOSITION OF CHRISTOPHER ROSADO, a Defendant herein, taken by Plaintiffs, 15 pursuant to Notice, at the offices of Lewis 16 Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP, 77 Water 17 Street, New York, New York, on Wednesday, 18 October 26, 2011, at 11:00 a.m., before Margaret Eustace, a Shorthand Reporter and 19 notary public, within and for the State of New 20 21 22 23 24 25 4 1 APPEARANCES: 2 (January 28, 2003 letter was SECREST WARDLE Attorneys for Plaintiffs -3 premarked Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1 Pro Hac Vice 4 for identification.) 2025 East Beltline SE, Suite 209 5 Grand Rapids, Michigan 49546 6 (E-mail chain was premarked as (616) 285-0143 7 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 2 for BY: HENRY EMRICH, ESQ. identification.) 9 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP (Neil Miller's time records 10 Attorneys for Defendants 77 Water Street, Suite 2100 were premarked as Plaintiffs' 11 New York, New York 10038 Exhibit 3 for identification.) 12 10 (212) 232-1370 13 BY: PAULA GILBERT, ESQ. 11 14 (Invoices were premarked as 12 ALSO PRESENT: MICHAEL MEIRESONNE Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4 for 15 13 identification.) 14 17 15 18 Whereupon, 16 17 CHRISTOPHER ROSADA. 19 18 after having been first duly sworn, was 20 19 examined and testified as follows: 20 21 22 **EXAMINATION** 22 23 BY MR. EMRICH: 23 24 Q. Good morning, Mr. Rosada. 24 My name is Henry Emrich. We are here 25 25



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

C. Rosada

5 C. Rosada litigation? 2 in the matter pending against your law firm A. No. arising out of the representation of your firm 3 Q. And after leaving Haythe & Curley, of Mr. Meiresonne and Industrial Quick Search where did you go to work? Company, and, I believe, Meiresonne & Associates, that occurred a few years ago. 7 7 Have you ever had your deposition taken before? 8 9 9 A. Yes. 10 10 Q. How many times? 11 11 A. Once. 12 Q. What were the circumstances regarding 12 13 that? 14 14 A. It was a medical malpractice action. Q. Could you provide for me a brief 15 15 16 discussion of your background prior to 16 17 17 becoming a lawyer? 18 18 A. I don't understand your question. 19 Q. You don't understand my question? 19 20 20 A. Yes. Q. Where did you go to college? 21 21 22 22 A. Harvard. 23 23 Q. And what did you study at Harvard? 24 A. I was an economics major. 24 25 Q. Where did you go to law school? 25 C. Rosada 1 1 2 A. Harvard. 2 3 Q. When did you graduate from Harvard? 3 4 A. 1988. Q. Any other degrees? 5 A. No.

A. I started my own practice. Q. Why did you leave Haythe & Curley? A. I wanted to work for myself. Q. So when did you start your own practice? A. I believe in April 2002 or 2000 --I'm sorry, 1992. Excuse me. Q. Do you live here in New York? A. Yes. Q. Where do you live? A. Laurel Hollow. Q. What is your address there? A. 101 Holly Lane. Q. Are you married? A. Yes. Q. How long have you been married? A. Since 1999. Q. Children? A. Yes. Q. How many children? C. Rosada A. Two. Q. And their ages? MS. GILBERT: Objection to form. A. 8 and 10. 6 Q. When you started your own practice in April of 1992, did you start on your own? Q. After graduating from Harvard, where A. Yes. A. I worked for a law firm Haythe, 9 Q. Was that here in Manhattan? H.A.Y.T.H.E., & Curley, C.U.R.L.E.Y. 10 A. No. Q. Where was Haythe & Curley located? Q. Where was it? 11 12 A. In Mineola. Q. Are they still in existence today? 13 Q. I'm not from here; where is Mineola? 14 A. On Long Island. Q. What did you do there? 15 Q. Is that a city or township? 16 A. It's a village. Q. How long did you work there? 17 Q. What did you do in Mineola? A. Approximately four and a half years. 18 MS. GILBERT: Objection to form. Q. What kind of things did you work on 19 A. When I began my own law practice? 20 Q. In regard to your law practice. A. When I first started? A. Litigation and bankruptcy matters. 21 Q. With regard to the litigation, what Q. Yes. 22 kind of litigation did you work on? 23 A. General practice.

Q. What did that involve?

Commercial litigation.

24

25



did you go to work?

A. In Manhattan.

A. I was an associate.

A. All forms of commercial litigation.

Q. Any particular kind of commercial

A. No.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

there?

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

1 C. Rosada 2 Q. Any particular kind of commercial 3 litigation? 4 A. No. 5 Bankruptcy work. Q. That was your specialty? 7 A. I wouldn't call it a specialty. 8 MS. GILBERT: Objection to form. Q. Just something you worked on 9 10 primarily? 11 A. I never said I worked on it 12 primarily. You asked what I practiced. I am 13 trying to tell you. 14 Q. Did that compose the primary part of your practice or the majority? 15 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 17 A. Which one, bankruptcy? 18 Q. Yes. 19 A. No. 20 Q. What did --A. I am not sure this was the primary 22 focus at that point in time. 23 Q. Did your work ever involve litigation 24 of intellectual property matters? 25 A. Yes. 1

C. Rosada time 2003 rolled around in these particular areas of copyright infringement or patent infringement, or you didn't work in patent infringement, but copyright infringement, and those types of matters? 7 MS. GILBERT: Objection to form. 8 A. I didn't hear the date. I'm sorry. 9 Q. Prior to 2003, how many matters would you have tried involving copyright infringement. A. None. 12 13 Q. How about any unfair business 14 practice? 15 A. Also none. Q. Did you advertise at all in your 16 practice as you began your private practice? 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to form. 18 19 A. Not that I recall. 20 Q. Did you hold yourself as any kind of 21 specialist in any of these areas that we have 22 talked about? 23 MS. GILBERT: Objection to form. 24 A. Not that I recall. 25 Q. When did you first become affiliated

9

10

25

C. Rosada 2 Q. What kind of intellectual property 3 matters? A. I had been involved in several copyright infringement and/or unfair competition cases. Both at the firm I told you about and then on my own. 8 Q. How about patent infringement 9 matters? 10 A. No patent infringement matters. 11 Q. Unfair competition matters? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Specifically what kind of unfair 14 competition matters? 15 A. I don't understand your question. 16 Q. Any particular kind of unfair competition matters? 17 A. No. 18 19 Q. Just general practice? General in 20 that field? 21 MS. GILBERT: Objection to form. A. If I understand your question, the 22 23 answer is yes, people were asserting unfair 24 competition claims. Q. How many cases had you tried by the

12 1 C. Rosada with Mr. Miller? 2 A. I am not sure I understand the 4 question entirely. 5 Q. When did you first meet Mr. Miller? A. Sometime in the early '90s. Q. What were the circumstances regarding your meeting? 9 A. He was a suite mate, we were both in the same suite in the same building. 10 Q. When did you and Mr. Miller become 11 connected in practicing law together? 12 13 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 14 A. Sometime in the '90s I used Neil to 15 work on some files of mine. I can't recall 16 the precise date. 17 Q. What kind of files? 18 A. Always litigation. 19 Q. When did the law firm of Miller Rosado and -- how do you pronounce that last 20 name? 21 22 A. Algios. 23 Q. Algios. 24 -- when did that firm begin?

A. I don't recall if it was January of



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

15 13 1 C. Rosada C. Rosada 2000 or January 2001. I believe -- I think it A. Yes. I shouldn't say I don't know. 2 I don't recall. I know he did litigation but was January 2000, but I am not sure. 3 I don't recall, sitting here today, what his Q. And how did you meet Mr. Algios? background was. 5 A. He was also a suite mate of mine. 6 Q. What kind of litigation did he work Q. So the three of you decided to form a 7 on? practice together? MS. GILBERT: Objection to form. 8 8 A. Essentially. 9 A. I just said I don't recall. Q. Was it formed then in 2001? 9 Q. You don't know as you sit here today 10 10 A. Like I said, I don't remember if it 11 what his background was? 11 was January 2000 or January 2001, but I MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 12 12 believe one of those dates. A. By background, I assume you are 13 13 Q. Fair enough. asking what his pedigree was, and no, I don't. 14 Was it an LLP at that time? 14 Q. What kind of legal matters, 15 A. Yes. 15 substantive legal matters did he handle or he 16 Q. And did it only involve the three of 16 have a particular expertise in handling? 17 17 you? A. To my knowledge, he was working on 18 18 A. Yes. 19 commercial litigation. Q. Were there any other associates in 19 MR. EMRICH: Counsel, you just had 20 20 the firm? 21 an off-the-record communication with your A. At any time? 21 22 Q. From 2001 to 2003. 23 Did you want to take a break and talk A. We did have an associate at one 23 24 with your client? point. I don't know if she was there in that 25 MS. GILBERT: No, please continue. time frame. 16 14 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 BY MR. EMRICH: 2 Q. And in 2003, were there other 3 employees in your firm? Q. Did Mr. Miller have any training A. Yes. background or expertise in handling of 4 5 Q. And how many? copyright infringement matters? A. I believe there were three. A. I don't recall. Q. Did he have expertise in handling 7 Q. What were their names and roles? A. We had a secretary, Regina Allen, patent litigation matters? A.L.L.E.N. we had a paralegal Bonnie, A. I don't recall. 9 Q. Did he have any experience in B.O.N.N.I.E., Siegel, S.I.E.G.E.L., and I 10 don't remember who our third employee was at handling unfair business practice litigation? 11 A. I don't recall. 12 the time. 12 Q. Mr. Rosada, prior to today's 13 Q. So Ms. Siegel was a paralegal? 13 deposition, how did you to prepare for it? 14 A. Yes. 14 A. I met with my counsel earlier today. Q. And the third employee, what was --15 16 was it a him or a her? 16 Q. Was that the first time? A. It was her. 17 A. That I met with my counsel? 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Q. What was her function? 18 18 Q. That you met with them. A. She would have been a legal 19 19 A. No. I think I met with Mr. Anesh at 20 20 secretary. Q. What kind of litigation background the inception of the litigation. 21 21 did Mr. Miller have? 22 Q. So you have met with your counsel 22



litigation background he had?

A. I don't know.

Q. Did you ever learn what kind of

23

24

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

twice in this matter?

A. Yes.

23

24

25

1 C. Rosada 2 Q. When you say you met with your counsel this morning before this deposition, that would have been Mr. Anesh? A. And Ms. Gilbert. 6 Q. I was going to ask you that. 7 How long did you spend with them? 8 A. A little over an hour. 9 Q. Had you talked to them prior to meeting with them today about today's deposition? 11 1.2 A. I don't believe so. 13 Q. So no communication with them? A. I didn't say that. You asked if I 14 15 spoke to them. Q. So you did not speak with them? 16 17 A. Correct. Q. Did you have communication with them? 18 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. How many times? 21 A. I don't recall. Q. How did that communication occur? 22 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 23 24 I believe it was by e-mail. 25 Q. Did you talk with Mr. Miller about

October 26, C. Rosada today. I made sure he was covering. Q. Something that you were to cover? 3 A. It was one of my matters, correct. 4 Q. So he had to cover it for you? 5 A. Correct. Q. Was that all that you discussed with Mr. Miller when you talked with him about this 9 deposition? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 10 11 I want to caution the witness not to 12 reveal any privileged communications he had with Mr. Miller. 13 14 BY MR. EMRICH: 15 Q. Was that the only thing that you talked about? 16 17 A. I believe so. Q. Did you look at any documents? 18 A. When I came to speak with my lawyers 19 20 this morning. 21 Q. That would have been the first time 22 you looked at any documents? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. You didn't look at any documents with

17

25

18

Mr. Miller?

1 C. Rosada today's deposition? 2 A. Yes. 4 Q. When did you talk with him? 5 A. Yesterday. Q. Was that the only time you talked with him about today's deposition? 8 9 Q. How many other times have you talked with him? 10 11 A. I think one before. Q. Where did those discussions take 1.2 13 place? 14 A. In our offices. 15 Q. Why did you talk with him? 16 A. I just told him that I was --1.7 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 18 A. -- being deposed. 19 Q. Why did you talk with him? A. I told him I was being deposed. 20 Q. So in two conversations that all 21 22 talked about was with regard to this 23 deposition? A. It was about scheduling as well. 24

There is another matter the firm is handling

20 C. Rosada 1 A. No. 2 Q. Specifically with regard to what you looked at this morning, was that the first time and the only time you have looked at documents prior to your deposition in order to get ready or prepare for your deposition? A. Yes. 8 Q. What specifically did you look at? 9 A. I looked at the retainer letter, I 10 looked a several e-mails. I looked at certain 11 pleadings. 12 Q. Which pleadings? 13 A. I looked at, I believe, the complaint 14 15 in this action. 16 Q. Anything else? 17 A. I think I looked at the second amended complaint in the underlying Thomas 18 action. I looked IQS's answer in the 19 underlying Thomas action. And I looked at 20 some billing records. 21 22 Q. Anything else? A. I may have looked at some of our 23 discovery compliance in this action. 24

