

COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

THE	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,))
	VS.	SUPERIOR COURT NO. A-090435
	HUNT, AKA JOSEPH HUNT, JOSEPH HENRY GAMSKY,))
	DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.	0CT 0 9 1987

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY
HONORABLE LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE PRESIDING
REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL

APPEARANCES:

FOR PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT: JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP

STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL 3580 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD

ROOM 800

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90010

FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT: IN PROPRIA PERSONA

VOLUME 55 OF 101 (PAGES 8374 TO 8565 , INCLUSIVE)



ROSEMARIE GOODBODY, CSR NO. 932 SALLY YERGER, CSR NO. 2008 OFFICIAL REPORTERS

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT WEST C

HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

PLAINTIFF,

VS.

NO. A-090435

JOSEPH HUNT,

DEFENDANT.

REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1987

VOLUME 55

PAGES 8374 TO 8565, INCL.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: IRA REINER, DISTRICT ATTORNEY BY: FREDERICK N. WAPNER, DEPUTY

1725 MAIN STREET

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 90401

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

ARTHUR H. BARENS, ESQ. 10209 SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067

AND

RICHARD C. CHIER, ESQ. 10920 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

> ROSEMARIE GOODBODY, CSR NO. 932 SALLY YERGER, CSR NO. 2008 OFFICIAL REPORTERS

1	TUESDAY, F	FEBRUARY 25,	1987 V	DLUME 55	PAGES	8374 TO 8565				
2			А	.M.		8374				
3	P.M. 8438									
4										
5		CHRONOL	OGICAL IN	DEX OF WI	TNESSES					
6										
7		REDIRECT	RECROSS							
8	•	SUMED)		8378	8479					
9		FURTHER 8533 FURTHER 8547								
10	MAY, TOM F	FRANK	8548							
11										
12		ΕX	HIBITS FO	R VOLUME	<u>55</u>					
13	İ					FOR				
14	DEFENDANT '	'S EXHIBITS:			I DE	ENTIFICATION				
15	K-1 SHAR	K-1 SHARE CERTIFICATE - SELDON - TO DICKER								
16	K-2 SHAR	RE CERTIFICAT	E - SELDO	N – TO BF	ROWNING	8 4 0 4				
17	L-1 PROX	KY - BEN DOST	I			8405				
18	L-2 PROX	KY - DEAN KAR	NY		•	8405				
19	L-3 PROX	KY - JOE HUNT				8563				
20	L-4 PROM	MISSORY NOTE				8563				
21	M-1 STOC	CK CERTIFICAT	E NO. 3 -	WESTCARS		8456				
22	M-2 STO	CK CERTIFICAT	E NO. 4 -	WESTCARS	5	8456				
23	M-3 STOC	CK CERTIFICAT	E NO. 5 -	WESTCARS	5	8456				
24	M-4 STOC	CK CERTIFICAT	E NO. 6 -	WESTCARS	5	8456				
25	M-5 STOC	CK CERTIFICAT	E NO. 7 -	WESTCARS	5	8456				
26	N OPTI	ION AGREEMENT				8527				
27										
28										
1										

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1987; 10:45 A.M. . 1 2 DEPARTMENT WEST C HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE 3 (APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.) 4 5 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD 6 OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE AND HEARING OF 7 THE JURY:) THE COURT: THERE IS A MOTION OF SOME KIND? 8 9 MR. WAPNER: YES, YOUR HONOR. 10 YESTERDAY, COUNSEL HAD INDICATED THAT THEY WANTED TO PRECLUDE CERTAIN TESTIMONY BECAUSE THEY CLAIMED THEY WERE 11 SURPRISED BY THE TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESSES, DIDN'T HAVE ANY 12 ADVANCE KNOWLEDGE, AND WE WORKED ONE OF THOSE ISSUES OUT BECAUSE 13 IT TURNED OUT IT WAS IN THE POLICE REPORT. 14 15 THERE ARE, I THINK, TWO REMAINING QUESTIONS. ONE HAS TO DO WITH INQUIRY THAT I WANTED TO MAKE OF A WITNESS 16 17 ABOUT THE FACT THAT HE GOT A MAGAZINE THAT HAD TO DO WITH 18 SOMETHING ABOUT GUNS, AS A RESULT OF WHICH HE GOT ON A MAILING 19 LIST AND GOT ALL KINDS OF CATALOGS, THE BACK OF WHICH HAD ADVERTISEMENTS FOR BOOKS SIMILAR TO THOSE FOUND ON MR. PITTMAN 20 21 AT THE TIME HE WAS ARRESTED. 22 AND THE OFFER OF PROOF IS THAT AT LEAST THAT 23 WOULD GIVE THE DEFENDANT -- AND THAT THE WITNESS GAVE ONE 24 OF THESE CATALOGS TO THE DEFENDANT AND THAT WOULD AT LEAST 25 GIVE THE DEFENDANT SOME KNOWLEDGE OF THESE TYPES OF BOOKS. 26 THERE IS NO CLAIM THAT THE BOOKS THAT MR. PITTMAN HAD WERE 27 ORDERED FROM THESE CATALOGS, BECAUSE, IN FACT, MANY OF THEM

HAVE LITTLE -- SOME OF THEM, AT LEAST, HAVE LITTLE STICKERS

ON THE FRONT THAT SAY "GROCERY" AND THEN THEY HAVE A PRICE, WHICH WOULD INDICATE THAT SOME OF THEM WERE BOUGHT AT A STORE. OTHERS DO NOT HAVE THAT STICKER ON THEM.

1 SO THAT IS ONE THING THAT WE WANTED TO DISCUSS. 2 AND I BELIEVE THE WITNESS ALSO STARTED TO SAY ON THE STAND 3 THAT THERE WAS A DISCUSSION AT SOME POINT OF KILLING THE MAY BROTHERS AND I DON'T KNOW THAT I HAVE ANY NOTES OF THAT. 4 5 AND IF YOU WILL GIVE ME JUST A MOMENT, I CAN 6 TELL YOU WHETHER THAT IS IN THE POLICE REPORT. IT IS NOT 7 IN THE INITIAL POLICE REPORT THAT -- NOT IN THE INITIAL 8 STATEMENT THAT MR. DICKER MADE TO THE POLICE. 9 THE COURT: WELL, WHAT IS IT YOU ARE PROPOSING WITH 10 RESPECT TO TWO OF THE ITEMS? 11 MR. WAPNER: WELL, THERE WAS AN OBJECTION AS TO BOTH 12 OF THOSE BECAUSE THERE WAS NO NOTICE AND AS TO THE ISSUE ABOUT 13 THE CATALOG, I PROPOSE THAT IT SHOULD BE ALLOWED -- HE SHOULD 14 BE ALLOWED TO TESTIFY ABOUT THEM AND COUNSEL HAS NOW HAD THE 15 NOTES. 16 THEY ARE NOT VERY EXTENSIVE. AND I DON'T SEE 17 HOW --18 THE COURT: HE HAD THE NOTES FROM THE POLICE REPORT? 19 MR. WAPNER: NO. IT IS NOTES I MADE OF A CONVERSATION 20 I HAD WITH THE WITNESS ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 22. 21 SO, IT IS MY POSITION THAT HE SHOULD BE ALLOWED 22 TO TESTIFY ABOUT THAT. AND AS FAR AS THE DISCUSSION OF KILLING 23 THE MAY BROTHERS, I WILL JUST -- I DON'T INTEND TO ASK THE 24 WITNESS ABOUT THAT. 25 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I THOUGHT THAT THAT WOULD BE 26 UNDER 352, IN ANY EVENT, THAT I WOULD NOT PERMIT IT. 27 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, MIGHT I BE HEARD ON THE 28

+

CATALOG?

THE COURT: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THERE WAS TESTIMONY IN THE PITTMAN TRIAL BY THE WITNESS KARNY ON A FEW OCCASIONS AND I BELIEVE BY JEFF RAYMOND, AS WELL, SPECIFICALLY THAT HUNT DID NOT OWN ANY BOOKS AS THOSE DESCRIBED FOUND IN PITTMAN'S POSSESSION.

I DO NOT SEE THE RELEVANCY OF THE PROFFERED TESTIMONY OF THIS WITNESS, TO SAY THAT AT SOME TIME, HE GAVE HUNT AN ORDER FORM FROM THE BACK OF A MAGAZINE HE HAS READ.

THERE IS NO TESTIMONY TO SHOW THAT HUNT EVER ORDERED THE BOOKS. THERE IS NO TESTIMONY TO SHOW THAT HUNT EVER GAVE THE ORDER FORM TO MR. PITTMAN OR ANYBODY ELSE. THERE IS NO TESTIMONY THAT SHOWS HUNT DID ANYTHING EXCEPT PUT IT ON HIS DESK.

THE COURT: I THINK IN THE INTEREST OF -- I THINK I WILL EXCLUDE IT IN THE EXERCISE OF MY DISCRETION.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. LET'S GET THIS SHOW ON THE ROAD. IS THE WITNESS HERE?

MR. WAPNER: YES.

22

23

24

25

26

27

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD 1 IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) 2 THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. 3 I AM SORRY FOR THE DELAY. WE HAD THINGS TO DO 4 DISCUSS OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. 5 6 GO AHEAD. 7 8 EVAN GEORGE DICKER, CALLED AS A WITNESS BY THE PEOPLE, HAVING BEEN PREVIOUSLY 9 SWORN, RESUMED THE STAND AND TESTIFIED FURTHER AS FOLLOWS: 10 THE CLERK: ALL RIGHT, YOU HAVE BEEN SWORN. YOU ARE 11 STILL UNDER OATH. SO IF YOU WOULD STATE YOUR NAME AGAIN FOR 12 13 THE RECORD. THE WITNESS: EVAN GEORGE DICKER. 14 15 16 CROSS-EXAMINATION (RESUMED) BY MR. BARENS: 17 18 GOOD MORNING, MR. DICKER. Q 19 GOOD MORNING. Α 20 MR. DICKER, WE HAD SOME DISCUSSION YESTERDAY ABOUT THIS PARADOX PHILOSOPHY AND I WAS WONDERING WHEN YOU STOPPED 21 BELIEVING IN THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY? 22 23 I THINK GRADUALLY IN THE LATTER PART -- LATER PART OF 1983 -- '-4 -- EXCUSE ME -- I BEGAN DECLINING IN MY 24 BELIEF. I STOPPED BEING GUIDED BY IT, BEGINNING PROBABLY 25 IN AUGUST OR SEPTEMBER, AND BY THE END OF THE YEAR, I 26 CONSIDERED MYSELF TO HAVE NOT BEEN GUIDED BY IT. 27 28 Q DID YOU CHANGE THE WAY YOU ACTED IN LIGHT OF THAT

THE WITNESS: I DON'T THINK IT IS IN MY SELF-INTEREST

28

TO TESTIFY HERE. 1 2 THE COURT: GO AHEAD. BY MR. BARENS: MR. DICKER, YOU TOLD US YESTERDAY 3 THAT YOU HAD SOME CONCERNS ABOUT BEING ARRESTED. 4 5 A I DID. Q AND WHAT WERE YOU CONCERNED ABOUT? 6 THE COURT: HE TESTIFIED ABOUT BEING AN ACCESSORY AFTER 7 THE FACT, DIDN'T HE TELL YOU THAT YESTERDAY? 8 MR. BARENS: I THINK WE MIGHT GET A BIT MORE THAN THAT, 9 10 IF I CAN ASK HIM. THE COURT: IF YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS TO ASK 11 12 HIM ABOUT THAT --MR. BARENS: THAT IS WHAT I PLAN TO DO, YOUR HONOR. 13 Q MR. DICKER, YOU SAID YOU HAD SOME CONCERN ABOUT 14 15 BEING AN ACCESSORY? 16 A THAT WAS ONE OF MY CONCERNS, YES. 17 THE COURT: AFTER THE FACT? 18 THE WITNESS: AFTER THE FACT, YES. 19 Q BY MR. BARENS: MR. DICKER, DO YOU KNOW WHAT 20 OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IS? 21 A I HAVE HEARD OF IT, YES. 22 Q AND WOULD OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE INVOLVE TELLING 23 A STORY TO THE POLICE THAT WOULD OBSTRUCT THEIR VIEW OF FACTS 24 KNOWN TO YOU SO AS TO COOL THE TRAIL, SO TO SPEAK? 25 A I AM NOT RECALLING FROM THE CRIMINAL LAW BUT IS 26 THERE A MENS REA OR AN INTENT REQUIRED IN THAT CRIME, IF YOU 27 KNOW? 28 Q I BELIEVE THAT THAT IS A WOBBLER TYPE OFFENSE,

IF THE JUDGE WANTS TO CORRECT ME -- I BELIEVE THE MERE ACTIVITY PER SE IS CIRCUMSCRIBED. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, GO AHEAD. Q BY MR. BARENS: IN ANY EVENT, YOU HAD ENGAGED IN A BIT OF OBSTRUCTION, HAD YOU NOT, SIR? A I THINK THAT IS PROBABLY CORRECT, YES. Q AND YOU ARE TELLING ME THAT THE THING YOU DID IN THAT REGARD WAS THAT WHEN YOU FIRST TALKED TO THE POLICE, WHEN WAS THAT? A WHEN I FIRST SPOKE -- ARE WE DISCUSSING AT THE WILSHIRE MANNING? Q YES, SIR. A I BELIEVE THAT WAS IN THE BEGINNING OF OCTOBER OF 1984. AND AT THAT POINT, YOU TOLD THEM THAT AS FAR AS YOU KNOW LEVIN WAS MISSING? A YES, I DID.

YOUR HONOR.

```
1
             Q AND YOU DENIED THE HAPPENSTANCE OF THE 6/24
      MEETING?
  2
           A I DENIED THAT I WAS PRESENT AT A MEETING WHERE
  3
      JOE HUNT TOLD ME HE MURDERED RON LEVIN. I REALIZE THAT IT
  4
      IS JUST PLAYING WITH WORDS, BUT THAT IS --
  5
  6
                 THAT'S ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN PLAY WITH WORDS.
            0
  7
                  WHEN YOU SAID THAT RON LEVIN WAS MISSING IN
     OCTOBER, HAVE YOU EVER SEEN HIS BODY?
  8
  9
                 WHILE HE WAS LIVING OR AFTER HE WAS DEAD, I GUESS?
 10
                 WELL, I DON'T KNOW THAT HE IS DEAD, MR. DICKER.
     I AM ASKING YOU IF YOU KNOW AS A FACT THAT HE IS? DID YOU
 11
 12
     EVER SEE A BODY?
 13
            A SO WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THE DEAD MR. LEVIN'S
 14
     BODY?
15
               I DON'T KNOW THAT HE IS DEAD LEGALLY, MR. DICKER.
16
     THE JURY WILL DECIDE THAT EVENTUALLY. I AM ASKING YOU --
17
           THE COURT: DON'T OFFER GRATUITOUSLY ANY OPINIONS OF
18
    YOUR OWN, WHETHER HE IS OR IS NOT, JUST ASK THE QUESTION.
19
           MR. WAPNER: WELL, THERE IS AN OBJECTION.
20
           MR. BARENS: IT WAS NOT A GRATUITY.
21
           MR. WAPNER: THE OBJECTION IS THAT THE QUESTION IS
22
    VAGUE. IF HE IS ASKING HIM, DID HE SEE A BODY --
23
           THE COURT: WELL, YOU MIGHT ASK THAT QUESTION. NOBODY
24
    HAS EVER SEEN THE BODY. IS THAT RIGHT?
25
           MR. BARENS: INCLUDING THIS WITNESS.
26
           THE COURT: NOR YOU NOR I.
27
           MR. BARENS: NOR DO WE KNOW ONE EXISTS QUITE WELL,
```

HIM.

1		Q	AS	FAR	AS	YC)U KNE	EW?							
2		А	AS	FAR	AS	I	KNEW,	YES.							
3		Q	OK.	AΥ.	ТНА	ΔT	REMA	INS THE	CAS	SE AS	S FAF	R AS	YOU	KNOW	1
4	TODAY,	THAT	NO ·	ONE I	HAS	SE	EN HI	M?							
5		А	AS	FAR	AS	I	KNOW	TODAY,	NO	ONE	HAS	SEEN	I HIM	•	
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															
19															
20															
21															
22															
23															
24															
25															
26															
27															

```
OKAY. THAT IS WHAT YOU WERE BASING YOUR KNOWLEDGE
  1
      ON IN OCTOBER AND YOUR KNOWLEDGE REMAINED THE SAME BETWEEN
  2
      OCTOBER AND DECEMBER?
  3
            А
                  THAT'S CORRECT.
  5
                  ALL RIGHT. NOW, GETTING BACK TO THE BBC --
                  ACTUALLY, THERE MAY HAVE BEEN -- I AM NOT SURE
  6
     OF THE DATE OF THE CODE STATEMENT. THE CODE STATEMENT MAY
  7
     HAVE PRECEDED MY FIRST MEETING IN OCTOBER WITH DETECTIVE
 8
     ZOELLER AND MY SECOND MEETING WITH DETECTIVE ZOELLER.
 9
 10
                 YOU MENTIONED -- YOU WERE REFERRING TO STATEMENTS
            Q
     AND I ASSUME THAT THAT WAS ONE OF THE ONES YOU WERE REFERRING
 11
12
     TO?
13
               YES.
14
                 OKAY. GETTING BACK TO THE BBC NOW, YOU WERE
    MENTIONING YESTERDAY THAT HUNT DESCRIBED THAT HE HAD MADE
15
    A CONSIDERABLE NUMBER OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR LEVIN IN
16
    THE CLAYTON BROKERAGE ACCOUNT?
17
18
                I DIDN'T SAY IT WAS IN THE CLAYTON BROKERAGE
    ACCOUNT. BUT I DID STATE THAT HE MADE CONSIDERABLE MILLIONS
19
20
    OR SOME MILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR LEVIN.
21
                 TRADING IN COMMODITIES?
           Q
22
                 CORRECT.
23
                 AND THAT THE BENEFICIARIES OF THAT TRADING ACTIVITY
           Q
24
    WAS TO BE THE BBC?
25
                THE BBC WOULD BE ONE OF THE BENEFICIARIES AND
26
   ITS MEMBERS WOULD BE ANOTHER GROUP OF BENEFICIARIES.
27
                DID HUNT TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, HAVE SOME LEGAL
          0
28
   OBLIGATION TO GIVE THE PROCEEDS FROM THE LEVIN TRADING TO
```

- 5

THE	BBC?	

A YOU MEAN A CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION?

Q ANY OBLIGATION.

A POSSIBLY AN ORAL CONTRACT. BUT CERTAINLY, NO WRITTEN CONTRACT.

Q ALL RIGHT. DID YOU HAVE SOME SENSE THAT HIS TRADING ACTIVITIES FOR THE BBC, FOR LEVIN, HAD AT LEAST INITIALLY BEEN INDEPENDENT OF ANY OTHER ACTIVITIES HE WAS INVOLVED IN?

A WELL, DEFERRING TO THE WAY THE BBC WORKED IN THAT, BECAUSE THE BBC WAS I BELIEVE, THE ONE WHO MADE THE CONNECTION BETWEEN LEVIN AND HUNT AND THEN THE BBC ITSELF, WOULD GAIN A BENEFIT FROM IT FOR ITS PARTICIPATION IN THE TRANSACTION.

YOU NEVER KNEW THAT TO BE A FACT?

KNEW THAT HE WAS ACTUALLY TRADING TO BE A FACT?

26

27

28

Q

Q

NO.

THAT THE BBC WAS TRADING FOR LEVIN. 1 I NEVER KNEW THE BBC WAS TRADING FOR LEVIN AS 2 A FACT, NO. 3 ALL RIGHT. YOU DIDN'T HEAR OF ANY BBC TRADING Q 4 ACTIVITY FOR LEVIN THAT YOU ARE AWARE OF, DID YOU? 5 Α NO. 6 ALL RIGHT. THUS, THE ONLY TRADING YOU EVENTUALLY 7 HEARD ABOUT WAS TRADING IN SOME ACCOUNT THAT HUNT WAS ENGAGED 8 IN WITH LEVIN? 9 Α 10 THAT'S CORRECT. NOW, WHEN THE MATTER OF THOSE TRADES DIDN'T COME 11 THROUGH IN THE SENSE THAT YOU SAY YOU NEVER SAW ANY CASH FROM 12 THAT TRANSACTION, THE NEXT THING YOU HEARD WAS THAT YOU WERE 13 GETTING AN INTEREST IN A SHOPPING CENTER SOMEWHAT IN LIEU 14 OF THE PROCEEDS FROM THE COMMODITIES TRADING? 15 16 THAT'S CORRECT. 17 BEFORE THAT, HAD YOU HEARD THERE WAS SOME EFFORT BY HUNT TO TRY TO COLLECT THE MONEY FROM THE COMMODITIES 18 TRADING ACCOUNT? 19 20 I DID NOT HEAR THAT, NO. Α 21 HUNT NEVER SAID THAT HE WAS TALKING WITH LEVIN AND EXPECTING TO GET THE MONEY THAT WAS DUE THE BBC FROM HIM? 22 23 Α THAT HE DID SAY, YES. 24 AND DID HE SAY THAT GENERALLY TO MOST OF THE BBC Q 25 PEOPLE? 26 I CAN -- I DON'T RECALL SPECIFICALLY HEARING ANY CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN HUNT AND ANY OTHER BBC MEMBERS WHERE 27 THAT WAS MENTIONED BUT IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT IT WAS 28

) 	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	1 6	15	14	13	12	<u>-</u> 1	10	9	ω	7	თ	ഗ	4	ω	2	→
																					D	Ø	HARMED.	REPUTATION	Þ	REPUTATION	P
							•														POSSIBLY, YES.	IN ANYONE ELSE'S EYES?		WOULD BE NOT IN MY EYES, IT WOULD NOT BE	I DIDN'T FEEL THAT HIS CREDIBILITY OR	OR CREDIBILITY WAS ON THE LINE IN THIS TRANSACTION?	DID YOU EVER GET A FEELING THAT HUNT'S

26

27

28

Q THERE WAS SOME SENSE YOU HAD THAT HUNT COULD 1 SUSTAIN A LOSS OF FACE IN THIS SETTING, WERE THIS TRANSACTION 2 3 TO FAIL? A HE WOULDN'T HAVE, IN MY EYES. BUT IT IS POSSIBLE THAT HE COULD HAVE IN SOMEONE'S. 5 6 Q ALL RIGHT. LATER ON, THE SHOPPING CENTER AS 7 TOLD TO YOU, DID YOU FEEL THAT THAT CAUSED HIM TO HAVE SOME REAFFIRMATION OF HUNT'S STATUS IN THE GROUP WHEN YOU WERE 8 TOLD YOU WERE NOT GOING TO LOSE MONEY? INSTEAD OF THE MONEY, 9 10 YOU ARE NOW GOING TO HAVE A SHOPPING CENTER? DID THAT APPARENTLY RECONFIRM HUNT'S VALIDITY AS A BUSINESSMAN? 11 12 A YES. 13 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. 14 THE WITNESS: EXCUSE ME. YOUR HONOR, THE PEOPLE ARE 15 STARING IN THE DOOR. COULD WE JUST --16 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 17 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU. 18 (PAUSE.) 19 BY MR. BARENS: OKAY. SO HUNT'S STOCK APPARENTLY 20 GOES UP A BIT WHEN THIS SHOPPING CENTER TRANSACTION IS 21 DISCUSSED. 22 NOW, HOW LONG DID YOU FOLKS BELIEVE THAT THE 23 SHOPPING CENTER WAS A REALITY? 24 MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME. IF THERE IS AN OBJECTION, IT IS ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT HE IS ASKING FOR OTHER PEOPLE'S OPINIONS, AS OPPOSED TO JUST THIS WITNESS. THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

Q BY MR. BARENS: MR. DICKER, HOW LONG DID YOU

27

28

AND OTHER PEOPLE THAT YOU ARE AWARE OF FROM THE WAY THEY ACTED 1 AND SPOKE, BELIEVE THAT THE SHOPPING CENTER WAS A REALITY? 2 3 I WOULD SAY ONE TO THREE MONTHS. NOW, DURING THAT ONE TO THREE MONTHS, THERE WERE 4 SOME EFFORTS GOING ON TO GET TITLE DOCUMENTS TO THE SHOPPING 5 6 CENTER? 7 IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING, YES. AND WHO DID YOU HAVE THAT UNDERSTANDING FROM? 8 9 I DON'T RECALL PRECISELY. 10 DID YOU HEAR JOE HUNT SAYING THAT HE WAS UNDER-TAKING CERTAIN MEASURES TO TRY TO SECURE AND CONFIRM THE 11 EXISTENCE OF THE BBC'S INTEREST IN THE SHOPPING CENTER? 12 13 I THINK THERE WAS. I DO RECALL JOE HAVING A DISCUSSION. I DON'T RECALL WITH WHOM, ABOUT SENDING SOMEBODY 14 15 TO CHICAGO TO LOOK AT THE SHOPPING CENTER. 16 Q RIGHT. WHO WERE YOU GOING TO SEND? 17 Α I DON'T RECALL. 18 Q WAS IT BEN DOSTI? 19 IT MAY VERY WELL HAVE BEEN. 20 ALL RIGHT. ONCE YOU SAY THAT THE EFFORTS 21 CONFIRMED THE POSSESSION THAT YOU HAD IN THE SHOPPING CENTER, 22 YOU WERE EXACTLY IN THE ANALOGOUS POSITION TAKEN TO INSURE 23 THE CASHING OF THE CHECK FROM LEVIN? THAT IS THE WAY IT LOOKED 24 TO YOU WHEN YOU LOOKED AT THEM? 25 THE ACTIVITY TO CONFIRM THE EXISTENCE OF THE SHOPPING CENTER, TO GET THE TITLE DOCUMENTS THEN SEND SOMEONE TO TAKE A LOOK AT THEM, IS ANALOGOUS TO THE EFFORTS THAT YOU UNDERTOOK TO CASH THE CHECK AND SEND SOMEONE TO SWITZERLAND

Q RIGHT. IS THAT AGREED?

TO TRY TO UNDERTAKE THOSE EFFORTS AS WELL? A I THINK IF YOU LOOK AT IT, YOU KNOW FROM A DISTANCE, IT DOES SEEM SIMILAR, YES. I THINK THAT THERE IS A DISTINCTION IN ONE SIDE WHERE YOU ARE TRYING TO CASH A CHECK. AND IN ANOTHER SIDE, YOU ARE TRYING TO CONFIRM PROPERTY. A ONE IS A NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENT. THE PROPERTY IS --IT IS REASONABLE TO TAKE A LOOK AT PROPERTY THAT YOU NOW BELIEVE YOU ARE ENTITLED TO. Q ALL RIGHT. WELL, AS WE GO THROUGH IT, THEY BOTH INVOLVED PAPER WORK? IN OTHER WORDS, YOU HAD PAPERS THAT YOU WERE TRYING TO EXECUTE UPON OR VERIFY THE EXISTENCE OF?

WITH REGARDS TO THE LOCATION OF THE SHOPPING CENTER. 1 IN REFERENCE TO THE MILLION FIVE CHECK, THAT IS 2 WRITTEN ON A FOREIGN BANK ACCOUNT, IS IT NOT, SIR? 3 YES, IT WAS. 4 AND NONE OF YOU HERE HAD ANY PAPERWORK ON THAT 5 Q ACCOUNT, DID YOU? 6 7 WE HAD THE CHECK. I AM TALKING ABOUT THE PAPERWORK AS FAR AS TITLE 8 TO THE ACCOUNT OR ANY BANK STATEMENTS ON THE ACCOUNT, THINGS 9 OF THAT NATURE. 10 11 A NOTHING BESIDE THE CHECK, NO. AND DID ANY OF YOU HAVE ANY PARTICULAR EXPERTISE 12 CONCERNING FOREIGN BANKING MATTERS? 13 14 NONE THAT I AM AWARE OF, NO. SO YOU HAD NEVER PERSONALLY ENGAGED IN CASHING 15 A SWISS CHECK BEFORE, HAD YOU, SIR? 16 17 NO, I HAD NOT. Α 18 AND THUS, THERE WAS A MEETING WHEREIN, OR SOME DISCUSSION WHEREIN YOU DETERMINED THAT IT WAS ADVISABLE IN 19 A BUSINESS SENSE TO SEND MR. DOSTI OVER TO SEE WHAT COULD 20 21 BE DONE TO EXPEDITE THAT MATTER? 22 A I THINK IF THERE WAS A MEETING OR DISCUSSION, IT WAS HELD PRIOR TO MY ARRIVING AT THE OFFICE THAT DAY. 23 24 AND THEN YOU LATER HEARD ABOUT IT? Q 25 I WAS LATER INSTRUCTED TO PREPARE THE MINUTES. 26 AT THAT SPECIFIC MOMENT IN TIME, IN YOUR MIND 27 WAS THERE ANYTHING SINISTER ABOUT THAT ACTIVITY? 28 SINISTER ABOUT SENDING MR. DOSTI TO EUROPE TO

CASH THE CHECK?

Q YES, SIR.

A THE ONLY SINISTER ELEMENT OF IT WAS IT WAS AUTHORIZED BY A BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING THAT DID NOT OCCUR.

Q OTHER THAN THE FACT, I THINK YOU TESTIFIED PREVIOUSLY THAT MOST, IF NOT ALL OF YOUR MINUTES WITH A SINGLE EXCEPTION WERE SOMEWHAT CREATURES OF INVENTION RATHER THAN REALITY.

A THAT'S CORRECT AND --

Q AND OTHER THAN THAT --

MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. I BELIEVE THE WITNESS HAD NOT FINISHED ANSWERING THE QUESTION.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT.