Q. What would that have been?



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

		October 26, 2011
2	11	23
1 C. Rosada	1	C. Rosada
2 A. I believe it was responses to	2	about. These are your productions, you
³ interrogatories.	3	can ask the witness about them.
4 Q. Anything else?	4	MR. EMRICH: Okay.
5 A. Not that I recall.	5	MS. GILBERT: February 4, 2003 from
 Q. When you say you looked at some 	6	Mr. Rosada to Mr. Meiresonne, looks like a
7 e-mails, what e-mails do you recall looking	7	string from February 4, 2003, string of
8 at?	8	e-mails.
9 A. Several e-mails from 2003 and some	9	MR. EMRICH: Have you produced these
10 other e-mails from, I believe, 2006.	10	e-mails previously?
Q. Were these e-mails from your firm?	11	MS. GILBERT: You have produced
12 A. Some of them may have been. I don't	12	these.
13 think there were any general one way or	13	MR. EMRICH: Okay, go ahead.
14 another.	14	MS. GILBERT: February 5, 2003 from
15 Q. Do you have those e-mails with you	15	Mr. Meiresonne to Mr. Rosada.
16 today?	16	MR. EMRICH: Okay.
17 A. I don't have them, but my counsel has	17	MS. GILBERT: February 6, 2003 from
18 them.	18	Mr. Meiresonne to Mr. Rosada.
19 MR. EMRICH: Do you have them here	19	February 11, 2003 from Mr. Meiresonne
20 with you today?	20	to Mr. Rosada.
21 MS. GILBERT: They were produced by	21	February 12, 2003 from Mr. Meiresonne
plaintiff in this action.	22	to Mr. Rosada.
MR. EMRICH: Could we identify on the	23	February 13, 2003 from Mr. Meiresonne
record what e-mails he looked at, please.	24	to Mr. Rosada.
25 MS. GILBERT: Off the record for a	25	MR. EMRICH: And that's it?
	+	WIII. LIVITION. AND INICIONAL
1 C. Rosada	2	C. Pasada
2 second.	1 2	C. Rosada
3 MR. EMRICH: Sure.	3	MS. GILBERT: No, I am looking
4 (Discussion held off the record.)	4	through. I want to make sure what I am
5 MR. EMRICH: Back on the record.	5	giving you is accurate.
6 I would like the date of the e-mail	6	February 18, 2003 from Mr. Meiresonne to Mr. Rosada,.
	7	•
	8	March 10, 2003 from Mr. Meiresonne to Mr. Rosada.
1 - 9 9 -	9	
9 MS. GILBERT: I am not going to 10 describe what it is regarding. I will	10	MR. EMRICH: What was the date of
	1	the last one? MS. GILBERT: March 10, 2003.
11 give you the date of the e-mail and 12 parties name though.	11	•
13 MR. EMRICH: Go ahead.		Some of these the dates are cut off.
	13	If it would be easier off the
14 I want to know what specific e-mails 15 he reviewed, please.	14	record.
15 he reviewed, please.	15	(Discussion held off the record.)
16 MC CHIDEDTI Abaabitaki lanuari	16	MR. EMRICH: The record should
16 MS. GILBERT: Absolutely. January	1 4-	والمناف المراد والمراد والمراد المراد المراد المراد والمراد وا
27, 2003 is the date of the first e-mail	17	reflect counsel and their client left the
27, 2003 is the date of the first e-mail from Mike Meiresonne I apologize if I	18	room to have a conference and we are now
17 27, 2003 is the date of the first e-mail 18 from Mike Meiresonne I apologize if I 19 am mispronouncing that to Chris Rosado.	18 1.9	room to have a conference and we are now back on the record.
17 27, 2003 is the date of the first e-mail 18 from Mike Meiresonne I apologize if I 19 am mispronouncing that to Chris Rosado. 20 MR. EMRICH: What does that e-mail	18 19 20	room to have a conference and we are now back on the record. MS. GILBERT: So I have agreed to
17 27, 2003 is the date of the first e-mail 18 from Mike Meiresonne I apologize if I 19 am mispronouncing that to Chris Rosado. 20 MR. EMRICH: What does that e-mail 21 relate to?	18 19 20 21	room to have a conference and we are now back on the record. MS. GILBERT: So I have agreed to give you range of pages from your disk
17 27, 2003 is the date of the first e-mail 18 from Mike Meiresonne I apologize if I 19 am mispronouncing that to Chris Rosado. 20 MR. EMRICH: What does that e-mail 21 relate to? 22 MS. GILBERT: I don't want to put on	18 19 20 21 22	room to have a conference and we are now back on the record. MS. GILBERT: So I have agreed to give you range of pages from your disk that you produced, plaintiffs' production,
17 27, 2003 is the date of the first e-mail 18 from Mike Meiresonne I apologize if I 19 am mispronouncing that to Chris Rosado. 20 MR. EMRICH: What does that e-mail 21 relate to? 22 MS. GILBERT: I don't want to put on 23 the record what it relates to. You can	18 1.9 20 21 22 23	room to have a conference and we are now back on the record. MS. GILBERT: So I have agreed to give you range of pages from your disk that you produced, plaintiffs' production, that's the easiest way to identify.
17 27, 2003 is the date of the first e-mail 18 from Mike Meiresonne I apologize if I 19 am mispronouncing that to Chris Rosado. 20 MR. EMRICH: What does that e-mail 21 relate to? 22 MS. GILBERT: I don't want to put on	18 19 20 21 22	room to have a conference and we are now back on the record. MS. GILBERT: So I have agreed to give you range of pages from your disk that you produced, plaintiffs' production,



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

25 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada 1 2 information. here in this office somewhere? 2 BY MR. EMRICH: 3 MS. GILBERT: I have the disk. I Q. Without revealing privileged 4 don't want to interrupt the deposition to information, any particular reason why you take time -reviewed the e-mails? 6 MR. EMRICH: I want to see what 7 A. Because my counsel showed them to me. 7 specific documents that he reviewed prior 8 Q. Fair enough. 8 to today. Whether we have them or not is Q. Did you review any correspondence in 9 9 really irrelevant. I want to know what he this case prior to today's deposition? reviewed, and if we can't identify them, I 10 10 11 A. Other than e-mails? would like to see them. 11 Q. Yes, sir. 12 12 MS. GILBERT: Okay. 13 A. I don't believe so. 13 MR. EMRICH: We can do it at a 14 Q. Would that also be true for any other 14 correspondence or any correspondence reviewed MS. GILBERT: At a break I will go 15 15 by you related to this matter prior to today's and print them and we can continue at this 16 16 date irrespective of whether or not it was 17 17 point with the deposition. reviewed in preparation for your deposition? 18 MR. EMRICH: That's fair, okay. 18 MS. GILBERT: Objection to form. 19 19 BY MR. EMRICH: Q. So were those the only e-mails you 20 A. As I indicated, counsel, I didn't 20 would have reviewed, Mr. Rosada, prior to 21 review anything before I came here today. 21 22 Q. We were talking again about things 22 today's deposition? 23 that you would have reviewed. 23 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Did you review any expert reports 24 A. The ones that my counsel showed me? 24 prior to today's deposition? Q. Yes. 26 28 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1

2 A. Yes.

Q. You have not reviewed any other

4 e-mails?

5

6

14

17

19

21

23

25

A. My answer remains the same, no.

Q. Do you recall the last date of any

e-mail that you would have reviewed prior to

today's deposition?

A. I don't understand the question. 9

Q. Do you recall what the last date or 10 the date on the last e-mail you reviewed prior

to today's deposition in terms of a 12

chronological order?

A. That I reviewed with my counsel

15 today?

16 Q. Yes.

A. No.

18 Q. So you haven't reviewed any other

e-mails?

20 A. Again, no.

Q. And what was the purpose of reviewing

22 the e-mails?

MS. GILBERT: I am going to object

24 to the form.

His answer could contain privileged

1

2 A. No.

3

6

8

10

15

16

17

19

Q. Have you ever seen any expert

4 reports --

A. Not that I recall.

Q. -- related to this matter prior to

7 today's deposition?

A. Not that I recall.

9 Q. Did you review any deposition

testimony prior to today's deposition?

11 A. No.

Q. Did you discuss with Mr. Miller his 12

1.3 deposition testimony at any time prior to

14 today's deposition?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form

in that he could reveal privileged

communications between Mr. Rosada and

18 Mr. Miller.

I don't believe so.

Q. Mr. Miller and you are still 20

together?

21 22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Is Mr. Algios still with the firm?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Do you have other lawyers working in



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

CHE	istopher Rosado		October 26, 2011				
	. 29		31				
1	C. Rosada	1	C. Rosada				
2	your firm at the present time?	2	have any experience in terms of producing				
3	A. No.	3	documents?				
4	Q. Have there been any other lawyers	4	MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.				
5	working in your firm since 2003?	5	A. I don't know.				
6	A. Yes.	6	Q. Do any of them have experience with				
7	Q. And the names of those persons?	7	Bates stamping of documents?				
8	 A. We had an associate for a brief time, 	8	A. Yes.				
9	Preeti, P.R.E.E.T.I., Kohli, K.O.H.L.I.	9					
10	Q. What was the last name?	10					
11	A. K.O.H.L.I.	11	Q. Do you know how long she has had the				
12	Q. Anyone else?	12	ability or knowledge to Bates stamp documents?				
13	A. No.	13	A. No. "				
14	Q. When was that person employed by the	14	Q. Is it a recent development for her or				
15	firm?	15	something she has always had?				
16	A. I don't recall.	16	A. I don't know.				
17	 Q. Describe for me the hierarchy of the 	17	Q. Do you know if she ever received any				
18	firm. Are you all equal partners?	18	specific training regarding Bates stamping of				
19	A. Yes.	19	documents?				
20	Q. Do any of you hold any particular	20	A. I don't know.				
21	titles in the firm?	21	Q. Mr. Rosada, I am going to show you				
22	A. No.	22	what I have marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1.				
23	Q. Is there a managing partner?	23	ask you to take a look at that.				
24	A. No.	24	(Witness complies.)				
25	Q. Has there ever been a managing	25	A. Okay.				
	30		· 32				
1	C. Rosada	1	C. Rosada				
2	partner?	2	Q. Have you seen this before?				
3	A. No.	3	A. Yes.				
4	Q. No officers, then, in the firm among	4	Q. What is that, sir?				
5	the three of you?	5	A. It is a retainer letter between my				
6	A. No.	6	firm and Industrial Quick Search.				
7	Q. Are your interests in the firm equal?	7	Q. That letter was authored by you?				
8	A. I don't understand your question.	8	A. Yes.				
9	Q. Do you all have the same interest in	9	Q. Does that describe the parameters of				
10	relation to the other partners	10	the work to be done in this case?				
11	MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.	11	MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.				
12	^		A 31				
	Q or does one person have a greater	12	A. No.				
13	ownership interest in the firm than the	13	Q. Does it describe the scope of the				
14	ownership interest in the firm than the others?	13 14	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation?				
14 15	ownership interest in the firm than the others? A. No, it is all equal.	13 14 15	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation? A. It contains the parameters of our				
14 15 16	ownership interest in the firm than the others? A. No, it is all equal. Q. Do you still have three nonlawyer	13 14 15 16	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation? A. It contains the parameters of our representation of Industrial Quick Search,				
14 15 16 17	ownership interest in the firm than the others? A. No, it is all equal. Q. Do you still have three nonlawyer personnel working for you?	13 14 15 16 17	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation? A. It contains the parameters of our representation of Industrial Quick Search, yes.				
14 15 16 17 18	ownership interest in the firm than the others? A. No, it is all equal. Q. Do you still have three nonlawyer personnel working for you? A. Yes.	13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation? A. It contains the parameters of our representation of Industrial Quick Search, yes. Q. In the first paragraph of that letter				
14 15 16 17 18	ownership interest in the firm than the others? A. No, it is all equal. Q. Do you still have three nonlawyer personnel working for you? A. Yes. Q. The same persons as in 2003?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation? A. It contains the parameters of our representation of Industrial Quick Search, yes. Q. In the first paragraph of that letter it indicates you are going to be primarily				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ownership interest in the firm than the others? A. No, it is all equal. Q. Do you still have three nonlawyer personnel working for you? A. Yes. Q. The same persons as in 2003? A. Two of them.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation? A. It contains the parameters of our representation of Industrial Quick Search, yes. Q. In the first paragraph of that letter it indicates you are going to be primarily responsible for the handling of this matter;				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ownership interest in the firm than the others? A. No, it is all equal. Q. Do you still have three nonlawyer personnel working for you? A. Yes. Q. The same persons as in 2003? A. Two of them. Q. Which person is no longer working	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation? A. It contains the parameters of our representation of Industrial Quick Search, yes. Q. In the first paragraph of that letter it indicates you are going to be primarily responsible for the handling of this matter; is that correct?				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ownership interest in the firm than the others? A. No, it is all equal. Q. Do you still have three nonlawyer personnel working for you? A. Yes. Q. The same persons as in 2003? A. Two of them. Q. Which person is no longer working there, the one that you couldn't come up with	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation? A. It contains the parameters of our representation of Industrial Quick Search, yes. Q. In the first paragraph of that letter it indicates you are going to be primarily responsible for the handling of this matter; is that correct? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ownership interest in the firm than the others? A. No, it is all equal. Q. Do you still have three nonlawyer personnel working for you? A. Yes. Q. The same persons as in 2003? A. Two of them. Q. Which person is no longer working there, the one that you couldn't come up with name of?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation? A. It contains the parameters of our representation of Industrial Quick Search, yes. Q. In the first paragraph of that letter it indicates you are going to be primarily responsible for the handling of this matter; is that correct? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. It says I will have primary				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ownership interest in the firm than the others? A. No, it is all equal. Q. Do you still have three nonlawyer personnel working for you? A. Yes. Q. The same persons as in 2003? A. Two of them. Q. Which person is no longer working there, the one that you couldn't come up with	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Does it describe the scope of the representation? A. It contains the parameters of our representation of Industrial Quick Search, yes. Q. In the first paragraph of that letter it indicates you are going to be primarily responsible for the handling of this matter; is that correct? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.				



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

36

C. Rosada
A. I don't believe you are.
Q. Tell me why I am not correct. You
just read it to me.

A. Essentially what it is saying is that I am going to have the prime responsibility for client contact with Mr. Meiresonne.

Q. I am going to ask you to take a look
at that letter and I want you to read for me
the -- or I want you to go down to the seventh
sentence or line, correct?

12 A. Yes.

13

14

1

5

6

9

10 11

14

16

17

18

21

23

Q. And I want to go over to the sentence starting with "I." And I am going to read it. I want you to listen to me.

"I will have primary responsibility

"I will have primary responsibility
for your representation although I may consult
and utilize other attorneys and legal
assistants in the best exercise of my

professional judgment."
Is that correct? Did I read that
correctly?

A. You did.

Q. I've heard counsel describe a number of e-mails between you and Mr. Meiresonne

C. Rosada

Q. When did you tell him that?

A. I don't recall.

33

1

2 3

9

10

Q. Why would you send a letter out, if I may ask, Mr. Rosada, and state in that letter that you were going to have primary

responsibility for your representation when,in fact, you were not?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I disagree with what is your

characterization. What was meant by that, is that I would be the primary client contact on

13 this litigation. And I was. I was

responsible for billing because I had brought Industrial Quick Search to the firm and that I

would have contact with Mr. Meiresonne.

Q. What does the term primary responsibility for your representation mean to vou?

20 A. What I just told you.

Q. So at some point then did you stop

22 working on the file?

23 A. No.

24

25

1

3

10

13

14

17

18

19

20

34

MS. GILBERT: Objection to form.

Q. Was there a point where you worked on

C. Rosada

following the date of that letter, going through a period at least until March 10, 2003

where you and Mr. Meiresonne had contact,

correct?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. That you heard it, yes, I guess youdid hear it.

Q. I heard your counsel read those into the record as e-mails you read, correct?

A. That I reviewed, correct.

Q. So were you handling this matter for Mr. Meiresonne?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

15 A. The answer is no.

Q. You were not?

A. Was I handling it, no. My firm was handling it.

Q. Did you ever have a discussion with Mr. Meiresonne about who was to handle the

A. Yes, absolutely.

matter?

Q. What did you tell him?

A. That Neil Miller would be primarily

responsible for the litigation.

C. Rosada

2 the file?

A. Yes.

4 Q. At what point did you work on the

5 file?

6 A. Intermittently throughout the

7 representation.8 Q. Did you of

Q. Did you communicate with the client

9 throughout the representation?

A. I don't recall.

Q. I will show you what we have marked as Exhibit 2. Take look at that if you would.

(Witness complies.)

A. Okay.

Q. Is that an e-mail from you to

16 Mr. Meiresonne?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. It appears to be.

Q. And date of that e-mail is?

A. It says March 27, 2003.

Q. With regard to the second paragraph of that e-mail, could you read that into the

²³ record, please?

A. "We will discuss a discovery strategy

25 in the very near future. Normally federal

ESQUIRE an Alexander Gallo Company

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

Christopher Rosado 1 C. Rosada courts are strict about compliance with the 2 3 discovery schedule. Although I believe we will have some ability to put matters off 4 short term due to our substitution." 5 6 Q. As you sit here today, do you recall 7 what you meant by a discovery strategy? 8 A. No. Q. Did you ever have a discussion with 9 10 him about your discovery strategy? 11 A. I don't recall. Q. Did you ever communicate anything in 12 writing to him about a discovery strategy? 13 14 A. I don't recall. Q. As you sit here today, what would you 15 mean by discussing a discovery strategy as set forth in that e-mail? 17 18 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Q. What would that have entailed? 19 20 MS. GILBERT: Objection. 21 I don't recall. 22 Q. In the course of your representation

C. Rosada 2 My second point is I instruct the client not to have discussions with anybody about this case or to take any action in this case without consulting with us. I obviously tell them not to discuss the matter with 7 anybody because whatever they discuss with somebody else might be discoverable. 9 The third instruction I always give is not to destroy anything or do anything 10 again without discussing with us. 12 That's my custom and practice. I specifically remember when we first 13 met, because it was a Saturday and both Neil 15 and I were there, which was fairly unusual, and Mr. Meiresonne and one of his daughters were there, and I remember asking his daughter 17 to leave the conference we were in for one 18 second to have a discussion with 19 20 Mr. Meiresonne. I don't recall the particulars of what was said, but given that I 22 asked his daughter to leave, given my custom 23 and practice, I believe that's exactly what I would have done. That's what I do with all my

C. Rosada

sending him any letters?

A. I don't recall.

23

24

25

1

2

10

13

19

20

21

Q. Do you recall ever sending him what 3 4

of Mr. Meiresonne and IQS, do you recall

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

we refer to as a litigation hold letter? 5

A. I don't recall.

Q. Did you have any discussions with him specifically about discovery preservation or document preservation?

9

A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. When did you have that discussion?

A. It would have been in our initial 11 12 meeting.

Q. What would you have told him?

14 A. My custom and practice is whenever we 15 are engaged in the firm upon my initial meeting with the client, I go over some ground 16

rules. One of the ground rules is -- I 17

18 usually go over three points.

The first thing I talk about is I sort of analogize a litigation to a war. And I say in any war there will be some battles you will lose and some casualties you will take. If you are not prepared to lose some battles and take some casualties, don't get

involved in the war.

C. Rosada 1

2 Q. Would you have billed for this

conversation?

5 the initial meeting, it would have been part of that billing.

7 8 for this meeting?

Q. So only one of you would have billed?

11 12

Q. Would the bill reflect what was

1.3

15 Q. Do you recall the date of this

16

9

10

18

21

A. I don't.

20 Mr. Meiresonne?

A. Not that I recall.

that?

A. No.

25

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

Suite 4715 One Penn Plaza New York, NY 10119 www.esquiresolutions.com



clients.

38

37

A. Yes. It was probably -- if we had

Q. So Mr. Miller would also have billed

A. We never double bill in my firm.

A. Absolutely.

talked about? 14

A. Just initial consultation.

meeting? 17

Q. Did you then follow-up those

instructions in any kind of correspondence to 19

22 Q. Is it your custom and practice to do

23 24

Q. Why not?

C. Rosada

2 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't know how to answer that 3

4 question.

1

6

7

13

22

25

1

3

5

6

7

10

15

16

20

21

5 Q. It is not something you do then?

A. I said no.

Q. At the time of your initial

representation of Mr. Meiresonne, was there a

particular individual in your firm who would

have been familiar with or qualified to handle

document production? 11

12 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't understand your question.

Q. Was there someone in your firm with 14

particular knowledge or expertise in the

protocols for handling the production of 16

17 documents?

18 A. I was proficient. Mr. Miller was

proficient. 19

Q. Anyone else?

21 A. Not that I recall.

Q. Did you involve any paralegal or

legal assistants in the document production or 23

review? 24

A. Not that I recall.

C. Rosada

2 were to withhold a document, would you prepare

a privilege log? 3

A. If I was doing it personally?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Q. If you were doing it personally, was

it your custom and practice?

A. Yes. 8

9 Q. How about Mr. Miller?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to form.

11 A. I don't know.

Q. At the time you undertook 12

representation of Mr. Meiresonne, were you 13

familiar with Bates stamping of documents? 14

A. You keep saying I undertook. It was

the firm that undertook representation of 16

Mr. Meiresonne. 17

18 Q. Well, whether it was you or whether

it was the firm, I am asking you were you 19

familiar with what Bates stamping involved? 20

21 You don't have to scream. I do know,

22 yes.

25

1

7

8

10

11

21

23

23 Q. That would have been true -- I am not

24 screaming.

That would have been true in January

Q. Was it your custom and practice to 2

C. Rosada

review any documents produced by your clients

4 for privilege?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to form.

A. Can you repeat it?

Q. Was it your custom and practice to

review any documents that your clients would

produce to the other side in litigation? 9

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. Read the question back. 11

(Record read.) 12

13 It would depend on the matter.

14 Q. What do you mean by that?

A. I don't know how else to say it.

Q. Was it your custom and practice to

review a document to be produced to the other

17 side in discovery for privilege before turning 18

it over to the other side? 19

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Q. Yes or no, it is a simple answer.

22 A. It is not a simple answer, but I

23 think the answer is probably yes. Q. Was it your custom and practice if 24

you were producing numerous documents and you

42

41

1

4

5

10

15

C. Rosada

of 2003? 2

A. Yes.

4 Q. Would that have been true when you

had this conversation with Mr. Meiresonne in

your offices --

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Q. -- with Mr. Miller present that you

9 referred to this discussion about war?

MS. GILBERT: Object.

A. That I was familiar with Bates

stamping? 12

Q. Yes. Would you have discussed it 13

14 with him?

A. I don't think I would have discussed 15

16 Bates stamping in particular, no.

Q. Is it your custom and practice, sir,

17 to inventory documents before they are 18

produced to the other side in discovery? 19

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 20

A. No.

22 Q. It is not?

A. Not to inventory them, no.

24 Q. What is your custom and practice in

terms of keeping track of documents produced



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

45 1 C. Rosada C. Rosada to the other side in discovery? 2 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 2 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 3 A. It would depend on the matter. 3 A. When we get a discovery demand in a 4 Q. So the answer is yes? 4 particular matter, we provide that discovery 5 A. No, it would depend on the matter. 5 demand to the client, we discuss the Q. Do you discuss the issue of 6 7 privilege? particular demand with the client. The client 7 then produces whatever documents he or she or 8 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 8 9 A. If it is relevant. 9 it has in its possession. We review them, 10 whichever ones are responsive to the demand. Q. Do you advise the client what we provide, and the ones that aren't 11 privilege is? 12 A. It would depend on the matter. responsive, we either return to the client or 12 in some instances we retain documents we have 13 Q. So I am assuming, then, if there are 13 privileged documents you would advise the but were not produced. 14 14 1.5 client of what is privileged and what isn't 15 Q. What you are telling me is it is your custom and practice when you send out a 16 privileged, correct? 16 document request to the client that you 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 17 received from the other side to get documents 18 18 back and review them? 19 Q. And I take it you would also discuss 19 20 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 20 such concepts as relevance, correct? 21 A. I don't know. If a client produces 21 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. them, I am not sure of the logistics of it 22 A. It would depend on the matter. 22 all, if I am understanding the question. 23 Q. Would you explain to the client what 23 Q. You told me the standard procedure is 24 is a relevant document? 24 you send a document production request to 25 A. It would depend on the matter. 46 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 1 clients, correct? 2 Q. Would you expect that that would be 2 A. Correct. something that you would do as a matter of Q. Presumably that production, request 4 your custom and practice? 5 for production is accompanied by a letter, 5 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. correct? 6 A. It would depend on the matter. 7 A. I am sure accompanied by some 7 Q. So there are matters where you tell a communication. client to produce documents without discussing Q. And that communication would say what 9 9 relevance? 10 10 typically? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. I am not sure there is a typical That's not what he said. 11 A. I don't recall. But if it was letter, but there is some kind of 12 12 communication regarding it. 13 13 relevant, I would discuss it with the client. Q. Do you advise the client of the type 14 Q. Is it your job as a lawyer to explain of documents that are to be supplied? 15 15 to the client what is relevant? A. It would depend on the matter. 16 16 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 17 Q. Do you advise the client of the 17 Q. Is that part of your custom and parameters of what is to be produced insofar 18 18 practice, sir? as documents are concerned? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 19 19 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 20 A. It depends on the matter. 20 21 A. It would depend on the matter. Q. There are matters, then, that you

21

22

23

24

25



to those document requests?

Q. Do you discuss with them any

particular description of the scope of what

the client is supposed to produce in response

22

23

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

would not tell your client what is relevant?

A. I just answered that question.

Q. Is it your custom and practice to

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

52

C. Rosada explain privilege in the context of a 2 particular document production? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 4 5 Asked and answered. 6 A. It would depend on the matter. 7 Q. When a document production request is sent to the client such as in this case, do you discuss with the client or advise the client about specific procedures with regard to producing documents in response to that 11 request? 12 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 13 A. I didn't handle document production 14 15 Q. I am asking about your custom and 16 17 practice. Is it your custom and practice to 18 give instructions to the client about what 19 they are to do insofar as production of the 21 documents responsive to that production 22 request? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 23 24 A. It would depend on the matter. 25 Q. Is it your practice to give the C. Rosada 1 2 3

49 1 C. Rosada MR. MEIRESONNE: Henry, can we take 2 3 a minute? MR. EMRICH: Let's take a short 4 5 break. (Discussion held off the record.) 7 MR. EMRICH: Back on the record. 8 Q. Mr. Rosada, is it your expectation that any attorney what handles a matter for a 9 client on behalf of your firm, is it your 10 expectation that they follow the same custom and practice with regard to document 12 production as you would? 13 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 14 15 A. I don't know. Q. You don't know that? 16 17 A. I would assume that they would do something similar, if not identical. 18 Q. You would certainly expect them to 19 adhere to the standard of care for the 20 production of documents, correct? 21 22 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 23 A. If I understand your question, yes. 24 Q. So it wouldn't matter who handled the 25 matter, a legal matter, on behalf of a client

client advice about document retention? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 4 Say the question again. 5 Q. Is it your practice to give the client instruction regarding document storage 7 or document retention? 8 A. I don't know about document storage, 9 but I told you before that when we are initially engaged, during the initial client 10

meeting, I have this broad overview with the client. Among other things that I talk about is document retention. Q. So what kind of things do you talk about in connection with document retention?

A. Pretty basically not to destroy or get rid of anything without discussing it with us first.

Q. Do you discuss with them whether or 19 not a client has a document retention policy? 20

A. Not that I recall.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Do you ever request if a client has a document retention policy?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. Not that I recall.

C. Rosada 1

50

5

7

11

12

13

16

22

24

in your firm, you would expect them to adhere to whatever that standard of care was for the

production of documents?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. I don't understand your question.

Q. In your conversations with

Mr. Meiresonne, were you ever made aware that

any documents have been discarded or 9 destroyed? 10

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. After the fact.

Q. I am talking about in your

discussions prior to, let's say, March 31, 14

2003. 15

A. No.

17 Q. As a matter of practice and a matter of your custom and practice, if a client were

18

to tell you that documents, potentially 19

relevant documents had been destroyed or 20

discarded, what would you do? 21

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I would inquire further. 23

Q. What particular steps would you take?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 25



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972 Christopher Rosado October 26, 55 53 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 matters would you give or want to determine A. I would try and ascertain what 2 documents were destroyed. the names of those persons involved in the 3 production or preservation of documents? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 4 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 5 A. Because it might be relevant to the 6 A. I don't know if it would depend on a 6 matter as opposed to the circumstances of a 7 litigation. Q. Why? particular action. 8 9 Q. So, in other words, you might have 9 A. For the reasons that occurred here, communication with persons in a company who that there might be spoliation. 10 10 Q. I take it that would be true for any might be responsible for or involved with the 11 production and preservation of documents? lawyer handling a matter on behalf of your 12 12 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 13 MS. G!LBERT: Objection to the form. 14 A. I might. 14 Q. Was there a particular point in this A. I can't speak for the other lawyers 1.5 15 case where you turned over responsibility of 16 in the firm. 16 the file to Mr. Miller? Q. Would you expect that as a matter of 17 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. custom and practice? 18 18 19 A. Mr. Miller was responsible for the MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 19 A. I can't speak for the other lawyers 20 litigation from inception. 20 21 in the firm. 21 Q. So he was involved with this matter Q. When Miller Rosado & Algios handles a 22 from the time you met with Mr. Meiresonne in 22 matter, are there different standards of care 23 your office? 23 24 A. Correct. for handling these issues depending on who the 24 25 Q. And he would have been responsible lawyer might be handling the case? 54 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada 1 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. for handling matters in this litigation from 2 3 A. Not to my knowledge. that time? 4 Q. Do you or any other member of your 4 A. To the extent I understand the 5 firm send out specific instructions to clients 5 question, yes. about the instruction for discarding or Q. Along with you? 7 preservation of documents? 7 A. To a lesser degree, correct. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 8 Q. Did there come a time where he took A. I don't know what the other lawyers 9 9 over primary responsibility of the handling of in my firm do, but I do not. this matter on behalf of the firm? 10 10 Q. Is there a reason why you do not? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 11 11 A. No. 12 A. From the inception. 12 Q. Do you make any attempt to identify Q. So you are telling me, as you sit 13 13 who might be the key players in a company that here today, then you would have been 14 14 you are representing or a client that you are responsible or had primary responsibility for 15 representing with regard to the production or 16 handling this matter all throughout the

litigation?

the firm.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



conversations with?

preservation of documents?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't even understand the question.

A. It would depends on the matter.

would you expect to have those kinds of

Q. If you learned -- what kind of

Q. What situations would you then --

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I would have primary responsibility

Q. I am talking about handling the

A. Mr. Miller was responsible for the

matters with regard to the litigation.

for client contact between Mr. Meiresonne and

That's not what he said.

60

C. Rosada

underlying litigation from inception of the

3 retention.

4

16

17

20

22

1

3

6

10

11

12

14

15

18

22

23

Q. What exactly was your role then?

Explain to me what your role was.

A. I would have billed Mr. Meiresonne.

I would have communicated with Mr. Meiresonne

if he wanted to speak about the matter, he

wanted to call the firm. He could have called

and asked for me. I would have discussed

whatever concerns he had. 11

12 Q. Did you have regular communication

13 with Mr. Meiresonne?

A. I don't think that I had regular, but 14

I certainly spoke to him. 15

Q. And you said you billed him.

How would you have known what to bill

18 if you weren't working on the matter?

A. We have a billing program. 19

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

21 Q. Describe that for me.

A. We have an Amicus Attorney Program,

23 which is a calendar and billing program, and

Mr. Meiresonne's matter was entered into that

program.

1 C. Rosada

57

6

10

13

19

20

25

1

3

6

12

19

21

23

58

review it for sense and sensibility. And

there were several occasions during the course

of retention that I had discussions with Neil

and/or Mike regarding strategy.

Q. Specifically?

7 A. The only one I specifically recall is

the issue about damages after the spoliation

9 decision came down.

Q. That would be after the hearing?

11 A. It was after the decision, so it

would have been after the hearing. 12

Q. Were you ever involved in providing

any privilege or preparing any privilege log 14

for Mr. Meiresonne? 15

16 A. No.

17 Q. Were you ever involved in actually

reviewing documents that were to be produced? 18

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

21 Q. Were you ever involved in trying to

22 determine what documents were subject to

23 production and what documents were not subject

24 to production?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Q. In connection with your

C. Rosada

responsibilities in this case, did you have

4 any oversight of what was going on in the

5 litigation?