THE WITNESS: I WANTED TO STATE THERE DID SEEM SOMETHING PECULIAR ABOUT A CHECK YOU HAD TO SEND SOMEBODY TO EUROPE TO GET IT CASHED.

Q BY MR. BARENS: I AM ASKING YOU NOW IF WE ARE APPLYING THE WORD PECULIAR OR THE WORD SINISTER, DID YOU FEEL IT WAS SINISTER AT THE TIME. SIR?

A MY DEFINITION OF SINISTER BRINGS UP MORE FEELINGS
OF HORROR MOVIES THAN OF SENDING PEOPLE TO EUROPE TO CASH
CHEECKS. THAT SEEMS MORE -- THAT SEEMS MORE --

IF YOU ARE USING SINISTER IN THE SENSE OF SORT OF CLOAK AND DAGGER?

Q YES.

A AH, IT SEEMED -- IT SEEMED STRANGE.

Q OUT OF THE ORDINARY?

1	A YES, IT DID.
2	Q DID IT SEEM CORRUPT?
3	MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION TO ALL OF THIS AS CALLING FOR
4	A CONCLUSION ON THE PART OF THE WITNESS.
5	MR. BARENS: I AM ONLY ASKING WHAT HIS STATE OF MIND
6	WAS, HOW HE PERCEIVED THINGS THEN.
7	THE COURT: HE HAS ALREADY TOLD US HIS STATE OF MIND.
8	HE STATED IT WAS STRANGE. NOW THAT CHARACTERIZES HIS STATE
9	OF MIND.
10	NOW LET'S GET ON TO SOMETHING ELSE, WILL YOU?
11	Q BY MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. DID YOU THINK YOU
12	WERE DOING SOMETHING ILLEGAL?
13	A AGAIN, ONLY IN THE SENSE THAT THE CORPORATION
14	WAS UNDERTAKING ACTIONS THAT IT HAD NOT BEEN PROPERLY
15	AUTHORIZED TO DO.
16	Q YOU DIDN'T THINK THERE WAS ANYTHING ILLEGAL ABOUT
17	GOING OVER AND CASHING THE CHECK, DID YOU, THAT WAS WRITTEN
18	OUT IN THE CORPORATION'S NAME?
19	A AGAIN, ONLY BECAUSE IT HAD IT WAS NOT YET
20	AUTHORIZED BY THE CORPORATION.
21	Q BUT OTHER THAN THE FACT THAT THE NICETY OF THE
22	CORPORATE AUTHORIZATION HAD NOT BEEN ACCOMPLISHED, TO YOUR
23	KNOWLEDGE, WAS THERE SOMETHING ILLEGAL IN EXECUTING THAT CHECK
24	ON THAT BASIS?
25	A AT THAT POINT IN TIME, TO MY KNOWLEDGE, NO, THERE
26	WAS NOTHING ILLEGAL WITH IT.
27	Q AND YOU NEVER ADVISED ANYBODY THERE THAT YOU
28	THOUGHT IT WAS ILLEGAL, DID YOU?

Α NO, I DID NOT. NOW YOU MENTIONED EARLIER -- I WILL MOVE AHEAD WITH THAT -- YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU HAD SEEN SOME MEETINGS BETWEEN HUNT AND JIM GRAHAM WHEREIN THEY HAD CLOSED THE DOOR? Α YES, I DID. DID YOU SEE SOMETHING SINISTER ABOUT THAT? IT WAS DONE A LOT AND SO WHILE IT DIDN'T NECESSARILY SEEM SINISTER, I DIDN'T THINK ANYTHING WAS NECESSARILY AFOOT. IT SEEMED PECULIAR. DIDN'T HE ALSO MEET WITH YOU WITH THE DOOR CLOSED ON OCCASION? NEVER TO THE DEGREE THAT HE DID WITH MR. PITTMAN Α AND GENERALLY, IT WOULD PROBABLY BE WITH ONLY POSSIBLY DEALING WITH SOMETHING PERSONAL AND IT WAS VERY RARE. I --

1 ALL RIGHT. SO, IT WAS RARE THAT HE MET WITH 2 YOU WITH THE DOOR CLOSED? 3 А YES. 4 DID ANYTHING SINISTER HAPPEN WHEN HE MET WITH 5 YOU WITH THE DOOR CLOSED? 6 THE COURT: CAN'T WE USE ANOTHER WORD INSTEAD OF "SINISTER"? SUBSTITUTE SOMETHING ELSE BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW 8 WHAT SINISTER MEANS. IT MIGHT APPLY TO SOME CRIME OR SOMETHING. 9 MR. BARENS: WELL, THERE HAS BEEN A BIT OF AN IMPLICATION 10 ALREADY THAT --11 THE COURT: WELL, THERE HAS NOT BEEN ANY IMPLICATION. 12 HE HAS NOT USED THE WORD. YOU KEEP REPEATING [T. 13 MR. BARENS: IT IS MY WORD, ACTUALLY, JUDGE. 14 THE COURT: WELL, IT IS YOUR WORD. HE DISAGREES WITH 15 IT ALL OF THE TIME. YOU BETTER TRY SOMETHING NEW ON HIM. 16 BY MR. BARENS: WELL, ON THOSE RARE OCCASIONS 17 THAT YOU WOULD MEET BEHIND CLOSED DOORS, DID YOU EVER TALK 18 ABOUT BUSINESS? 19 А YES. 20 REGULAR BUSINESS? 21 I AM TRYING TO THINK IN THE DEALINGS WHERE THE 22 CORPORATE MINUTES -- WHERE I WAS INSTRUCTED TO SORT OF EXPEDITE 23 CORPORATE MINUTES, IF THAT WAS EVER DONE BEHIND CLOSED DOORS 24 AND I DON'T RECALL AT THIS TIME. 25 SO TO ANSWER YOUR QUESTION, I DON'T THINK ANY-26 THING SINISTER OCCURRED WHEN WE MET BEHIND CLOSED DOORS. 27 Q OKAY. DID YOU SEE HIM WITH OTHER PEOPLE BEHIND

28

THE DOOR BEING CLOSED?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 YES, I DID. 2 DO YOU REMEMBER WHO THOSE PEOPLE WERE? 3 PROBABLY MOST PEOPLE IN THE OFFICE. MOST PEOPLE IN THE OFFICE? SO, WAS THERE NOTHING 4 UNUSUAL OR OUT OF CHARACTER ABOUT MR. HUNT CLOSING A DOOR 5 6 WHEN HE HAD A MEETING? 7 A NO. BUT THE THING THAT I FOUND PECULIAR WITH JIM, WAS ONE, THE FREQUENCY; AND TWO, A LOT OF TIMES WHEN 8 THEY WERE BEHIND CLOSED DOORS DISCUSSING THINGS, YOU GENERALLY 9 ASSUMED IT DEALT WITH FINANCIAL MATTERS, YOU KNOW, SORT OF 10 WHAT I WOULD CALL HIGHER BUSINESS MATTERS DEALING WITH THE 11 BBC, WHICH I NEVER UNDERSTOOD OR KNEW JIM GRAHAM OR JIM 12 13 PITTMAN TO BE INVOLVED IN. WHAT SEEMS UNUSUAL TO YOU, IS HUNT'S HAVING A MEETING WITH THIS BIG BLACK FELLOW BEHIND CLOSED DOORS THAT YOU DON'T REALLY CONSIDER A PART OF THE FINANCIAL NEXUS OF THE BBC AT ALL, DO YOU? A I THINK IT IS NOT NECESSARILY THE FACT THAT HE IS A BIG, BLACK FELLOW. Q WHAT IS IT? WHAT SEEMED UNUSUAL? MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION. HE WAS NOT FINISHED WITH HIS ANSWER. MR. BARENS: SORRY. THE WITNESS: I THINK ONE, THE FREQUENCY OF IT, THE FACT THAT IT WAS OCCURRING VERY OFTEN. AND TWO, WHILE I DID THINK THAT YOUR STATEMENT IS CORRECT, THAT I DID NOT PERCEIVE HIM TO BE INVOLVED IN

THE HIGHER BUSINESS AND THOSE WERE GENERALLY THE MATTERS THAT

28

```
WERE DISCUSSED BEHIND THE CLOSED DOORS, BECAUSE THERE WAS
  1
     GENERALLY A GREAT DEAL OF FREEDOM OF INFORMATION IN THE BBC,
  2
     THERE WOULD NOT BE NEED FOR CLOSED DOORS.
  3
  4
                   NOW, YOU DIDN'T KNOW WHAT THEY WERE TALKING ABOUT,
             Q
  5
     DID YOU?
  6
                   I DID NOT.
  7
            Q
                  DID YOU EVER ASK ANYBODY?
  8
            А
                  I DID NOT.
 9
                  DO YOU EVER COMMENT TO ANYBODY THAT IT SURE IS
            Q
 10
     STRANGE THAT HUNT IS IN THERE MEETING A LOT WITH JIM PITTMAN
11
     OR GRAHAM?
12
            А
                  I DID NOT.
13
            Q
                  DID NOT?
14
                  I DID NOT.
15
                  OKAY. NOW, YOU MENTIONED YESTERDAY AFTER THAT
16
     POINT, THAT IT SEEMED LIKE JOE SPENT A LOT OF MONEY ON CLOTHES?
17
            А
                 YES, HE DID.
18
                  DID SOMETHING SEEM SINISTER ABOUT THAT?
19
           MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION, RELEVANCE.
20
           THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
21
           MR. BARENS: WELL, IT WAS BROUGHT UP IN THE TESTIMONY --
22
           THE COURT: DON'T ARGUE. LET'S NOT HAVE ANY ARGUMENTS.
23
    THE OBJECTION IS SUSTAINED.
24
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT.
25
           THE COURT: WE CANNOT AGREE UPON WHAT THE WORD
26
    "SINISTER" MEANS BUT YOU HAVE BEEN USING IT ALL OF THE TIME
    WITHOUT ANYBODY AGREEING TO WHAT IT MEANS.
```

MR. BARENS: I THOUGHT THE WITNESS USED IT IN HIS LAST

ASSOCIATED WITH THE CORPORATIONS -- ASSOCIATED WITH THE BBC,

```
1
      WERE YOU NOT?
  2
             A YES, I WAS.
             MR. BARENS: MAY I APPROACH THE WITNESS?
  3
  4
             THE COURT: YES.
  5
                   BY MR. BARENS: YOU MADE OUT THE PAPER WORK
  6
      FOR MICROGENESIS?
  7
                 YES, I DID.
  8
              I SHOW YOU STOCK CERTIFICATE NUMBER 1. DO YOU
  9
     RECOGNIZE THAT DOCUMENT?
 10
                  YES, I DO.
 11
                  DID YOU PREPARE THAT DOCUMENT?
 12
                  IT APPEARS TO BE PREPARED BY ME, YES.
            А
 13
                  DID YOU SEE A FAMILIAR SIGNATURE ON THAT DOCUMENT?
            Q
 14
              THAT APPEARS TO BE MY SIGNATURE, YES.
            А
15
              WHAT DOES THE DOCUMENT SHOW?
            Q
16
                  THAT DOCUMENT SHOWS THAT 67 SHARES OF MICROGENESIS
            А
17
     OF NORTH AMERICA ARE ISSUED TO SELDON, INC.
18
                 HOW MANY SHARES MICROGENESIS WERE AUTHORIZED,
19
    SIR?
20
           А
                 I BELIEVE 100.
21
                 AND YOU CREATED THAT PAPER WORK YOURSELF, DID
           Q
22
    YOU NOT?
23
                 YES. I DO BELIEVE SO.
24
           Q I SHOW YOU --
25
           MR. WAPNER: MAY THAT BE 185?
26
27
```

MR. BARENS: NO. I WOULD LIKE THIS MARKED AS 1 DEFENDANT'S NEXT. 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 3 MR. BARENS: AND WE WILL CALL THAT WHATEVER I AM AT. THE COURT: J WAS THE LAST ONE, WASN'T IT? 5 MR. BARENS: YES, SO WE WILL CALL THIS K-1 -- WHAT AN 6 APPROPRIATE THING FOR A SHARE CERTIFICATE -- K-1 ON THIS AND WE WILL CALL THIS K-2. 8 WHAT IS K-2? Q 9 K-2 APPEARS TO BE CERTIFICATE NUMBER FROM 10 MICROGENESIS OF NORTH AMERICA AND ISSUED 33 SHARES TO GENE 11 BROWNING. 12 Q WHO SIGNED THAT? 13 THAT APPEARS TO BE MY SIGNATURE. 14 THE COURT: PARDON ME. HOW MUCH WAS THE FIRST STOCK 15 CERTIFICATE FOR? 16 THE WITNESS: THE FIRST STOCK CERTIFICATE WAS FOR 17 67 SHARES AND THE SECOND STOCK CERTIFICATE WAS FOR 33. 18 THE COURT: THAT IS FOR THE SELDON CORPORATION? 19 THE WITNESS: THE FIRST ONE WAS TO SELDON, INC., YES. 20 THE COURT: WHO WERE THEY, BY THE WAY? 21 BY MR. BARENS: YES, QUITE SO. WHOWAS SELDON 22 Q CORPORATION, BY THE WAY? 23 24 SELDON CORPORATION WAS A HOLDING CORPORATION. 25 WHO WAS THE SHAREHOLDER OF SELDON CORPORATION? MY UNDERSTANDING WAS THAT NO ONE HELD THE SHARES 26 27 IN SELDON CORPORATION.

THE COURT: YOU MEAN IT HAD NEVER ISSUED ANY?

```
THE WITNESS: IT NEVER HAD ISSUED ANY SHARES, CORRECT.
 1
                  BY MR. BARENS: NOW GOING AHEAD WITH THE SELDON
           Q
 2
     MATTER, YOU ARE SURE NO SHARES WERE EVER ISSUED IN SELDON?
 3
           Α
                  I DO NOT RECALL ANY SHARES IN SELDON THAT -- I
 4
     WOULDN'T SAY THAT I AM SURE NONE WERE ISSUED. IF YOU CAN
 5
     SHOW ME THE CORPORATE RECORDS, I CAN TELL YOU FOR SURE.
 6
                  SIR, DID YOU ISSUE THE SHARES TO YOURSELF?
7
                  I MIGHT HAVE AT SOME TIME, YES.
8
                YOU MIGHT HAVE ISSUED ALL OF THE SHARES IN SELDON
9
     TO YOURSELF?
10
           A I THINK IT WAS THE INTENTION TO HAVE THE SHARES
11
     ISSUED TO MYSELF TO HOLD THEM BUT I DON'T THINK THEY WERE
12
     EVER ISSUED TO ME.
13
           Q
                 AND THEREFORE, IF THE SHARES WERE ISSUED TO YOU,
14
     YOU WOULD OWN 67 PERCENT OF THAT COMPANY --
15
                 THAT'S CORRECT --
           Α
16
                 -- MICROGENESIS?
           Q
17
                 THAT'S CORRECT.
18
                 AND THEN BROWNING WOULD OWN THE BALANCE?
           Q
19
                 THAT'S CORRECT.
20
                 NOW I WOULD LIKE TO SHOW YOU SOME DOCUMENTS THAT
21
     HAVE THE TITLE "PROXY" ON THEM.
22
23
           MR. BARENS: I WILL CALL THIS DEFENDANT'S NEXT 1 AND 2.
24
           THE COURT: L-1 AND -2.
25
           MR. BARENS: WE ARE AT L-1?
26
           THE COURT: YES.
27
           Q
                BY MR. BARENS: WHAT IS L-1, SIR?
```

L-1 IS A PROXY SIGNED BY ME, GRANTING TO BEN DOSTI

THE OPTION TO PURCHASE 32 SHARES OF STOCK OWNED BY THE UNDERSIGNED IN THAT CERTAIN CALIFORNIA CORPORATION KNOWN AS SELDON, INC., TO WHICH THE PARTY TO WHOM THIS OPTION IS BEING GIVEN IS ALREADY A SHAREHOLDER THEREOF.

THE OPTION PRICE BEING \$1 PER SHARE.

MR. WAPNER: MR. DICKER, EXCUSE ME FOR A SECOND. SLOW DOWN, WILL YOU?

THE WITNESS: I AM SORRY. EXCUSE ME.

"THE OPTION PRICE IS \$1 PER SHARE, AND THIS OPTION MAY BE EXERCISED AT ANY TIME, UPON WRITTEN NOTICE GIVEN AND RECEIVED BY THE UNDERSIGNED, WITHIN BLANK YEARS FROM DATE HEREOF.

"IN ADDITION TO THE OPTION GRANTED ABOVE, THE UNDERSIGNED ALSO GRANTS TO THE PARTY TO WHOM THE OPTION IS BEING GIVEN A VOTING PROXY ON THE 32 SHARES OF STOCK INVOLVED HEREIN, EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY, WHICH PROXY MAY BE REVOKED ONLY UPON TERMS AND CONDITIONS MUTUALLY AGREED UPON."

BY MR. BARENS: THUS IN THAT DOCUMENT, YOU HAVE REPRESENTED TO MR. DOSTI THAT YOU ARE THE OWNER OF SELDON?

THAT IS CORRECT, I HAVE REPRESENTED TO HIM THAT I OWN 32 SHARES OF IT.

ALL RIGHT. NOW I SHOW YOU L-2; COULD YOU PLEASE TELL US WHAT L-2 IS.

L-2 IS THE EXACT SAME PROXY, EXCEPT IT IS TO THE BENEFIT OF DEAN KARNY.

Q AND THAT IS FOR HOW MANY SHARES, SIR?

23

25

26

27

A ALSO FOR 32. 1 THE COURT: PARDON ME. DID YOU HAVE ANY INSTRUCTIONS 2 FROM ANYBODY TO EXECUTE THESE PROXIES OR THE CERTIFICATE? 3 THE WITNESS: YES, I DID. 4 THE COURT: FROM WHOM DID YOU GET THOSE INSTRUCTIONS? 5 THE WITNESS: JOSEPH HUNT. 6 THE COURT: HE TOLD YOU WHAT TO DO, DID HE? 7 THE WITNESS: YES, HE DID. 8 THE COURT: AND YOU DID THAT; IS THAT CORRECT? 9 THE WITNESS: THAT'S CORRECT. 10 THE COURT: LET'S GET ON, WILL YOU? 11 MR. BARENS: IF YOU WILL ALLOW ME TO EXAMINE THIS 12 WITNESS. 13 THE COURT: I AM ALLOWING YOU TO EXAMINE HIM. WE ARE 14 WASTING AN AWFUL LOT OF TIME. 15 MR. BARENS: PERHAPS IN YOUR OPINION, YOUR HONOR. 16 THE COURT: YES, IN MY OPINION WE ARE. 17 MR. BARENS: AGAIN, YOUR HONOR, IF I MIGHT PROCEED ON 18 WITH THIS EXAMINATION. 19 THE COURT: THE IMPLICATION OF THESE QUESTIONS YOU HAVE 20 BEEN ASKING IS TO GIVE THE IMPRESSION TO THE JURY THAT HE 21 HAD TAKEN THE STOCK HIMSELF. 22 MR. BARENS: NOT AT ALL, YOUR HONOR. 23 THE COURT: YES, THAT IS THE DISTINCT IMPRESSION I GOT. 24 MR. BARENS: I REALIZE --25 THE COURT: THAT IS WHY I ASKED THE QUESTIONS I ASKED. 26 MR. BARENS: IF I CAN FINISH WITH THE WITNESS, I WILL 27 GET TO WHERE I AM GOING TO GO. 28

THE COURT: LET'S GO ON TO SOMETHING IMPORTANT.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1(

26

27

28

BY MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, MR. DICKER, HIS HONOR HAS SKIPPED AHEAD TO THE QUESTIONS I WAS GOING TO ASK YOU ABOUT MR. HUNT'S PARTICIPATION IN THIS, BUT THANKING HIS HONOR FOR SAVING US THAT TIME, WHAT I NOW WANT TO GET TO IS ASKING YOU WHY WAS IT THAT YOU CONSTRUCTED THE MATTER WHERE MR. HUNT DID NOT APPEAR AS A SHAREHOLDER IN MICROGENESIS?

I DID IT AT HIS DIRECTION. Α

Q DO YOU KNOW WHY THAT DIRECTION WAS GIVEN?

NO. I DON'T.

OKAY, YOU NEVER ASKED HIM OR ANYBODY ABOUT WHY HE DID NOT APPEAR AS A SHAREHOLDER IN MICROGENESIS?

I THINK AT ONE TIME, HE STATED THAT BECAUSE OF HIS DAY-TO-DAY BUSINESS DEALINGS, HE MAY BE UNDER A GREAT DEAL MORE EXPOSURE TO POSSIBLE CIVIL LIABILITY WHICH MIGHT, YOU KNOW, AT SOME TIME REACH, YOU KNOW, SOME THINGS OF VALUE THAT HE HELD AND SO HE WANTED TO DISINTEREST HIMSELF FROM POSSESSION OF THOSE.

EXCUSE ME A MOMENT.

THE FACT THEN BECAME THAT AT LEAST IN TITLE, SIR, YOU HAD LEGAL TITLE TO MICROGENESIS?

I MEAN IN THE SIMPLEST UNDERSTANDING OF A CORPORATION, BECAUSE I HAD GIVEN OVER A VOTING PROXY AND THEY COULD PURCHASE THE STOCKS AT ANY TIME.

I HAD ABSOLUTELY NO CONTROL OF MICROGENESIS.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

```
1
                THEREFORE, MESSRS. DOSTI AND KARNY WOULD, ALONG
     WITH MR. BROWNING?
 2
 3
           A AND AS MEMORY SERVES ME, A THIRD PROXY HAD BEEN
     ISSUED TO MR. HUNT.
 5
                AND THAT WAS FOR HOW MANY SHARES?
 6
                32 ALSO. PLUS, I THINK MR. HUNT HAD ACTUALLY
    THE CONTROL, HAD THE 33RD SHARE, ALSO.
 7
 8
                AND HOW COULD WE DO THAT IF WE HAVE GOT PROXIES
 9
    FROM YOU? WHAT ABOUT BROWNING IN THAT SCENARIO?
10
           A WELL, YOU ARE IGNORING THE FACT THAT BROWNING
    HAS SHARES OF MICROGENESIS AND SELDON HAD THE 67. SO, HE
11
    QUALIFIED 100 SHARES OF MICROGENESIS.
12
13
                 IF I EVER ACTUALLY ISSUED THE CERTIFICATE WHICH
14
    I DON'T RECALL MYSELF DOING, THERE WERE 100 SHARES OF SELDON
15
    ALSO OUT. THAT WOULD GIVE US 32, 32 AND 33 -- WAIT, EXCUSE
16
    ME. IT WAS BE 64. SO IT WOULD BE 36.
17
                IT WOULD BE 32, 32 AND 36 IN SELDON. THE PRICES
18
    WERE NOT FOR THE SELDON SHARES OF MICROGENESIS.
19
                SO THIS IS IN 1983 SOMETIME?
                THEY APPEAR TO BE EXECUTED 8 NOVEMBER, 1983.
                OKAY. IN NOVEMBER, YOUR SENSE IS THAT HUNT HAD
           Q
   SOME CONCERN ABOUT LIMITING PERSONAL LIABILITY?
          А
                YES.
          Q
                AND WHAT DID HE TELL YOU?
          А
                I BELIEVE HE EXPRESSED THAT TO ME.
          Q
                WHAT DID YOU SAY TO THAT?
               I JUST ACKNOWLEDGED IT AND DID WHAT HE TOLD ME
   TO DO.
```

```
1
             Q YOU WERE SAYING TO HIM, "I WILL TAKE THE POTENTIAL
  2
      LIABILITY INSTEAD OF YOU"?
  3
                  I THINK THE THOUGHT WAS, SINCE I WAS ONLY THE
  4
      SECRETARY OF THE CORPORATION, I WAS NOT INVOLVED PERSONALLY
  5
      IN THE TRADING OR IN ANY NEGOTIATIONS AND TOOK A VERY BACK
  6
      SEAT, IT WAS UNLIKELY THAT I WOULD INCUR ANY PERSONAL LIABILITY.
  7
                   AND IF I DID, THEY COULD ON IMMEDIATE NOTICE,
  8
     EXECUTE THE PROXIES AND TAKE AWAY ANYTHING THAT I OWNED OR
     THE CORPORATION STOCK IN THE CORPORATION THAT I OWNED.
 10
            Q BUT INSTEAD OF YOU OWNING IT, THEN TWO MORE
 11
     SIGNIFICANT BBC PEOPLE WOULD OWN THE SHARES?
 12
            A THAT'S CORRECT.
 13
                  THEREFORE, HOW HAD THEY IMPROVED OUR POSITION
 14
     ON THAT?
15
                 WELL, WE HAVE CREATED ONE STEP. I MEAN, WE HAVE
16
     BUILT IN ONE BARRIER INTO THE PROBLEM.
17
                  AND YOU THOUGHT THAT IT WAS QUITE ALL RIGHT,
            Q
18
     SIR?
19
                 I DON'T UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION.
            Α
20
                  WELL, DID YOU HAVE ANY MISGIVINGS ABOUT THAT?
            Q
21
            А
                 MISGIVINGS ABOUT WHAT?
22
           Q
                 ABOUT ANY OF THOSE TRANSACTIONS?
23
                 I PERCEIVED THEM TO ALL BE LEGAL.
           А
24
           Q
                 YOU DID?
25
           Α
                 YES, I DID.
26
                 ALL RIGHT, SIR. NOW, WHEN YOU GOT THE CHECK
27
    OR SAW THE CHECK ON 6/7, YOU MENTIONED THAT HUNT APPEARED
28
    TO BE EXCITED?
```

26

27

28

Q

1 А HE APPEARED PLEASED, YES. 2 DID ALL OF YOU APPEAR SOMEWHAT EXCITED AND PLEASED Q 3 ABOUT THAT? 4 I THINK SO, YES. 5 DID ONCE AGAIN, HUNT'S CREDIBILITY SEEM ENHANCED? 6 I DON'T NECESSARILY KNOW OF CREDIBILITY BEING ENHANCED. IT WOULD SEEM -- I THINK THAT EVERYONE VIEWED THIS 7 8 AS BEING A GOOD THING, GETTING A CHECK FOR -- I THINK ENHANCED SEEMS TO MEAN THAT IT WAS ENHANCED, AS BROUGHT BACK 9 10 UP TO SOME LEVEL. 11 Q YES. 12 A I THINK THAT IT WOULD HAVE IMPROVED HIS CREDIBILITY: 13 AGAIN, IN MY EYES, HIS CREDIBILITY HAD NOT BEEN HURT. 14 HOW ABOUT ANYBODY ELSE'S EYES THAT YOU WERE AWARE Q 15 OF? 16 А I WAS NOT AWARE OF IT. 17 YOU HAD NOT HEARD ANY CONVERSATIONS PRIOR TO 18 JUNE 6, BY ANYONE SAYING THAT THEY THOUGHT THAT HUNT HAD 19 BEEN ROOKED AGAIN BY LEVIN? 20 A IN DISCUSSING THIS, TO CORRECT MY LAST ANSWER, 21 IT WOULD BE DISCUSSING PRESENT MEMBERS OF THE BBC. 22 I BELIEVE RONALD PARDOVITCH HAD BECOME VERY --23 OR JOE, TO USE YOUR TERMS, LOST CREDIBILITY IN RONALD'S EYES 24 BY HIS INABILITY TO GET THE TITLE DOCUMENTS FOR THE SHOPPING CENTER FROM RON LEVIN. AND RONALD PARDOVITCH LEFT THE BBC I THINK, MAINLY ON THAT BASIS.

HAD EITHER OF THE MAY BROTHERS EVER TOLD YOU

THAT THEY DIDN'T THINK HUNT COULD DELIVER ON THE MONEYS HE WAS SUPPOSED TO GET FROM LEVIN?

MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION, VAGUE AS TO WHAT MONEYS HE IS TALKING ABOUT.