A. No.

7 Q. So you would not have reviewed what

Mr. Miller was doing with regard to the

handling of the litigation? 9

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

I didn't say that.

Q. Did you have oversight?

13 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. The answer is no.

Q. Did you involve yourself in any

16 aspect of the handling of the litigation at

any point after March of 2003? 17

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. When you say did I involve myself, 19

no. But I was asked to participate in certain 20

21 parts of it.

Q. What were those parts?

A. Generally I would review any material

document that went out, such as a pleading or

response to discovery, some motion. I would

C. Rosada

2 A. No.

Q. Did you ever review any documents for

privilege? 4

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. Not that I recall.

7 Q. Were those tasks that were assigned

to Mr. Miller?

9 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. Yes.

10 Q. And performed by Mr. Miller? 11

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

13 A. I don't know.

14 Q. Did you specifically ever provide any

assistance to Mr. Meiresonne in producing any 15

16 documents?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Did you ever answer any questions

that Mr. Meiresonne may have asked Mr. Miller

or the firm about production of documents? 20

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. Not that I recall. 22

Q. Did you ever come out to

Mr. Meiresonne's business to review any 24

documents?



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

61 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 produced documents without reviewing them for 2 A. No. privilege? 3 Q. Did you ever come out to MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Mr. Meiresonne's business at all? A. No. A. Not that I recall. Q. How about as to whether or not the Q. Again, were those things being 6 documents subject to -- are relevant or 7 handled by Mr. Miller? discoverable? 8 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 9 9 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. What things? Q. The production of documents, the 10 A. Not that I recall. 10 11 Q. You certainly don't leave those kinds review of documents, the review of documents 11 of determinations to the client, do you? 12 for privilege? 12 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 13 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 13 14 A. I don't understand your question. A. Document production was handled by 14 15 Q. Do you leave to the client as a 15 Mr. Miller. matter of your custom and practice a decision Q. That's something you would expect him 16 16 as to what document is discoverable? 17 to handle? 17 18 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 18 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. I still don't understand the 19 19 A. Yes. 20 auestion. 2.0 Q. Again, would you expect him as a member of your firm to review documents that 21 Q. Do you leave it to the client to 21 were to be produced for privilege? 22 determine what documents should be produced? 22 23 A. To some degree you have to. 23 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 24 Q. Do you leave it to the client to A. It would depend on the matter. 24 determine what document is privileged? 25 Q. Would you expect him to review 62 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 π. 2 documents as to whether they are relevant? 2 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 3 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 3 A. Not generally. A. It would depends on the matter. Q. So that's something you make a 4 5 Q. Just out of curiosity, what matters decision on, correct? can you think of involving document 6 A. I don't have access to all the files 7 production, what circumstances, what matters for all clients. I can only review what they would give rise to you not reviewing a provide to me. That's why I don't understand 8 document to determine if it was relevant? 9 certain your questions. Certainly, it has not MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 10 been my custom and practice in document A. I don't understand your question. 11 production for me to review every document a 11 Q. As you sit here, you say it depends client may have in his office or offices from 12 12 13 on the matter when I ask these questions as to 13 the beginning of time until then. 14 whether you review them for privilege. 14 That's why I send the discovery 15 What particular matters can you think 15 demand to them, and as the matter dictates, discuss where I think it is appropriate to 16 of where you would not review a document to 16 determine if it was privileged before 17 17 discuss it with them. 18 producing it? 18 Q. And then, again, when you turn over 19 A. I don't know if it was one issue or documents, I take it, you review them before 19 if it is litigation globally. It would depend 20 they get turned over? on the facts and circumstances of that MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 21 22 particular action on how we approach the 22 A. It would be my custom and practice 23 document production. 23 whatever documents were produced to me by the 24 Q. Are there matters that you can tell client, I would review them before they were 24

turned over.



me about as you sit here today where you have

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

C. Rosada 2 Q. And I take it that that would be a 3 custom and practice for your firm as well, 4 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 5 6 A. I can't speak for other people in my 7 firm. 8 Q. Would you expect that other people in your firm who are attorneys in the State of 9 10 New York practicing in this particular area, would it be your expectation that each of them would adhere to the same custom and practice 12 as you with regard to production of documents? 13 14 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. I can't speak for other employees in 15 16 my firm. 17 Q. Mr. Rosada, as I have listened to you 18 today I get the impression that you and Mr. Miller were interchangeable in terms of 19 20 the handling of this matter for

Mr. Meiresonne; is that correct?

A. That's not correct at all.

correct about that?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Q. Why isn't that correct? What is not

22

23

24

65

C. Rosada 1 2 A. Not that I recall. 3 Q. Any of the other attorneys in Mr. Rittenger's law firm? 4 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 5 6 Not that I am aware of. 7 Q. With regard to this particular matter, do you know why your firm was hired? 9 A. You would have to ask Mr. Meiresonne. 10 Q. I am asking you if you know as you sit here today any particular reason why he 12 came to your firm? A. I don't. 13 Q. Any particular reason why you ended 14 up taking the matter in or taking 1.5 responsibility for the matter? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 17 A. I don't understand the question. 18 Q. In your firm, did you get some kind 19 special credit for bringing in a matter? 20 21 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 22 A. When you say special credit, what do 23 you mean? I don't understand the question. 24 Q. From a billing standpoint, from a

compensation standpoint?

1 C. Rosada 2 A. Mr. Miller was assigned 3 responsibility for handling the underlying 4 litigation. 5 Q. Did you ever send a letter out to Mr. Meiresonne telling him that? 7 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 8 A. No. 9 Q. Did you ever send an e-mail to Mr. Meiresonne telling him that? 10 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 11 12 A. There was no reason to. He was told 13 that in the initial meeting. That's why Mr. Miller was there. 14 15 Q. Mr. Rosada, did you have any prior experience with the -- with Mr. Rittenger's 16 law firm prior to this particular case? 17 1.8 I don't believe so. 19 Q. How about Mr. Miller? 20 A. I don't know. 21 Q. Did you have any connection or relationship with Mr. Rittenger? 22 23 A. No. 24 Q. So you had not known him prior to this case?

66 68 C. Rosada 1 2 A. Yes. Q. Tell me about that. 3 4 A. Our general policy is whoever brings the client to the firm takes 25 percent of the billing and the rest is firm income. 7 Q. Was that the situation here? A. Yes. 8 9 Q. So you brought the client to the firm? 10 11 A. I was the client -- he contacted me. but if I understand your question --12 Q. Do you know why he contacted you? 1.3 A. I believe he was referred to me by 14 another client. 15 Q. Mr. Rosada, I ask you to take a look 1.7 at what I have marked as Exhibit 4 and ask you if those look familiar. 18 (Witness complies.) 19 20 A. Okay. Q. Have you had a chance to look at 21 22 those, sir? A. I looked through. I didn't review 23 each and every time entry. 24 Q. Do they look familiar? 25



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

69 1 C. Rosada C. Rosada 2 Q. Anything else? 2 A. They appear to be either time entries A. Not that I recall. or bills rendered by the firm to 3 3 Q. Before those time records are Mr. Meiresonne on this matter. produced, how was time logged in your firm? 5 Q. For work done by your firm? 6 A. Correct. A. It is put directly in the Amicus program. Q. I notice at the top of every bill Q. So into a computer? where the time entries appear there is the 8 8 9 A. Correct. 9 name Chris Rosada. 10 Why is that, sir? 10 Q. So each of you had a computer that A. That's just the way the Amicus 11 you would have entered time into? 11 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 12 12 program prints. 13 What time are you talking about? 13 Q. Are these particular bills then sent out under your signature? 14 Q. In 2003. 14 15 A. Yes. 15 A. There is no signature. Q. And then are monthly performance Q. Are they sent out by you? 16 16 produced or computer sheets showing the time 17 A. Yes. 17 that has been entered? Q. So you review each of these bills 18 18 19 A. No. 19 before they get sent out? 20 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 20 Q. What is produced? 21 A. My custom is to review bills before 21 A. What is produced when? they are sent out. 22 Q. After the time has been entered, how 22 Q. Why? 23 does time end up onto your bills? 23 24 A. I run a report. 24 A. To make sure they are accurate. 25 Q. What kind of report? 25 Q. What do you look at? 70 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 2 A. To make sure there is not some A. A time report. mistake when somebody types something in. Q. Is that a computer report? 4 Q. Anything else? A. From Amicus. 5 A. It would depend on the matter, I 5 Q. Is that a computer program? quess. 6 A. Amicus Attorney is a computer 7 Q. Specifically with respect to this 7 program. matter, did Mr. Miller review the bills before 8 Q. So you are able to pull that out --MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 9 they went out? 9 10 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 10 Q. -- from the Amicus program? A. Not that I recall. A. I am able to pull out the time 11 Q. Just so I understand, how would you entries from the computer program, correct. 12 12 know they were accurate? Q. Okay, not a problem for you? 13 1.3 A. When you say how would I know they A. When you say not a problem I don't 14 14 were accurate --15 know what you mean. 15 Q. You said you wanted to review them 16 Q. You are able to do that as a member 17 for accuracy? 17 of your law firm with that program in place? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 18 18 A. If I saw that somebody misplaced a A. It is one of the points of the 19 19 decimal and somebody spent 24 hours on 20 20 program. document production doing a pleading, I could 21 Q. It is a simple question. I am just 22 see that that's a typo, so I would know that. 22 trying to ascertain --23 I will generally be familiar with the A. And I am just trying to answer. 23 matters, what's going on generally. That 24 Q. Now, I am going to show you what we



would be another way I would know.

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

Suite 4715 One Penn Plaza New York, NY 10119 www.esquiresolutions.com

have marked as Exhibit 3 and ask you to take a

73 75 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 2 Q. And he would do that on his computer? 2 look at those. A. You would have to ask Mr. Miller. (Witness complies.) 3 3 Q. I am asking if you know as the keeper 4 A. Okay. of this program as or the one who maintains Q. What are those? 5 this program and the one who sent these bills A. They appear to be certain invoices 6 7 out? 7 from the firm. 8 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 8 Q. That's different from what we just A. IT maintains the computers. I don't 9 9 looked at that was sent to Mr. Meiresonne, maintain the computers. 10 11 Q. Who was the IT guy in 2003? 11 MS. GILBERT: Meaning Plaintiffs' 12 A. I don't know. 12 Exhibit 4? Q. Who is the IT guy today? MR. EMRICH: Yes. 13 13 A. Michael Delaura, D.E.L.A.U.R.A., I A. If you are asking if they are IQS 14 14 15 bills, no, they don't appear to be. Q. How long has he been your IT guy? Q. They are other client matters? 16 16 A. I don't know. 17 17 A. They appeared to be. Q. Is he with a company? 18 18 Q. Are these pulled from the same 19 A. Yes. 19 program? Q. What is the name of the company? 20 A. Some of them. 20 21 Q. What about the others? 21 A. Binary --Q. B.I ---MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 22 22 Q. Where do the others come from? 23 A. N.A.R.Y. 23 24 Q. Just Binary? 24 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 25 A. I am going to finish. 25 A. I don't know. 74 76 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 1 Q. I am sorry. I apologize? 2 Q. When was the Amicus program in place? 2 A. Platform. Platform or Platforms. I 3 A. I don't know. Q. Was it in place in 2003? don't know if it is singular or plural. 4 4 5 A. Yes. Q. And what is the address of Binary Q. So you had the ability to access that Platform? program for billing information pertinent to a 7 A. I don't know. particular client? Q. Are they here in New York? 8 8 9 A. No. 9 A. Yes. 10 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Q. Any particular part of New York? 10 Q. What information could you access and A. They are on Long Island. 11 how could you access it? Q. Is that where we are today on Long 12 12 A. Some of my other partners didn't use 13 13 Island? the Amicus program for billing purpose, I did. 14 14 A. No, we are in Manhattan. Q. Did Mr. Miller use the Amicus Q. I don't know, that's why I am asking. 15 15 program? A. I don't know anything west of the 17 A. Not to my knowledge. 17 Hudson so ... MS. GILBERT: In 2003. Q. So I take it that your firm is in 18 18 19 A. For billing purposes in my matter, in 19 Long Island? a matter that I brought into the firm, I input 20 20 A. Yes. that matter into the Amicus Attorney so I 21 Q. I just know it is big, this place we 22 establish a matter because it is a calendering 22 are at.

23

24



the program.

23

and billing program. If Mr. Miller worked on

that matter, he would input time right into

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

A. Certainly a lot of people.

Q. By virtue of the fact that the

records, the time records that you have there

C. Rosada

are different and they are represented to us

as being Mr. Miller's time records for matters

he handled in the time frame from April 1, 4

2003 through September 1, 2003, I take it he 5

was using a different billing system for other

7 clients of his than was used in this

particular case?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

10

9

11

12

13

16

17

20

22

1

2

3

5

6

Q. That was because this was your matter, Mr. Rosada, that you brought in?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

14 A. The difference in bill was

15 historical.

Q. There is no need to be defensive. I

am trying to understand why we have so many

18 different billing forms in this particular

19

A. I am not being defensive. When I

said it's historical, I am trying to explain. 21

Q. Explain it for me.

23 A. The different billing packages were

24 historical. Before we were a firm, each of us

used a different billing software and then we

78

77

1

11

13

18

19

4 5

9

15

16

17

C. Rosada

carried it over to when we became a firm.

Q. Is that still the way you do things

4 today?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. Less so today.

Q. Just so I am clear and I can

understand why there are several different

formats that appear in that sheaf of bills for

Mr. Miller is because he used different 1.0

billing formats depending on a particular

client; is that correct? 12

A. If I understand the question yes. 13

14 Q. So some of the formats are

15 typewritten and some of them are handwritten,

16 correct?

17

19

21

25

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I think part of this -- I don't think 18

there would be handwritten bills. I think

20 these are supporting entries.

Q. That's how he logs his time when he

creates a particular entry or performs the 22

23 service?

24 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. It would depend on the matter.

C. Rosada

Q. What would depend on matter? What do

you mean by that?

A. If I brought a client to the firm,

that client would be automatically entered

into the Amicus program. Anybody in the firm

who worked on the program, whether Neil or I,

on a very rare occasion our other partner Lou,

that time would be entered directly in the 9

10 Amicus program.

Q. With regard to Mr. Miller's

12 professional --

Q. With regard to Mr. Miller's rendering

15

17 time?

A. Again, if I understand your question,

20

21

entirely what his custom and practice was in

2003. 23

C. Rosada

Exhibit 3, does that account for why there are

so many different formats?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. When you say so many --

Q. Or several formats?

7 A. Again, if I understand your question,

the answer is yes.

Q. Thank you.

10 And I take it because of that you are not able to get an idea or you are not able to use this Amicus to get a handle on what each 12

particular attorney is working on at any given 13 time; is that correct? 14

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. That's correct.

Q. I am just trying to understand some

18 things, Mr. Rosado, that's all.

19 Mr. Rosada, with regard to the work done by the Miller Rosado & Algios firm in 20

this particular case back in 2003, there was 21 pending in I believe the Federal District 22

23 Court for the Southern District of New York;

24 is that correct?