THE COURT: ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT THE MONEY RESULTING FROM THE MARKET TRANSACTIONS, YOU MEAN? IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT?

```
1
           MR. BARENS: YES.
 2
           THE WITNESS: WHICH --
                  BY MR. BARENS: THE COMMIDITIES MARKET TRANSACTIONS.
    HAD EITHER OF THE MAY BROTHERS EVER MENTIONED TO YOU OR
5
    ANYONE ELSE IN YOUR PRESENCE, THAT THEY DID NOT THINK HUNT
6
    WOULD BE ABLE TO SUCCEED IN GETTING THE MONEY FROM LEVIN?
                 NOT THAT I RECALL.
8
                 ALL RIGHT. HOW ABOUT AFTER THE MILLION FIVE CHECK
           Q
9
    WAS RECEIVED? DID THE MAY BROTHERS EVER MENTION THEN THAT
10
    THEY DIDN'T THINK IT WOULD CASH?
11
                 NOT THAT I RECALL.
12
                 DID ANYBODY EVER MENTION THAT?
13
                 NOT THAT I RECALL.
14
                 THUS, EVEN THOUGH ALL OF YOU WERE AWARE OF LEVIN'S
15
    HISTORY, SO TO SPEAK, NONE OF YOU EVER SPECULATED THAT THE
16
    CHECK WOULDN'T GO THROUGH?
17
           Α
                 ACTUALLY, I THINK THAT IS WRONG BECAUSE I
18
    SPECULATED. I FELT THERE WAS A POSSIBILITY OF THAT.
19
                 DID ANYBODY ELSE HAVE THAT FEELING, TO YOUR KNOW-
20
    LEDGE?
21
                 TO MY KNOWLEDGE, NO.
22
                 IT WAS NEVER DISCUSSED BY YOU WITH ANYONE?
           Q
23
                  I DON'T RECALL DISCUSSING IT WITH ANYBODY.
24
                 ALL RIGHT. NOW, WHEN YOU STARTED DISCUSSING
25
    IT, YOU DECIDED ON CERTAIN ACTIONS YOU WOULD TAKE TO NEGOTIATE
26
    THE CHECK?
27
           А
                 TO EXPEDITE THE CASHING THE CHECK, YES.
28
```

DID HUNT EXPRESS ANY CONCERN ABOUT WHY HE WANTED

```
1
      TO EXPEDITE THE CHECK?
  2
                 LOSING INTEREST WAS HIS MAIN CONCERN.
  3
                 ALL RIGHT. DOES THAT SEEM TO YOU TO BE A REASON-
     ABLE BUSINESS COMMENT?
  5
                 HE TOLD ME THAT IT WOULD TAKE FOUR WEEKS TO CASH
     IT THROUGH NORMAL BANKING TRANSACTIONS AND IN LIGHT OF THE
 6
     LARGE SIZE OF THE DRAFT, I MEAN, THE INTEREST IS A LOT OF
 7
 8
     MONEY.
 9
                  SO YES, SEEMED TO ME TO BE QUITE A REASONABLE
 10
     BUSINESS JUDGMENT.
11
              ALL RIGHT. NOTHING SEEMED CORRUPT OR EXCUSE
            Q
12
     THE EXPRESSION, "SINISTER" ABOUT THAT?
13
            А
                 NO, IT DID NOT.
14
                 ALL RIGHT. AND PURSUANT THERETO, COUNSEL FOR
            0
15
     YOU, MR. ADELMAN, SUGGESTED THAT YOU GENTLEMEN SHOULD GO OVER
16
     TO THE BANK?
17
              WELL, A FRIEND OF HIS HAD A VERY GOOD RELATIONSHIP
18
     WITH THAT BANK AND YES, HE DID SUGGEST THAT WE TRY CASHING
19
     THE CHECK THROUGH THAT BANK.
20
            THE COURT: IS THAT THE WORLD BANK?
21
            THE WITNESS: THE WORLD TRADE BANK.
22
                 BY MR. BARENS: THAT WAS AT MR. ADELMAN'S
23
     SUGGESTION?
24
           A NEIL ADELMAN'S SUGGESTION, YES.
25
                 HE WAS COUNSEL THAT WORKED IN CONJUNCTION WITH
           Q
26
    THE BBC?
27
             THAT'S CORRECT.
           A
28
                 YOU WENT OVER THERE TO THAT BANK AND GOT THE SIGNATURE
           Q
```

ALL RIGHT NOW, AGAIN, WHEN YOU GO TO THE BANK 1 AS ANOTHER ACTIVITY AND GET THE SIGNATURE CARD, DOES 2 ANYTHING SEEM CORRUPT OR SINISTER ABOUT THAT TO YOU? 3 GETTING THE SIGNATURE CARD? 5 Q YES. А NO. 6 AGAIN, THAT SEEMS JUST LIKE BUSINESS ACTIVITY? 7 8 CORRECT. AGAIN, I AM GOING TO TRY, AT LEAST IN THE FIRST 9 PART OF MY EXAMINATION WITH YOU TO BE WITH THE ORDER YOU WERE 10 IN YESTERDAY. 11 YOU MENTIONED IN OCTOBER OR NOVEMBER OF 1984 YOU 12 STARTED DESTROYING SOME DOCUMENTS? 13 14 THAT'S CORRECT. 15 AND WHICH DOCUMENTS DID YOU DESTROY? 16 TO THE BEST OF MY RECOLLECTION, I DESTROYED THE ORIGINAL -- I KNOW I DESTROYED THE ORIGINAL OF THE CORPORATE 17 MINUTES, DISCUSSING THE MEETING OF JUNE THE 7TH AUTHORIZING 18 BEN DOSTI TO TRAVEL TO EUROPE AND I BELIEVE I DESTROYED 19 CERTAIN PAGES OF MY NOTARIAL JOURNAL. 20 21 Q I AM SORRY? 22 MY NOTARY JOURNAL. 23 Q YOUR NOTARY JOURNAL, INDEED. 24 I SUPPOSE THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN SOMETHING 25 SENSITIVE IN THERE? 26 YES. 27 YOU DISCUSSED THOSE ACTIVITIES WITH THE POLICE? 28 I THINK I ONLY DISCUSSED DESTROYING THE MINUTES

I DON'T THINK I EVER DISCUSSED DESTROYING THE JOURNAL WITH THE POLICE, THOUGH I MIGHT HAVE.

THE COURT: PARDON ME. SO THAT THE JURY WOULD UNDERSTAND IT, YOU ARE A NOTARY PUBLIC; IS THAT RIGHT?

THE WITNESS: THAT'S CORRECT.

THE COURT: AND AS A NOTARY PUBLIC, YOU HAVE GOT TO MAKE AN ENTRY OF EVERY DOCUMENT THAT YOU NOTARIZE; IS THAT

THE WITNESS: THAT'S CORRECT.

THE COURT: AND THERE ARE CERTAIN DOCUMENTS THAT YOU NOTARIZED THAT YOU MADE A RECORD OF AND THOSE ARE THE RECORDS YOU DESTROYED?

THE WITNESS: I DESTROYED CERTAIN PAGES OF MY JOURNAL,

THE COURT: WHY WAS THAT?

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR --

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE MATTER?

MR. BARENS: MAY WE APPROACH?

THE COURT: I THINK I KNOW WHAT YOU MEAN.

ALL RIGHT, GO AHEAD. DON'T ANSWER THAT QUESTION.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE WITNESS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

MR. BARENS: THIS IS ALL OUT OF AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION AT THIS POINT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: YES.

BY MR. BARENS: YOU LATER ON TOLD THE POLICE ABOUT YOUR DESTRUCTION OF CORPORATE MINUTES.

YOU WEREN'T SPEAKING TO HIM?

28

Q

1	A I WAS NOT SPEAKING TO HIM.
2	Q WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU HAD SPOKEN TO HIM PRIOR
3	TO THAT?
4	A I PROBABLY SPOKE TO HIM AT SOME TIME SHORTLY
5	SUBSEQUENT TO HIS SECOND ARREST.
6	Q WHEN DO YOU REMEMBER THE FIRST ONE AS BEING?
7	A THE I REMEMBER THEM BOTH BEING, TAKING PLACE
8	IN EITHER SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER.
9	THERE WERE THREE ARRESTS. FIRST JIM GRAHAM WAS
10	ARRESTED AND THEN JOE WAS ARRESTED AND THEN THEY WERE BOTH
11	ARRESTED TOGETHER.
12	I THINK ALL THREE OF THE ARRESTS TOOK PLACE IN
13	SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

	Q ISN'T IT TRUE THAT THE CONVERSATION YOU GAVE US							
2	YESTERDAY ABOUT THE TELEVISION CHANGER AND THE SHEET MISSING							
3	TOOK PLACE AFTER MR. HUNT'S FIRST ARREST AND PRIOR TO HIS							
4	SECOND ARREST?							
5	A IT MAY HAVE. I							
6	Q ISN'T IT TRUE THAT HUNT TOLD YOU THAT HE HAD HEARD							
7	FROM BEN DOSTI AND DEAN KARNY AND LAUREN RABB ABOUT THE							
8	TELEVISION CHANGER AND THE MISSING SHEET?							
9	A NO, IT IS NOT TRUE.							
10	Q YOU DIDN'T HEAR THAT FROM ANY OF THOSE PEOPLE							
11	PRIOR TO THE TIME THAT HUNT TOLD IT TO YOU?							
12	A NO, I HAD NOT.							
13	Q YOU NEVER HEARD THEM SAY THAT THEY HAD ANY							
14	INFORMATION, ANY OF THOSE THREE PEOPLE THAT THEY HAD ANY							
15	INFORMATION CONCERNING LEVIN'S DISAPPEARANCE PRIOR TO THE							
16	TIME THAT HUNT TOLD YOU THAT STORY?							
17	A WELL, I MEAN BEN AND DEAN WOULD HAVE THE SAME							
18	INFORMATION.							
19	THEY WERE PRESENT AT THE MEETING.							
20	I ASSUME THEY HAD DISCUSSIONS WITH JOE ALSO.							
21	Q I AM TALKING ABOUT INFORMATION AND/OR KNOWLEDGE							
22	INDEPENDENT OF THE 6-24 MEETING.							
23	MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR HEARSAY AS TO WHAT							
24	OTHER PEOPLE, MR. DOSTI SAID OR							
25	THE COURT: OVERRULED. I WILL LET HIM ANSWER.							
26	MR. WAPNER: MAY WE APPROACH THE BENCH BRIEFLY?							
27	THE COURT: YES.							

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD

AT THE BENCH:)

3

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

4

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER MR. BARENS 5 INTENDS TO CALL MR. DOSTI AS A WITNESS. I KNOW THAT I DO

6

NOT INTEND TO CALL HIM AS A WITNESS AND I WOULD OBJECT TO

7

ANY STATEMENT THAT MR. DOSTI MADE TO THIS THIRD PARTY OF

8

HEARSAY STATEMENTS, UNLESS MR. DOSTI IS PRODUCED.

9

IF THEY WANT TO PRODUCE HIM, THEN MR. DOSTI CAN

10

TESTIFY ABOUT THESE STATEMENTS.

11

12

13

14

15

WILL TESTIFY.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

BUT TO TRY AND BACKDOOR THIS BY GETTING IN THE HEARSAY STATEMENTS FROM THE WITNESS, I DON'T THINK IT IS PERMISSIBLE AND I DON'T EXPECT BASED ON WHAT I KNOW ABOUT MR. DOSTI AND HIS CURRENT PROBLEMS, I DON'T EXPECT THAT HE

BUT IF COUNSEL CAN PRODUCE HIM, THEY CANTGET THESE STATEMENTS IN OTHERWISE.

THE COURT: OF COURSE HE WON'T BE PRODUCED AND DOSTI IS NOT GOING TO TESTIFY. IF HE HAS A LAWYER, HE OBVIOUSLY WILL TELL HIM NOT TO TESTIFY.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE TWO PROBLEMS HERE.

YOUR HONOR, NUMBER ONE, THE PEOPLE HAVE UNIFORMLY THROUGHOUT THE PRESENTATION OF THEIR CASE MADE USE OF --

THE COURT: AS I INDICATED BEFORE, ADDRESS YOURSELF TO HIS OBJECTIONS TO THIS PARTICULAR QUESTION.

MR. BARENS: I CAN ONLY SAY THERE IS NOTHING UNCOMMON IN THIS CASE ABOUT MAKING REFERENCES TO WHAT THIRD PARTIES HAVE SAID. MEMBERS OF THE BBC HAVE BEEN TREATED THROUGHOUT

THIS TRIAL WITH SOME DEFERENCE TO THE HEARSAY OBJECTION, WE HAVE HEARD THAT.

NUMBER TWO, I WOULD BE WILLING IN PRIVATE TO COMMENT ON WHETHER OR NOT MR. DOSTI WILL BE PRESENT AS A WITNESS IN THIS TRIAL, I WOULD COMMENT WITH YOUR HONOR BUT I AM NOT PREPARED TO DISCUSS WITH THE PROSECUTION OUR DEFENSE, BUT I WOULD BE WILLING TO DISCUSS THAT ISSUE WITH YOUR HONOR.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYTHING TO DISCUSS.

THE COURT: THERE IS NOTHING TO DISCUSS?

MR. WAPNER: HE IS EITHER HERE OR HE IS NOT. IF HE
IS NOT HERE, THEN THE STATEMENTS HE MAKES TO THIRD PARTIES
WHICH ARE OFFERED FOR THE TRUTH OF THE STATEMENT ARE HEARSAY
STATEMENTS.

THE COURT: PARDON ME. WILL YOU STATE THE QUESTION 'AGAIN THAT YOU ASKED HIM?

MR. BARENS: I CAN SUMMARIZE IT.

THE COURT: YES, GO AHEAD. WHAT IS THE QUESTION?

MR. BARENS: BASICALLY, I ASKED THE WITNESS -- THE POINT

I AM TRYING TO MAKE AND THE OFFER OF PROOF IS THIS: THIS

WHOLE CONVERSATION ABOUT HUNT TELLING HIM THAT THE CHANGER

WAS MISSING AND THE SHEET WAS MISSING, WHICH HE ATTRIBUTES

THE COURT: YES.

SOLELY TO HUNT --

MR. BARENS: -- IS A SUBJECT THAT HAD BEEN WELL DISCUSSED IN THE BBC BY AT LEAST THREE MEMBERS IN THOSE

OFFICES BEFORE HUNT HAD THE CONVERSATION WITH HIM, AND I

F

```
1
            MR. BARENS: A MOMENT, YOUR HONOR.
 2
                  (PAUSE.)
3
            THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. RESTATE YOUR QUESTION.
            MR. BARENS: I THINK IT WAS ASKED AND ANSWERED, JUDGE.
5
            THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IF IT HAS BEEN ASKED AND ANSWERED,
6
    GO AHEAD.
7
            MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
8
                  DID YOU HAVE FURTHER CONCERN IN YOUR OWN MIND
    THAT LEVIN MIGHT RESCIND THE TRANSACTION OR REMOVE THE FUNDS
10
    FROM THE ACCOUNT BEFORE THE CHECK CLEARED?
11
            THE COURT: YOU MEAN THAT HE COULD STOP PAYMENT ON
12
    THE CHECK?
13
            THE WITNESS: BETWEEN --
14
            MR. BARENS: I THINK YOU SAID YESTERDAY, OR REMOVE THE
15
    FUNDS FROM THE ACCOUNT, AS OPPOSED TO THAT.
16
            THE COURT: REMOVE THE FUNDS FROM THE ACCOUNT OR STOP
17
    PAYMENT ON THE CHECK?
18
            THE WITNESS: BETWEEN THE 7TH OF JUNE AND THE 24TH
19
    OF JUNE, YES.
20
                 BY MR. BARENS: YOU DID HAVE THAT CONCERN?
            Q
21
                  YES.
22
                  DID YOU DISCUSS THAT CONCERN WITH ANYONE?
            Q
23
                 NO.
24
                  DID YOU HEAR ANYONE ELSE DISCUSS THAT CONCERN?
            Q
25
                 NO.
26
                 IT WAS JUST A PERSONAL ONE TO YOURSELF, AN OPINION
            Q
27
    THAT YOU HAD?
```

I ONLY HAD THE KNOWLEDGE OF MY HOLDING THAT OPINION,

YES.

Q OKAY. NOW, BASED ON YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF LEVIN
AND HIS BACKGROUND, WOULD YOU PRESUME THAT OTHER PEOPLE HAD
THE SAME FEELING?

MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION, CALLS FOR A CONCLUSION ON THE PART OF THE WITNESS. RELEVANCE.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

Q BY MR. BARENS: DID YOU FEEL IN ANY RESPECT THAT HUNT HAD ONCE AGAIN, AT LEAST POTENTIALLY, BEEN CONNED BY LEVIN IN THIS TRANSACTION?

A WELL, IN THIS TRANSACTION HE HAD THE ADVANTAGE OF HAVING A CONTRACT AND A CHECK. SO KNOWING LEVIN, I FIGURED THERE MAY VERY WELL HAVE BEEN A CON IN THERE SOME-WHERE.

Q BUT YOU DIDN'T HAVE SOME OPINION DID YOU, THAT LEVIN WAS A GREAT RESPECTOR OF CONTRACTS? DID YOU?

A NOT AT ALL.

Q YOU WOULDN'T PUT IT PAST HIM TO WRITE A BAD CHECK, WOULD YOU?

A CERTAINLY NOT.

Q ALL RIGHT. SO YOU THOUGHT THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN A CON IN THERE SOMEWHERE. DID YOU EVER WARN HUNT ABOUT THAT CONCERN THAT YOU HAD?

A I THINK A LONG TIME AGO, POSSIBLY WHEN HE WAS I MEAN, FIRST DEALING WITH LEVIN, I SAID TO HIM THAT LEVIN -- I HAD HEARD LEVIN WAS A CON MAN AND JOE JUST DISMISSED THAT AND FELT THAT LEVIN COULDN'T RUN A CON ON HIM.

Q ALL RIGHT. NOW, WAS HUNT ACTING AS THOUGH THERE

WERE SOME URGENCY CONCERNING THE CASHING OF THE LEVIN CHECK? A YES, BECAUSE HE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT LOSING THE INTEREST OR HE STATED HE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT LOSING THE INTEREST. Q OKAY. AND HOW ABOUT YOUR GENERAL SITUATION CONCERNING WHETHER OR NOT THE MATTER MIGHT HAVE BEEN RESCINDED? THAT WAS JUST A THOUGHT THAT YOU HAD IN YOUR OWN MIND? THAT WAS MY OWN THOUGHT. YOU DIDN'T EXPRESS THAT TO ANYONE? Q Α I DID NOT. OKAY. NOW, YOU MENTIONED THAT THERE WAS SOME ANXIETY, I BELIEVE WAS YOUR WORD YESTERDAY, ABOUT THE CHECK BEING CASHED, AMONG THE GENERAL POPULATION OF THE BBC MEMBERS BETWEEN 6/7 AND 6/24. WHAT DID YOU MEAN BY THAT REFERENCE, SIR? A I DON'T RECALL THAT REFERENCE.

	Q	WAS	THERE	CONCERN	OR	INCREASING	DISCOMFORT	ABOUT
THAT	ISSUE?							

A I REMEMBER AS THE TIME PROGRESSED -- AS THE TIME GOT YOU KNOW, AS IT GOT FARTHER FROM CASHING THE CHECK AND THE CHECK HAD NOT COME THROUGH BANKING CHANNELS, I REMEMBER USING THE WORD "ANXIETY."

NOW I RECALL WHAT I WAS TALKING ABOUT. BUT I DON'T REMEMBER ANY EXACT STATEMENTS. I DON'T REMEMBER ANYONE SAYING ANYTHING AT ALL.

BUT IT MAY HAVE JUST BEEN PERSONAL, THAT THE CHECK JUST HAD NOT BEEN CASHED.

IT WAS BEGINNING TO SEEM LIKE A LONG PERIOD OF TIME.

Q WAS IT BEGINNING TO SEEM LIKE THE MONEY FROM
THE CLAYTON BROKERAGE DEAL -- SORRY, THE COMMODITIES TRADING
DEAL WE VISITED?

A IT STILL SEEMED LIKE TO ME, SEEMED LIKE SOMETHING DIFFERENT BECAUSE THERE WAS THE CONTRACT AND THERE WAS THE CHECK. IT WAS NOT JUST AN EMPTY PROMISE.

Q WELL, DIDN'T YOU REALLY HAVE THE REALITY OF A SITUATION WHERE LEVIN WAS SUPPOSED TO HAVE DONE THE BBC SOME GOOD AND ALTHOUGH PROMISED AND REPRESENTED, IT HAS NOT OCCURRED AS A REALITY?

MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION, ARGUMENTATIVE.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

THE WITNESS: WELL, IN THE WORST SITUATION, WE HAD
THE RIGHTS TO THE SILICA AND CERAMICS BACK. SO EVEN IF THE
MONEY HAD NOT COME THROUGH, IT DIDN'T SEEM LIKE ALL THAT BAD

OF A DEAL TO ME.

Q BY MR. BARENS: BECAUSE YOU FELT THAT THE RIGHTS
TO THE SILIC AND THE CERAMICS WERE VERY, VERY VALUABLE?

A I DID.

Q AND DID THE FAILURE OF THIS TRANSACTION TO CULMINATE, ALSO START LOOKING LIKE THE SHOPPING CENTER REVISITED?

A ONLY IN THE FACT THAT YOU KNOW, ONCE AGAIN, WE HAD MADE A DEAL WITH LEVIN AND ONCE AGAIN, WE HAD NOT GOTTEN ANYTHING OUT OF IT.

Q AND ONCE AGAIN, WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN TO MR. HUNT'S REPUTATION OR STANDING AS A RESULT OF THIS FAILURE?

A AGAIN, IN MY EYES, I DON'T THINK IT WOULD HAVE AFFECTED IT.

Q HOW ABOUT ANYBODY ELSE'S?

A I CAN'T TELL YOU WHAT ANYBODY WOULD THINK.

Q EARLIER ON, YOU TOLD ME THAT YOU THOUGHT THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN SOME DEPRECIATION IN HUNT'S STATUS IN YOUR GROUP THERE, IN THE BBC GROUP AS A RESULT OF PRIOR FAILURES WITH LEVIN. WOULD THERE HAVE BEEN SOMETHING DIFFERENT THIS TIME AROUND?

A WELL, IF I SAY THAT BEFORE, IT WAS JUST AS A POSSIBILITY, YES. I DIDN'T STATE THAT I KNEW OF IT. BUT IT IS ALWAYS -- I MEAN, YOU CAN'T TELL WHAT PEOPLE ARE GOING TO THINK.

Q RIGHT. WELL, HERE, YOU HAVE THE TEMPORAL

AND SPIRITUAL LEADER, ACCORDING TO WHAT YOU TOLD ME YESTERDAY,

OF THE BBC, FALLING FLAT ON HIS FACE ONCE AGAIN ON A BIG

1 PROMISE. WHAT DO YOU THINK THE PERCEPTION OF HIM AMONG 2 THE PEOPLE OF THE BBC WOULD HAVE BEEN AT THAT POINT? 3 A I HAVE STATED THERE WAS A POSSIBILITY THAT IT COULD DEPRECIATE. BUT I CAN'T GIVE YOU ANY OPINION OR HOW 5 THEY PERCEIVED JOE. 6 Q WELL, YOUR OPINION IT SEEMS TOWARD MR. HUNT, 7 IS AT LEAST AT THIS POINT IN TIME, UNLATERABLE? 8 9 WELL, NOT NECESSARILY UNALTERABLE. HE WAS TRYING А TO MAKE A DEAL WITH RON LEVIN. AT ITS BEST, IT WAS PROBABLY 10 11 SHAKY, IN MY OPINION. 12 SO FAILURE WITH RON LEVIN IS JUST SORT OF, NOTHING VENTURED AND NOTHING GAINED. I MEAN, I WOULD SAY 13 TO TRY AND SEE IF IT WORKS. 14 15 AND REALLY, SINCE LEVIN'S ACCOUNTS WERE SEPARATE FROM OURS, WE REALLY WEREN'T HARMED, TO MY KNOWLEDGE, BY OUR FAILURE TO MAKE MONEY THERE. AND SO, WE DIDN'T GET THE MONEY THERE. AND THEN WE DIDN'T GET THE SHOPPING CENTER, AGAIN. WE WEREN'T HARMED IN THIS INSTANCE. WE HAD A CONTRACT. IF HE DOESN'T PAY THE CHECK, THE CONTRACT IS VOID.

26 27

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	Q BY MR. BARENS: NOW AT THAT POINT, IF THE CONTRACT
2	
3	
4	Q AND OUT OF THAT, WHAT WOULD JOE HUNT GET?
5	A AGAIN, WHATEVER HE WROTE HIMSELF THE CHECK OUT
6	
7	Q IS THAT THE WAY BUSINESS WAS?
8	A GENERALLY, JOE WROTE OUT THE CHECKS.
9.	Q DID YOU?
10	A I THINK ON OCCASION I MAY HAVE SIGNED A CHECK
11	TO MYSELF ON ONE OR TWO OCCASIONS.
12	Q NOW, DID YOU HAVE ANY UNDERSTANDING THAT FROM
13	THE MILLION FIVE HUNT WAS JUST GOING TO POCKET THAT MONEY?
14	A I HAD NO UNDERSTANDING OF THAT FACT.
15	Q WEREN'T YOU TOLD TO THE CONTRARY; CERTAIN THINGS
16	THAT WERE GOING TO HAPPEN WITH THAT MONEY?
17	A I WAS ON JUNE 24TH, YES.
18	Q DID YOU HAVE A BELIEF THAT THAT MONEY WAS GOING
19	TO BE USED TO PAY OFF INVESTORS?
20	A ON JUNE 24 I DID, YES.
21	Q AND WAS THERE ALSO SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT USING
22	A PORTION OF THOSE MONEYS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
23	ON THE TECHNOLOGY?
24	A IT WAS PRIOR TO JUNE 24, IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING
25	THAT A GREAT DEAL OF THAT MONEY WOULD BE USED IN FURTHERING
26	MICROGENESIS, YES.
27	Q YOU UNDERSTOOD, OTHER THAN THAT YOU HAD NO REAL
28	BUDGET, DID YOU, TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, FOR RESEARCH AND

DEVELOPMENT ON THAT TECHNOLOGY?

A BUDGET FOR CERTAIN OF THE PROJECTS -- I AM SURE

A BUDGET WAS INCLUDED AND DISCUSSED IN THE MEETING OF MAY 29TH

OF THE MICROGENESIS BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Q DID YOU HAVE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE THAT YOU HAD MONEY IN THE ACCOUNT FOR THE BUILDING OF THE MACHINES AND BUILDING OF ANY FURTHER TECHNOLOGY AT MICORGENESIS?

A AT WHAT TIME?

Q AT ANY TIME PRIOR TO JUNE 7?

A I BELIEVE WE HAD SOME MONEYS. I THINK WE HAD
RECEIVED SOME MONEYS FROM INVESTORS OR PEOPLE WHO HAD BOUGHT
MACHINES THAT WAS BEING USED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
OF MICROGENESIS.

Q AND YOU FELT YOU HAD SUFFICIENT FUNDING PRIOR

TO THE RECEIPT OF THE LEVIN CHECK FOR THE R&D ACTIVITIES YOU

NEEDED IN THIS REGARD?

A IF ANY OPINION I WOULD HAVE HAD TOWARDS, YOU KNOW, HOW MUCH MONEY WE HAD FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR MICROGENESIS WOULD HAVE BEEN WHAT I WAS TOLD BY OTHER PEOPLE.

I HAD NO PERSONAL OPINION. I HAD VERY LITTLE KNOWLEDGE AND STILL DO HAVE VERY LITTLE KNOWLEDGE IN THAT AREA.