25 A. That's correct.

> Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

Suite 4715 One Penn Plaza New York, NY 10119 www.esquiresolutions.com



A. Finish your question.

professional services, it depended on the matter as to how he would keep track of the

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

if Mr. Miller brought a client to the firm,

how he rendered his bills, I don't know

22

24 Q. As you look at the bills in that time

frame, that spans the bills in front of you in

84

81 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada 1 as the matter your firm was retained to handle 2 Q. The particular matter that we are in 3 on behalf of Mr. Meiresonne and his companies? 3 today, involved in today taking your MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 4 deposition, is in a different District Court? A. I don't understand the question. 5 5 A. Is that a question? Q. Are you familiar with the what 6 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 6 standard of care is for attorney handling the 7 Q. Yes. 7 A. Yes. 8 8 9 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 9 Q. And it's the Eastern District; is A. I don't understand your question. 10 10 that correct? Q. What don't you understand about my 11 A. That's correct. 11 Q. As a litigator, as an attorney 12 question? 12 A. When you say standard of care, I am 13 practicing in this particular area, have you 13 not sure what you are referring to. 14 had experience in both courts? 14 Q. The standard of care handling a 15 A. Yes. 15 matter for an attorney, that governs an 16 16 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. attorney's actions, governs his contact? 17 17 Q. Does your custom and practice in A. I don't understand. 18 terms of how you handle a matter or how your 18 Q. As to whether it meets the standard firm handles a matter differ depending on 19 19 of care? 20 20 whether it is the Federal District Court for MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. the Southern District of New York or the 21 Q. You don't know what standard of care 22 Federal District Court for the Eastern 22 23 District of New York? 23 is for an attorney practicing law in either of 24 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 24 these districts? 25 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 25 A. I don't believe so. 82

C. Rosada

Q. Would that be true with regard to your firm's handling of client matters?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

5 A. If there is distinction between Eastern District and Southern District?

7 Q. Yes, in terms of your custom and practice. 8

9 A. I don't believe so.

Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

11 Q. Would that also hold true for any other attorney handling a matter in either the 12 Eastern District or Southern District? 13

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't know.

Q. Is the standard of care applicable to an attorney handling a matter on behalf of a client in either district court the same, as far as you know?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. To the extent I understand your 21

22 question, it is the same.

23 Q. Are you familiar, sir, with what the 24 standard of care is or was in 2003 for an attorney of your firm handling a matter such

1

7

C. Rosada

2 A. About having professional competent representation? 3

Q. You certainly know what I am asking 4 you, don't you?

A. No. Don't testify for me, sir.

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Q. Is it your opinion that an attorney should have competence in handling a substantive issue in the courts, in either 10

11 court that we have mentioned? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 12

A. Yes. 13

Q. Again, do you know what that standard 14

15 of care is?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't understand your question, I'm

sorry. 18

16

17

23

Q. Did you consider yourself competent 19 to handle the particular matter on behalf of 20

Mr. Meiresonne and his companies back in 2003? 21

22 A. Me, myself?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes. 24

25 Q. Did you consider Mr. Miller competent



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

85 C. Rosada C. Rosada to handle the matter back in 2003? 2 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 2 3 A. Correct. 3 4 Q. Do you have any knowledge as to Q. Did you consider your firm competent 4 whether or not there were any departures from to handle the matter on behalf of Mr. Meiresonne and his companies back in 2003? the standard of care by Mr. Miller in regard 6 to the two matters you just mentioned? 7 A. Yes. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Q. I asked you previously if you had 8 8 reviewed any of the expert reports in this 9 A. What two matters? 9 10 Q. Regarding handling of the document case and you indicated that you had not; is that correct? production and handling of the evidence at the 11 12 A. I said not that I recall. hearing. 12 MS. GILBERT: Objection. Q. Did you ever have any discussions 13 13 A. Not to my knowledge. with your expert that has been retained to 14 14 Q. That knowledge would come from what? 15 review the work done in this case? A. My general understanding of the 16 A. Not that I recall. 16 17 Q. Any communications of any kind with 17 Q. But not a review of anything that 18 18 them? happened during the critical times? 19 19 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 20 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 20 A. Not that I recall. 21 Q. Did anyone ever tell you what that 21 A. When you say critical times, I am not person's opinions were? 22 sure what you mean. 22 MS. GILBERT: Objection. 23 Q. Let's say March 2003 until August of 23 24 2003. 24 A. Not that I recall. 25 A. Okay. Q. How about with regard to plaintiffs' 25 86 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 1 expert, did anyone ever discuss with you those 2 time insofar as the production of documents? 3 opinions? 4 A. Not that I recall. 4 5 5

Q. Do you have any knowledge or understanding of what plaintiffs' claims are with regard to the allegations of negligence on the part of Mr. Miller? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. What is your understanding of what those allegations of negligence relate to? 12 A. My understanding of the claims in 13 this action is that the plaintiffs are alleging that Mr. Miller didn't adequately supervise document production and/or didn't introduce certain evidence in the damages 17 portion that would have changed the outcome of 18

20 Q. Is that the extent of your knowledge?

That's my general understanding.

22 Q. I've heard you testify today that you

23 didn't review any correspondence or any other e-mails other than what you have testified to

earlier, correct?

the matter.

19

Q. Any idea what Mr. Miller did at that

A. Not that I recall sitting here today.

Q. Did you ever read the hearing

transcript in this case?

A. Not that I remember.

Q. So it would be your position that

your firm, Mr. Miller or your firm, did

nothing negligent in the handling of 10

11 Mr. Meiresonne's matter? 12

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

13 A. Absolutely.

16

20

21

23

Q. Absolutely what? 14

15 A. Absolutely not.

Q. Mr. Rosada, when was the first time

17 you were aware that there had been a problem

with regard to the production of documents in 18

this particular case? 19

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. The date?

22 Q. Yes, sir.

A. I don't recall.

24 Q. Approximately.

25 A. I don't recall the date.

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

5

11

18

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

7

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

91

92

C. Rosada

2 Q. Do you have any approximate idea of 3 the time when you first became aware of it? MS. GILBERT: Objection. 4

He said he doesn't recall.

A. It would have been after the

6 plaintiffs made their spoliation motion. 8

Q. So that would have been what,

,sometime in September or October 2003? 9

10 A. I don't know.

Q. How did you become aware of it?

A. Mr. Miller told me. 12

Q. What did he tell you?

14 A. That the plaintiffs had made a 15 spoliation motion.

16 Q. What specifically did he tell you?

17 Did you read the motion?

A. At some point I read the motion.

Q. Would it have been in connection with 19 20 that conversation?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. Or conversation shortly thereafter.

Q. Did you have any discussion with

Mr. Miller about that particular motion and

basis for the motion?

C. Rosada

89

1

7

8

11

1.2

16 17

20

21

22

1

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

22

23

90

would have told you no, what I reviewed today.

If you asked me any e-mails at any time, I 3

would have told you I don't recall.

Q. Did you and Mr. Miller communicate at all in writing about what had transpired?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

I don't believe so.

Q. Did you and Mr. Miller communicate by 9

computer about what had transpired? 10

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't believe so.

Q. Did he send you a copy of a motion by 13 computer to look at or did you pull it out of 14 15

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't recall.

Q. What did you do when you found out 18 that the spoliation motion had been filed? 19

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't understand your question.

Q. After you found out that the

23 spoliation motion had been filed and related

to the document production that occurred

sometime in August 2003, what did you do?

C. Rosada

A. I am sure I did, but I don't recall the particulars.

Q. Did you ask him what he had done in connection with the document production?

A. I don't recall.

Q. Did you ask him if he could -- if

there were any -- did you look at any

correspondence in the time frame from March 9 2003 to the time that motion was filed? 10

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

I don't believe so.

Q. And you didn't review any e-mails during that time frame?

15 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't recall.

Q. When you said earlier you hadn't reviewed any e-mails except e-mails that the attorney produced, correct?

A. You were talking about in preparation 20 21 for the deposition.

22 Q. I asked you previously whether you 23 reviewed any e-mails at any time.

A. If your question was any e-mails at any time in connection with this deposition, I C. Rosada

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't recall in particular, but I

probably discussed the matter with Neil. 5

Q. Is that the only person you discussed it with?

A. I am sure I discussed it at some point with Mr. Meiresonne.

Q. Why did you discuss it with Mr. Meiresonne?

A. I was part of the case.

Q. Well, you weren't involved in that

document production, were you? A. No, I was not.

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Q. You told me Mr. Miller had been

17 supervising it, correct?

18 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. Yes.

Q. Why did you have a discussion with 20

Mr. Meiresonne? 21

A. Why?

Q. Yes.

24 A. Because I was part of the case.

25 Q. What do you remember about that



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

95 93 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada 1 Q. Did you have any discussion with discussion? 2 Mr. Meiresonne about whether or not there was A. I don't remember the particulars of 3 a document retention policy in place at his the conversation or conversations. It may 4 company at that time? have been more than one. Q. Did you ask him what had happened? A. I don't recall. 6 Q. Did you ever ask him to explain to A. I don't believe I was the person 7 doing the questioning and answering. you what had happened with regard to the 8 9 documents that were allegedly destroyed in 9 Q. Who was? A. Probably Mr. Miller. 10 July 2003 or in 2001? 10 11 A. I don't know if I ever asked that Q. So if Mr. Miller was doing the 11 question, but it was surely discussed. questioning and answering, why would you have 1.2 12 13 Q. Do you ever recall telling him that 13 talked to Mr. Meiresonne? based on what he told you that it sounded like MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 14 a typical or normal way for a business person A. I was part of the conference call. 15 to handle the discarding of documents? Q. As you sit here today, what do you 16 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 17 recall specifically about what gave rise to 17 18 A. I don't recall ever having that 18 the motion for spoliation motion? 19 conversation. A. My recollection is that there were 19 allegations that Mr. Meiresonne destroyed 20 Q. Is it possible you had that 2.0 documents in 2001 and again in 2003. 21 conversation? 21 Q. When in 2003? 22 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 22 23 A. Anything is possible, but certainly 23 A. I don't recall. 24 doubtful. Q. Did you have any conversations with 24 25 Q. Why is that, sir? him about that? 96 1 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. Because that's not something I think 2 3 A. I believe I did. I would have said based on the facts as I 4 Q. What do you recall about those understand them. 5 conversations? Q. Did you go back and review any of the 6 A. I don't recall the specifics of the e-mails or correspondence leading up to the 7 conversation. 7 document inspection that occurred at his Q. Did you provide any advice to 8 business in August of 2003? Mr. Meiresonne about the particular motion 9 9 A. Not that I recall. that had been filed? 10 Q. Did you ever make any inquiries about 10 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. that particular document inspection? 11 11 A. Independent of Mr. Miller, I don't MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 1.2 12 A. I don't understand your question. 13 believe so. 13 14 Q. Did you provide any recommendations 14 Q. Did you ever ask Mr. Meiresonne about to Mr. Meiresonne as to how he should respond that particular document inspection that to that motion or how your firm should respond occurred at his business in August of 2003? to that motion? 17 A. Like I said, during these conference 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. calls, one or more conference calls we 18 18 A. Independent of Mr. Miller, I don't 19 19 certainly discussed the background of the document production, but I don't remember the believe so. 20 20 Q. Did you provide any indication to particulars of what was discussed. 21 Mr. Meiresonne whether or not the motion was 22 Q. Did you discuss the aspects of that

23

24



A. I don't recall.

23

24 25 something that he should concern himself with?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

document inspection at Mr. Meiresonne's

business in August of 2003 with Mr. Miller?

A. Independently of Mr. Meiresonne?

97 C. Rosada 1 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 2 3 Q. Yes. A. Not that I recall. Q. Did you ask or take it upon yourself 5 to review any e-mails that exchanged hands 7 between Mr. Miller and Mr. Meiresonne in the days leading up to the document inspection? 8 9 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. Not that I recall. 10 11 Q. Is that something that you think you 12 should have looked at? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 13 A. Mr. Miller was primarily responsible 14 for the handling of the case, so he was 15 16 handling whatever motions came in. 17 Q. So you weren't playing any role in terms of advising Mr. Meiresonne about how to 18 19 handle that motion, is that what you are saying? 20 21 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. That's not what I am saying at all. 22 Q. What are you saying? 23 A. I am saying when Mr. Miller or Mr. Meiresonne consulted with me, I rendered 98

1 C. Rosada Q. Did you determine if he was present 2 3 for that document production? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 5 Q. Or inspection? 6 A. I found out subsequent that he was not present at the production in Michigan. 7 8 Q. How did you find that out? 9 A. I believe Mr. Miller told me. 10 Q. Did that cause you any concern? 11 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 12 13 Q. It didn't cause you any concern? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 14 15 Q. Why not? 16 MS. GILBERT: Objection. 17 A. I don't know how to answer that 18 19 question. 20 Q. You didn't see any reason for him to 21 be present at that document production? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 22 A. Not based on the conversations I had 23 24 with Mr. Miller. 25 Q. What conversations did you have with

C. Rosada 1 whatever opinion they asked me. Q. So how were you able to render an 3 opinion if you didn't know what the facts 4 5 were? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 6 A. Who said I didn't know what the facts 7 8 were Q. Did you know what the facts were? 9 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 10 A. I knew what they explained to me and 11 12 I rendered an opinion --13 Q. What did they explain to you? A. I don't recall the particulars of the 14 conversations. Q. Do you recall the generalities? 16 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. What do you recall? A. I recall discussing the spoliation 19 20 motion. 21 Q. Did you ask Mr. Miller about how he handled the document inspection at 23 Mr. Meiresonne's business in August of 2003? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 24

1 C. Rosada Mr. Miller? 3 A. He told me at some point what went on with the document production. Q. What did he tell you? A. I don't remember the particulars. 6 7 Q. Did you write it down? 8 A. No. Q. Did you have any communication with 9 your insurance carrier following the filing of this motion for spoliation motion? 11 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 12 13 A. No. 14 Q. Did you make any claim or give notice of any kind to your insurance carrier following the filing of this motion? 16 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection. 18 A. No. 19 Q. Why not? MS. GILBERT: Objection. 20 21 A. I didn't think I had reason to. Q. And you don't recall looking at any 22 of the communications that went back and forth 23 between Mr. Meiresonne and Mr. Miller?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