Q NOW YOUR NEXT TESTIMONY GOT US TO THE 6-24 MEETING AND YOU SAY THAT THIS MEETING TOOK PLACE AND THEN FIRST THERE WERE TWO OCCASIONS WHERE HUNT AND THREE OTHER PEOPLE, I THINK MESSRS. KARNY, DOSTI AND GRAHAM LEAVE THE ROOM AND REAPPEAR?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

Q ALL RIGHT, BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND DEPARTURE

1 AND REAPPEARANCES, WHAT DID YOU FOLKS REMAINING IN THE ROOM 2 TALK ABOUT? 3 A I THINK BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND DEPARTURE, 4 WE CLEANED UP. 5 YOU CLEANED UP? Q 6 Α YES. 7 YOU DIDN'T TALK ABOUT ANYTHING, DID YOU, 8 CONCERNING THE MEETING OR "GEE, I WONDER WHAT IS GOING ON 9 IN THAT OTHER ROOM THERE WITH THOSE GUYS?" 10 THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN -- YOU KNOW, THERE MAY HAVE 11 BEEN SOME DISCUSSION. HOW IT SEEMED A LITTLE PECULIAR THAT 12 WE ARE BEING CALLED FOR--YOU KNOW, HAVING MEETINGS ON SUNDAYS 13 OR FRIDAY EVENINGS, BEING CALLED TO MEETINGS WASN'T 14 PARTICULARLY STRANGE. 15 IT WAS STRANGE, THIS IS PROBABLY ONE OF THE FIRST 16 TIMES THAT THERE HAD BEEN A MEETING OF THE MAJORITY OF THE 17 BBC BUT NOT ALL OF THE BBC. 18 OKAY. AND DID YOU GUYS TALK ABOUT, YOU KNOW, 0 19 "MAYBE WE OUGHT TO LEAVE"? 20 I DON'T THINK ANYONE DISCUSSED BETWEEN THE FIRST --21 OKAY NOW I THINK I HAVE GOT MY TIME FRAME. I 22 THINK I MADE A MISTAKE IN THE TIME FRAME. 23 SO WE ARE TALKING ABOUT, THIS WOULD HAVE BEEN 24 WHILE THEY WERE OUT OF THE ROOM THE SECOND TIME? 25 Q YES, BETWEEN. 26 -- OR BEFORE? 27 I DIDN'T KNOW THEY WERE OUT OF THE ROOM TWICE. 28

THEY ARE OUT OF THE ROOM BETWEEN BEING OUT OF THE ROOM,

ACTUALLY. 1 MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION. VAGUE. 2 BY MR. BARENS: I AM SORRY. LET ME SET THIS UP Q 3 FOR YOU. 4 Α 5 OKAY. THEY ARE THERE AND THEN THEY GO INTO A BEDROOM 6 OR SOMEWHERE FOR FIVE TO TEN MINUTES, YOU TESTIFY, AND THEN 7 THEY REAPPEAR AND THEN THEY LEAVE THE ROOM AGAIN. 8 CORRECT. 9 BREAKING THIS DOWN BETWEEN THE FIRST TIME THAT 10 THEY LEAVE THE ROOM AND REAPPEAR, WHAT DO YOU FOLKS TALK ABOUT? 11 BASE -- WE HAD JUST FINISHED HAVING LUNCH AND 12 THERE HAD BEEN NO FORMAL MEETING. THERE HAD BEEN NOTHING 13 DISCUSSED YET SO WE JUST, WE WERE CLEANING UP AND BASICALLY 14 NOTHING. 15 16 I THINK THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN -- I MEAN IT IS REASONABLE THAT THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN SOME DISCUSSIONS, AS 17 I SAID BEFORE, THE FACT THAT WE WERE HAVING A MEETING AND 18 IT WAS WITH THE MAJORITY OF THE BBC BUT NOT ALL OF THE BBC. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

1 NOW HOW ABOUT THE SECOND TIME THESE PEOPLE WERE Q OUT OF THE ROOM, WHAT DID YOU DISCUSS THEN? 2 3 NOT A LOT. IT WAS PRETTY QUIET. PEOPLE JUST SORT OF, YOU KNOW, MEANDERED BY THEMSELVES, TRYING TO FIGURE 4 5 OUT WHAT WAS GOING ON. 6 AND DURING THE -- THEN THEY REAPPEARED AND YOU Q 7 GAVE ME THREE EXPRESSIONS YESTERDAY: HUNT ANNOUNCES TO THE GROUP ASSEMBLED, "WE KNOCKED OFF, BUMPED OFF, TOOK CARE OF," 8 9 AT LEAST HE SAID SOME ONE OF THOSE THREE THINGS WITH REFERENCE 10 TO LEVIN, OR THEN YOU SAID A FOURTH THING "I AM NOT SURE". 11 Α OKAY. I DIDN'T SAY "WE." 12 I AM SURE -- IF I DID SAY "WE," IF I SAID IT, 13 I WAS WRONG THEN. 14 IT WAS "JIM AND I" OR "JIM" IT WAS "JIM AND I." 15 NOT "WE." 16 Q JIM AND I? 17 AND HE SAID ONE OF THE THREE OR SOMETHING SIMILAR. Α 18 IT WASN'T THAT I MURDERED OR KILLED OR ANYTHING 19 LIKE THAT. 20 BUT IT WAS SOMETHING THAT THE MOST -- THE CLOSEST 21 THING THAT I CAN, WITHOUT REMEMBERING EXACTLY WHAT HE SAID, 22 WAS LIKE "TOOK CARE OF". 23 WE DIDN'T HAVE THE MURDER WORD USED? Q 24 WE DID NOT HAVE THE MURDER WORD USED. Α 25 AND WE DIDN'T HAVE THE KILL WORD USED? Q 26 А WE DID NOT . 27 WE HAD LANGUAGE USED THAT HAD AN IMPLICATION, Q

AT LEAST FOR YOU AS A LISTENER, THAT THAT MIGHT HAVE HAPPENED?

```
THE LANGUAGE USED LED ME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT
  1
             А
  2
      HE HAD KILLED RON LEVIN OR THAT JIM AND HE HAD KILLED RON
  3
      LEVIN.
  4
                   OKAY. THAT WAS YOUR BELIEF AT THAT POINT?
             Q
  5
                   NOT IMMEDIATELY.
  6
                   IT WAS ABOUT -- IT WAS WITHIN A MINUTE OF HIS
  7
      STATEMENT THAT THAT BECAME MY BELIEF.
  8
                   OKAY. AND WHAT DID YOU SAY WHEN YOU HEARD THAT?
             Q
  9
             Α
                   I SAID NOTHING.
 10
             Q
                   YOU SAID NOTHING?
 11
                   WHAT DID EVERYBODY ELSE SAY?
 12
                   EVERYONE ELSE SAID NOTHING.
             А
 13
                   DIDN'T ANYBODY SAY "BOY, THAT IS A SHOCKING THING?"
14
     OR "WHAT A THING TO COME AND TELL US ON A SUNDAY". NOBODY
15
     SAID ANYTHING LIKE THAT?
16
                   NOBODY SAID ANYTHING LIKE THAT, TO MY RECOLLECTION.
17
             Q
                   DID ANYBODY JUMP UP AND SAY, "I AM GOING TO GO
18
     TO THE POLICE"?
19
             А
                   NOBODY SAID THAT.
20
            Q
                   NOBODY SAID ANYTHING?
21
                  NOBODY SAID ANYTHING.
22
                  DID ANYBODY LEAVE?
            Q
23
            Α
                  NOBODY LEFT.
24
                  OKAY. HOW LONG DID THE MEETING LAST AFTER THAT
25
     POINT UNTIL YOU LEFT THE ROOM?
26
                  I DON'T HAVE A VERY GOOD RECOLLECTION BUT I
27
     BELIEVE MATTERS WERE CONTINUED TO BE DISCUSSED FOR A SHORT
28
     PERIOD OF TIME AND THEN THE MEETING DISBURSED AND I LEFT
29
     FAIRLY PROMPTLY AFTER THAT.
```

```
1
                   WELL, COULD YOU GIVE ME SOME TIME ESTIMATE FROM
             Q
  2
      THE TIME OF THIS ANNOUNCEMENT ABOUT ONE OF THOSE THREE WAYS
      HE MIGHT HAVE SAID IT, AT THE TIME YOU LEFT THE ROOM?
  3
                   WITHIN 30 TO 60 MINUTES.
  5
                   THIRTY TO SIXTY MINUTES YOU ARE ALL THERE. DID
             Q
  6
      YOU LEAVE WITH ANYONE?
  7
                   NO, I DID NOT. NO, I BELIEVE THAT I WAS BY
  8
      MYSELF.
  9
                   DID YOU LEAVE FIRST OR LAST OR KIND OF IN THE
            Q
 10
      MIDDLE?
 11
            Α
                  I DON'T RECALL.
 12
                  OKAY. WELL, YOU DIDN'T GO TO THE POLICE THEN,
 13
     AFTER YOU LEFT THE MEETING, DID YOU?
 14
            Α
                  NO, I DID NOT.
15
                  DID YOU DO ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR OR ANYTHING
16
     DIFFERENT AFTER YOU LEFT THE MEETING?
17
            А
                 NOT THAT I RECALL, NO.
18
                  DID YOU EVER HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT MEETING,
19
     NOW, LET'S GO BETWEEN JUNE 24 AND JUNE 30TH? DID YOU DISCUSS
20
     THAT MEETING WITH ANYONE?
21
                 I AM SURE I DID.
            А
22
                  WITH WHOM, SIR?
            Q
23
                  I DON'T HAVE ANY SPECIFIC RECOLLECTIONS OF ANY
24
     DISCUSSIONS.
25
            THE COURT: I THINK THIS MIGHT BE A GOOD POINT TO GO
26
     OVER FOR LUNCH.
27
                  LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, WE'LL TAKE
28
    A RECESS NOW UNTIL 1:30 THIS AFTERNOON. THE SAME ADMONITION
```

I GAVE YOU STILL APPLIES.

(AT 12:00 NOON AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN

TO RESUME AT 1:30 P.M. OF THE SAME DAY.)

.

21 22 23

```
1
     SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1987; 1:37 P.M.
2
     DEPARTMENT WEST C
                            HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGÉ
3
                  (APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.)
4
5
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YOU MAY CONTINUE YOUR
6
    EXAMINATION.
7
           MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
8
9
                          EVAN GEORGE DICKER,
10
    THE WITNESS ON THE STAND AT THE TIME OF ADJOURNMENT, RESUMED
11
    THE STAND AND TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:
12
13
                            CROSS-EXAMINATION (RESUMED)
14
    BY MR. BARENS:
15
                GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. DICKER.
16
                 GOOD AFTERNOON.
17
                 MR. DICKER, FOLLOWING ALONG WITH YESTERDAY'S
18
    TESTIMONY. YOU INDICATED THAT AFTER THE 6-24 MEETING. YOU
19
    FELT THREATENED.
20
           Α
                I FELT THAT I HAD BEEN THREATENED, YES.
21
                 BY MR. HUNT, ACTUALLY?
            Q
22
                 YES.
23
                  AND WHAT WAS IT THAT MADE YOU FEEL THREATENED,
24
    AGAIN?
25
                 AGAIN, I FELT THAT I HAD BEEN THREATENED.
26
                  I DIDN'T SPECIFICALLY FEEL THREATENED BECAUSE
27
     I HADN'T UP UNTIL, I GUESS, DECEMBER OF 1984, COMMITTED ANY
28
     ACTS THAT WERE SORT OF CONTRARY TO WHATIHAD BEEN TOLD TO DO
```

SO I DIDN'T FEEL THREATENED UNTIL THEN.

I FELT THAT I HAD BEEN THREATENED BY HIS

STATEMENT AT THE END OF THE MEETING WHERE HE INDICATED THAT

PEOPLE WHO -- YOU KNOW, WHERE HE INDICATED THAT SOME VERY

SERIOUS THINGS HAD BEEN DISCUSSED TODAY AND PEOPLE WHO -
I DON'T KNOW IF IT WAS -- I DON' T REMEMBER THE EXACT WORDS

USED -- BUT WOULD BE DEALT WITH IF, YOU KNOW, THEY TALKED

WITH OTHER PEOPLE.

Q THAT IS ALL YOU REMEMBER HIM SAYING?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

27

28

NOW, EVERYONE IN THAT ROOM DID NOT SUBSCRIBE TO 1 THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY, DID THEY? 2 A I DON'T KNOW WHAT OTHER PEOPLE SUBSCRIBED TO OR 3 DIDN'T SUBSCRIBE TO. 4 Q SO YOU COULDN'T TELL ME FOR INSTANCE WHETHER OR 5 NOT THE MAY BOYS BELIEVED IN THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY? 6 I COULD NOT. 7 YOU DIDN'T KNOW? YOU HAD NEVER DISCUSSED WITH 8 ANYBODY IN THAT ROOM WHETHER THEY BELIEVED IN IT OR NOT? 9 A I DID DISCUSS WITH SOME PEOPLE WHETHER OR NOT 10 THEY DID OR DIDN'T BELIEVE IN IT. 11 Q DID YOU DISCUSS WITH ANYONE IN THAT ROOM THAT 12 TOLD YOU THAT THEY DID NOT? 13 AT WHICH TIME? 14 AT ANY POINT IN TIME PRIOR TO THIS MEETING, SIR? 15 Q PRIOR TO THAT MEETING, NONE OF THE PEOPLE I SPOKE 16 TO INDICATED THAT THEY DID NOT SUBSCRIBE TO PARADOX PHILOSOPHY. 17 18 Q INCLUDING JEFF RAYMOND? 19 INCLUDING JEFF RAYMOND. YOU HAD A SENSE FROM HIM THAT HE DID SUBSCRIBE 20 TO THAT BELIEF SYSTEM? 21 A I DIDN'T INDICATE THAT I SAID HE HAD NEVER PRIOR 22 TO THAT MEETING, STATED THAT HE DID NOT SUBSCRIBE TO IT. 23. 24 I DON'T IN RECOLLECTION -- I WOULD STATE THAT HE APPEARED TO BELIEVE IN IT, THOUGH I CANNOT SAY FOR CERTAIN 25

THAT HE DID, IN FACT.

Q DO YOU HAVE SOME SENSE?

A PRIOR TO THE MEETING OF JUNE 24?

1 RIGHT. DID YOU HAVE SOME SENSE THAT THE BELIEF 2 IN THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY WOULD KEEP PEOPLE IN THAT MEETING, 3 AT THAT POINT IN TIME, FROM SAYING ANYTHING TO ANYBODY ABOUT 4 WHAT THEY HAD HEARD IN THAT MEETING? 5 Α I AM NOT SURE. 6 YOU ARE NOT SURE? 7 I KNOW IN MY CIRCUMSTANCE, IT DID. А 8 Q IT DID TO YOU? 9 Α YES. 10 Q WOULD YOU TELL ME WHY? 11 BECAUSE I WOULD STILL SAY AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME, 12 I BELIEVED -- YES, IT WAS YESTERDAY I GUESS THAT I SAID, THAT 13 JOE AS AN INDIVIDUAL WAS IMPORTANT TO ME, THAT HIS CONTINUATION 14 WAS IMPORTANT TO ME AND SO I WOULD TAKE STEPS REASONABLY AIMED 15 TO FURTHER THAT END OR FURTHER JOE'S EXISTENCE. 16 Q WHY WAS HIS CONTINUATION IMPORTANT TO YOU, SIR? 17 BECAUSE I FELT, YOU KNOW, THAT ONE, HE WAS AN 18 IMPORTANT ROLE MODEL. AND TWO, I FELT THAT MY SUCCESS IN 19 THE WORLD OR MY SUCCESS IN THE WORLD COULD BE BASED UPON HIS 20 SUCCESS. 21 IN OTHER WORDS, AS A RESULT OF HIS CONTINUING 22 FINANCIAL SUCCESS OR AT LEAST POTENTIAL FINANCIAL SUCCESS, 23 THAT COULD ENHANCE YOUR FINANCIAL SUCCESS? 24 Α YES. 25 AND I GUESS BY DECEMBER OF 1984, THAT NO LONGER 26 APPEARED TO BE TRUE TO YOU? 27 BY -- EXCUSE ME? BY DECEMBER OF 1984. IT WAS 28

NO LONGER TRUE. CORRECT.

1	Q AND WERE THOSE STATEMENTS MADE TO YOU DIRECTLY										
2	OR TO THE GROUP ASSEMBLED?										
3	A THEY WERE MADE TO THE GROUP ASSEMBLED.										
4	Q AND AFTER THAT MEETING, DID PEOPLE TELL YOU THEY										
5	FELT THREATENED?										
6	A I DON'T RECALL SPECIFICALLY ANYONE STATING THAT										
7	THEY HAD FELT THREATENED.										
8	Q DID YOU HAVE A STATE OF MIND THAT EVERYBODY IN										
9	THAT ROOM WAS GOING TO BE KILLED?										
10	A NO, I DID NOT.										
11	Q NOW LATER ON FOLLOWING YOUR TESTIMONY, YOU SAID										
12	THAT THERE WAS A MEETING WHEREIN HUNT TOLD YOU ABOUT THE										
13	CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH LEVIN HAD SIGNED THE CONTRACTUAL										
14	AGREEMENT?										
15	A I NO, IT WASN'T A CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT AND										
16	Q OR THE OPTION?										
17	A THE CHECK, THE 1.5 MILLION DOLLARS.										
18	Q JUST THE CHECK WAS ALL THAT WAS DISCUSSED AT										
19	THAT MEETING?										
20	A THAT WAS ALL THAT HAD BEEN DISCUSSED AT THE										
21	MEETING.										
22	I DON'T RECALL IT BEING A MEETING PER SE. JUST										
23	A CONVERSATION BETWEEN THE TWO OF US.										
24	Q WAS ANYONE ELSE PRESENT?										
25	A I DON'T BELIEVE SO.										
26	Q OKAY. AND AFTER THAT, YOU TOLD OF ANOTHER										
27	DISCUSSION WHERE YOU WERE TOLD THAT MR. LEVIN HAD BEEN DISPOSED										
28	OF IN ACID; IS THAT TRUE?										

I DON'T KNOW IF I USED THE WORD "DISPOSED." 1 2 IT WAS SOMETHING THAT THEY HAD DISPOSED -- YES, 3 THEY HAD DISPOSED OF THE BODY WITH ACID. 4 Q WHEN DID THAT HAPPEN? I BELIEVE THAT HAPPENED SUBSEQUENT TO THE 5 6 CONVERSATION DEALING WITH THE DURESS AND I BELIEVE WITHIN A COUPLE OF WEEKS OF THE MEETING OF JUNE 24, 1984. 7 WHO WAS PRESENT AT THAT MEETING? 8 Q 9 JUST MYSELF AND MR. HUNT. AND, AGAIN, IT WASN'T 10 NECESSARILY A MEETING. JUST A CONVERSATION. 11 WHY WERE YOU THE ONLY ONE PRESENT NOW AT BOTH 12 OF THOSE SITUATIONS WHERE WE TALK ABOUT THE SIGNING UNDER 13 DURESS AND WE TALK ABOUT THE ACID AND YOU WERE THE ONLY ONE 14 PRESENT AT THAT RAINCOAT CONVERSATION, WEREN'T YOU? 15 THAT IS CORRECT. Α 16 WHY, DO YOU HAVE ANY SENSE OF THAT? 17 WELL, IN THE THREE SPECIFIC INSTANCES, BECAUSE 18 I MADE -- I ASKED THE QUESTION. NO ONE ELSE HAD HIS RAINCOAT 19 TO ASK HIM, TO TELL HIM HE HAS HIS RAINCOAT. 20 WHAT ABOUT THE CHECK? Q 21 THE CHECK, I WAS ONLY -- I KNEW I HARBORED A 22 SUSPICION ABOUT RON LEVIN'S VERACITY IN BUSINESS DEALINGS 23 SO I MADE AN INQUIRY BASED ON MY SUSPICION. 24 Q THAT WAS THE FIRST TIME YOU HAD EVER ASKED ABOUT 25 THE CHECK? 26 A I DON'T RECALL IF I HAD ASKED ABOUT THE CHECK 27 ON OTHER -- YOU KNOW, I DON'T REMEMBER SPECIFICALLY SAYING,

"HAS THE MONEY COME IN FROM THE CHECK" OR ANYTHING ELSE.

1 Q SO NOW WHERE ARE WE IN POINT OF TIME, ARE WE 2 IN SEPTEMBER, OCTOBER? 3 A IF WE ARE DEALING WITH EITHER THE CHECK -- THE 4 CONVERSATION DEALING WITH THE CHECK OR THE CONVERSATION DEALING WITH THE BODY, WE WOULD PROBABLY STILL BE IN JULY 5 6 AND POSSIBLY EVEN THE END OF JUNE. 7 AND THAT IS THE FIRST TIME WHERE YOU ASKED ABOUT 8 THE CASHING OR THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE EXECUTION 9 OF THE CHECK? 10 A I BELIEVE SO. 11 HAD ANYONE ELSE ASKED, TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE? TO 12 YOUR KNOWLEDGE, HAD ANYONE ELSE ASKED ABOUT THAT PRIOR TO 13 THAT DAY? 14 NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE. 15 Q OKAY. WHEN YOU WERE TOLD THE STORY ABOUT THE 16 ACID, WHERE ARE YOU? 17 I BELIEVE I AM IN THE OFFICE, THOUGH I MIGHT 18 HAVE BEEN SOME -- IN THE AREA SURROUNDING THE OFFICE. 19 AND WHEN YOU HEAR THAT, WHAT DO YOU SAY? 20 I THINK MY INITIAL REACTION WAS, WHERE THEY WOULD 21 GET THE ACID TO DISPOSE OF THE BODY, AND I THINK --22 ASIDE --Q 23 THE COURT: LET HIM FINISH, WILL YOU, PLEASE? 24 MR. BARENS: OH, SORRY, YOUR HONOR. 25 THE WITNESS: I THINK I EVEN ASKED JOE THAT AND I THINK 26 HE STATED THAT IT WAS COMMONLY AVAILABLE. 27 Q BY MR. BARENS: I SEE.

AND YOU SAID?

A I DON'T RECALL. WELL, YOU MEAN WHEN HE TELLS YOU THAT THEY HAVE DONE AWAY WITH THIS FELLOW IN ACID AND WHATNOT, YOUR SOLE INQUIRY IS, "WHERE WOULD YOU GET THE ACID?" A I THINK SO. THAT WAS ALL YOU SAID? UH-HUH. MR. WAPNER: IS THAT YES? THE WITNESS: YES, THAT IS YES.

1 BY MR. BARENS: AND WITH THAT STATEMENT AND THAT QUESTION, THE CONVERSATION ENDED? 2 3 A I DON'T -- I DON'T NECESSARILY KNOW IF THE 4 CONVERSATION ENDED, BUT I DON'T RECALL ANY OTHER THINGS THAT 5 WERE DISCUSSED WITH REGARDS TO MR. LEVIN'S BODY AND DISPOSING 6 OF IT. 7 Q WERE YOU UPSET WHEN YOU HEARD THAT? 8 I KIND OF -- I THOUGHT ABOUT IT FOR A WHILE AND 9 IT SEEMED -- I GUESS I HAD SOME SORT OF A PICTURE IN MY MIND 10 OF THAT AND IT SEEMED IT WAS A LITTLE STRANGE TO ME. 11 Q LITTLE STRANGE INDEED. 12 DID YOU SAY ANYTHING TO HUNT LIKE, "KIND OF AN 13 UNSAVORY THING TO DO" OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT? 14 AGAIN, CONSIDERING MY, YOU KNOW, -- YOU KNOW, 15 MY POSITION THAT I FELT IN RELATIONSHIP TO MR. HUNT, NO, I 16 DID NOT. 17 AND YOU DIDN'T SAY ANYTHING ELSE TO ANYBODY ELSE Q 18 ABOUT THAT, DID YOU? 19 I DON'T RECALL TELLING ANYBODY ELSE THAT THEY 20 HAD PUT THE BODY IN OR DISPOSED OF THE BODY WITH ACID. 21 NOBODY ELSE TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE --Q 22 DID ANYBODY ELSE HEAR THAT STORY ABOUT THE ACID? 23 I DON'T KNOW THAT. TO MY KNOWLEDGE, I DON'T Α 24 KNOW OF ANYONE ELSE HEARING THAT STORY. 25 WHEN YOU HEARD THAT, THAT DIDN'T PROMPT YOU TO 26 GO TO THE POLICE ABOUT IT? 27 Α NO. 28 Q YOU DIDN'T LEAVE THE BBC AT THAT POINT, DID YOU?

1 Α NO, I DID NOT. 2 DID YOU BELIEVE IT? Q 3 I BELIEVED THAT -- I WASN'T OUITE SURE IF THEY 4 HAD ACTUALLY. YOU KNOW, MY FIRST THOUGHT WAS, YOU KNOW, I 5 IMAGINED SORT OF LIKE PLACING THE ENTIRE BODY IN A VAT OF 6 ACID AND THAT DIDN'T RING A BELL TO ME. BUT I ALSO -- I 7 FIGURED MAYBE THEY HAD. YOU KNOW. BURNED OFF PARTS OF THE 8 SKIN OR FINGERPRINTS OR SOMETHING WITH THE ACID AND SO THAT 9 MADE SENSE TO ME, SO I BELIEVED THAT, YES. 10 YOU DID BELIEVE THAT? 11 YES. 12 BUT YOU DIDN'T BELIEVE HE JUST PUT HIM IN A VAT Q 13 OF ACID AND SOMETHING LIKE THAT AND HE COMPLETELY DISAPPEARED? 14 THAT'S CORRECT. Α 15 YOU DIDN'T BELIEVE THAT? 0 16 Д NO. BUT THAT IS NOT WHAT JOE SAID TO ME. 17 OF COURSE NOT. Q 18 AFTER HE SAID THAT TO YOU, WHAT DID YOU DO, JUST 19 KEEP WORKING AS YOU WERE? 20 I DON'T KNOW IF WE WERE WORKING. I DON'T KNOW 21 IF WE WERE WALKING TO THE STORE TO GET A SODA. I RECALL BEING 22 SOMEWHERE IN THE AREA OF THE OFFICE SO I DON'T REMEMBER WHERE 23 THE CONVERSATION TOOK FROM THERE. 24 THE CONVERSATION TOOK PLACE ALMOST THREE YEARS 25 AGO AND PART OF IT -- YOU KNOW, SOME PARTS OF IT STUCK IN 26 MY MIND BECAUSE FOR OBVIOUS REASONS AND, YOU KNOW, THE 27

REMAINDER OF THE CONVERSATION, I JUST, I DO NOT RECALL.

3

Q OKAY. BUT IT CERTAINLY DIDN'T PROMPT YOU TO DO 1 2 ANYTHING, DID IT? 3 A IT DID NOT. IT DIDN'T I SUPPOSE, CHANGE YOUR ASSESSMENT OF MR. HUNT? 5 6 Α IT DID NOT. 7 ALL RIGHT, AFTER THAT, YOU TALKED ABOUT THIS CONVERSATION ABOUT THE RAINCOAT? 8 9 I DON'T -- I AM NOT -- I BELIEVE THE CONVERSATION -+ 10 YES. THERE WAS THE CONVERSATION OF THE RAINCOAT. AND THE CONVERSATION DEALING WITH MR. RAYMOND AND THOSE TOOK PLACE 11 VERY CLOSE TO EACH OTHER. I AM NOT 100 PERCENT SURE WHICH 12 ONE WAS FIRST AND WHICH ONE WAS AFTER. 13 14 AFTER YOU HAD THE CONVERSATION ABOUT THE RAINCOAT, 15 DID YOU HAVE A LOOK AT THE RAINCOAT? 16 A I THINK THAT EVENING, I -- ACTUALLY, I KNOW THAT EVENING, JOE JUST CAME OVER AND PICKED UP THE COAT. SO I 17 NEVER LOOKED AT IT AFTER MY CONVERSATION ABOUT THE RAINCOAT. 18 19 DID YOU BELIEVE WHAT HE TOLD YOU ABOUT THE Q 20 RAINCOAT? 21 YEAH. I KIND OF DID BECAUSE YOU KNOW, IF HE HAD 22 NOT, YOU KNOW, WITHOUT THE IMPROVISO (SIC) HE HAD IT 23 DRYCLEANED OR CLEANED, IF HE JUST SAID THAT RON LEVIN'S 24 BRAINS WERE SMEARED ON IT, I WOULD THINK IT WOULD BE BIZARRE 25 THAT HE WOULD WEAR IT TO MY BIRTHDAY PARTY. 26 BUT SINCE HE ADDED THAT PART, IT MADE SENSE AND 27 IT SEEMED POSSIBLE THAT IT HAD BEEN USED TO PROTECT HIS HEAD

OR SOMETHING AND IT GOT BUMPED AROUND OR I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY

1

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

HOW HE MET HIS DEMISE, BUT POSSIBLY SOMETHING THAT MIGHT ALLOW THE COAT TO BECOME SMEARED THAT WAY.

OKAY. WITH THAT IN MIND, ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT YOU BELIEVED ANYTHING AND EVERYTHING THAT HUNT TOLD YOU?

IF HE TOLD ME THAT TODAY WAS FRIDAY, I WOULDN'T BELIEVE HIM. AND IF BACK THEN, HE HAD TOLD ME, YOU KNOW, SOMETHING THAT WAS OBVIOUSLY FALSE --

HOW ABOUT BLACK IS WHITE? Q

WELL, IF YOU DON'T -- I MEAN, BLACK AND WHITE ARE JUST -- IF THEY ARE JUST PHILOSOPHICAL POSITIONS, THEN I MEAN, THEY CAN ALWAYS BE THE SAME AND THEY CAN ALWAYS INTERCHANGE AND THEY REALLY ARE ONLY -- BLACK IS WHITE IS ONLY UNDERSTOOD IN CONNECTION WITH EVERYTHING BEING A SHADE OF GRAY IN BETWEEN.

WELL, WE HAD A PROBLEM YESTERDAY IN UNDERSTANDING Q WHEN A PERSON WHO SUBSCRIBES TO THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY IS TELLING THE TRUTH. I AM TRYING TO GET SOME BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF WHEN YOU HAD A SIGNAL THAT ENABLED YOU TO KNOW HUNT WAS TELLING THE TRUTH?

I THOUGHT ABOUT THAT ALSO A LOT BECAUSE YOU KNOW, IT BROUGHT SOME THOUGHTS TO ME. I THINK YOU GAVE ME AN IDEA THAT I THINK WAS PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT, THAT THE OBJECTS OF THE PERSON'S -- THAT THE PERSON'S GOALS BECOME VERY IMPORTANT IN TELLING WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE TELLING THE TRUTH.

AND SO, USING THAT AND YOU KNOW, RETHINKING THINGS OVER, IT DID MAKE SENSE TO ME IN THESE INSTANCES I JUST DISCUSSED, THAT HE WAS TELLING THE TRUTH.

A - 3

Q BECAUSE THE OBJECT WAS, THE WAY YOU PERCEIVED IT SIR, TO --

A WELL, I DON'T UNDERSTAND EXACTLY WHY HE TOLD EVERYBODY WHAT HE HAD DONE TO RON LEVIN. I GUESS THE JOKE I HAD MADE AT TIMES, WAS WHY BOTHER COMMITTING THE PERFECT CRIME IF YOU CAN'T TELL YOUR FRIENDS.

Q INDEED.

A I THINK THAT THERE WAS SOME BRAGGING IN IT.

I THINK ALSO IT WAS ALMOST SORT OF LIKE AN EAGLE RETURNING

TO THE NEST WITH FOOD, YOU KNOW, FOOD THAT HE HAS NOT EATEN

HIMSELF BUT IS BRINGING TO THE CHILDREN.

AND A PART OF THAT FOOD WOULD BE A MILLION FIVE, 1 SIR? 2 3 4 FOLLOW ME ALL THAT MUCH MORE." 5 Q ABSOLUTELY. 6 7 JUST ASK THE QUESTIONS. 8 MR. BARENS: SURE. 9 10 11 12 SAYING, "I DID THIS FOR YOU." 13 14 15 16 WAS ONE OF THE MESSAGES THAT I PERCEIVED. 17 18 19 20 AND TEMPORAL OF THE BBC? 21 22 Α YES HE DID. 23 Q THE BBC? 24 25 26 27

YES. THAT WOULD BE IT. YES, IT WAS SORT OF LIKE A STATEMENT OF "I HAVE DONE THIS FOR YOU, NOW YOU SHOULD THE COURT: LET'S CUT OUT THE REMARKS AFTER THE ANSWERS. WE HAVE GOT THIS -- THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. WE HAVE GOT THIS SITUATION WHERE HE COMES BACK AND TELLS YOU FELLOWS A STORY THAT YOU INTERPRET AS HIM DID YOU HAVE THAT STATE OF MIND? I PERCEIVED THAT THAT WAS ONE OF THE MESSAGES --WELL, I DIDN'T PERCEIVE IT AS BEING THE SOLE MESSAGE. THAT DID YOU FEEL AMONG HUNT'S IMPORTANT ASPECTS ON HIS AGENDA OF THINGS, OBJECTIVES THAT YOU JUST REFERRED TO, DID HE HAVE AN OBJECTIVE TO REMAIN AS THE LEADER, SPIRITUAL AND DID HE WANT TO APPEAR AS THE CARETAKER FOR I THINK THAT HE WOULD HAVE BEEN HAPPY IF MORE PEOPLE WERE PUTTING IN THEIR MONEY. I DON'T THINK HE HAD TO BE THE EXCLUSIVE MONEY PROVIDER, IF YOU LIKE, OF THE BBC. BUT I THINK IT WAS -- I THINK CENTRAL CONTROL AND POWER AND

LEADERSHIP WERE VERY IMPORTANT TO HIM.

Q AND THAT SEEMS TO BE IMPORTANT AT ALL TIMES, THE WAY HE CONDUCTED HIMSELF AROUND THE OFFICE AND PERHAPS LED MEETINGS AND ADDRESSED PEOPLE?

A I THINK THOSE WERE INDICATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE THAT HE FELT FOR THAT POSITION, YES.

Q AND THE NATURE OF HIS OFFICE AND THE WAY HE WAS TREATED IN I SUPPOSE, SOME DEFERENTIAL MANNER, WOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH THAT?

A YES. IT WOULD BE.

Q AND I BELIEVE OR AT LEAST I UNDERSTAND THAT YOU PEOPLE WOULD DISAGREE WITH HIM?

A PEOPLE DID DISAGREE WITH HIM, YES.

Q WHEN THEY DISAGREED, HOW DID THINGS WORK OUT?

A IN GENERAL, THE WAY AS I RECALL, THE WAY JOE WANTED THEM.

Q DID YOU SENSE THAT HE HAD SOME SORT OF VETO AUTHORITY, PERHAPS SELF-SUBSCRIBED, DURING DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES?

A I FELT NOT NECESSARILY A VETO, SINCE THE THREE SHADINGS WERE YOU KNOW, SORT OF IN CHARGE OF THE BBC FROM A PHILOSOPHICAL STANDPOINT AND THE BUSINESS ALL FLOWED FROM THE PHILOSOPHY. THEN THE SHADINGS TO A CERTAIN DEGREE WOULD ALSO CONTROL THE BUSINESS. AND IT APPEARED THAT THE DECISIONS MADE BY THE SHADINGS WERE GENERALLY MADE -- JOE'S OPINION GENERALLY PREVAILED AND THE SHADINGS EVENTUALLY AGREED WITH HIM.

Q BECAUSE JOE WAS IN FACT, THE FIRST SELF-APPOINTED

SHADING?

A HE WAS IN FACT, THE FIRST SELF-APPOINTED SHADING BUT NOT BECAUSE OF THAT FACT.

BUT IT SEEMED MORE THAT THEY JUST -- IF THERE
WAS ANY RESISTANCE BY ONE OF THEM, HE WOULD GET THE OTHER
IN HIS CORNER AND THEN THOSE TWO WOULD GET THE THIRD TO AGREE.

Q OKAY. YOU MENTIONED THIS MORNING IN TESTIMONY THAT THERE WAS AN APPEARANCE AS TO CORPORATE STRUCTURE, FOR INSTANCE IN THE STOCK ISSUANCE ON MICROGENESIS.

AND THEN I BELIEVE IN RESPONSE TO HIS HONOR'S INQUIRY, YOU INDICATED THAT THE CORPORATE STRUCTURES WERE A RESULT OF AN INDICATION YOU HAD GOTTEN FROM HUNT AS TO HOW THINGS SHOULD BE?

A I WAS INSTRUCTED BY MR. HUNT OF HOW THEY SHOULD BE.

Q AND THUSLY, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE APPARENT SHARE
OWNERSHIP IN THESE ENTITIES, WOULD IT BE YOUR TESTIMONY THAT
IRRESPECTIVE OF THEIR APPEARANCE AT LAW, THE REALITY WAS THAT
IT ENDED UP THAT WAY BECAUSE OF SOMETHING HUNT CONSTRUCTED?

A I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND THAT QUESTION.

Q WELL, YOU HAVE SHAREHOLDERSHIPS. I SUBMIT TO YOU MR. DICKER, THAT IF MICROGENESIS -- THAT DOESN'T PUT MR. HUNT IN A CONTROLLING POSITION AS FAR AS WHAT WE CALL A MAJORITY SHAREHOLDER. IS THAT TRUE?

A THAT IS -- I AM JUST TRYING TO THINK. I AM JUST THINKING THAT -- NO. YOUR STATEMENT IS CORRECT.

```
1
                  AND I BELIEVE, SIR, WOULD THAT ALSO NOT BE TRUE
  2
      WITH REFERENCE TO WESTCAR, INC., WESTCAR OF NORTH AMERICA,
  3
      INC.?
  4
            A I DON'T REMEMBER HOW THE SHARES IN WESTCARS WERE
  5
      ISSUED.
             MR. BARENS: IF I MIGHT APPROACH THE WITNESS, I WANT
  6
  7
      TO GET TO THAT TOPIC, YOUR HONOR.
 8
             THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
 9
            MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
 10
                 MR. DICKER, I SHOW YOU WHAT APPEAR TO BE SHARE
     CERTIFICATES OF WESTCARS OF NORTH AMERICA.
11
12
            MR. BARENS: I THINK I AM AT M, I BELIEVE I AM AT M,
13
     YOUR HONOR.
14
            THE COURT: YES, THAT WOULD BE M, YES.
15
                  BY MR. BARENS: DO YOU RECOGNIZE THESE DOCUMENTS,
            0
16
     MR. DICKER?
17
                 YES, THESE APPEAR TO BE SHARE CERTIFICATES OR
18
     STOCK CERTIFICATES FROM WESTCARS OF NORTH AMERICA.
19
                  AND DID YOU PREPARE THOSE SHARE CERTIFICATES,
            Q
20
     SIR?
21
                  THEY APPEAR TO BE PREPARED BY ME AND COUNTERSIGNED
            Α
22
     BY THE PRESIDENT, STEVE TAGLIANETTI.
23
                  DO YOU SEE A FAMILIAR SIGNATURE ON THESE PAPERS?
            Q
24
            Α
                  YES, I DO.
25
            Q
                  WHOSE?
26
            Α
                  IT APPEARS TO BE MY SIGNATURE.
27
            Q
                  AND WOULD YOU JUST GO THROUGH AND IDENTIFY --
28
                  AND I WILL MARK THESE SUBSEQUENTLY, YOUR HONOR --
```

```
1
                   JUST BRIEFLY GIVE THE NAME ON THE SHARE
  2
      CERTIFICATE AND THE AMOUNT OF SHARES, SIR.
  3
             Α
               YES.
  4
                  CERTIFICATE NUMBER 3 ISSUES 29 SHARES TO DEAN
  5
      L. KARNY.
                   CERTIFICATE NUMBER 4 ISSUES 20 SHARES TO TOM
  6
 7
     FRANK MAY.
 8
                   CERTIFICATE NUMBER 5 ISSUES AN ADDITIONAL 20
 9
     SHARE'S TO DEAN L. KARNY.
 10
                  CERTIFICATE NUMBER 6 ISSUES AN ADDITIONAL 20
     SHARES TO TOM FRANK MAY.
11
12
                  CERTIFICATE NUMBER 7 ISSUES AN ADDITIONAL 11
13
     SHARES TO TOM FRANK MAY.
14
            MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE MARKED THOSE M-1
15
     THROUGH 5 IN THE SAME ORDER TO WHICH THE WITNESS REFERENCED
16
     THEM.
17
                 BY MR. BARENS: WERE THERE ANY OTHER SHARE
            Q
     CERTIFICATES IN WESTCARS OF NORTH AMERICA THAT YOU REMEMBER?
18
19
                  THERE ARE NONE THAT I RECALL BESIDES THOSE.
20
                  AND THIS WOULD ACCOUNT FOR ALL OF THE SHARE
21
     OWNERSHIP IN THAT ENTITY, SIR?
22
                  IF IT -- I THINK IT WAS 19, 11 AND THREE 20'S,
            Α
23
     SIR.
24
            Q
                  QUITE SO.
25
                  THEN THAT WOULD BE 100 AND THAT WOULD INDICATE
26
    ALL OF THE SHARES THAT ARE AUTHORIZED TO BE ISSUED.
27
            Q
                 OKAY, IT ADDS UP TO A HUNDRED PERCENT.
28
                  I NOTE MR. HUNT'S NAME IS NOT ON THOSE SHARE
```

1 BASICALLY DIVIDED INTO THIRDS, EXCEPT HE HAD GOTTEN A FEW 2 EXTRA SHARES IN THE PROXY CERTIFICATE OR A FEW EXTRA POINTS 3 OR PERCENTAGES IN THE PROXY CERTIFICATES. AND THE SECOND THING WAS WHILE THERE WERE VERY --5 WHILE THERE WAS ONE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING. THERE WAS 6 NEVER A SHAREHOLDER'S MEETING. 7 Q YES? 8 A THERE WERE NEVER ANY SHAREHOLDER'S MEETINGS AND 9 ALL MATTERS THAT WOULD BE DETERMINED AT SHAREHOLDER'S MEETINGS. 10 WHICH WOULD GENERALLY BE --11 THE COURT: GO AHEAD. DON'T PAY ANY ATTENTION TO WHAT 12 THEY ARE DOING. 13 THE WITNESS: WHICH WOULD GENERALLY --14 MR. BARENS: I AM LISTENING. 15 THE WITNESS: -- WHICH WOULD GENERALLY BE THE ELECTION 16 OF -- EXCUSE ME -- THE ELECTION OF DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS 17 WAS DONE BY JOE. HE JUST TOLD ME TO HAVE WHO WAS TO BECOME 18 THE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS. 19 THE COURT: ONE THING HE LEFT OUT AND THAT WAS THE 20 CONSIDERATION FOR THESE SHARES OF STOCK. WERE YOU TOLD, WAS 21 ANY MONEY PASSED OR ANYTHING? 22 THE WITNESS: I THINK THE ISSUES FOR THE WESTCAR STOCK. 23 WHICH I NOTICED --24 EXCUSE ME. COULD I SEE THE MICROGENESIS STOCK 25 CERTIFICATE AGAIN?

I BELIEVE THE PEOPLE DID. I FORGET WHAT THAT --

MR. BARENS: I HAVEN'T ACTUALLY SHOWN THOSE TO YOU,

26

27

28

SIR.

MIGHT HAVE BEEN PURCHASED FOR TURNING OVER PINK SLIPS TO THE

D

1 COMPANY. 2 THE COURT: BY THOSE WHO ARE THE STOCKHOLDERS? 3 THE WITNESS: I DON'T BELIEVE SO. 4 I DON'T RECALL DEAN KARNY EVER TURNING OVER 5 ANYTHING, A PINK SLIP, EXCEPT POSSIBLY ONE TO A FIAT. 6 Q THE COURT: A PINK SLIP FOR WHAT? 7 THE WITNESS: ON HIS CAR. 8 THE COURT: ON HIS CAR? 9 THE WITNESS: YES. 10 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENED 11 TO THE PINK SLIP, DO YOU? 12 THE WITNESS: NO, I DON'T. 13 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, GO AHEAD. 14 Q BY MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, NOW YOU ARE TELLING 15 US THAT YOU BELIEVED THAT HUNT WAS IN A POSITION TO CONTROL 16 THIS MICROGENESIS THROUGH SELDON BECAUSE HE HAD RECEIVED A 17 PROXY IN EXCESS OF THE PROXY GIVEN TO THE OTHER TWO BBC PEOPLE 18 THAT WOULD ENABLE HIM TO DO THAT? 19 THAT WAS MY RECOLLECTION, YES. 20 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. IF I MIGHT APPROACH THE WITNESS, 21 YOUR HONOR? 22 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 23 24 25 26 27

Q AND I HAND YOU A STATEMENT THAT I BELIEVE SAYS 1 "PROXY" AT THE TOP. CAN YOU TELL US WHAT THAT IS, SIR? 2 3 THAT IS A PROXY WHICH WAS ISSUED TO JOSEPH HUNT AND THE PROXY PORTION OF THAT, I READ THIS MORNING, WAS CROSSED OUT. 5 SO, HE HAD AN OPTION TO PURCHASE 32 SHARES. 6 7 SO, HE HAD THE SAME NUMBER OF PROXY SHARES THAT 8 THE OTHER TWO PEOPLE HAD THIS MORNING? 9 А THAT'S CORRECT. 10 Q IS THERE SOMETHING DIFFERENT ABOUT THE HUNT PROXY AS OPPOSED TO THE TWO THAT YOU SAW THIS MORNING? 11 12 WELL, AS I HAD STATED JUST PRIOR TO YOUR STATEMENT, 13 THE PROXY PORTION GIVING THE RIGHTS TO VOTE IN PLACE OF MY 14 SHARES ARE CROSSED OUT. AND APPARENTLY, BY ME WITH MY --15 WHAT APPEARS TO BE MY INITIALS NEXT TO IT. 16 WHEN YOU SAY THAT IT APPEARS TO BE, DO YOU BELIEVE Q 17 THOSE ARE IN FACT, YOUR INITIALS, SIR? 18 А YES I DO. 19 THEREFORE, AT LEAST BASED ON WHAT WE SEE HERE, 20 HUNT COULD NOT VOTE THIS PROXY? 21 THAT'S CORRECT. BUT HE STILL COULD FOR \$32 22 PURCHASE THE SHARES AND HAVE COMPLETE CONTROL OVER THEM. 23 Q OVER THESE 32? 24 Α YES. 25 THEN THE OTHER TWO GENTLEMEN YOU REFERENCED THIS 26 MORNING WOULD HAVE CONTROL OVER 32 SHARES RESPECTIVELY 27 THEMSELVES?

28

A THAT'S CORRECT.

BUT IT WOULD NONETHELESS, BE YOUR TESTIMONY THAT 1 THIS WAS SO BECAUSE OF HUNT TELLING YOU THAT YOU MAKE IT THIS 2 WAY? 3 A THAT'S CORRECT. WOULD IT THUS BE A FAIR STATEMENT TO SAY THAT 5 HE COULD CONTROL THINGS AS FAR AS MICROGENESIS WAS CONCERNED 6 THROUGH SOME FORCE OF PERSONALITY? 7 THAT WAS IN EFFECT, HOW HE CONTROLLED IT. ALL RIGHT. NOW, WHEN WE GET DOWN TO IT, 9 MR. DICKER, THE WAY THINGS ARE BEING RUN IN THIS BUSINESS, 10 ARE RUN BECAUSE HUNT IS THE LEADER AND IS ABLE TO CONTROL 11 THINGS THROUGH FORCE OF PERSONALITY. IS THAT A FAIR 12 STATEMENT? 13 A I THINK IT IS A VERY FAIR STATEMENT. 14 AND THAT MAINTAINS SO LONG AS HE IS THE LEADER 15 Q 16 IN FACT, SIR? A I THINK THE TWO ARE THE SAME. I THINK THAT HE 17 CONTINUES HIS -- HE CONTINUES BEING LEADER BECAUSE OF HIS 18 CONTROL. HE CONTINUES SO I DON'T THINK SINCE THERE IS NOBODY 19 SINCE HIS ONLY YOU KNOW, TITLE ABOVE THAT OF THE OTHER TWO 20 SHADINGS WOULD BE THE FACT THAT HE HAS THE FIRST SHADING AND 21 THAT THAT WAS -- HIS CONTROL WAS NOT BASED UPON HIS 22 LEADERSHIP BUT HIS CONTROL WAS BASED UPON HIS ABILITY TO 23 EXERT THE CONTROL. 24 25 Q ALL RIGHT. AND DID ALL OF THAT SEEM IMPORTANT 26 TO HIM?

A HE SEEMED TO ENJOY THE POSITION AND THE CONTROL

27

28

AND THE POWER.

1	Q DID YOU CONSIDER HIM TO BE FROM AN ANALOGOUS									
2	SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND TO YOU?									
3	A I NEVER CONSIDERED IT.									
4	Q YOU NEVER DID?									
5	A NO.									
6	Q DO YOU KNOW HOW THE OTHER BOYS FELT IN THAT REGARD									
7	PERHAPS THE MAY BROTHERS?									
8	MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION, CALLING FOR SPECULATION.									
9	MR. BARENS: ONLY ANSWER THAT QUESTION IF YOU KNOW,									
10	BASED ON ANY COMMENTS MADE TO YOU, SIR.									
11	THE WITNESS: NO. I DID NOT HEAR ANY COMMENTS. WAIT,									
12	CAN I POSSIBLY HAVE A REFERENCE IN TIME?									
13	Q BY MR. BARENS: AT ANY TIME BETWEEN THE TIME YOU									
14	STARTED YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE BBC AND SAY, DECEMBER OF									
15	1984, SIR?									
16	A I NEVER HEARD THE MAYS SAY ANY COMMENTS IN REGARDS									
17	TO DIFFERENCES IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS BETWEEN THEMSELVE									
18	AND MR. HUNT.									
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										

 $\Delta = 4$

Q ALL RIGHT. DID YOU HEAR OTHER DISCUSSIONS ABOUT MR. HUNT IN THAT REGARD FROM ANYONE?

A DURING THAT PERIOD OF TIME, NO.

Q ALL RIGHT. HAVE YOU AT ANY PERIOD OF TIME, HEARD THAT TYPE OF DISCUSSION?

A I THINK I MAY AT SOME TIME HAVE READ SOMETHING DISCUSSING THE DIFFERENCES IN THE BACKGROUNDS, SUBSEQUENT TO DECEMBER OF 1984.

Q I SEE. BUT NO DISCUSSION BETWEEN BBC MEMBERS, IS I BELIEVE WHAT YOU ARE TELLING ME?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

Q OKAY. NOW, YOU DISCUSSED YESTERDAY, A MEETING
OF SORTS WHEREIN IT WAS DISCUSSED, I THINK YOU ATTRIBUTED
IT TO HUNT, THAT MR. RAYMOND'S GIRLFRIEND SHOULD BE KILLED
AND THAT SOMEHOW OR ANOTHER, THAT WOULD RESULT IN AN
IMPLICATION THAT RAYMOND HAD KILLED LEVIN? IS THAT THE STORY
YOU TOLD YESTERDAY?

A YES.

Q WHAT DID YOU SAY DURING THAT MEETING?

A DURING THAT MEETING, I DID NOT SAY ANYTHING.

Q NOT A WORD?

A I DON'T RECALL IF I DID NOT SAY A WORD. I KNOW
I THAT I WAS NOT IMMEDIATELY PLEASED WITH THE PLAN.

AND I LATER VOICED THAT TO ANOTHER MEMBER OF THE BBC. AND HE AGREED WITH ME AND IF THE PLAN HAD BEEN DISCUSSED ANY FURTHER, I THINK THAT WE WERE BOTH INTENDING TO OPPOSE IT.

Q ALL RIGHT. AT THE TIME WHEN THE DISCUSSION WAS

ARTICULATED, DID YOU NOT PROTEST? 1 THAT'S CORRECT. 2 BUT YOU HAD, ALTHOUGH THE WORDS WERE SPOKEN, YOU 3 HAD NO INTENT TO CARRY THOSE WORDS OUT? 4 THAT IS DEFINITELY CORRECT. Α 5 AND DO YOU KNOW WHO ELSE WAS PRESENT AT THAT 6 MEETING? 7 I DON'T RECALL IF HE WAS ACTUALLY PRESENT AT THE 8 MEETING, BUT I RECALL THAT STEVE LOPEZ, SOMEHOW OR ANOTHER 9 BECAME PRIVY TO THE INFORMATION BECAUSE WE DISCUSSED IT AND 10 I KNEW THAT HE HAD DISCUSSED IT AND MY RECOLLECTION IS THAT 11 JOE WAS PRESENT AND THAT JOHN ALLEN OR DEAN MAY HAVE -- I 12 THINK WERE PRESENT, THOUGH I CANNOT SAY FOR SURE. 13 DURING THAT MEETING, DID ANYONE PROTEST? 14 NOT THAT I RECALL, NO. 15 OKAY. DURING THAT MEETING, DID ANYONE PARTICIPATE 16 IN THE DIALOGUE? 17 I RECALL ONLY JOE DISCUSSING -- ONLY JOE SPEAKING. Α 18 NO ONE ELSE SAID A WORD? 19 I WOULD THINK THAT THAT WAS PROBABLY AN ACCURATE, 20 THOUGH DISAPPOINTING TIME. I REMEMBER ONLY JOE ARTICULATING 21 AT THE TIME. 22 ALTHOUGH THAT WAS SAID, IT WAS NOT DONE? Q 23 THAT'S CORRECT. 24 WAS THERE IN THE BBC, A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THINGS 25 PEOPLE SAID AND PEOPLE DID? 26 MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION, VAGUE. 27

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT.

1 HOW ABOUTDURING THE EXISTENCE OF THE BBC, LET'S 2 SAY DURING 1983, DID YOU EVER HEAR DISCUSSIONS IN THE OFFICES 3 THAT MONEY WAS BEING MADE IN THE COMMODITIES MARKET? 4 THE COURT: YOU MEAN OTHER THAN WITH LEVIN? 5 MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR, INDEED. 6 THE WITNESS: I DON'T RECALL ANY IN 1983, NO. 7 BY MR. BARENS: HOW ABOUT 1982? 8 1982, I DON'T BELIEVE THERE WERE ANY. 9 Q IN 1984? 10 I BELIEVE IN 1984, THERE WERE. 11 AND DID YOU ACTUALLY SEE THAT TO BE TRUE? 0 12 I SAW THAT THERE WAS MONEY, YOU KNOW, SUPPOSEDLY 13 GOING THROUGH, YOU KNOW, THE ACCOUNTS IN THE COMPANIES AND 14 THAT MONEY WAS COMING FROM SOMEWHERE. 15 BUT YOU NEVER VERIFIED FOR YOURSELF THAT THOSE 16 WERE PROCEEDS FROM GAINS IN THE MARKET? 17 A I DID NOT VERIFY THAT FOR MYSELF, NO. 18 SO YOU DON'T KNOW IF HUNT SAID THAT, THAT WAS 19 A TRUE STATEMENT OR NOT? 20 I DO NOT KNOW WHETHER WHAT HUNT SAID IS A TRUE 21 STATEMENT OR NOT. 22 YOU NEVER SAW ANYTHING RELATIVE TO THE LEVIN 23 COMMODITIES TRADING, DID YOU, THAT WOULD VERIFY WHETHER THAT 24 WAS TRUE OR NOT? 25 I RECALL SEEING SOMETHING FROM A BROKERAGE HOUSE 26 THAT I THINK SOMEBODY IDENTIFIED AS THE HOUSE WHERE LEVIN'S 27 ACCOUNTS WERE HELD AND IT HAD A BUNCH OF NUMBERS ON IT. BUT 28

I CAN'T READ THE STATEMENT SO I DON'T KNOW WHAT IT SAID.

1 IT COULD HAVE SAID ANYTHING.

Q IS IT A FACT THAT THE ONLY REASON YOU HAVE TO BELIEVE THAT HUNT MADE ALL OF THAT MONEY FOR LEVIN IN THE COMMODITIES MARKET IS BECAUSE IT IS SOMETHING HUNT TOLD YOU WAS TRUE?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

Q SO MOST OF WHAT YOU BELIEVE TO BE TRUE ABOUT WHAT HUNT DID OR DIDN'T DO IS BASED PRIMARILY ON WHAT HUNT TOLD YOU?

A ON WHAT JOE HUNT SAID AND ALSO THE FACT THAT,
YOU KNOW, HE SAID HE WAS MAKING MONEY IN THE ACCOUNTS AND
I DIDN'T SEE ANY OTHER SOURCE EXCEPT FOR SOME SMALL INVESTORS
FROM MICROGENESIS, AND THERE WAS A LOT OF MONEY AROUND AND
A GREAT DEAL OF MONEY WAS BEING SPENT ON MICROGENESIS, SO
IF MONEY WASN'T COMING FROM THE INVESTORS AND THE INVESTORS'
ACCOUNTS IN SOME WAY, SHAPE OR FORM, THERE IS NO OTHER WAY -I HAD NO OTHER MEANS OF BELIEVING OR UNDERSTANDING HOW IT
WAS COMING INTO THE BUSINESS.

Q ON THE REST OF THE THINGS YOU HAVE TOLD US ABOUT TODAY, ISN'T IT A FACT THAT CONCERNING THE BUSINESS ABOUT THE ACID AND THE RAINCOAT AND THE MATTERS ABOUT LEVIN, THAT THE ONLY REASON YOU WOULD BELIEVE THEY ARE TRUE IS BECAUSE IT IS SOMETHING HUNT TOLD YOU?

A CONSIDERING MOST OF THEM WERE CONVERSATION

BETWEEN -- YES -- CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN MYSELF AND MR. HUNT, ONE

OF MY BIGGEST BASES WOULD, OF COURSE, BE THE FACT THAT HE

STATED THEM AND I BELIEVED THEM TO BE TRUE.

Q YES, ALL RIGHT, I THINK YOU HAVE ANSWERED MY

```
QUESTION IN THAT REGARD.
 1
 2
                  YOU SAID THAT YOU WERE AFRAID AFTER THAT AND
     SCARED, I THINK IS MORE APPROPRIATELY THE WORD YOU USED, UP
 3
     UNTIL DECEMBER OF '84; IS THAT CORRECT?
 4
 5
            A I THINK, YES.
            Q AND YOU WERE AFRAID OF WHAT, SIR?
 6
 7
                 PROSECUTION.
 8
                 AND THEN A TIME COMES IN DECEMBER OF '84 WHERE
            Q
 9
     YOU WERE NOT.
10
            A THAT'S CORRECT.
11
            Q
                 WHY IS THAT?
12
13
14
15
16
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
```

1 A

1	A BECAUSE I HAD STATEMENTS BOTH AT									
2	STONOSE I MAD STATEMENTS BOTH AT THE BEVERLY									
3	HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT AFTER THEY HAD SORT OF STATED									
4	CASUALLY THAT THEY WERE NOT INTERESTED IN PROSECUTING ME AND									
5	MY STATEMENTS DEALING SPECIFICALLY WITH THE NOTARIZATION TO									
6	THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND MY WHAT WAS A GRANT OF IMMUNITY,									
7	WHICH HASN'T COME ABOUT YET, TOWARDS THOSE DEALING WITH THE									
	NOTARY, AND THAT I THEN FELT IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT BOTH									
8	OF WHICH WERE FREELY TAKEN STATEMENTS FROM ME, THAT I WOULD									
9	NOT BE PROSECUTED.									
10	Q SO ONCE YOU HAD HAD SOME ASSURANCE THAT THEY									
11	WERE NOT INTERESTED IN ARRESTING YOU OR PROSECUTING YOU, YOU									
12	CHANGED FROM THE STORY YOU HAD GIVEN IN OCTOBER TO THE STORY									
13	YOU ARE NOW GIVING?									
14	A THAT'S CORRECT.									
15	Q YOU NO LONGER SAID THAT YOU THOUGHT LEVIN WAS									
16	MISSING AT THAT POINT?									
17	A IN DECEMBER OF 1984, I DID NOT SAY THAT, THAT									
18	IS CORRECT.									
19	Q OKAY. NOW, AFTER HUNT HAD BEEN ARRESTED									
20	INITIALLY, WHICH I GUESS WAS OCTOBER '84.									
21	A THAT SOUNDS CORRECT.									
22	Q YOU REMAINED SUPPORTIVE OF JOE HUNT?									
23	A I DID.									
24	Q AND WHY IS THAT?									
25	A TO A CERTAIN DEGREE, I STILL BELIEVED IN HIM.									
26	Q WHAT ACTUALLY DID YOU BELIEVE IN HIM ABOUT?									
27	A I STILL BELIEVED, AT THIS POINT IN TIME, I STILL									
28	TO SOME DEGREE BELIEVED THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY WAS CORRECT.									
	FILLUSUPHT WAS CORRECT.									

```
1
                  AND THUS, YOU STILL BELIEVED HE COULD BE A
2
    RESOURCE FOR FINANCIAL ACHIEVEMENT FOR YOU, SIR?
3
                  YES, I THINK THAT WOULD BE A CORRECT STATEMENT.
                  AND AGAIN, AFTER A POINT IN TIME THAT IS NO LONGER
4
            Q
5
    THE CASE?
                 IT WAS -- YES.
6
            Α
7
                  AND BY DECEMBER --
8
                  IT WAS ACTUALLY BEFORE HE WAS EVEN ARRESTED FOR
9
    THE SECOND TIME.
10
                  THE SECOND TIME; AND BY THEN, YOU NO LONGERFELT
            Q
11
    THAT ANYTHING TO DO WITH HUNT WOULD FURTHER YOUR FINANCIAL
12
    ASPIRATIONS, SIR?
13
                  WELL, BEFORE HE WAS ARRESTED THE SECOND TIME,
14
     I HAD TOLD HIM THAT I WAS GOING TO STOP WORKING IN THE OFFICES
15
    AND SEEK EMPLOYMENT ELSEWHERE, BUT WISHED TO REMAIN IN HIS
16
    FRIENDSHIP.
17
                ONE OF THE PEOPLE WHO WAS PRESENT AT THE 6-24
18
    MEETING WAS A FELLOW NAMED STEVE TAGLIANETTI?
19
                  YES, I BELIEVE THAT IS CORRECT.
20
                  AND SUBSEQUENT TO THE 6-24 MEETING, DID HE STOP
21
    WORKING FOR THE BBC?
22
                 YES, HE DID.
            Д
23
                  AND WAS HE IN FACT FIRED BY MR. HUNT?
            Q
24
                  THAT IS MY UNDERSTANDING, YES.
            А
25
                  AND COULD YOU TELL ME WHY HE GOT FIRED?
            Q
26
                  I HAVE NO IDEA.
            Α
27
                  BUT YOU KNOW IN FACT THAT WAS A DECISION MADE
28
     BY HUNT, THAT HE GET OUT OF THE BBC?
```

1	A I DON'T KNOW THAT THAT IS A FACT.								
2	IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT JOE FIRED HIM.								
3	Q AND [SUPPOSE, BASED ON WHAT YOU COULD OBSERVE,								
4	HUNT WAS AWARE THAT HE KNEW ABOUT THE INFORMATION GIVEN HIM								
5	AT THE 6-24 MEETING?								
6	A THAT'S CORRECT.								
7	Q DID YOU EVER SAY TO YOUR FRIEND AT THAT POINT,								
8	HUNT, WELL, LISTEN, IF YOU FIRE TAGLIANETTI, HE MAY GO TELL								
9	SOMEBODY ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED AT THAT 6-24 MEETING?								
10	A I NEVER SAID THAT.								
11	Q DID ANYBODY TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE?								
12	A NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE.								
13	Q HUNT DID NOT EXPRESS CONCERN TO YOU ABOUT FIRING								
14	TAGLIANETTI?								
15	A I AT THAT TIME, IT SEEMED THAT IF HE HAD FIRED								
16	TAGLIANETTI THAT HE HAD DONE IT UNDER A SUFFICIENT SORT								
17	YOU KNOW, THAT HE HAD MADE IT CLEAR TO STEVE WHAT WOULD HAPPEN								
18	TO HIM IF HE WENT TO THE POLICE.								
19	Q AND YOU ASSUMED THAT?								
20	A I ASSUMED THAT, YES.								
21	Q YOU NEVER HEARD THAT CONVERSATION, DID YOU?								
22	A I NEVER HEARD THAT CONVERSATION.								
23	Q AND THAT IS SOMETHING YOU STILL ASSUME TODAY?								
24	A IT WOULD SEEM REASONABLE. I DON'T I DON'T								
25	IF YOU ASKED ME THAT, YES, I ASSUME THAT HE TOLD								
26	STEVE IN SO MANY WORDS THAT IF HE WENT TO THE POLICE, HE WOULD								
27	BE DEALT WITH OR REAFFIRMED WHAT HE STATED AT THE MEETING.								