24



A. I don't recall.

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

101 103 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 decision. 2 Q. In the days leading up to that Q. What do you recall discussing with 3 document production ---4 MS. GILBERT: Objection. A. The answer is still going to be no. A. I don't think I recall the Q. Did you have any involvement with the particulars. 6 Q. Did you write any letters or other preparation of the response for the motion? correspondence to Mr. Meiresonne about what he 8 A. Other than probably reviewing it once 9 Neil drafted it, no. should or shouldn't do? 10 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 10 Q. What exactly would you review it for if you didn't know what had happened? 11 A. Not that I recall. 11 Q. Did you discuss with him whether or 12 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 12 not he should appeal the matter? 13 A. I can still read it for persuasive A. Not that I recall. grammar, various other issues to see whether 14 or not it was legally persuasive and cited the 15 Q. Did you discuss either of the those 15 16 concepts with Mr. Miller? law correctly, et cetera. 16 17 A. Not that I recall. 17 Q. Did you have any communications with Q. Did you ever research the matter to 18 Mr. Rittenger or anyone from his firm after 18 the motion had been filed? 19 determine if, in fact, he had a basis for 19 A. Regarding the motion? 20 appeal? Q. Yes, sir. 21 A. I don't think I did any research. 21 22 Q. Did Mr. Miller? 22 A. No. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 23 Q. Regarding what led to the motion? 23 24 A. I don't know. 24 A. No. 25 Q. Did you play any role in the hearing 25 Q. Would that have been something you 102 C. Rosada 1 1 C. Rosada that was held after the motion was filed? 2 would have discussed with Mr. Miller? 3 A. No. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 4 Q. Why not? 4 A. It may have. 5 A. Because Mr. Miller was handling the Q. Did you have any discussions with matter for the firm. Mr. Rittenger or anyone from his firm after Q. Did you provide any advice to 7 the decision came down? Mr. Meiresonne about how that hearing should A. I believe so. be handled? Q. What were the circumstances 9 10 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. surrounding those executions? 11 A. Not that I recall. 11 A. I believe I had one or two Q. Did you discuss with Mr. Miller any 12 12 conversations with Mr. Rittenger about trying 13 aspects of the introduction of evidence at to settle the action. 14 that hearing? 14 Q. And what do you remember about those 15 A. Not that I recall. 15 discussions? 16 Q. After the decision by the judge came 16 A. I don't remember anything about them. down, did you have any involvement in this Q. What did he tell you in response to 17 17 18 matter? those communications? 18 19 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 19 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. Yes. 20 20 I don't remember. Q. What was your involvement in this 21 Q. Why would you have been discussing it 22 matter at that point? 22 with Mr. Rittenger if Mr. Miller had been 23 A. I believe I had subsequent 23 handling it? conversations with Mr. Meiresonne and 24 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Mr. Miller regarding the ramifications of the 25 A. I don't know why I participated in



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

107 105 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada about what happened that gave you a basis or 2 this particular aspect of it. I don't know. reason? 3 I don't recall I should say. A. I knew what happened based on reading Q. Had you talked to Mr. Meiresonne the decision and reading the papers. I am a about settlement before talking to fairly strong negotiator so I think the point Mr. Rittenger? 7 was have me at least broach the subject with 7 A. Absolutely. 8 them. 8 Q. Did you have specific authority? 9 Q. Before you bothered to broach the A. I don't think we discussed a number. 9 I think we were trying to broach the subject 10 subject of settlement with Mr. Rittenger, did you review anything or come to any conclusions of settlement. 11 about what Mr. Meiresonne's exposure was in 12 12 Q. So you had no authority to --13 the case? 13 specific authority on settlement, but you just 14 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. wanted to discuss with Rittenger whether or 15 A. Like I said, we certainly reviewed not he would settle? the decision and the underlying motion papers. 16 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 16 Do I remember the details of 17 17 Not what I wanted to do. 18 everything, no, I do not. 18 Q. Who wanted to do that? 19 Q. You didn't really answer my question. A. The client. 19 Q. So you are telling me it was his 20 A. I certainly did. 20 decision to settle? 21 Q. Before you had this discussion about 21 22 settlement with Mr. Rittenger, did you make 22 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 23 any -- did you investigate what the potential 23 A. It is always the client's decision at exposure to Mr. Meiresonne was? 24 the end of the day to take certain steps in 24 25 A. Did i personally? litigation. 106 108 1 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 2 I am trying to talk and you are 2 Q. Yes, sir? 3 A. No, I didn't personally.

interrupting.

Q. My apologies, go ahead and talk.

A. I remember having a discussion with Mr. Meiresonne after the decision came down

7 and at some point the issue about settlement

came up, and it was decided that I would make

the overture and call Mr. Rittenger just to 9

broach the subject about settlement, to feel 10 them out. There was no settlement authority,

there was no nothing, just to open up dialogue 12 13 about settlement.

Q. Again I am curious why you had that discussion?

A. I don't remember, but it was a joint decision. I think Mr. Meiresonne, Mr. Miller

and myself had a discussion and they said why don't you give Mr. Rittenger a call. 19

Q. Did you have some particular or 20

unique expertise or quality that allowed you 21 to discuss this matter with Mr. Rittenger? 22 23

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. No.

4

5

14

15

16

17

24

Q. Did you have any particular knowledge

4 Q. Did Mr. Miller?

5

10

12

14

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

6 A. I know that there was an

investigation about damages. I don't know

when that occurred.

9 Q. Who did the investigation on damages?

A. Mr. Miller.

11 Q. Did you review that?

A. At some point in time, yes.

13 Q. Did you agree with it?

A. I don't recall.

15 Q. Did you then go back to

16 Mr. Meiresonne and discuss with him what his

potential exposure was? 17

18 A. I don't remember the sequence. I 19

don't know if I had a discussion with him

20 before, after. I don't remember.

Q. Let me ask you: When you first took 21

this matter on, did you have any discussions 22 with Mr. Meiresonne about the exposure to his

23 company presented by that lawsuit? 24

A. I don't recall.

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

111 109 1 C. Rosada C. Rosada Q. Again, specifically with regard to 2 Q. Is that something that as a matter of this settlement, the settlement overtures and your custom and practice you would do? 3 A. It would depend on the matter. this negotiating that you were going to do with Mr. Rittenger, you don't recall having Q. In this matter, is it something that you would expect to do? any specific authority? 6 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Q. Based on your custom and practice? 8 A. I don't recall. 8 9 Q. Did Mr. Rittenger ever indicate to 9 MS. GILBERT: Objection. 10 A. I don't think in the initial meeting you what their position was regarding we discussed damages. We didn't have the full settlement? 11 A. I am sure they did at some point, but file. We didn't have all the facts at hand. 12 12 At the time we probably just had the summons I don't recall when that was. and complaint, maybe the answer, so I don't 14 Q. Did he ever make a demand to you? 15 A. I don't remember him ever making a Q. So do you know this Mr. Schaefer, the demand to me personally, no. 16 17 Q. Did there ever come a time when you gentleman who wrote some memorandums about 17 copyright law on behalf of your firm in July made an attempt to determine what 18 19 Mr. Meiresonne's exposure was and advise him 19 and August 2003? 20 A. Do I know him, no. 20 accordingly? 21 Q. Did you ever have any dealings with 21 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 22 A. Did I? 22 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 23 Q. Yes. 23 24 A. No. A. He dealt pretty much exclusively with 24 25 Q. Did Neil Miller ever do that? 25 Mr. Miller. 110 1 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 2 Q. Did you read the memorandums he had 2 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. prepared? A. I believe so. A. Yes. 4 Q. Was that something you were privy to? 5 Q. At the time he prepared them, was he 5 A. I don't understand the guestion. a lawyer? 6 Q. Was it something you were aware of? A. No. 7 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Q. What was he? 8 8 A. That Mr. Miller was taking account of 9 A. He was a law student. 9 the damages, yes, sir. Q. Do you know what year he was in or 10 Q. Did you ever make an offer to had finished? 11 Mr. Rittenger? A. I don't recall. 12 A. I don't believe I did. 12 Q. Does first year ring a bell? 13 13 Q. Who did? 14 A. I don't recall. 14 A. I don't know if anybody did, but I Q. Was he someone who did research for 15 15 don't believe I did, though. your firm? 16 MR. EMRICH: Let's take a short 17 A. He did some work for Mr. Miller. 17 break. Q. Not for you? 18 18 (Recess taken.) A. Not for me directly. He did it at 19 19 MR. EMRICH: Back on the record. the request of Mr. Miller. 20 20 Q. Mr. Rosada, I would like to ask you 21 Q. Was he on salary or was he paid by some questions about the specifics of the 21 22 the firm, an employee of the firm or an 22 billing in this case. independent contractor? 23 23 A. Okav. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 24 24 Q. You talked about the fact that you 25 A. He wasn't an employee of the firm.



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

were able to or that because you brought this

22

23

24

25

C. Rosada matter to the firm you received 25 percent of all billings; is that correct? 3 A. Net billings. 4 Q. What does that mean? 6 A. Less disbursements on the case. Q. Do you have any idea what is billed in this case over the course of the 9 representation? A. No. 10 Q. Does \$450,000 ring a bell? 11 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 12 13 14 Q. With respect to the billing, according to your letter, billings were to be 15 sent on a monthly basis; is that correct? 16 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 17 18 A. I don't remember if it is a periodic 19 basis. 20 Q. So, again, if it says that in your

letter, is that something that again doesn't

it says, I don't know what you mean by that.

A. When you say again doesn't mean what

mean what it says?

Q. I am sure you don't?

113

114

115 1 C. Rosada 2 Q. Did he replenish any retainers that needed to be replenish when he was asked to replenish them? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 5 6 A. He was never asked to replenish a 7 retainer. Q. Did he pay any retainer you asked him 8 to pay in a timely manner? 9 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 10 11 A. I believe the only one I asked him to pay was the initial one. 12 13 Q. Do you know if other retainers were paid? 14 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 15 A. I believe Mr. Meiresonne advance paid 16 17 fees. 18 Q. And at whose request was that? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 19 20 A. It would have been at 21 Mr. Meiresonne's request. 22 Q. Do you know why? 23 A. I do not know why. 24 Q. So there no issues with regard to

payment in this case by Mr. Meiresonne?

C. Rosada 1 MS. GILBERT: Objection. 2 3 MR. EMRICH: I will withdraw the 4 comment. 5 BY MR. EMRICH: 6 Q. As part of your responsibilities in 7 this case with billing, did you determine or attempt to determine if bills were sent on a monthly basis? 9 A. I don't recall. 10 Q. Do you know if they were? 11 A. I don't believe they were. 12 Q. If the letter that you sent, marked 14 as Exhibit 1, says bills were to go out on a 15 monthly basis and they didn't, why would that 16 be? 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 18 I don't recall. Q. Were all of your bills paid in a 19 timely fashion by Mr. Meiresonne? 20 21 I don't believe so. Q. Did he provide you whatever retainers 22 23 you asked for in a timely fashion? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 24

1 C. Rosada MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 2 A. Not that I recall. 4 Q. Were there any billing disputes with Mr. Meiresonne in this case? A. I don't believe there was a billing dispute. I believe that there was a mistake on one of the bills that sometime during the 9 course of our representation our hourly rate had changed and the default rate was with what 10 started to get billed to Mr. Meiresonne. The new higher default rate started getting billed 12 to him by accident. It was an oversight on our part. Mr. Meiresonne noted it at one 14 point and we refunded the discrepancy. 16 Q. So in other words, you were over billing him? 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 18 19 A. No, we were not purposely over billing him. It was a mistake. 20 Q. Let me ask you this --21 A. I am trying to answer. 22 MS. GILBERT: Please let him finish 23 MR. EMRICH: My apologies. 24 A. As I explained to you, during the 25

I don't believe so.

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

116

Christopher Rosado October 26, 119 117 C. Rosada C. Rosada course of his representation our standard 2 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 2 hourly rate increased. That increase is A. I don't know. Q. With regard to your firm's computer entered into the Amicus program. Somehow, system, who was responsible for maintaining again I am not expert on the program, that got carried over to his bill. So for part of the this in 2003? 7 time entries he got billed at the higher rate, A. I don't recall. and I did not realize it when the bill went Q. Among the three of you, were either of you -- did you have any particular out. Mr. Meiresonne picked it up and he was correct and I refunded the error to him responsibility with regard to the maintenance immediately. of the computer system? 11 12 A. No. Q. So, in other words, you were billing 12 him more than you had agreed to bill him? 13 Q. So neither you nor Mr. Miller nor 13 14 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Mr. Algios had any particular specialized knowledge in dealing with it? 15 A. Again, not on purpose. Q. I don't care whether it was on 16 16 A. No. 1.7 Q. Did you have an IT person on staff? purpose on not. 17 18 A. I am explaining to you. You keep 18 19 Q. You had this Mr. -- what was his name 19 interrupting me. It makes it very difficult to testify. I don't interrupt you when you 20 again? 21 are asking questions. 21 A. Delaura. Q. My apologies. 22 Q. Was he in place back in 2003? 22 23 A. Like I told you, we had a new rate 23 A. I don't know. that got entered as a default rate in the 24 Q. Do you know who was? 24 25 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. program. That default rate got applied to his 118 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada bill at that juncture. That's what occurred. 2 2 A. I don't recall. Q. This was again something that would Q. What kind of computer system did you have appeared in the bills that you reviewed 4 have back in 2003? 5 for accuracy before they went out? A. I don't know. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 6 Q. Is it the same system that's in place 7 A. It would have been in the bills that 7 today? I reviewed, correct. 8 A. I don't believe so. Q. Apparently you didn't catch it? 9 9 Q. When was it replaced? 10 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 10 A. I don't recall. 11 A. I apparently did not catch it, Q. What kind of system was put in? 11

12 correct.

19

20

22

13 Q. Did you ever have any discussions with Mr. Meiresonne or were you ever privy to any discussions with Mr. Meiresonne where he asked you not to pursue a particular task due 17

to the cost of that task? 18 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. With me, not that I recall.

Q. So far as you know, that was not an issue with any matters that you were doing?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

23 A. I said I never had a conversation with Mr. Meiresonne to that effect.

Q. Did anyone else in the firm?

A. I don't know.

13 Q. What kind of -- does your firm --

14 strike that.

12

15

18

19

23

Does your firm have a policy

16 regarding the preservation of any electronic

data or information on your computer system? 17

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't understand the question.

20 Q. How are the electronic communications 21

that occur on your computer preserved?

22 A. E-mails?

Q. Any electronic communications?

24 A. I don't understand electronic

communication.