I DON'T RECALL.

28

TO MR. HUNT?

MR. BARENS: A MOMENT, YOUR HONOR. 1 THE COURT: YES. 2 (PAUSE.) 3 BY MR. BARENS: WITH REFERENCE TO THE MICROGENESIS 4 TECHNOLOGY, DID HUNT HAVE SOME CONCERNS ABOUT SECURITY 5 REGARDING THE SAFETY OF THAT EQUIPMENT? 6 A YES HE DID. 7 AND DID HE FEEL SOMEONE WAS TRYING TO TAKE THAT 8 EQUIPMENT FROM HIM? 9 MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION, CALLING FOR SPECULATION AS TO 10 WHAT --11 MR. BARENS: I AM ASKING BASED ON CONVERSATIONS THAT 12 HE WAS A PARTY TO. 13 THE COURT: DID HE EVER EXPRESS TO YOU ANY CONCERN ABOUT 14 SOMEBODY TAKING --15 THE WITNESS: I KNOW VERY LATE, AFTER TOM AND DAVE AND 16 17 JEFF HAD I GUESS, SORT OF BROKEN OFF FROM THE BBC, I DON'T RECALL HIM EXPRESSING ANY CONCERN TO ME -- YES. ACTUALLY, 18 19 I DO. YES. HE DID HAVE SOME CONCERNS. Q BY MR. BARENS: WHAT CONCERNS WERE THOSE, SIR? 20 21 I THINK HE HAD CONCERNS THAT TOM AND DAVID MAY AND JEFF RAYMOND MAY HAVE BEEN TRYING TO STEAL THE TECHNOLOGY. 22 23 DID IT TURN OUT THAT IN FACT, THEY HAD AT LEAST, 24 SECRETED THE TECHNOLOGY, IF NOT STOLEN IT? 25 THEY CERTAINLY TOOK POSSESSION OF SOME OF THE 26 MACHINERY.

Q AND PLACED IT SO THAT THE WHEREABOUTS WERE UNKNOWN

27

28

THE BURGLARY?

MR. BARENS: I AM ASKING IF HUNT EVER EXPRESSED IT. 1 MR. WAPNER: IT IS A HEARSAY STATEMENT OF THE DEFENDANT. 2 THE COURT: WELL, I WILL LET HIM ANSWER THAT. 3 THE WITNESS: I THINK THERE WERE A LOT OF PEOPLE WHO 4 WERE SUSPECTED OF TAKING. SO THE ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION, 5 IS YES. HE DID. I RECALL HIM EXPRESSING SOMETHING. 6 BY MR. BARENS: WHAT DID HE SAY, SIR? Q 7 A I THINK AT ONE POINT IN TIME HE EXPRESSED SOME 8 CONCERN THAT IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN TOM AND DAVE. 9 AT ANOTHER POINT IN TIME. HE EXPRESSED SOME 10 CONCERN IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN JERRY EISENBERG. 11 THE COURT: THAT WAS WHAT? HE WAS THE COMPANY LAWYER, 12 WAS HE? 13 THE WITNESS: HE WAS GENERAL COUNSEL AND MICHAEL FELDMAN. 14 THE COURT: WHO? 15 16 THE WITNESS: HE WAS AN ACCOUNTANT WITH THE COMPANY. AND ALSO THERE WAS SOMEBODY WHO WE OWED SOME -- WE BOUGHT 17 A TYPEWRITER FROM SOME COMPANY AND FOR SOME REASON OR ANOTHER. 18 THEY WERE UNHAPPY WITH HOW WE WERE PAYING THEM OR WE REFUSED 19 20 TO PAY THEM OR SOMETHING. THE GUY SAID THAT HE WAS GOING TO GET EVEN. 21 22 SO JOE EXPRESSED SOME CONCERN THAT IT MIGHT HAVE 23 BEEN HIM. 24 Q BY MR. BARENS: THOSE SEEMED TO BE THE PEOPLE 25 THAT HE MENTIONED THAT HE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT THAT COMMITTED

A THAT HE EXPRESSED MIGHT HAVE COMMITTED THAT BURGLARY, YES.

1 WAS JERRY EISENBERG FIRED? Q 2 А TO MY KNOWLEDGE, YES. 3 WHO FIRED HIM? 4 TO MY KNOWLEDGE, JOSEPH HUNT. 5 IT WAS AFTER THAT EVENT? Q -YES, IT WAS -- IT WAS EITHER THE WEEKEND BEFORE 6 7 OR DURING THE WEEK AFTER. 8 0 DID THE COMMENT HUNT MADE ABOUT THE MAY BROTHERS 9 PERHAPS HAVING COMMITTED THE BURGLARY, WAS THE SENSE OF IT 10 YOU GOT, THAT THE MAY BROTHERS MAY HAVE ACTED IN CONJUNCTION 11 WITH EISENBERG, IN HUNT'S OPINION? 12 I HAVE NO RECOLLECTION OF THAT. 13 AND HAD HUNT EVER LOANED YOU ANY MONEY? 14 I DON'T RECALL HUNT EVER LOANING ME ANY MONEY. 15 THAT IS, VERSUS JOSEPH HUNT GIVING ME MONEY? 16 MR. BARENS: OKAY. IF I MIGHT APPROACH THE WITNESS, 17 YOUR HONOR? 18 THE COURT: YES. ALL RIGHT. 19 BY MR. BARENS: SIR, I AM HANDING YOU A DOCUMENT 20 CAPTIONED "PROMISSORY NOTE." WOULD YOU TELL US WHAT THAT 21 IS ABOUT? 22 Α YES. THIS IS A PROMISSORY NOTE MADE BY MF 23 BENEFITING JOSEPH HUNT DATED ON THE SAME DAY OF THE -- DATED 24 THE 8TH OF NOVEMBER, 1983, FOR \$5,250. 25 Q AND WHO SEEMED TO GET WHAT, PURSUANT TO THAT? 26 THE PAYEE WOULD BE JOSEPH HUNT AND I WOULD BE 27 THE MAKER OF THE PROMISSORY NOTE. SO JOE WOULD GET THE MONEY 28 AND I WOULD PAY IT TO HIM.

3 F

Q	DID	ΗE	LOAN	YOU	MONEY	ΙN	CONJUNCTION	WITH	THAT
---	-----	----	------	-----	-------	----	-------------	------	------

- A NO HE DID NOT.
- Q WHY DID YOU WRITE A PROMISSORY NOTE FOR MONEY THAT YOU HAD NOT RECEIVED, SIR?

A IT WAS A PART OF THE WHOLE SYSTEM DEALING WITH THE PROXIES.

Q AND WHY DON'T YOU TELL US --

THE COURT: DID HE GIVE YOU THE MONEY? DID YOU PUT IT IN YOUR POCKET? IS THAT IT?

THE WITNESS: HE NEVER GAVE ME ANY MONEY.

Q BY MR. BARENS: SO, WHEN WAS THIS DONE?

A WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IS THAT I THINK SELDON WAS GOING TO -- BEFORE SELDON ISSUED THE STOCK TO ME, IT WAS GOING TO BUY UP THE NOTES AND THEN FOR SOME -- IT WAS A WHOLE -- I DON'T RECALL THE EXACT SYSTEM.

BUT IT WAS A WHOLE, ELABORATE SYSTEM DEALING WITH CONSIDERATION, SO THAT WITHOUT ACTUALLY PUTTING IN MONEY INTO SELDON -- THAT WAS HOW SELDON WAS GOING TO BUY CERTIFICATES IN MICROGENESIS, BY BUYING THOSE NOTES AND THEN IT WAS A WHOLE, ELABORATE SYSTEM THAT JOSEPH HUNT CREATED FOR IT.

```
AN ELABORATE SYSTEM TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE SOME-
 1
           Q
 2
    THING HAD OCCURRED THAT IN FACT WAS MERELY A PAPER TRANSACTION?
 3
           А
                 CORRECT.
 4
                AS OPPOSED TO ANYTHING OF SUBSTANCE; IS THAT
 5
    CORRECT?
 6
           A THAT'S CORRECT.
 7
           MR. BARENS: NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
 8
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. REDIRECT?
 9
           MR. WAPNER: YES. THANK YOU.
10
11
                         REDIRECT EXAMINATION
12
    BY MR. WAPNER:
13
           Q AT THE MEETING OF JUNE THE 24TH, THERE WAS A
14
    STATEMENT BY MR. HUNT THAT WAS LIKE A PREAMBLE TO THE MEETING;
15
    IS THAT RIGHT?
16
           Α
                THAT'S CORRECT.
17
           Q
                 AND THAT WAS BEFORE THEY --
18
                 AFTER THEY CAME OUT OF THE BEDROOM THE FIRST
19
    TIME AND BEFORE THEY WENT IN THE SECOND TIME?
20
                 THAT'S CORRECT.
21
                 AND THAT WAS THE STATEMENT ABOUT ACHIEVING
22
    GREATNESS AND LAWS MIGHT HAVE TO BE BROKEN AND THINGS LIKE
23
    THAT?
24
           A THAT'S CORRECT.
25
           0
                HAD MR. HUNT EVER SAID ANYTHING SIMILAR TO THAT
26
    STATEMENT AT ANY OTHER TIME?
27
                THE EVENING BEFORE. THE EVENING BEFORE
28
    WE WERE ALL GOING TO GO OUT TOGETHER. IT WAS A SATURDAY
```

```
EVENING, BUT HE WAS NOT AMONG THOSE PEOPLE AND HE HAD GONE
 1
 2
     INTO THAT PREAMBLE AGAIN BUT HE WAS INTERRUPTED BY SOME OF
 3
     MY FRIENDS.
 4
            Q
                  DID HE EVER GET TO FINISH IT?
 5
                  NO, NOT THAT EVENING. NO.
6
                  SO WHAT HE SAID TO YOU THE NIGHT BEFORE WAS THE
7
     BEGINNING OF WHAT HE SAID THE NEXT DAY?
 8
                  IT WAS ALSO REPEATED THE NEXT DAY ALSO, YES.
9
            MR. BARENS: I AM A BIT VAGUE, JUDGE, AS TO WHAT WE
10
    ARE TALKING ABOUT, WHAT STATEMENT?
11
            THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WILL YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION
12
    AS TO EXACTLY WHAT WAS SAID?
13
                  BY MR. WAPNER: WHAT WAS THE STATEMENT AT THE
14
    MEETING THAT HE MADE AFTER HE, JIM GRAHAM OR PITTMAN, DEAN
15
    KARNY AND BEN DOSTI CAME OUT OF THE ROOM FOR THE FIRST TIME?
16
                 HE STARTED DISCUSSING THAT TO ACHIEVE OR HOLD
17
    ONTO WEALTH, GREAT WEALTH, YOU MUST SOMETIMES TRANSGRESS THE
18
    LAW AND IF YOU ARE UNWILLING TO DO THAT, THEN YOU WILL END
19
    UP HAVING -- YOU WON'T BE ABLE TO ACHIEVE THIS WEALTH AND
20
    IF YOU DO, IT WILL JUST BE TAKEN AWAY FROM YOU. AND THAT
21
    WAS THE FIRST PART, THAT WAS THE BEGINNING OF IT.
22
            0
                 HAD HE EVER SAID THAT TO YOU BEFORE?
23
                  YES, HE HAD BEGUN THAT DISCUSSION TO ME THE
24
    EVENING BEFORE.
25
            Q
                 AND HOW FAR DID HE GET?
26
            Α
                  TO ABOUT THAT PART.
27
            Q
                  WHAT HAPPENED?
```

WE WERE INTERRUPTED BY -- WE WERE ALONE IN MY

1 APARTMENT AT THAT TIME AND THEN SOME OTHER PEOPLE CAME OVER. AND YOU DIDN'T HEAR ANYTHING MORE ABOUT THAT 2 3 THE NIGHT BEFORE THE MEETING? THAT'S CORRECT. 5 WHEN YOU FIRST HEARD MR. HUNT TALK ABOUT THE BBC AND THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY, YOU SAID THAT YOU WERE 6 ENTHRALLED WITH THE SOCIAL END AND THE BUSINESS END AND THE 7 8 ACHIEVEMENT OF GREATNESS, THE STATEMENT THAT HE MADE ABOUT 9 THE ACHIEVEMENT OF GREATNESS? 10 Α THAT'S CORRECT. 11 Q WHEN WAS THAT, FIRST OF ALL? 12 А THIS WAS NOVEMBER OF 1982. 13 AND WHAT EFFECT DID MR. HUNT'S PERSONALITY HAVE 14 ON YOU AT THAT TIME IN TERMS OF HOW PERSUASIVE HE WAS TO YOU, 15 HOW MUCH YOU BELIEVED HIM? 16 IT WAS -- IT WAS THE WAY HE PRESENTED IT THAT 17 MADE IT SO BELIEVABLE AND SO PERSUASIVE. 18 Q AND HOW WAS THAT? 19 IT WAS JUST -- IT WAS HIS ABILITY, I MEAN, TO 20 SPEAK, THINGS SOUNDED -- SOUNDED VERY GOOD. 21 HIS ABILITY TO USE RHETORIC? 22 YES, HIS RHETORIC ABILITY WAS VERY IMPORTANT 23 IN MY BEING ENTHRALLED WITH THE BBC. 24 AND DID YOU AT SOME POINT, COME TO HAVE SOME 25 VIEW OF THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY THAT WAS CONSISTENT WITH MR. 26 HUNT'S ABILITY TO USE RHETORIC? 27 WELL, IT WAS -- IT WAS SORT OF HIS DISCUSSIONS

OF PARADOX PHILOSOPHY, HIS STATEMENTS OF WHAT IT WAS AND SORT

1 OF HIS, ALMOST AS A MODEL, THAT BECAME MY UNDERSTANDING OF 2 PARADOX PHILOSOPHY. AND AS YOU WERE REFLECTING BACK ON IT NOW, WAS THERE 3 SUCH A THING AS A PARADOX PHILOSOPHY? 4 5 NOT REALLY. NOW AS I REFLECT BACK ON IT, PARADOX PHILOSOPHY 6 7 WAS SIMPLY A TOOL THAT MR. HUNT USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH HIS 8 EXCELLENT RHETORICAL ABILITY TO SIMPLY PERSUADE PEOPLE THAT WHATEVER HE WANTED THEM TO DO WAS CORRECT. 10 MR. BARENS: OBJECTION ON THE BASIS OF CONCLUSION, 11 YOUR HONOR. 12 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 13 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 14 BY MR. WAPNER: WHEN THE POLICE CAME TO JOE HUNT'S 15 CONDOMINIUM ON OCTOBER THE 7TH, DID YOU STILL FEEL THAT HE 16 WAS A GREAT MAN? 17 A AT THAT -- AT THAT POINT, I WAS BEGINNING --18 YOU KNOW, JUST BECAUSE OF THINGS THAT HAD OCCURRED, LET'S 19 SAY, HIS STATURE IN MY MIND WAS BEGINNING TO DECREASE. 20 I ALSO FELT KIND OF BETRAYED BECAUSE I THINK 21 HE KNEW THE POLICE WERE GOING TO BE THERE AND THE APARTMENT 22 WAS GOING TO BE SEARCHED AND HE SORT -- HE JUST ASKED ME TO 23 STAY THERE AND I WAS KIND OF UPSET WITH THAT ALSO. 24 WHEN DID HE ASK YOU TO STAY THERE? 0 25 THAT WAS ACTUALLY THE SECOND NIGHT, I THINK --26 APPROXIMATELY TWO PREVIOUS NIGHTS, ON FRIDAY NIGHT, HE HAD ALSO 27 ASKED ME TO STAY THERE. 28

(UNREPORTED COLLOQUY BETWEEN COUNSEL.)

Q BY MR. WAPNER: WHEN YOU WENT TO THE POLICE IN DECEMBER OF 1984, DID YOU STILL THINK THAT JOE HUNT WAS A GREAT MAN? A NO, I DID NOT. Q WHY NOT? IN LOOKING AT WHAT HE HAD DONE AND THE THINGS --MR. BARENS: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. MAY WE APPROACH THE BENCH? THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 21 .

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD

AT THE BENCH:)

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, AS YOU ARE AWARE AT THIS POINT OF THE TRIAL, WE HAVE NOT PUT MR. HUNT'S CHARACTER IN ISSUE, AS WE HAVE NOT PUT ON A DEFENSE, AS YET.

WE HAVE NOW ASKED THE WITNESS -- OR THE

PROSECUTION HAS NOW ASKED THE WITNESS TO GIVE A SUMMARY OF

HIS ASSESSMENT OF MR. HUNT'S GENERAL CHARACTER, GENERAL

CONDUCT, GENERAL DEPORTMENT. AND THE WAY THAT HE HAD --

THE COURT: THE QUESTIONS THAT YOU HAVE BEEN ASKING EXPLORE HIS STATE OF MIND. THOSE ARE THE THINGS YOU HAVE BEEN GOING INTO IN GREAT DETAIL OF EVERY WITNESS.

MR. WAPNER: NOT ONLY THAT, YOUR HONOR, IT IS IN DIRECT RESPONSE TO A STATEMENT THE WITNESS MADE DURING CROSS-EXAMINATION.

MR. BARENS: WELL, HE HAS NOW ASKED HIM A SUMMARY, WHICH
I DO NOT BELIEVE IS RELEVANT, YOUR HONOR.

HE IS ASKING HIM TO SUMMARIZE HOW HE FELT ABOUT MR. HUNT WHEN HE WENT TO THE POLICE AND --

THE COURT: ON CROSS-EXAMINATION YOU HAVE BEEN ASKING ANY NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ABOUT HIS STATE OF MIND IN THAT RESPECT.

MR. CHIER: BUT --

THE COURT: IF YOU DON'T TELL HIM TO SHUT UP, I WILL

GET THE BAILIFF TO SIT HIM ON THE CHAIR AND TELL HIM TO KEEP

QUIET.

MR. BARENS: YOU JUST KEEP STILL.

THEN, COULD I HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TO MR. CHIER BEFORE WE CONCLUDE?

THE COURT: CERTAINLY. ALL THROUGH YOUR CROSSEXAMINATION, ANY NUMBER OF TIMES, YOU HAVE ASKED HIM ABOUT
HIS OPINIONS AS TO HIS REACTIONS TOWARD HUNT, DID HE LIKE
HIM OR DIDN'T HE LIKE HIM. WHAT DID HE THINK. ALL OF THAT
WAS ON CROSS-EXAMINATION.

HE HAS A RIGHT TO REDIRECT, TO ASK HIM WHEN, IF AT ANY TIME, HE CHANGED HIS MIND ABOUT HIM.

MR. BARENS: IF THAT IS ALL WE ARE GOING TO BE DOING, I WOULD NOT BE HERE. WHAT HE IS ASKING HIM NOW, HE IS NOT ASKING HIM, DID HE CHANGE HIS MIND. HE IS ASKING HIM, WHAT DID YOU THINK OF THE TYPE OF GUY HE WAS WHEN YOU WENT TO THE POLICE. THAT IS THE QUESTION THAT IS ASKED.

THE COURT: NO. HE ASKED HIM WHETHER HE THOUGHT HE WAS A GREAT MAN.

MR. WAPNER: RIGHT.

THE COURT: OBJECTION OVERRULED.

MR. BARENS: NOW HE IS ASKING HIM, WHAT DID YOU THINK OF MR. HUNT, THEN TRYING TO GET HIM TO MAKE SOME STATEMENT TO THE JURY ABOUT HIS ASSESSMENT OF HUNT'S CHARACTER. THAT IS WHAT IS GOING ON.

THE COURT: I THINK IT WAS SUFFICIENTLY EXPLORED ON CROSS-EXAMINATION. I THINK THIS IS REDIRECT. IT IS PROPER.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: NOW YOU CAN TALK TO HIM.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU.

₊ - 3

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD AT THE BENCH:)

2

3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THAT WAS ABOVE AND BEYOND. YOUR HONOR. WE HAVE JUST HAD A PENALTY PHASE-TYPE DIALOGUE FROM THE WITNESS. I WOULD URGE YOUR HONOR, IN ORDER TO PRESERVE A FAIR TRIAL HERE, TO INSTRUCT THE JURY TO DISREGARD THOSE COMMENTS ABOUT LIVES HE DESTROYED.

THE COURT: ABOUT WHAT?

MR. BARENS: ABOUT LIVES HE DESTROYED.

THE COURT: I WILL STRIKE THAT PART OF IT.

MR. BARENS: I WOULD APPRECIATE IT, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS A BIT MUCH.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. OKAY. ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

MR. WAPNER: I HAVE NOTHING TO SAY.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD

IN OPEN COURT:)

THE COURT: THE JURY WILL DISREGARD THE STATEMENT ABOUT THE "LIVES HE HAS DESTROYED."

GO AHEAD.

BY MR. WAPNER: MR. DICKER, YOU WERE ASKED IF MR. HUNT EVER HELD HIMSELF OUT TO YOU OR TO ANYONE ELSE AS A SHADING. DO YOU KNOW WHETHER HE DID?

I ACTUALLY -- YES, I BELIEVE THAT HE HAD AT TIMES, NOT OFTEN. BUT --

Q DID YOU EVER SEE ANY STATIONERY THAT HE HAD THAT SAID, "JOE HUNT, SHADING," ON IT?

YES I DID. Α 1 SHOWING YOU PEOPLE'S 94 FOR IDENTIFICATION, 2 REFERRING TO THE THIRD PAGE OF THAT DOCUMENT, DO YOU RECOGNIZE 3 THIS STATIONERY ON WHICH THAT LETTER IS TYPED? 4 A IT STATES, "JOSEPH HUNT, SHADING," AND I DO 5 RECOGNIZE IT. 6 THE COURT: "JOSEPH HUNT, SHADING", IS THAT IT? 7 THE WITNESS: YES, "JOSEPH HUNT, SHADING." 8 BY MR. WAPNER: WHERE HAVE YOU SEEN IT BEFORE? Q 9 I HAVE SEEN IT BEFORE AT THE OFFICE. 10 MR. WAPNER: MAY I JUST PASS IT BRIEFLY IN FRONT OF 11 THE JURY, YOUR HONOR? 12 THE COURT: YES. 13 (PAUSE.) 14 BY MR. WAPNER: WHEN MR. HUNT MENTIONED TO YOU 15 16 IN THE PRESENCE OF SOME OTHER PEOPLE THAT HE HAD THIS PLAN WHERE HE WAS GOING TO KILL JEFF RAYMOND'S GIRLFRIEND AND BLAME 17 THAT MURDER AND MR. LEVIN'S MURDER ON JEFF RAYMOND, HOW COME 18 YOU DIDN'T SAY ANYTHING TO HIM? 19 A AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME, I WAS A LITTLE SHOCKED 20 21 AND I KNEW NOTHING WAS GOING TO HAPPEN FOR A WHILE. I KIND OF WANTED TO SEE WHAT OTHER PEOPLE FELT ABOUT IT BEFORE 22 23 APPROACHING HIM. 24 25 26 27

Q WHAT EFFECT DID IT HAVE ON YOU, THE FACT THAT
THE PERSON MAKING THE STATEMENT WAS JOE HUNT AND NOT
SOMEBODY ELSE?

A IT STILL AT THAT POINT IN TIME, I WAS A LITTLE
IN AWE AND MAYBE NOT AS QUICK TO REACT ADVERSELY TO A
STATEMENT HE MADE.

Q WHEN YOU SAID YOU KNEW IT WASN'T GOING TO HAPPEN RIGHT AWAY, WHAT DID YOU MEAN?

A THERE WERE A LOT OF -- I DON'T RECALL THE

SPECIFICS OF THE PLAN -- BUT I RECALL THAT IT WAS SOMEWHAT

COMPLICATED AND THAT THEY WEREN'T JUST GOING TO RUN OUT AFTER

LUNCH AND SHOOT RENEE.

Q WHEN THAT WAS DISCUSSED, WHO ELSE WAS PRESENT?

A MY RECOLLECTION IS MR. HUNT WAS PRESENT AND

MR. ALLEN AND MR. KARNY MAY HAVE BEEN PRESENT AND MR. LOPEZ -
AND I DON'T THINK MR. LOPEZ WAS PRESENT THAT MORNING BUT HE

WAS LATER ON INFORMED OF THE PLAN.

Q SO IT WAS JUST HUNT, YOU, DEAN KARNY AND JOHN ALLEN?

A I BELIEVE MR. ALLEN AND MR. KARNY WERE PRESENT.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE YESTERDAY I OBJECTED,

AND I WANT TO REITERATE TODAY AS TO THIS PORTION OF THE

TESTIMONY, THE DEFENSE HAS A 352 AND 1100 OBJECTION TO THE

SUBJECT MATTER OF THIS DIALOGUE.

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO BE HEARD AGAIN?

MR. BARENS: IF YOU WOULD, YOUR HONOR.

THEE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

^

AT THE BENCH:)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

YOUR HONOR, WE HAVE NOW HAD --

THE COURT: ANOTHER THING, DON'T THANK ME WHEN I MAKE A FAVORABLE OR UNFAVORABLE RULING OR THANK THE JURORS. DON'T SAY GOOD MORNING OR GOOD AFTERNOON. YOU ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO DO THAT. YOU ARE A VERY POLITE MAN AND I APPRECIATE POLITENESS. AND I WOULD SUGGEST YOU DON'T DO IT.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD

MR. BARENS: IT IS A HABIT I HAVE AFTER 20 YEARS OF DOING THAT.

THE COURT: I KNOW IT BUT THERE ARE SOME ETHICAL RULES ABOUT THAT AND THEY SAY YOU SHOULDN'T DO IT, CURRYING FAVOR OF THE WITNESSES OR THE JURY.

MR. BARENS: I DON'T MEAN TO CURRY FAVOR.

THE COURT: I KNOW THAT YOU DON'T.

I DON'T WANT YOU TO BE IMPOLITE BUT DON'T BE POLITE.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, YOUR HONOR. BE THAT AS IT MAY, YOUR HONOR, THEY HAVE NOW PUT ON EVIDENCE ABOUT ANOTHER ALLEGED MURDER PLOT, WHICH DOES NOT IN ANY WAY GO TO PROVE ANY FACTS IN ISSUE IN THIS CASE. IT DOESN'T GO TO PROVE THAT MR. LEVIN WAS KILLED OR NOT KILLED.

IT GOES ONLY TO ASSASSINATE MR. HUNT'S CHARACTER.

WE WOULD HAVE A MOTION TO STRIKE ALL OF THE TESTIMONY BOTH YESTERDAY AND TODAY CONCERNING THIS OTHER ALLEGED MURDER.

I BELIEVE THERE IS GOOD AND AMPLE PRECEDENT

YOUR HONOR, FOR THE PROPOSITION THAT ALLOWING THE PROSECUTION TO INTRODUCE EVIDENCE OF ANOTHER UNPROVEN MURDER OR ANOTHER PLANNED MURDER IS GROUNDS FOR A MISTRIAL. I BELIEVE WE ARE IN THE SAME POSITION, CERTAINLY NO BETTER THAN THE MATTERS THAT COULD BE ASSERTED AS AGAINST MR. KARNY IN THAT UNPROVEN HOLLYWOOD INCIDENT, THAT WE WILL NOT DEAL WITH IN THIS TRIAL IN ANY RESPECT. THE COURT: ABOUT KARNY, WHAT? MR. BARENS: THAT MATTER THAT HE MAY HAVE BEEN A SUSPECT AT ONE POINT IN TIME, YOUR HONOR. REMEMBER THAT

MR. BARENS: THAT MATTER THAT HE MAY HAVE BEEN A

SUSPECT AT ONE POINT IN TIME, YOUR HONOR. REMEMBER THAT

DIALOGUE, THAT WE ARE NOT GOING TO REFERENCE IN THIS TRIAL?

AND I DO NOT MEAN TO REFERENCE FACTUALLY. BUT ONLY FOR

BACKGROUND, YOUR HONOR, IN THIS CONTEXT.

THE COURT: WELL, IF YOU HAVE TESTIMONY KARNY SAID HE INTENDED TO MURDER THIS GUY IN HOLLYWOOD, YOU CAN GO AHEAD AND GIVE EVIDENCE THAT HE SAID HE WOULD DO IT IF YOU WANT TO.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE POINT WE GET TO MORE SPECIFICALLY IS RELEVANCE. AS A MATTER OF FACT --

MR. WAPNER: I AM SORRY. I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND THAT LAST RULING.

THE COURT: WHICH RULING?

MR. WAPNER: ABOUT HOLLYWOOD.

THE COURT: I SAID THAT IF HE HAS TESTIMONY THAT KARNY SAID TO ANYBODY "I KILLED THIS GUY IN HOLLYWOOD," GO AHEAD AND DO IT.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY.

MR. BARENS: I THINK YOUR HONOR SPEAKS IN JEST TO A DEGREE.

```
THE COURT: I AM NOT TALKING IN JEST. YOU GO AHEAD
 1
      AND PRODUCE THAT EVIDENCE IF YOU HAVE ANY.
 2
            MR. BARENS: I CAN'T GET DISCOVERY OF THAT MATERIAL,
 3
      AS YOUR HONOR IS AWARE AND IF I CAN'T GET DISCOVERY, I DON'T
 4
      KNOW WHAT THAT IS.
 5
           THE COURT: LET'S GET ON WITH THIS. WHAT IS YOUR
 6
      REPLY TO THAT?
 7
           MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, IT IS NOT LIKE WE GRATUITOUSLY
 8
      THREW IN A COMMENT THAT HE PLANNED TO KILL SOMEBODY ELSE.
9
      THE STATEMENT IS "WE WILL DISPOSE OF THIS GIRL AND PLANT THAT
10
     MURDER AND LEVIN'S MURDER ON RAYMOND" BY SOMEHOW PLANTING
11
12
      THE TELEVISION CHANGER AND THE SHEET ON RAYMOND.
                 NOW, THAT IS A STATEMENT THAT, ONE, ADMITS
13
     MR. HUNT IS NOW SAYING "LEVIN IS DEAD AND I AM GOING TO TAKE
14
     SUSPICION AWAY FROM MYSELF BY BLAMING THE MURDER ON SOMEONE
15
16
     ELSE."
                  SO IT IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THIS CASE.
17
18
           THE COURT: I THINK SO, TOO.
19
                  YOUR MOTION WILL BE DENIED.
20
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
21
           THE COURT: YOU ARE WELCOME. THANK YOU.
22
                  (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD
23
                 IN OPEN COURT:)
24
                BY MR. WAPNER: CAN YOU PLACE AT ANY POINT IN
           Q
25
     TIME A TIME WHEN YOU STOPPED BELIEVING IN THE PARADOX
26
     PHILOSOPHY?
27
           A I THINK IT WAS A GRADUAL PROCESS, TAKING MOST
```

OF THE LATTER -- THE LATER PORTION OF 1984 AND BY NOVEMBER

1	I GENERALLY DID NOT BELIEVE IN PARADOX PHILOSOPHY.
2	Q DO YOU RECALL MR. HUNT BEING ARRESTED FOR THE
3	FIRST TIME APPROXIMATELY SEPTEMBER 28?
4	A I RECALL HIM BEING ARRESTED FOR THE FIRST TIME
5	THE END OF SEPTEMBER, BEGINNING OF OCTOBER, YES.
6	Q WAS HE RELEASED VERY SHORTLY THEREAFTER?
7	A I THINK WITHIN A WEEK.
8	Q AFTER HE WAS ARRESTED THE FIRST TIME, WHAT DID
9	YOU DO, IF ANYTHING, OR HOW IN ANY WAY DID YOUR ASSOCIATION
10	OR RELATIONSHIP WITH HIM CHANGE?
11	A WELL, DURING THE PERIOD BETWEEN HIS ARRESTS, I
12	DECIDED TO STOP WORKING IN THE OFFICE AND I DIDN'T FEEL AS
13	CLOSE OF AN ASSOCIATION WITH HIM AS I HAD IN THE PAST.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

SIDE, DO YOU SEE THAT DATE?

Q AND WHAT WAS IT THAT CAUSED YOU NOT TO HAVE AS 1 CLOSE AN ASSOCIATION WITH HIM AS YOU HAD HAD IN THE PAST? 2 3 MR. BARENS: WE HAVE AN OBJECTION. RELEVANCY, YOUR HONOR. 5 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 6 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU. THE WITNESS: I WAS UNCOMFORTABLE ABOUT MANY OF THE 8 THINGS THAT WERE OCCURRING AND ALSO TO SOME DEGREE, MY 9 PARTICIPATION IN THEM. 10 I DIDN'T LIKE A LOT OF THE THINGS THAT WERE BEING 11 TALKED ABOUT. I FELT UNCOMFORTABLE ABOUT THEM. 12 I JUST WISHED TO START TO DISTANCE MYSELF --13 BETWEEN MYSELF AND MR. HUNT. 14 Q BY MR. WAPNER: AND MR. HUNT WAS ARRESTED AGAIN 15 APPROXIMATELY OCTOBER 22ND, IS THAT RIGHT? 16 A THAT SOUNDS LIKE IT COULD BE CORRECT, WITHIN 17 THAT PERIOD OF TIME. 18 Q I SHOWED -- IF I SHOWED YOU AN ARREST WITH THAT 19 DATE ON IT, WOULD YOU SAY THAT IT WAS CORRECT? 20 YES, I WOULD. 21 IN ANY EVENT, AFTER HE WAS ARRESTED THE SECOND 22 TIME, DID HE REMAIN IN CUSTODY FOR A PERIOD OF TIME? 23 YES. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT HE WAS IN А 24 CUSTODY FOR A PERIOD OF TIME. 25 AND SHOWING YOU WHAT APPEARS TO BE AN ARREST 26 REPORT AND BOOKING FORM AND DIRECTING YOUR ATTENTION TO A 27 DATE APPROXIMATELY A THIRD OF THE WAY DOWN ON THE LEFT-HAND

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

YES, I DO.

DOES THAT REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION TO THE DATE 0 MR. HUNT WAS ARRESTED FOR THE SECOND TIME?

> YES, IT DOES. Α

WHAT WAS THAT DATE? Q

THAT DATE IS OCTOBER 22ND, 1984.

AND DID YOU HAVE MUCH DIRECT CONTACT WITH MR. HUNT AFTER HE WAS IN CUSTODY?

I MAY HAVE HAD A PHONE CALL, ONE OR TWO PHONE CALLS FROM HIM FROM JAIL.

AND AFTER HE WAS -- BETWEEN THE TIME THAT HE WAS ARRESTED ON OCTOBER THE 22ND AND THE TIME THAT YOU WENT TO THE POLICE ON DECEMBER THE 7TH, DID YOU CONTINUE -- WHAT WAS YOUR THOUGHT PROCESS WITH REGARD TO WHETHER OR NOT YOU WERE GOING TO GO TO THE POLICE AND IF SO, WHY?

MR. BARENS: OBJECTION, RELEVANCY, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

THE WITNESS: IT WOULD PROBABLY BY I WOULD SAY, THE END OF OCTOBER, I FELT THAT GOING TO THE POLICE -- EXCUSE IT WAS THE MIDDLE OF NOVEMBER. I HAD PRETTY WELL CONCLUDED THAT IT WAS THE CORRECT THING, TO GO TO THE POLICE AND THAT THE THINGS I HAD DONE WERE WRONG AND I SHOULD SPEAK WITH THE POLICE AND BASICALLY SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT AND TELL THEM WHAT IT WAS I KNEW.

AND DID YOU AROUND THAT TIME, OBTAIN A LAWYER? I OBTAINED A LAWYER AT THE END OF NOVEMBER OF 1984.

> Q AND DID MR. HUNT'S ARREST AND THE FACT THAT HE

25

26

27

WAS NOT -- THAT HE WAS IN CUSTODY, HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH YOUR DECISION TO GO TO THE POLICE OR YOUR GRADUAL DECLINE AND YOUR BELIEF IN THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY?

A ONLY TO THE DEGREE THAT HIS NON-PRESENCE, HE WAS NO LONGER THERE AND A REASSURING FACTOR OR REAFFIRMING FACTOR.

HE WAS NOT THERE TO YOU KNOW, TALK TO ME ABOUT IT AND SORT OF KEEP ME IN LINE, TO SOME DEGREE. YES, IT DID.

Q WHAT WAS MR. PITTMAN'S ROLE IN THE BBC?

A IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT HE WAS IN CHARGE OF SECURITY.

28

1	Q WHAT DID THAT MEAN?
2	A WELL, BOTH THE PLANT AND THE OFFICES, THERE WERE
3	ALARM SYSTEMS. AND YOU KNOW, THERE WERE FENCES AND HE ALSO
4	RAN ERRANDS. BASICALLY, THAT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING OF HIS
5	ROLE.
6	Q DID YOU EVER SEE MR. PITTMAN WITH A PEN GUN?
7	A YES, I DID.
8	Q DID YOU EVER SEE HIM WITH ANOTHER
9	MR. BARENS: OBJECTION AS TO RELEVANCY. AND ALSO UNDE
10	352.
11	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
12	Q BY MR. WAPNER: DID YOU EVER SEE MR. PITTMAN
13	WITH ANOTHER GUN THAT WAS LIKE A FOUR-BARREL OR SOMETHING?
14	A YES, I DID. IT WAS A .357 WITH FOUR BARRELS
15	SO IT COULD HAVE FIRED FOUR BARRELS SIMULTANEOUSLY OR
16	INDIVIDUALLY.
17	MR. BARENS: WE HAVE A MOTION TO STRIKE THE LAST
18	ANSWER, YOUR HONOR. THERE IS NO CONNECTING EVIDENCE ON ANY
19	OF THAT.
20	THE COURT: OVERRULED. MOTION DENIED.
21	Q BY MR. WAPNER: TELL ME ABOUT THE BUSINESS, HOW
22	THE DIFFERENT BUSINESSES WITHIN THE BBC, WERE RUN IN
23	PRACTICAL EFFECT.
24	I AM NOT TALKING ABOUT THE STOCK CERTIFICATES
25	THAT WERE ISSUED. BUT IN TERMS OF THE DAY-TO-DAY OPERATIONS,
26	WHO WAS IN CHARGE OF RUNNING THE BUSINESSES OF THE BBC?

WHO WAS IN CHARGE OF THE BANK ACCOUNTS OF THE

JOE WAS.

```
BUSINESSES OF THE BBC?
1
 2
                  JOE WAS.
 3
                  THE MONEY THAT CAME TO BUY THE CARS FOR WESTCARS,
 4
    WHO PROVIDED THAT?
5
            Α
                  JOE DID.
 6
                 THE MONEY THAT CAME TO BUY THE PARTS TO BUILD
7
    THE CYCLATRON. WHO PROVIDED THAT?
8
                  BY "PROVIDING" DO YOU MEAN FROM THE BBC'S ACCOUNTS
9
    AS TO WHO ACTUALLY --
10
            0
                  WHERE DID THE MONEY COME FROM, IF YOU KNOW?
11
                 IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT IT WAS COMING FROM
12
    THE COMMODITIES TRADING AND OTHER INVESTORS.
13
            Q
                  AND SPEAKING OF THE COMMODITIES TRADING, IN TERMS
14
    OF BEING TOLD AT THE MEETING THAT THE CHECK FROM LEVIN WAS
15
    GIONG TO BE USED TO PAY OFF THE INVESTORS, WHAT INVESTORS
16
    WERE THEY TALKING ABOUT?
17
                 THE COMMODITIES INVESTORS.
18
            Q
                 NOT THE INVESTORS IN THE CYCLATRON?
19
                  CORRECT.
20
                  ALL RIGHT. SO THE MONEY FROM THAT, OSTENSIBLY
21
    WAS OBTAINED FOR AN OPTION IN MICROGENESIS AND WAS GOING TO
22
    BE USED TO PAY OFF INVESTORS IN A SPEARATE BUSINESS ENTIRELY?
23
           Α
                 THAT'S CORRECT.
24
                 ACCORDING TO THE WAY THE CORPORATIONS ARE SUPPOSED
            Q
25
    TO BE RUN, THAT IS NOT KOSHER?
26
                 NOT UNLESS ONE CORPORATION LENT MONEY TO ANOTHER
27
    CORPORATION, AFTER --
28
```

MR. BARENS: OBJECTION, NO FOUNDATION FOR THIS OPINION,

YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WELL, HE IS FAMILIAR WITH THE FINANCIAL -- WERE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE COMPANIES?

THE WITNESS: WELL, I AM FAMILIAR WITH HOW

CORPORATIONS ARE SUPPOSED TO TRANSACT BUSINESS AMONG THEMSELVES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

/

THAT THEY NEEDED MORE MONEY FOR PARTS ON THE CYCLATRON BUT

```
JUST GIVE MONEY TO DIFFERENT BBC MEMBERS.
 1
                  WHAT DO YOU MEAN "FOR DOING WELL"?
 2
                 WELL, IF THEY HAD DONE SOMETHING WELL OR JOE HAD
 3
      SAID THINGS ARE GOING WELL OR "YOU HAVE BEEN WORKING REALLY
     HARD," HE WOULD GIVE THEM MONEY.
 5
                  HOW MUCH ARE WE TALKING ABOUT?
            Q
 6
                  HUNDREDS OF DOLLARS.
7
                  DID THAT HAPPEN MORE THAN ONCE?
            Q
8
            Α
                  I RECALL IT ON A COUPLE OF OCCASIONS.
9
                  WHEN JOE HUNT CAME TO THE OFFICES OF --
            Q
10
                  (MR. CHIER EXITED THE COURTROOM.)
11
                  BY MR. WAPNER: -- WHEN HE CAME TO THE OFFICES
            Q
12
     OF THE BBC WITH THE CHECK FOR $1.5 MILLION IN HIS HAND, WITH
13
      A CONTRACT, DID YOU FEEL THAT HE WASN'T GOING TO GET ANY OF
14
      THIS MONEY?
15
16
           A NO, I DON'T -- I DON'T THINK I FELT THAT.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
```

```
DID YOU FEEL THERE WAS GOING TO BE A MEETING OF
1
     THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF SELDON THAT WAS GOING TO AUTHORIZE
2
     THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MICROGENESIS --
3
                EXCUSE ME. COULD YOU START WITH YOUR FIRST
4
     QUESTION? I THINK --
5
                DID YOU THINK THAT WHEN JOE HUNT SHOWED UP WITH
6
     THE MONEY, THE $1.5 MILLION CHECK AND THE CONTRACT THAT
7
     SOMEHOW IT WAS ALL GOING TO GO TO MICROGENESIS AND HE WASN'T
8
     GOING TO GET ANY OF IT?
9
           Α
                 NO.
10
                 HE -- I THOUGHT HE WAS GOING TO GET SOME OF THE
11
     MONEY, YES, AND IT WAS NOT ALL GOING TO GO TO MICROGENESIS.
12
                AND AS FAR AS WHO WAS ACTUALLY CONTROLLING
13
     MICROGENESIS, WHO WAS THAT?
14
           Α
                JOE WAS.
15
                AFTER THE DISCUSSION OF THE SHOPPING CENTER HAD
16
     FINALLY ENDED, THAT IS, YOU FINALLY REALIZED THERE WASN'T
17
     GOING TO BE ANY SHOPPING CENTER, DID YOU HEAR OF LEVIN AGAIN
18
     AFTER THAT UNTIL THE DATE OF JUNE THE 7TH?
19
           A NO, I DON'T RECALL.
20
           0
                WERE YOU GOING -
21
22
           MR. BARENS: I AM SORRY. I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE ANSWER.
     IT IS A DOUBLE, LIKE WE HAVE GOT A NO AND --
23
24
           THE COURT: CLEAR IT UP, WILL YOU?
25
           MR. WAPNER: I WILL TRY AND CLEAR IT UP.
26
             DOES THAT MEAN YOU DIDN'T HEAR OF LEVIN OR YOU
27
     DON'T REMEMBER WHETHER YOU DID OR NOT?
```

I HAVE NO RECOLLECTION OF HEARING OF LEVIN IN

```
ANY --
 1
                  I IMAGINE HIS NAME HAD TO HAVE COME UP IN SOME
 2
      CONTEXT. BUT I DON'T RECALL HEARING OF AN ONGOING
 3
      RELATIONSHIP OF -- I HAVE NO RECOLLECTION OF ANY ONGOING --
 4
      I AM TRYING TO THINK OF THE WORD -- SORT OF A HIGH LEVEL.
5
      RELATIONSHIP EXISTING BETWEEN RON LEVIN AND THE BBC.
 6
                  AND YOU SAW HIM IN THE BBC OFFICES ON ONE
            Q
7
      OCCASION?
8
                  I RECALL SEEING HIM ONLY ONCE IN THE BBC OFFICES.
9
                  APPROXIMATELY WHEN WAS THAT?
10
                 THAT WAS IN 1983, PROBABLY IN -- IN AUGUST,
11
      SEPTEMBER, OCTOBER.
12
                  IN 1984, DID YOU GO TO THE OFFICES OF THE BBC
13
     AS PRETTY MUCH OF AN EIGHT-HOUR JOB?
14
                  MORE OF ABOUT SEVEN HOURS.
15
16
            Q
                  WAS THAT PRETTY MUCH FIVE DAYS A WEEK?
                  YES, IT WAS FIVE DAYS A WEEK.
17
            Α
                  WERE YOU DOING THAT IN JUNE OF 1984?
18
            Q
                  YES, I WAS.
19
            Α
                  HAD YOU BEEN IN THE OFFICES EVERY DAY DURING THE
20
            0
21
     WEEK OF JUNE, THAT IS, JUNE THE 6TH IN THE MIDDLE OF THE
22
              THE BEGINNING, OF JUNE 3RD?
     WEEK OR
23
                  YES, I WAS.
            А
24
                  OR JUNE THE 4TH, I GUESS.
            Q
25
                  YES, I DID.
            Α
26
                  AND DO YOU RECALL GENERALLY WHAT TIME YOU GOT
            0
27
     TO WORK DURING THAT TIME?
28
                  I USUALLY WOULD GET TO WORK AROUND 10:00.
```

1 AND WHAT DID JOE HUNT SAY TO YOU? 2 JOE DISMISSED IT, OUT OF HAND. HE FELT -- YES, I 3 GOT THE IMPRESSION JOE FELT THAT RON COULDN'T CON HIM. 4 Q WHAT DID JOE HUNT DO OR SAY THAT LEFT YOU WITH 5 THAT IMPRESSION? 6 A I THINK HE SAID, "DON'T WORRY ABOUT IT. I CAN 7 HANDLE LEVIN," OR "RON." 8 Q DID HE SAY ANYTHING --9 THE COURT: I THINK WE'LL GIVE THE JURY A LITTLE BREAK. 10 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. 11 THE COURT: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, WE'LL 12 TAKE A RECESS AT THIS TIME. IT WILL BE 15 MINUTES. 13 THE SAME ADMONITION THAT I GAVE YOU WILL STILL 14 APPLY. 15 (RECESS.) 16 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU MAY CONTINUE. 17 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. 18 Q AT THE MEETING IN JUNE, DID YOU EVER HEAR JOE 19 HUNT USE AN EXAMPLE WITH THE GROUP THAT HAD SOMETHING TO DO 20 WITH THE MOVIE, RAMBO OR FIRST BLOOD? 21 A I DON'T RECALL IF IT WAS AT THE MEETING ON THE 22 24TH OF JUNE. 23 Q ALL RIGHT. DID YOU EVER HEAR HIM USE THAT AS 24 AN EXAMPLE? 25 A YES. 26 MR. BARENS: WE OBJECT, YOUR HONOR ON THE BASIS BOTH 27 OF RELEVANCE AND UNDER 352.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

Q

THE WITNESS: THERE WAS ONE THING IN THE MOVIE RAMBO, 1 2 WHERE RAMBO IS RUNNING THROUGH THE FOREST AND HE RAN INTO 3 A LITTLE KID. AND HE --4 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, COULD WE BE ADVISED AS TO 5 THE WITNESS, IS HE NOW TESTIFYING AS TO WHAT HE SAW IN THE 6 MOVIE OR AS TO WHAT HUNT TALKED ABOUT? 7 MR. WAPNER: I WILL BE HAPPY TO CLEAR THAT UP. 8 THE COURT: THERE HAS BEEN TESTIMONY ABOUT THIS 9 PARTICULAR INCIDENT, RAMBO. HAVE WE NOT ALREADY HEARD THAT 10 TESTIMONY? 11 MR. WAPNER: YES. I JUST WANTED TO ASK THE WITNESS 12 WHETHER HE HEARD IT AT THE MEETING OR SOME OTHER TIME. 13 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 14 BY MR. WAPNER: THIS WAS HAVING TO DO WITH SOME 15 SCENE IN RAMBO AND MR. HUNT'S OPINION OF WHAT THE CHARACTER 16 SHOULD HAVE DONE IN THE MOVIE? 17 THAT'S CORRECT. Α 18 Q DID HE EVER TALK TO YOU ABOUT THAT? 19 Α YES. HE DID. 20 DO YOU RECALL WHEN AND WHERE THAT CONVERSATION 21 WAS? 22 NO. I DON'T. А 23 AND SO WE ARE CLEAR THAT WE ARE DISCUSSING THE 24 SAME THING, THIS WAS A SCENE THAT HAS TO DO WITH SOME LITTLE 25 BOY AND RAMBO RUNNING ACROSS THE LITTLE BOY AND WHAT HE SHOULD 26 DO ABOUT THAT? 27 THAT'S CORRECT.

DID YOU SEE THE CONTRACT THAT RON LEVIN PURPORTEDLY

1 SIGNED THAT WE HAVE MARKED AS PEOPLE'S 58 FOR IDENTIFICATION? 2 IS THAT THE OPTION AGREEMENT? 3 Q YES. 4 YES, I HAVE. 5 AND IN THAT AGREEMENT, RON LEVIN APPARENTLY AGREES 6 TO PAY 1.5 MILLION FOR WHAT? 7 FOR THE RIGHTS, UPON PAYMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL 8 SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS. IF HE PAYS THE ADDITIONAL SEVEN MILLION 9 DOLLARS HE WILL ACTUALLY ACQUIRE THE RIGHTS FOR TEN YEARS. 10 BUT THE 1.5 MILLION, ONLY GIVES HIM THE PRIVILEGE Q 11 TO SPEND THE SEVEN MILLION LATER, RIGHT? 12 Α THAT'S CORRECT. 13 WAS THERE EVER ANY DISCUSSION BETWEEN YOU AND 14 MR. HUNT ABOUT WHAT YOU WERE GOING TO DO WITH THE SEVEN MILLION 15 THAT MR. LEVIN WAS GOING TO COME UP WITH? 16 I NEVER HAD ANY DISCUSSION WITH MR. HUNT WITH 17 REGARD TO US RECEIVING THE SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS. 18 WAS THERE ANY DISCUSSION WITH ANYBODY IN THE 0 19 BBC ABOUT WHAT YOU WERE GOING TO DO WITH THE MONEY COMING 20 FRCM LEVIN, THE SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS? 21 NOT THAT I EVER HEARD, NO. 22 AFTER YOU LEFT THE MEETING, DID YOU HAVE ANY 23 DISCUSSION AT ALL ONE WAY OR THE OTHER WITH ANYBODY ABOUT 24 WHAT THEY FELT ABOUT WHAT HAD GONE ON? 25 THERE WERE DISCUSSIONS WITH INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE Α 26 AT THE MEETING. SPECIFICALLY, I DON'T RECALL ANY, OTHER THAN 27 THE DISCUSSION I HAVE ALREADY TESTIFIED ABOUT, WITH MR. HUNT. 28

ALL RIGHT. BUT DID YOU HAVE ANY DISCUSSIONS

Q

WITH OTHER PEOPLE, AS YOU LEFT THE MEETING? A NO, NOT AS I WAS ACTUALLY LEAVING THE MEETING. I DON'T RECALL ANY. Q THE STATEMENT THAT MR. HUNT MADE AT THE MEETING WITH REGARD TO BEING DEALT WITH, WHAT DID YOU FEEL WOULD HAPPEN TO YOU, IF IN FACT, YOU HAD DECIDED TO GO TO THE POLICE AT THAT PO[NT? A IF MR. HUNT KNEW I HAD GONE TO THE POLICE AND CAUGHT ME, I THOUGHT THAT I MIGHT HAVE BEEN KILLED.

Q YOU SAID IN ANSWER TO A QUESTION ON CROSS-EXAMINATION ABOUT THE ACID, "THAT IS NOT WHAT JOE HUNT SAID TO ME" REGARDING THE DIPPING THE BODY IN A VAT OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT?

A RIGHT.

Q WHAT WAS IT THAT HE SAID SPECIFICALLY?

A HE SAID THAT THE BODY HAD BEEN DISPOSED OF WITH ACID.

Q AND YOU WERE ASKED SOME QUESTIONS BY MR.

BARENS ABOUT A PERSON'S TRUTHFULNESS OR NOT, UNDER THE PARADOX

PHILOSOPHY, HAVING TO DO WITH HIS OBJECTIVES.

A WELL, THAT IS HOW YOU WOULD DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT HE WAS TELLING THE TRUTH OR ONE OF THE WAYS.

Q WAS THAT DISCUSSED AS PART OF THE PARADOX
PHILOSOPHY?

A NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE.

Q HOW DID YOU COME TO THAT CONCLUSION?

THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY, BUT JUST IN LIFE, ONE WAY TO TELL
IF SOMEBODY IS TELLING THE TRUTH IS IF YOU KNOW WHAT THEIR
OBJECTS ARE, THEIR OBJECTIVES, THEN YOU CAN PERCEIVE HOW WHAT
THEY ARE SAYING WOULD FIT WITH THOSE OBJECTIVES AND IF -YOU KNOW, IF WHAT THEY SAY MEANS EITHER A OR B, IF A SEEMS
MORE IN LINE WITH THEIR OBJECTIVES AS YOU UNDERSTAND THEM,
THAT IS, IT IS LIKELY THAT IT IS THE TRUTH. IF IT WOULD BE
THE OPPOSITE, IT IS LIKELY THEY ARE NOT TELLING THE TRUTH
OR A GREATER POSSIBILITY OF THAT FACT.

Q AND WHAT DID YOU MEAN WHEN YOU SAID THAT YOU

```
1
    FELT LIKE MR. HUNT'S STATEMENTS TO THE GROUP WERE LIKE AN
 2
    EAGLE RETURNING TO THE NEST?
 3
                 WELL, HE SORT OF CAME BACK -- YOU KNOW, NOW
 4
    WE UNDERSTOOD THAT THIS 1.5 MILLION DOLLAR CHECK WAS SORT
5
    OF TIED IN WITH MR. LEVIN'S BEING KILLED AND THAT WAS KIND
6
    OF LIKE A PRESENT, LIKE HE HAD GONE OUT ON THE HUNT AND
7
    RETURNED TO HIS NEST WITH THE PROCEEDS OF THE HUNT. THAT HE
8
    HAD DONE THIS FOR US.
                LIKE AN EAGLE KILLING SOMETHING AND BRINGING
10
    IT BACK TO THE NEST?
11
           А
                YES.
12
           Q HE HAD DONE IT TO BENEFIT THE GROUP?
13
           Α
                THAT'S CORRECT.
14
                WHAT DID HE DO TO BENEFIT THE GROUP, THE KILLING
15
    OR GETTING THE CHECK OR BOTH?
16
           MR. BARENS: I SUPPOSE "ALLEGED KILLING" AS HE IS
17
    NOW SAYING "THE KILLING."
18
                BY MR. WAPNER: I WILL REPHRASE THE OUESTION:
19
    WHAT WAS YOUR IMPRESSION THAT HE WAS SAYING HE HAD DONE FOR
20
    THE BENEFIT OF THE GROUP, GETTING THE CHECK, THAT HE WAS SAYING
21
    HE DID THE KILLING OR BOTH?
22
                IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING HE WAS SAYING HE COULD
23
    NOT HAVE GOTTEN THE CHECK WITHOUT THE OTHER. THE TWO WERE
24
    INTERRELATED.
25
                HE TOLD YOU HE GOT THE CHECK AT THE TIME OF THE
26
    KILLING?
27
           Д
                YES, THAT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING.
28
```

WHEN YOU SAY IT WAS LIKE AN EAGLE RETURNING TO

Q

1	THE NEST, IS THAT SOMETHING, IS THAT REFLECTIVE OF HIS ATTITUD
2	AT THE TIME HE WAS MAKING THIS STATEMENT?
3	A REFLECTIVE OF MY MY RECALLING THE ATMOSPHERE
4	OF EVERYTHING.
5	I CAN'T PARTICULARLY PINPOINT IT ON HIS ATTITUDE.
6	Q DID HE SEEM TO BE PROUD WHEN HE MADE THIS
7	STATEMENT?
8	A HE CERTAINLY DIDN'T SEEM TO BE ASHAMED.
9	Q YOU SAID IT WAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT MR.
10	TAGLIANETTI WAS FIRED; WHAT WAS THAT UNDERSTANDING BASED ON?
11	A ON BEING INFORMED THAT HE HAD BEEN FIRED, BY ONE
12	OR ANOTHER MEMBER OF THE BBC, I DON'T RECALL SPECIFICALLY
13	WHICH ONE.
14	
15	
16	
17	·
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Q AND SO YOU DON'T KNOW IF IN FACT, HE WAS FIRED 1 OR IF HE RESIGNED? 2 I DON'T KNOW FOR A FACT WHICH ONE OCCURRED. 3 AND AS FAR AS -- STRIKE THAT. 4 AS FAR AS MR. EISENBERG, WHETHER HE WAS FIRED 5 OR RESIGNED, WAS THAT AGAIN, SOMETHING YOU WERE TOLD BY 6 SOMEBODY? 7 I WAS TOLD BY SOMEBODY. I DON'T BELIEVE I WAS 8 PRESENT WHEN JOE ACTUALLY, ASSUMING THAT HE DID, FIRED HIM. 9 SO YOU AGAIN, DON'T KNOW WHETHER MR. EISENBERG 10 WAS FIRED OR WHETHER HE ACTUALLY RESIGNED? 11 THAT'S CORRECT. 12 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. NOTHING FURTHER. 13 THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY RECROSS-EXAMINATION? 14 MR. BARENS: IS YOUR HONOR GOING TO HAVE QUESTIONS? 15 16 THE COURT: NO. MR. BARENS: ON THE EXHIBIT? 17 THE COURT: NO, NO. I HAVE NO QUESTIONS. ON WHAT? 18 19 MR. BARENS: ON AN EXHIBIT? 20 THE COURT: NO, NO. 21 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. JUST A MOMENT, YOUR HONOR. 22 (PAUSE.) 23 24 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 25 BY MR. BARENS: 26 YOU SAID THAT INITIALLY, YOU GOT INVOLVED WITH 27 THE BBC IN NOVEMBER OF 1982 BECAUSE OF THE RHETORIC THAT HAD 28 EXPRESSED?