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

121 1 C. Rosada 2 Q. Let's start with e-mails. 3 A. We have a hosting service. Q. Who hosts it? 4 5 I believe it is called Web Host. 6 Q. How long have they hosted it? 7 A. I don't recall. Q. Do you back up your computer system 9 on a regular basis? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. How long has that been done? 12 A. I don't recall. Q. Was it being done in 2003? 14 A. I don't recall. 15 Q. Are those records maintained by anyone? 16 A. When you say maintained by anyone --17 18 Q. The data backup. 19 A. We have a backup drive or server, 20 something like that. 21 Q. Who maintains that? 22 A. Currently? 23 Q. Yes. 24 A. Mr. Delaura. Q. Who would have maintained it back in 122

123 C. Rosada 1 2 That's not what he said. 3 A. I didn't say that at all. 4 Q. What is the policy? 5 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 6 A. Again, we retain -- when you are talking about -- I don't understand the term electronic communication entirely. But we retain things on our backup drive. They are 10 saved to our server. I don't believe e-mails are saved to our server. And we have a backup of that server. 12 13 Q. Did you, yourself, ever make any 14 attempt to recover any e-mails that may have gone back and forth between Mr. Miller and 15 Mr. Meiresonne going back to 2003 to present? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 17 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. What efforts did you take? 20 A. I looked at our web hosting to see 21 whether or not I had an e-mail. 22 Q. Would that have been true with regard 23 to any e-mails between you and Mr. Miller? 24 A. There were no e-mails between me and 25 Mr. Miller. 124

1 C. Rosada 2003? 2 3 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. Whoever the IT guy was in 2003. 4 Q. How did you maintain any client 5 documents that were stored on those computers? 7 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 8 A. I don't understand the question. Q. Is there any policy for preserving 9 what's on your computer system, client 10 11 materials, documents or like? 12 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 13 We have a backup server. Q. Do you retain tapes, do you retain 14 15 disks, anything of that sort? 16 A. I don't know what the standard practice is. 17 18 Q. Who would know in your firm? 19 A. The IT person. He is not with our firm, but the IT person would know. 20 21 Q. What I am hearing you say then is 22 that there really isn't an established firm 23 policy for preserving electronic data at your 24 firm?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

C. Rosada 1 2 Q. So there was a particular document 3 that you looked at? 4 A. No. 5 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. I think my counsel asked me if I had any e-mails regarding this matter, and I looked on my e-mail host to see if I had any. 9 Q. Were you ever aware that Mr. Meiresonne had communicated to Mr. Miller 10 that a number of documents had been discarded 11 in 2001? 12 13 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 14 A. Ever at any time? 15 Q. Yes, sir. 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. When were you made aware of that? A. I believe sometime after the 18 19 spoliation motion. 20 Q. Did you ever determine when that disclosure was made to Mr. Miller? 21 22 A. I believe it was sometime after the 23 spoliation motion. 24 Q. Did you ever see any e-mails between Mr. Meiresonne and Mr. Miller that would have



25

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

Christopher Rosado 125 1 C. Rosada C. Rosada been dated in March or April 2003 in which It's hard to understand your questions. 2 MR. EMRICH: Strike that. Mr. Meiresonne indicated to Mr. Miller that 3 certain documents had been discarded at some Q. Let's do this: Would you agree that it is reasonable and prudent to advise a point in time prior to that date? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. client to not destroy potentially relevant 6 7 documents? 7 A. Not that I recall. Q. Do you know if Mr. Miller was ever 8 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 8 made aware or ever acknowledged being aware of 9 A. It would depend on the matter. 9 those facts in March or April 2003? 10 Q. I am talking about a matter such as 10 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 11 this matter that you were retained to handle 11 A. I didn't understand the question. pending in these courts, in this court that it 12 12 Can you read that back? 13 was pending in in 2003? 13 (Record read.) 14 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 14 A. During the pendency of the 15 15 A. Not to my knowledge. Q. With respect to the handling of the 16 litigation? 16 defense of this case, did you and Mr. Miller 17 Q. Yes, sir. 17 A. Yes. discuss strategy? 18 18 A. On occasion. 19 Q. You had told us that was done in this 19 20 Q. Do you recall specifically what was conversation that you allegedly had with 21 discussed? 21 Mr. Meiresonne; is that correct? A. I do not. 22 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 22 Q. In the e-mail of March 27th that you 23 A. Absolutely. 23 sent to Mr. Meiresonne that we talked about Q. You have told me it is not your 24 earlier that's marked Exhibit 2, and we talked practice to send a litigation hold letter; is 25 126 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada about a discovery strategy, was that ever

2 that correct? 4 A. That's correct. sent such a letter here? A. I don't know. 8 Q. Is it his practice to do that? 9 10 Q. Does the firm have a different 11 12 13 letters? 14 A. Not to my knowledge. 15 17 should be advised that any and all documents 18 19 20

21

22

23

24

discussed with Mr. Meiresonne by you?

Q. Again, what kind of strategy would

you have followed in this particular case?

A. I would have to review documents

Q. Again, there is no dispute in your

practicing in 2003 in this area who -- strike

Let me ask you this: There is no

dispute in your mind that Mr. Meiresonne or

any other client that you handled a matter for

in their possession that may or may not be

relevant to a case should be preserved; is

If you can understand it, you can

A. Can I have the question read back.

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

mind that an attorney such as yourself

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

A. No.

that correct?

answer.

again. I don't recall.

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

Suite 4715 One Penn Plaza New York, NY 10119 www.esquiresolutions.com

128

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Q. And do you know if Mr. Miller ever

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. You would have to ask Mr. Miller.

practice in regards to sending litigation hold

Q. As a matter of your custom and practice in the course of handling matters such as the matter in this case, that you learn in the course of that matter that your client has destroyed or discarded potentially relevant documents, what is your -- what do you do?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

Q. What action do you take?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

25 A. It depends on the matter.

129 1 C. Rosada 2 Q. How would it depend on the matter? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 3 A. It would depend on the totality of 4 the circumstances. Q. Is it something that you discuss with 6 the client then? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 8 9 A. I've never had a situation other than this one where a client, to my knowledge, destroyed relevant documents. 11 Q. So if you come -- if that knowledge 12 comes to you, what steps would you take? 13 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 14 A. It would depend on the matter. I haven't had to address that situation. 16 Q. Would you send a letter to the 17 18 client --19 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Q. -- advising him to not destroy 20 21 documents or advising them what they do may potentially impact the outcome of the 22 23 litigation? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 24 25 A. Again, I never had to address that

131 1 C. Rosada 2 opposing side in a case? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 3 A. Is it my custom and practice to 4 review documents? Q. Yes. 7 A. I review whatever documents the 8 client --9 Q. Is that your custom and practice? A. You keep interrupting me. 10 11 Q. Sorry. 12 A. Whatever documents the client 13 produces to me. 14 Q. So that's your custom and practice? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 15 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Again, why do you review the documents before they are sent to the other 18 19 side? 20 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. It would depend on the evidence, on 22 the facts of the particular matter. 23 Q. You said you do it all the time, 24 right?

25

130

1 C. Rosada situation. It would depend on the totality of the circumstances and particulars of that 4 5 Q. You are certainly familiar with the 6 doctrine of spoliation, correct? 7 A. Yes. 8 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 9 Q. What is your understanding of that doctrine? 10 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 11 A. That you are not -- a party is not to 12 destroy or otherwise discard relevant 13 documents during the pendency of the matter. 14 Q. Again, is that the extent of your 15 16 obligation to simply tell the client that? 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 18 A. I don't know how to answer that 19 auestion. 20 Q. Does someone -- go ahead. A. I told you what my custom and 21 practice is. I can't tell you anything 22 23 different.

Q. Is it your custom and practice to

review documents before they are sent to the

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 132 C. Rosada 1 2 A. But the reasons depends on the facts of the particular matter. 4 Q. What are the reasons for reviewing 5 documents before they are sent? 6 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 7 A. Whether the documents are responsive to the request. 9 Q. Anything else? MS. GILBERT: Objection. 10 A. Whether or not there is any 11 privileged material. 12 Q. Anything else? 13 MS. GILBERT: Same objection. 14 A. Nothing else that I recall at the 1.5 16 17 Q. Have you ever been involved in a case where a document inspection occurred at a 18 19 client's business? 20 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. I don't recall. 21 22 Q. Is it your custom and practice in a situation where documents are reviewed at a 23 24 client's business by the other side in litigation for you to be present for that



24

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

reviewing them?

that it's the totally of the circumstances. 12 It depends on the facts of a particular matter. I don't know how to answer any other 14 15 way. 16 Q. If a client didn't want you to be present, what steps would you take with 17 respect to a document inspection or client 18 documents being reviewed by the other counsel? 19 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 20 A. It would depend on the particulars of 21 the matter.

Q. Would you advise them as to how to

handle inspection or production of documents

wouldn't want to be present. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. Lunderstand what you said. I gave you the answer. Q. All right. Would you instruct your client to not produce documents or not allow the other side to take the documents that were inspected if you were not there? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. It would depend on the particulars of the matter what my instructions would be. Q. Have you ever turned over documents to the other side in a litigation without



for inspection?

22

23

24

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

140

137 1 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada 2 MR. EMRICH: Sure (handing). 2 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Q. Have you ever seen that document A. Not that I recall. 3 3 4 before? 4 Q. I want you to assume that your client 5 A. Not that I recall. told you they did not want to pay for you to be there for this document production. I want 6 Q. Do you know what it is? 7 A. It's an article. you to assume that they did not have other 7 Q. Where does that article appear? 8 8 counsel working on the matter. I want you to 9 A. I have no idea. assume that the client was looking to you or 9 Q. Does it say on the article where it your firm or whoever is handling the matter on 10 your behalf with respect to how a document 11 appears? A. There is a name on it. I don't know production or inspection at their place of 12 where it appeared. business by other side was to be handled, what 13 13 would you do, what steps would you take? 14 Q. What is the name? 15 A. Are you going to ask me to read the MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 15 New York Law Journal? A. It would depend on the particulars of 16 16 Q. Is the New York Law Journal an 17 17 the matter. 18 authoritative publication? 18 Q. What advice would you give? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 19 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 19 A. It would depend on the particulars of 20 I have no idea. 21 the matter. 21 Q. If I were to tell you that that Q. What particulars of the matter would 22 document was provided by your law firm in 22 23 response to a document production that we sent 23 guide your advice? 24 to your firm, do you have any idea or MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 24 explanation why it would be in the file? 25 There are a myriad of factors. 138 1 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada 2

Q. What are the factors? 2 3 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 4 A. You keep asking me the same question 5 over and over and over, and you are going to 6 get the same answer. 7 Q. Okay. 8 Do you have any idea in this case 9 what was reviewed by counsel for the other side in the document production at issue in 10 this case in August of 2003? 11 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 12 13 14 Q. Do you have any knowledge as to

whether there was any recording or

16 inventorying of what was reviewed by the other 17 side?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 18 19

A. No. 20 (NY Law Journal Article was marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 5 21

22 for identification.) 23 Q. Mr. Rosada, I am going to show you what I have marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 5. 24

MS. GILBERT: Do you have a copy?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

3

8

9

11

12

15

16

18

22

23

4 Q. I am going to read a statement to you and I am going to ask you if you agree with it 5

6 from this document. 7

Would you agree with me that the document is entitled, "Spoliation of Evidence: Attorneys Beware," correct?

10

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. That's what it looks like.

Q. Do you know Edward Spiro?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Do you have any idea who he is?

A. The answer would still be no.

Q. Do you know of the law firm Morvillo

17 Abramowitz Grand Iason & Silberberg?

19 Q. Have you ever read his publication,

"Civil Practice in the Southern District of 20

New York, Second Edition"? 21

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. Not that I recall.

24 Q. Is the Southern District of New York

where this particular litigation was pending?



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

143 141 1 C. Rosada C. Rosada Q. You would not agree with that? 2 A. Are you talking about the Thomas 3 3 A. No. matter? 4 Q. Yes. Q. Okay. 5 A. Yes. Q. When did you put your insurance carrier on notice of the claim in this case? 6 Q. I will read this statement to you, 7 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 7 "This standard places a heavy burden" --MS. GILBERT: Sorry to interrupt, 8 8 A. I don't recall. 9 9 but where you are reading from? Q. Would you have been the one that did 10 MR. EMRICH: I am reading from the 10 that? second paragraph in the right-hand column 11 A. I don't recall. 11 12 of the article on the first page of the Q. Did you ever discuss with 12 Mr. Meiresonne the possibility that your firm 13 article. 14 had a conflict of interest after the 14 Q. "This standard places a heavy burden 15 on potential litigants to identify and 15 spoliation motion had been filed? preserve potentially relevant documents at the 16 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 16 17 earliest sign that litigation is likely." 17 A. Not that I recall. Would you agree with that statement? 18 Q. Did you ever have this discussion 18 19 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 19 with him at any time? 20 A. Are you trying to ask me to comment 20 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 21 on a line taken out of context in an article 21 A. Not that I recall. I've never read or seen before? 22 Q. Could you envision any circumstance 22 23 arising that would have prevented your firm 23 I want to make sure I understand the from continuing with the matter after that 24 question. spoliation motion was filed based on a 25 Q. Yes, I am asking would you agree with 142 144 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada 1 that? 2 conflict of interest? 3 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 3 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 4 A. I guess on the most general level, I 4 If you understand, you can answer. 5 would say yes. 5 A. I don't know how to answer that 6 Q. "Companies that have document 6 auestion. 7 retention destruction policies must ensure Q. I may have asked you this, but did 8 that documents which would be destroyed in the you review the transcript of the hearing in 9 ordinary course of business are retained and 9 this case? careful attention must be paid to preserving 10 10 A. Not that I recall. electronic evidence, including e-mails and 11 Q. Did you ever ask Mr. Miller if the other information stored on backup tapes." 12 court asked him at the hearing whether or not 12 Would you agree with that statement? 1.3 he was aware that documents had been destroyed MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 14 14 by Mr. Meiresonne? 15 You can answer. 15 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 16 A. I don't know how I would answer that. 16 A. Not that I recall. 17 Q. So no agreement or disagreement? 17 Q. Did Mr. Miller ever tell you that he A. Yes, I don't know how I would answer 18 18 had told the court that he was never not aware that question. 19 of documents having been destroyed? 19 20 Q. Would you agree with this statement, MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 20 "It is not sufficient for an attorney merely A. I don't understand the question. 21 22 to inform his or her client of the duty to 22 Can you repeat it? preserve evidence"? 23 23 (Record read.) MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 24 24 Q. That he was not aware of documents 25 25 having been destroyed.



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

148

145 1 C. Rosada C. Rosada 2 A. I don't recall. 2 MR. EMRICH: I sure will. It is Q. You brought with you a folder today? 3 part of a chain of e-mails. It looks like 3 4 A. Yes. 4 it is dated --5 Q. What is in that folder? 5 A. Some client documents. 6 7 Q. So it doesn't have anything to do 7 2003. 8 BY EMRICH: with this case? 9 9 A. Nothing. 10 MR. EMRICH: Why don't we take a 10 11 recess and you can get the e-mails that we talked about and I will review my notes 12 12 13 and we can decide where we are going. 13 14 (Recess taken.) 14 A. I do. (E-mails were marked as 15 15 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 6 for 16 16 case? 17 identification.) 17 18 MR. EMRICH: Mr. Rosada, we are 18 A. The answer is no. 19 going back on record for just a couple 19 Q. Fine. 20 20 more questions. 21 Q. Mr. Rosada, I am going to show you 22 what we have marked as Exhibit 6. Your counsel provided those to me and indicated to 23 me that those are copies of the e-mails that 24 say, 2003? 25 you would have reviewed prior to today's 146 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1

THE WITNESS: It is impossible to tell, but the top date is February 12, Q. On the other side of that it indicates Mike is telling this other lawyer that you are to be the lead attorney on the file when it comes over to your firm. Do you see that in that e-mail? Q. Would that describe your role in this MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. Now, with respect to the invoices that we have looked at, are you able -- in looking at those, can you tell me how much Mike would have paid your law firm in, let's A. Not easily. I would have to go back

2 deposition; is that correct? 3 A. It appears to be, ves. Q. And just so I am clear, you don't 4 recall reviewing any other e-mails prior to 5 today for any purpose whatsoever? 7 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 8 A. I'm sorry, say that again? 9 Q. Have you reviewed any other e-mails prior to today specifically with regard to this particular matter? 11 12 A. No. 13 Q. Other than what you have in front of 14 vou? 15 A. Yes. Just what I have in front of 16 me, correct. 17 Q. I pulled out one e-mail in there 18 where there is an e-mail Mike had sent to your predecessor law firm indicating in that e-mail 19 this person was to communicate with you at 20 516-294-5301. 21 22 Was that your phone number back then?

A. We had a series of phone numbers.

MS. GILBERT: Can you identify that

and -- I don't know if it was done other than on an annual basis. I can do it by the 4 computer. 5 Q. You couldn't do it by looking at the 6 bills. 7 Let's try this: Do those bills indicate or confirm a payment of \$25,000 made 8 9 on February 6, 2003? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 10 11 A. I don't know. 12 MS. GILBERT: Are you asking him to look through the document? 13 MR. EMRICH: Yes, I did. 14 15 A. I don't know. Q. How about on August 13, 2003 a 17 payment of \$25,000? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 18 A. I don't know if they have the dates 19 of payment on them. 20 Q. How about October 31, 2003, do they 21 22 reflect a payment of \$100,000? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 23

A. Certainly the payments would not have

been payments on account of the bill. Mike

24



document?

23

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

152

1 C. Rosada was having retainers for some reason. 2 Q. You certainly keep track of those? 3 A. Correct. 4 Q. They are kept track on the bills to 5 show him what his account balance is, retainer 6 balance is? A. Right. 8 9 Q. Do they show that? 10 A. There are balances the retainer showed. 11 Q. Consistent with the numbers that I 12 have given you? 13 A. I don't know. I can't tie it into 14 15 the numbers you gave me. Q. Do the bills in front of you reflect 16

149 a payment \$50,000 made on December 15, 2003? 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 18 19 A. Again, it wouldn't have been a payment on a particular bill. Mike was paying 21 advance retainers. Q. So how can I find out, if I can't 22 look at your bills, how much you would have 23 billed Mike for your firm's services? 24 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 25 150

C. Rosada time charges are in back. Q. Tick off what each bill provides.

MS. GILBERT: What are asking, total?

6 BY MR. EMRICH:

4

5

15

19

20

22

1

5

8

Q. Read the amounts billed in a particular bill.

9 A. On April 2, 2004 billed \$95,125. 10

Q. Does it say the period that included? A. It tells when it's through, March 31,

11 2004. The first time charges on that one is 12

August 4, 2003..

14 Q. Okay?

A. The next one --

Q. Before you go to the next one, I take 16 it then there wouldn't have been monthly bills 17

from August of 2003 to April 2004?

MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. I don't recall.

21 Q. Okay.

A. The next bill -- I mean, these bills

23 are not sequential. They are not in time

order. But there is, I think, an overall bill

from the inception of the litigation that we

C. Rosada

2 A. You can certainly see how much we 3 billed him.

Q. By looking at those documents?

A. Yes.

1

4

5

7

8

13

14

18

19

Q. Can you tell us what you billed? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

A. You want me to go bill by bill?

9 Q. However you want to do it. Just tell 10

A. On the bill on April 2, 2004 we billed him \$95,125 in legal fees --12

Q. Is that your first bill?

A. You keep interrupting me.

Q. I'm sorry. 15

A. -- and \$6,248 in disbursements. I 17

don't know what my first bill was or wasn't. MR. MEIRESONNE: Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

20 A. All I know is these are bills we had we produced in discovery.

22 Q. Looking at those bills again, can you 23 tell me coming back what each bill and what

24 you billed reflects?

A. The summary page is in front and the

C. Rosada

did some kind of aggregate to Mike at his

request apparently.

4 Q. What is the date of that?

A. April 12, 2007.

Q. What does it say? 7

MS. GILBERT: Identify the Bates

number.

A. 00022, April 12, 2007, it says total

amount remitted to Miller Rosado & Algios.

Those would have been monies that he put into

escrow with us, advance retainers. We put it 12

13 into an interest bearing account, and interest

14

accrued on it.

15 And we refunded part of the retainer 16 to him in the amount of 200,000, and the fees and expenses that were billed through March 17 31, 2006, \$201,605.50.

18 19

Q. You say you refunded \$200,000 to him?

20 A. That's what I said.

21 Q. I am just asking you.

22 A. And I am just answering you.

23 Q. I know you are.

24 After that, were there additional

25 bills?



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

155 153 1 C. Rosada 1. C. Rosada 2 And there are time sheets in back. 2 MS. GILBERT: After April 12, 2007? 3 Q. So if my math is it correct, I have 3 MR. EMRICH: Yes. 4 somewhere in the neighborhood of \$278,000 in 4 A. That's the summary statement. The legal fees billed; is that correct? bill on April 12th talks about the current balance of retainer 54,000, a bill of 6 A. I didn't do the math. 7 MS. GILBERT: Objection. 53,462.50 for legal fees. MS. GILBERT: What's the Bates 8 Q. Okay, you can back to the record and 8 9 look at it later. 9 number? THE WITNESS: 23. 10 MR. EMRICH: Mark that, please. 10 11 (Bill was marked as BY MR. EMRICH: 11 12 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 7 for 12 Q. Would that be in addition or over and 13 identification.) 13 above the \$201,000 you referenced? 14 Q. I am going to show you what we have A. Yes. 14 marked Exhibit 7? Q. What was that amount again? 15 15 MS. GILBERT: We will have to make a A. 54,787.75 -- I'm sorry, that was the 16 16 balance of the retainer. It was 53,462.50 and 17 copy for you. 17 18 Q. Take a look at that, Mr. Rosada. 18 \$347.46 for disbursements. 19 (Witness complies.) Q. Thank you. 19 Any other bills after that point? 20 Q. What date is on that bill or what is 21 A. After April 12, 2007? 21 it? 22 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 22 Q. Yes. 23 Q. What is it? 23 A. No, the other bills are prior to. 24 A. It's a bill. 24 Q. I'm sorry, they are not in sequential Q. And the date of bill? 25 order. If you would just go through them. 154 156 1 C. Rosada C. Rosada 1 A. There is a June 4, 2007 bill. MS. GILBERT: Objection to form. 2 2 3 Q. That would have been before the 3 A. August 18, 2003. 4 August bill? 4 Q. What period does it cover? A. That would have been after. The last 5 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. bill that we just talked about was April. 6 A. January 27, 2003 through July 31, 7 7 This would have been after. 2003. 8 Q. All right. 8 Q. Would that be your initial bill? 9 A. \$10,687.50 in legal feels and \$948 in 9 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. disbursements, Bates number 37. 10 10 A. I don't recall. Q. How much did you bill for legal 11 There was a July bill showing a 11 previous balance and then legal fees of services in that bill? 12 12 13 \$9,625. And that's it. 13 A. My firm billed \$24,187.50 in legal 14 Q. Okay. 14 fees and \$62 in disbursements. 15 MS. GILBERT: That's Miller 41? 15 Q. Thank you. 16 MR. EMRICH: Yes. 16 Do you know when your firm's services BY MR. EMRICH: 17 were terminated in this case? 17 18 Q. Anything after that? 18 A. No. I don't recall. 19 A. There is an August bill showing a Q. Just so I am clear and understanding 19 prior balance and then legal fees of what your arrangement was in your firm, you 20 20 would have received 25 percent of any of those 21 \$1,187.50. 21 amounts that were billed? 22 There is an October 1st bill showing 22 legal fees of \$125. 23 23 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.

24

25



2007, legal fees of \$2,000.

It is out of sequence, September 4,

24

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

A. Not for disbursements.

Q. 25 percent of the legal services

159 157 C. Rosada C. Rosada particular time frame, let's say 2007, from billed: is that correct? 2 January 1st to December 31, 2007, from your MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 3 computer system, from the information 4 backed up, what do you do to obtain it? Q. We talked a little bit about your 5 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 6 backup system at your firm for your electronic 7 A. I would ask my IT guy. 7 e-mails that we talked about and some other Q. You don't know how it is kept or things that you back up. 8 9 recorded? 9 Do you preserve the disks that are A. I don't know how it is done backed up in any kind archive? 10 physically. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 11 11 Q. That's fair. 12 A. I don't know what disks you are 12 I think I asked this before, I 13 talking about. apologize if I did, but do you know how many 14 Q. Any backup disks. documents were removed from Mr. Meiresonne's Do you back up information on to a 1.5 business by plaintiffs' counsel in August of 16 disk? 16 2003 when they inspected the documents? 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 17 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. A. I don't know. 18 18 19 A. No. 19 MR. MEIRESONNE: Off the record. 20 Q. Mr. Rosada, I just have a couple last 20 (Discussion held off the record.) 21 questions. Q. Do you back up your hard drive on 21 As you sit here today knowing what disks at your firm? 22 22 you know and looking at what you have looked 23 23 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. at, do you believe that your firm committed 24 A. I don't know how the backup is done. any departure from the standard of care in any 25 Q. Is that something done by the IT 158 160 C. Rosada 1 C. Rosada 1 2 person? aspect with any aspect of the handling of that MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. particular matter on behalf of Mr. Meiresonne 3 A. I believe he is the one that set it 4 or IQS? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 5 up. Q. Do you archive any of the backup 6 6 A. No. information? 7 Q. How about the same question with 7 regard to yourself? MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 8 A. I don't understand your question. MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 9 9 Q. Do you put it in any kind of an 10 archive? Do you catalog it? Do you save it Q. How about the same question with 11 in any kind of repository after it is backed 12 12 regard to Mr. Miller? 13 up? 13 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 14 MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. 14 A. No. Q. Is that a matter of firm's policy? 15 (Continued on next page to include MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form. signature and jurat.) 16 16 17 A. I still don't understand your 17 18 question. 18 19 Q. What do you do with the backup? 1.9 A. I don't understand how this thing is 20 21 backed up. I know we have a backup server. 21 What happens after that, I am not aware of 22 22 exactly the procedure. 23 24 Q. Let's ask this: If someone asked 24

25



you to produce certain information from a

Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

161	163
1	1
Q. So you don't believe you have any	2
3 liability or responsibility for what happened	3 CERTIFICATION
4 to Mr. Meiresonne?	4
MS. GILBERT: Objection to the form.	5 I, MARGARET EUSTACE, a Shorthand
6 A. No.	6 Reporter and notary public, within and for the
7 MR. EMRICH: Thank you.	7 State of New York, do hereby certify: 8 That CHRISTOPHER ROSADA, the
8 That's it.	i i
⁹ (Time noted: 2:15 p.m.)	9 witness whose examination is hereinbefore set 10 forth, was first duly sworn by me, and that
10	11 transcript of said testimony is a true record
11 12 CHRISTOPHER BOSADA	12 of the testimony given by said witness.
12 CHRISTOPHER ROSADA	13 I further certify that I am not
14	14 related to any of the parties to this action
15	15 by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way
16 Subscribed and sworn to	interested in the outcome of this matter.
17 before me this day	17
18 of ,2011	18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
19	19 hereunto set my hand this day of
20 Notary Public	20 , 20 11.
21	21
22	22
23	23 MARGARET EUSTACE
24	24
25	25
162	164
1	1 Deposition Errata Sheet
1 2 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4	 Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY
1 2 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE 7 1 8 (Premarked) January 28, 2003	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE 7 1 8 (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE 7 1 8 (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 9 2	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE 7 1 8 (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 9 2 10 (Premarked) E-mail chain 4	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE 7 1 8 (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 9 2	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE 7 1 8 (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 9 2 10 (Premarked) E-mail chain 4 11 3 (Premarked) Neil Miller's 12 time records 4	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath.
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE 7 1 8 (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 9 2 10 (Premarked) E-mail chain 4 11 3 (Premarked) Neil Miller's 12 time records 4 13 4	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath.
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE 7 1 8 (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 9 2 10 (Premarked) E-mail chain 4 11 3 (Premarked) Neil Miller's 12 time records 4 13 4 (Premarked) Invoices 4	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. CHRISTOPHER ROSADA
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE 7 1 8 (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 9 2 10 (Premarked) E-mail chain 4 11 3 (Premarked) Neil Miller's 12 time records 4 13 4 (Premarked) Invoices 4 14 5 NY Law Journal	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. CHRISTOPHER ROSADA Subscribed and sworn to on the day of
1 INDEX 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE 4 C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE 7 1 8 (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 9 2 10 (Premarked) E-mail chain 4 11 3 (Premarked) Neil Miller's 12 time records 4 13 4 (Premarked) Invoices 4 14 5 NY Law Journal 15 Article 138	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. CHRISTOPHER ROSADA Subscribed and sworn to on the day of —, 20 before me. Notary Public,
INDEX WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 EXHIBITS PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 (Premarked) E-mail chain 4 (Premarked) Neil Miller's time records 4 (Premarked) Invoices 4 NY Law Journal Article 138 16 6 E-mails 145 17 7 Bill 155	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. CHRISTOPHER ROSADA Subscribed and sworn to on the day of, 20 before me.
INDEX WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE C. Rosada Mr. Emrich EXHIBITS PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 (Premarked) E-mail chain 4 (Premarked) Neil Miller's time records 4 (Premarked) Invoices 4 NY Law Journal Article 138 16 6 E-mails 145 17 7 Bill 155	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. CHRISTOPHER ROSADA Subscribed and sworn to on the day of —, 20 before me. Notary Public,
INDEX WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE C. Rosada Mr. Emrich 4 EXHIBITS PLAINTIFFS' DESCRIPTION PAGE (Premarked) January 28, 2003 letter 4 (Premarked) E-mail chain 4 (Premarked) Neil Miller's time records 4 (Premarked) Invoices 4 NY Law Journal Article 138 16 6 E-mails 145 17 7 Bill 155	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. CHRISTOPHER ROSADA Subscribed and sworn to on the day of
1	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. CHRISTOPHER ROSADA Subscribed and sworn to on the day of
1	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. CHRISTOPHER ROSADA Subscribed and sworn to on the day of
1	Deposition Errata Sheet DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. CHRISTOPHER ROSADA Subscribed and sworn to on the day of



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972

	pher Rosado				October	20,	2011
			165				
1	Deposition Errata Sheet		I				
2 Pagel	NoLine NoChange t	0:	İ				
	on for change:						
	NoLine NoChange to						
	on for change:						
	NoLine NoChange to						
	on for change:						
. Page l	NoLine NoChange to	o:					
	on for change:		l				
	NoLine NoChange to		İ	•			
	on for change:						
	NoLine NoChange to						
_					•		
Reaso	n for change:						
	NoLine NoChange to						
Reaso	n for change:						
	ATURE:	_DATE:	-				
5	CHRISTOPHER ROSADA						
			166				
	Deposition Errata Sheet		1				
_	NoLine NoChange to						
	n for change:		1				
	NoLine NoChange to						
Reaso	n for change:						
	· —						
	NoLine NoChange to						
Page N	NoLine NoChange to	D:					
Page N	NoLine NoChange to	0:					
Page N Reason Page N	NoLine NoChange to	0:					
Page N Reason Page N	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to	0:					
Page N Reason Page N Reason	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change:	D:					
Page N Reason Page N Reason Page N	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to	D:	***				
Page N Reason Page N Reason Page N	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change:	D:					
Page N Reason Reason Page N Reason Reason	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to);	11.00				
Reason Page N Reason Page N Reason Page N	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to);					
Reason Page N Reason Page N Reason Page N	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to	D:					
Reason Page N Reason Page N Reason Page N	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to	D:					
Reason Page N Reason Page N Reason Page N Reason Page N	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to						
Reason Page N Reason Page N Reason Page N Reason Reason Page N	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to						
Reason Page N Reason Page N Reason Page N Reason	NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to n for change: NoLine NoChange to						



Toll Free: 800.944.9454 Facsimile: 212.557.5972