 $\int A - 1$

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

YES, I MEAN BECAUSE OF THE STATEMENTS MADE BY 1 HIM. 2 WEREN'T YOU ALSO INTERESTED IN BEING A PART OF Q 3 THIS BECAUSE THERE WERE OTHER YOUNG MEN, YOUR CONTEMPORARIES 4 THAT WERE INVOLVED, THAT SEEMED TO HAVE AMBITIONS SIMILAR 5 TO YOURSELF, THAT GOT THEM INVOLVED IN THIS? 6 THOSE WERE PART OF THE THINGS THAT JOE TOLD ME, 7 PART OF THE STATEMENTS MADE BY JOE. 8 DIDN'T THOSE OTHER BOYS CORROBORATE THAT? 9 I THINK DEAN WAS PRESENT AT THAT TIME. 10 HOW ABOUT LATER ON? DID YOU SEE ANY OTHER BOYS 11 INVOLVED THAT YOU LIKED OR KNEW? 12 YES I DID. 13

Α

WASN'T A PART OF YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THIS, BECAUSE YOU ENJOYED THE SOCIETY OF THESE OTHER PEOPLE, REPRESENTED BY --

YES IT WAS.

THEREFORE, YOU REALLY COULDN'T TELL ME THAT THERE WAS JUST A SINGLE THING THAT GOT YOU INVOLVED IN THE BBC, BUT RATHER, IT WAS THE WHOLE GESTALT OF THAT SITUATION?

WELL AGAIN, MOST OF THE THINGS WHEN I INITIALLY JOINED, WAS IN THAT ONE EVENING.

THERE WERE THE DISCUSSIONS BY JOE AND WHICH WERE CONTRIBUTED TO BY DEAN. AND THEN I WAS ASKED IF I WANTED TO BECOME A MEMBER AND I AGREED.

SO, IT WAS BASED IN LARGE PART ON WHAT JOE TOLD ME AND WHAT I PERCEIVED AND YOU KNOW, MY PERCEPTIONS BASED UPON JOE'S STATEMENTS.

25

26

Q

Α

1	Q THOSE WERE THEN ENHANCED BY THE FACT THAT THERE
2	WERE OTHER YOUNG MEN THAT PROVIDED A SOCIETY OF YOUNG MEN
3	THERE, THAT YOU FOUND ATTRACTIVE?
4	A THAT'S CORRECT.
5	Q NOW, BETWEEN THE TIME THAT HUNT WAS ARRESTED THE
6	FIRST TIME AND HUNT WAS ARRESTED THE SECOND TIME, I GUESS
7	THERE ELAPSED HOW LONG A PERIOD OF TIME, SIR?
8	A THREE TO FOUR WEEKS.
9	Q WERE YOU AWARE THAT BBC PEOPLE BY THAT TIME, HAD
10	GONE TO THE POLICE?
11	A I THINK WE KNEW THAT DURING SOME PERIOD OF TIME,
12	WE DID KNOW THAT THE MAYS HAD IT APPEARED THAT THE MAYS
13	HAD SPOKEN WITH THE POLICE.
14	Q AND DURING THAT PERIOD OF TIME, DID HUNT EVER
15	TELL YOU THAT HE WAS PLANNING TO FLEE?
16	A NO HE DID NOT.
17	Q YOU DIDN'T SEE HIM DO ANYTHING LIKE LEAVE FOR
18	BRAZIL OR ANYTHING, DID YOU?
19	A I CERTAINLY DID NOT SEE HIM LEAVE FOR BRAZIL.
20	Q ALL RIGHT. NOW, YOU MENTIONED THAT HUNT RAN
21	EVERYTHING. I GUESS THAT IS WHAT YOU WERE TELLING MR. WAPNER.
22	WAS THAT YOUR STATE OF MIND?
23	A IT IS MY STATE OF MIND THAT JOE HUNT WAS IN
24	CONTROL OF ALL OF THE COMPANIES, YES.
	CONTROL OF ALL OF THE COMPANIES, TES.

27 DID PEOPLE SEEM TO HAVE SOME AUTONOMY IN THE 28 PERFORMANCE OF THEIR TASKS?

YES HE DID.

DID HE EVER DELEGATE ANY RESPONSIBILITIES?

A TO A SMALL DEGREE. GENE BROWNING HAD TO HAVE SOME AUTONOMY WITH THE MACHINES BECAUSE THERE WAS SOME TECHNOLOGY THAT HE UNDERSTOOD. AND WHILE DAVE AND JEFF WERE WORKING ON THE MACHINE, THEY WOULD HAVE A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF AUTONOMY PURCHASING SUPPLIES AND TOOLS.

BUT IN THE END, IF THEY NEEDED MORE MONEY, THEY
WOULD HAVE GONE TO JOE FOR ALL OF THE DECISIONS. HE WAS
OVERSEEING THE COMPANY.

HE WAS INVOLVED A GREAT DEAL IN ALL OF THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES.

1	Q HE WAS THERE ALL OF THE TIME, WASN'T HE?
2	A YES. HE DID SPEND MANY HOURS AT THE OFFICE.
3	Q HE WENT TO WORK EARLY?
4	A DURING THE TIME OF THE COMMODITIES TRADING, HE
5	WENT TO WORK VERY EARLY.
6	Q THE REST OF THE TIME, HE WOULD USUALLY PRECEDE
7	YOU TO WORK, SIR?
8	A GENERALLY, YES.
9	Q AND IT WASN'T AS A PRACTICAL MATTER, POSSIBLE
10	FOR HIM TO HAVE DONE EVERYTHING, WAS IT?
11	A HE COULDN'T HAVE DONE I MEAN, CERTAINLY, HE
12	DIDN'T DO ALL OF THE CLERICAL WORK AND ALL OF THE RUNNING
13	AROUND AND ALL OF THE MANUAL LABOR, NO.
14	Q HE COULDN'T HAVE DONE THAT AND DONE ALL OF THE
15	OTHER THINGS, TOO? I MEAN, DID THE BUSINESS OPERATIONS
16	NECESSARILY INVOLVE THE PARTICIPATION OF OTHER PEOPLE?
17	A IT DID NECESSARILY INVOLVE THE PARTICIPATION OF
18	OTHER PEOPLE, YES.
19	Q ALL RIGHT. NOW, YOU INDICATED EARLIER THAT YOU
20	WERE FAMILIAR I BELIEVE, IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION, THAT YOU
21	WERE FAMILIAR WITH ALL OF THE FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THESE
22	BUSINESSES?
23	A I SAID THAT I WAS FAMILIAR WITH THE WAY
24	CORPORATIONS TRADE AND BORROW MONEY BETWEEN EACH OTHER. BUT
25	I WAS BY NO MEANS, FAMILIAR WITH ALL OF THE FINANCIAL
26	ASPECTS OF OUR INDIVIDUAL CORPORATIONS.
27	Q YOU KNEW WHAT FINANCIAL FUTURES TRADING COMPANY

WAS?

1.	A MY UNDERSTANDING OF FINANCIAL FUTURES TRADING		
2	COMPANY WAS THAT IT WAS DBA'D I BELIEVE, FROM EYE-CONTACT		
3	ADVERTISING.		
4	AND IT WAS THE CORPORATION THAT IN SOME MANNER,		
5	DEALT WITH THE LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS TRADING COMMODITIES OR		
6	IT WAS INVOLVED IN TRADING COMMODITIES.		
7	Q DO YOU KNOW HOW MUCH MONEY FINANCIAL FUTURES		
8	TRADING CORPORATION HAD RECEIVED FROM INVESTORS?		
9	A NO.		
10	Q ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE CONTRACTS SIGNED BETWEEN		
11	THE PEOPLE THAT HAD MONEY INVESTED FOR THEM BY THAT COMPANY		
12	AND FINANCIAL FUTURES?		
13	A I HAVE SEEN THE CONTRACT. I DON'T BELIEVE I HAVE		
14	EVER READ IT IN FULL.		
15	Q WERE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE POSITIONS THAT WERE		
16	UNDERTAKEN FOR THE INVESTORS?		
17	A I DID NOT UNDERSTAND THE COMMODITY MARKET AT ALL.		
18	Q DID YOU UNDERSTAND HOW MUCH OF THE INVESTOR MONEY		
19	WAS PLACED INTO THE BROKERAGE ACCOUNTS?		
20	A I DID NOT KNOW. I DID NOT HAVE ANY KNOWLEDGE		
21	OF THAT AT ALL.		
22	Q DID YOU REVIEW OR RECEIVE STATEMENTS FROM THE		
23	BROKERAGE ACCOUNTS?		
24	A IF I EVER SAW A STATEMENT FROM THE BROKERAGE		
25	ACCOUNT, I WOULD HAVE NO IDEA WHAT IT MEANT.		
26			
27			

=

1	Q ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE WITHDRAWALS AND	
2	DEPOSITS FROM FUTURES FINANCIAL TRADING COMPANY?	
3	A NO, I AM NOT.	
4	Q DO YOU KNOW WHETHER THAT COMPANY HAS LOANED THE	
5	BBC ANY MONEY?	
6	A I DO NOT KNOW THAT.	
7	Q D YOU KNOW WHETHER THAT COMPANY HAD LOANED	
8	MICROGENESIS MONEY?	
9	A I DO NOT RECALL THAT.	
10	Q DO YOU KNOW WHETHER MICROGENESIS HAD AN OBLIGATION	
11	TO PAY FUNDS BACK TO FINANCIAL FUTURES TRADING COMPANY?	
12	A I DO NOT KNOW THAT.	
13	Q SO YOU COULDN'T TELL ME ONE WAY OR ANOTHER, OUT	
14	OF THE 1.5 MILLIGN DOLLARS, WHETHER A PORTION OF THAT WOULD	
15	HAVE BEEN OBLIGATED FOR REPAYMENT OF DEBT STRUCTURE FOR	
16	MICROGENESIS TO FINANCIAL FUTURES TRADING COMPANY?	
17	A WHAT I CAN TELL YOU IS THERE WERE NO MINUTES	
18	EVER PREPARED OR EVER NO BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGSWERE	
19	HELD AUTHORIZING THE BORROWING OR LOANING OF MONEY BY ANY	
20	OF THE CORPORATIONS.	
21	BUT I DO NOT KNOW IF MICROGENESIS HAD INCURRED	
22	ANY OBLIGATIONS TO PAY.	
23	Q AT LEAST THE WAY THIS BUSINESS IS RUN, IF I DON'T	
24	SEE MINUTES ON A TRANSACTION, I SUPPOSE IT IS OF NO PARTICULAR	
25	NOTE AS THE MINUTES SEEMED TO HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED SOMEWHAT	
26	AFTER THE FACT AS A RULE?	
27	A AS A RULE, THAT WAS VERY TRUE.	
28	O DO YOU KNOW WHAT FINANCIAL OR LEGAL RESPONSIBILITI	

DO YOU KNOW WHAT FINANCIAL OR LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Q

1	JOE HUNT HAD IN TERMS OF THE INVESTORS OF FINANCIAL FUTURES		
2	TRADING COMPANY?		
3	A I DO NOT.		
4	Q DO YOU KNOW AS A FACT WHETHER OR NOT THE MONEYS		
5	INVESTED IN FINANCIAL FUTURES TRADING COMPANY WERE LOST?		
6	A I DO NOT.		
7	Q WAS HUNT GREEDY?		
8	A I NEVER SAW ANY EVIDENCE OF IT.		
9	Q DID YOU HAVE A SYSTEM AT THE BBC THAT REWARDS		
10	WERE BASED ON PERFORMANCE?		
11	A THAT IS CORRECT, YES.		
12	Q WAS THAT KIND OF ONE OF YOUR MAJOR ECONOMIC		
13	THEMES?		
14	A IT WAS CERTAINLY THAT REMUNERATION, YES, I GUESS		
15	YOU WOULD SAY IT WOULD BE.		
16	Q THAT ONE WOULD BE COMPENSATED OR REWARDED IN		
17	SOME FINANCIAL SENSE BASED ON THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE GROUP		
18	IN TERMS OF THAT INDIVIDUAL'S EFFORTS?		
19	A THAT'S CORRECT.		
20	Q IS THAT CONSISTENT WITH WHAT YOU TOLD US EARLIER		
21	ABOUT HUNT GOING TO THE BANK AND THEREAFTER PASSING MONEYS		
22	OUT TO PEOPLE ON OCCASION?		
23	A NOT NECESSARILY.		
24	SOME OF IT SEEMED		
25	IT COULD HAVE POSSIBLY BEEN SOME PART OF SOME		
26	PLAN IN JOE'S MIND TO REMUNERATE PEOPLE DIRECTLY FOR THEIR		
27	CONTRIBUTION AS HE SAW IT.		

BUT IT REALLY APPEARED THAT IT WAS AN

INDIVIDUALIZED DECISION MADE BY HIM.

SO I CAN'T TELL YOU IF HE WAS THINKING IN HIS MIND, WELL, YOU KNOW, X HAD DONE THIS SO HE WILL GET THAT AND Y HAD DONE THIS --

Q YES.

A -- OR IF HE WAS JUST PEELING OFF DOLLAR BILLS.

Q SIR, DID YOU GENTLEMEN HAVE DISCUSSIONS FROM
TIME TO TIME WHERE THE THEME OF REWARDS BASED ON SERVICES
RENDERED OR A MERIT SYSTEM FOR COMPENSATION WAS DISCUSSED?

A YES, WE DID.

Q AND WAS THAT DISCUSSED RIGHT FROM THE OUTSET IN YOUR ASSESSMENT OF HOW THE BBC WAS GOING TO OPERATE?

A CERTAINLY IT WAS DISCUSSED IN MANY OF THE EARLIER MEETINGS HELD BEFORE THE OFFICES WERE ESTABLISHED.

Q WAS IT POINTED OUT THAT COMPENSATION WOULD BE

BASED ON SERVICES RENDERED AS OPPOSED TO AN EQUITY OR OWNERSHIP INTEREST IN THE CORPORATIONS?

A YES.

Q THEREFORE, TITULAR OR NOMINAL SHAREHOLDINGS OR EQUITY POSITIONS IN THE VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE BBC WOULD NOT BE THE WAY PROFITS WOULD BE DIVIDED, RATHER THEY WOULD BE DIVIDED BASED ON A MERIT OR PERFORMANCE SYSTEM OF THE INDIVIDUAL?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

Q AND THAT AGAIN, WAS SOMEWHAT OF A VERY WELL

ARTICULATED AND UNDERSTOOD ECONOMIC THEME THAT YOU GENTLEMEN

HAD?

A THAT IS CORRECT.

Q YOU MENTIONED THAT DURING THE WORK WEEK OF THE FIRST SEVEN DAYS OF JUNE, 1984, THAT YOU HAD BEEN AT WORK THAT WEEK? Α THAT IS CORRECT. YOU WENT TO LUNCH, DIDN'T YOU? Α I DID. ON THE 5TH, DID YOU GO TO THE FORTUNE FOUNTAIN FOR LUNCH, SIR? A I HAVE NO RECOLLECTION.

```
1
           THE COURT REPORTER: WHAT WAS THAT?
2
           MR. BARENS: THE FORTUNE FOUNTAIN.
3
               YOU DON'T RECALL GOING OUT TO LUNCH THAT WEEK
4
     IN PARTICULAR?
5
           A I RECALL GOING OUT TO LUNCH THAT WEEK BUT I DON'T
6
    RECALL HAVING LUNCH AT THE FORTUNE FOUNTAIN.
7
           Q YOU MENTIONED YOU DIDN'T SEE RON LEVIN ON THE
8
     3RD OR THE 4TH, AND I DON'T KNOW, MAYBE YOU WERE REFERRING
    TO --
10
           A I WAS REFERRING TO THE WEEK OF THE 6TH AND 7TH
11
    ON WHATEVER THE DATES ARE.
12
           Q YOU DIDN'T SEE LEVIN THAT WEEK?
13
                 I HAVE NO RECOLLECTION OF SEEING LEVIN THAT WEEK.
14
                 BUT YOU WERE THERE, I THINK YOU TESTIFIED.
15
    ROUGHLY BETWEEN 10:00 AND 4:00?
16
                THAT IS A ROUGH ESTIMATE OF MY HOURS. YES.
17
              AND THEN BETWEEN 10:00 AND 4:00, YOU WOULD SOME-
18
    TIMES GO TO LUNCH?
19
           A I WOULD GO TO LUNCH AND I MAY HAVE BEEN OUT OF
20
    THE OFFICE FOR OTHER REASONS, TOO.
21
                FOR DIFFERENT ACTIVITIES YOU DID?
22
                YOU KNOW, FOR THE OFFICE, DOING THINGS FOR THE
23
    OFFICE.
24
              IN OTHER WORDS, YOU CAN'T TELL ME WITH ANY
25
    CERTAINTY THAT RON LEVIN WASN'T IN THE OFFICE THAT WEEK, CAN
26
    YOU?
27
           A I CANNOT.
28
           Q
                YOU MENTIONED ON REDIRECT THAT HUNT HAD NEVER
```

DISCUSSED THIS SEVEN MILLION DOLLAR ASPECT OF THE LEVIN OPTION AGREEMENT WITH YOU; IS THAT CORRECT?

A HE HAD NEVER SORT OF MENTIONED -- I MEAN IT HAD NEVER SEEMED -- IT SEEMED TO ME THAT HE NEVER REALLY THOUGHT HE WAS GOING TO GET IT.

Q RIGHT.

A YES.

Q AND DID HE SAY TO YOU, I NEVER REALLY THINK I
.
AM GOING TO GET THE SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS?

A NO.

BUT IT SEEMED THAT WE WERE -- IT SEEMED TO BE SOMETHING YOU WOULD DISCUSS.

I MEAN, YOU KNOW, MR. LEVIN HAD PURPORTEDLY PAID
A GREAT DEAL OF MONEY FOR A ONE-YEAR OPTION AND IT SEEMED
TO ME UNREASONABLE, UNLESS HE HAD A VERY GOOD INTENTION OF
ACTUALLY ACTIVATING THE OPTION, AND SO IT SEEMS TO ME THAT
IF HE HAD, YOU KNOW, IT WOULD SEEM TO ME THAT WOULD BE
SOMETHING WE WOULD CONSIDER THE POSSIBILITY OF THAT MONEY
COMING.

Q DID IT EVER OCCUR IN THE NORMAL COURSE OF
BUSINESS AFFAIRS THAT LEVIN COULD SELL HIS OPTION TO SOMEONE
IF THE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPED?

A HE COULD WITHIN A YEAR.

I CAN READ THE OPTION AGREEMENT AND SEE IF IT IS TRANSFERABLE.

YES, IT SAYS HERE LEVIN'S RIGHTS ARE FREELY ASSIGNABLE.

Q SO IT WAS A POSSIBILITY, AT LEAST AS YOU

UNDERSTAND THE WAY BUSINESS OPERATES, THAT LEVIN COULD MARKET 1 HIS POSITION UNDER THE OPTION DURING THAT TIME FRAME? 2 A THAT IS TRUE, BUT THE OPTION WOULDN'T HAVE ANY 4 GREAT VALUE TO ANYBODY UNLESS THEY PLANNED ON ACTING ON IT. 5 Q RIGHT. 6 WAS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING OR DID SOMEBODY COME 7 TO YOU AND SAY, WELL, WE DON'T PLAN TO ACT ON THIS? 8 NO ONE EVER SAID THAT TO ME. 9 YOU WERE FAMILIAR WITH THE GOLD SUN LIMITED 10 TRANSACTION THAT MICROGENESIS WAS INVOLVED IN? 11 A I RECOGNIZE THE NAME. I CAN'T EVEN TELL YOU 12 WHAT IT DEALT WITH. 13 Q DO YOU RECALL THAT GOLD SUN LIMITED, INVESTED 14 \$150,000 IN THE TECHNOLOGY? 15 A I DON'T HAVE A RECOLLECTION, BUT THAT DOESN'T 16 SEEM UNREASONABLE TO ME. 17 Q YOU DON'T RECALL THAT AT ALL, THAT \$150,000 CAME 18 IN FROM THOSE FOLKS? 19 I RECALL THERE WAS A DEAL WITH THE COMPANY. 20 IF YOU COULD TELL ME SOME OF THE NAMES OF THE 21 INDIVIDUALS IN THE COMPANY, I COULD POSSIBLY RECALL THE 22 TRANSACTION. 23 THE NAME GOLD SUN UNLIMITED DOES NOT IN AND OF 24 ITSELF CAUSE ME TO RECALL. 25 26 27

28

MR. BARENS: L?

THE COURT: ARE YOU OFFERING IT?

MR. BARENS: YES. I AM. IT IS N.

Q AND COULD YOU TELL ME WHAT THAT SPEAKS TO, SIR?

A IT IS AN OPTION AGREEMENT FOR THE RIGHTS TO

PURCHASE 20 CYCLATRONS AT \$200,000 PER MACHINE AND THE

PAYMENT FOR THE OPTION WAS -- EXCUSE ME. NOW, THAT IS

INCORRECT.

THIS WAS A MEMORANDUM. THIS WAS WHAT I BELIEVE IS AN OPTION AGREEMENT FOR THE RIGHTS TO PURCHASE AN ADDITIONAL 20 MACHINES AT A PRICE OF \$200,000 AND \$150,000 WAS PAID FOR THE OPTION. THE OPTION HAD APPROXIMATELY TWO YEARS TO RUN.

Q NOW, YOU RECALL THAT THE \$150,000 WAS ACTUALLY PAID TO YOU GENTLEMEN?

A I DO HAVE SOME RECOLLECTION, YES.

Q NOW, DID HUNT EVER DISCUSS WITH YOU, RECEIVING

THE TWO MILLION DOLLARS THAT THIS OPTION CALLED FOR, FOR THE

DELIVERY OF THE MACHINES REFERENCED HERE?

A THIS WAS --

Q SORRY, FOUR MILLION. MY MATHEMATICS ARE WRONG.

A I THINK THERE WERE DISCUSSIONS HELD. I DO HAVE SOME RECOLLECTION WHERE WE DISCUSSED BUILDING THE ADDITIONAL 20 MACHINES AND I THINK THERE WAS ALSO A FIRST SET OF MACHINES THAT HAD TO BE BUILT, WHICH WE NEVER DELIVERED.

- Q THIS WOULD HAVE CALLED FOR \$200,000 PER MACHINE?
- A FOR AN ADDITIONAL 20 MACHINES.
 - Q AND YOU DISCUSSED THE APPLICATION AND USE OF THE FUNDS THAT WOULD COME FROM THAT SALE?

A I THINK WE ALSO, AS MY MEMORY SERVES ME, THE

2 A - 3 REASON THAT IT NEVER CAME ABOUT -- I DON'T RECALL DISCUSSING 1 THAT. 2 BUT I THINK WE OWED THEM MACHINES EVEN BEFORE 3 THAT, BASED ON ANOTHER JOINT VENTURE AGREEMENT WHICH EVENTUALLY 4 BROKE DOWN. 5 WHAT I AM LOOKING FOR IN MY QUESTION, SIR, YOU 6 COMMENTED THAT YOU DON'T SPECIFICALLY RECALL DISCUSSING THE 7 FOUR MILLION DOLLARS? 8 THAT'S CORRECT. BUT THE REASON --9 Q SIR --10 MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME. 11 THE COURT: LET HIM FINISH. 12 THE WITNESS: THE REASON THERE IS -- I MEAN, YOU ARE 13 TRYING TO MAKE TWO THINGS SEEM SIMILAR THAT REALLY AREN'T. 14 15 Q BY MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. THE REASON IT WAS NEVER DISCUSSED WAS THAT WE 16 17 HAD, AS MY MEMORY SERVES ME, A JOINT VENTURE AGREEMENT WHICH IS REFERENCED IN THAT VERY DOCUMENT. AND THAT DOCUMENT WAS 18 FOR THE PURCHASE OF AN ADDITIONAL 20 MACHINES. AND WE NEVER 19 20 PROVIDED THEM WITH THE FIRST MACHINES UNDER THE JOINT VENTURE AGREEMENT, AS MY RECOLLECTION SERVES ME. 21 22 SO WE HAD NO -- THEY PURCHASED AN OPTION FOR 23 MACHINES AND NEVER GOT THE FIRST MACHINES. 24 25 26 27

WELL, JUST LIKE LEVIN, IT SEEMS TO ME SIR, NOT 23-1 Q 1 TO BE ARGUMENTATIVE WITH YOU, TO ANSWER YOUR CONTENTION --2 MR. WAPNER: WELL, THERE IS AN OBJECTION. 3 THE COURT: HE IS GIVING YOU THE FACTS. 4 BY MR. BARENS: DID YOU IN FACT, EVER DO ANYTHING 5 TO SUPPLY LEVIN WITH THE LEVEL OF TECHNOLOGY REQUIRED UNDER 6 THE OPTION, HE SEEMED TO HAVE BEEN BARGAINING FOR? 7 NOT THAT I KNOW OF. 8 ALL RIGHT. WHEN YOU HEARD ABOUT THIS COMMENT 9 ABOUT THE ACID, DID THAT IN ANY WAY, APPEAR -- I MEAN, USING 10 THE EXPRESSION, IF YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND IT TELL ME, DID THAT 11 APPEAR TO BE "HOLLYWOOD" TO YOU? 12 YOU MEAN JUST SORT OF -- WHY DON'T YOU EXPLAIN Α 13 THE EXPRESSION TO ME, HOW YOU ARE USING IT. 14 HOLLYWOOD BEING THAT IT WAS A BIT DRAMATIC? 15 SHOWY? 16 THEATRICAL? 17 18 Q THEATRICAL OR SHOWY IN SOME RESPECTS, THE WAY IT COMES OUT, SIR? 19 20 NO. BECAUSE I COULDN'T IMAGINE WHY SOMEBODY WOULD 21 SAY SOMETHING LIKE THAT. 22 THE SAME WAY YOU COULDN'T IMAGINE WHY ANYONE WOULD 23 SAY ANYTHING LIKE THAT TO YOU ON 6-24? 24 I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU ARE ASKING. Α 25 ALL RIGHT. I WILL LEAVE THAT WITH YOU FOR THE

THE COURT: HE WANTS TO ELICIT FROM YOU, YOUR OPINION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT WHEN HE TALKED ABOUT THE ACID, HE WAS

26

27

28

MOMENT.

3 - 2

```
Q AND IT SEEMED LIKE HE HAD UNDERTAKEN SOME
1
      PROMETHEAN EFFORT, TO STAY CONSISTENT WITH THE ANALOGY, ON
2
      YOUR BEHALF?
3
           A SOMETHING OF THE SORT OF -- GUARDIAN-LIKE, YEAH.
4
      THAT IS -- I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT PROMETHEAN MEANS.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

F

```
1
           THE COURT: PROMETHEUS, DON'T YOU REMEMBER HIM?
 2
           MR. BARENS: PROMETHEUS, FROM THE GREEK MYTHOLOGY.
 3
     IT IS ONE OF THE FEW TIMES I GET TO USE THE WORD, JUDGE.
 4
                WELL, IN ANY EVENT --
 5
           MR. WAPNER: THE ONLY EAGLES I KNOW ARE IN PHILADELPHIA.
 6
           MR. BARENS: THIS WAS LIKE A BIG EAGLE STORY.
 7
                  IN ANY EVENT, UNLESS YOUR HONOR WISHES TO MENTION
8
     ANYTHING ABOUT PROMETHEUS.
9
           THE COURT: NO, EXCEPT THERE WAS POETRY, "PROMETHEUS
10
       BOUND" AND SO FORTH. DO YOU REMEMBER THE POEM?
11
           MR. BARENS: YES. ACTUALLY, THE MYTH WAS A BIT MORE
12
    APPARENT IN MY MIND.
13
           THE WITNESS: DO YOU HAVE A QUESTION PENDING?
14
           MR. BARENS: NO.
15
                  (LAUGHTER IN THE COURTROOM.)
16
           MR. WAPNER: THEY ARE HAVING A GOOD TIME. I JUST SIT
17
    THERE AND LISTEN.
18
           MR. BARENS: MAYBE IT IS THE ONLY INSTANCE IN MY CAREER
19
    WHEREVER I COULD USE THE WORD.
20
           MR. WAPNER: CAN I TAKE A BREAK WHILE THIS IS GOING
21
    ON?
22
           MR. BARENS: IN ANY EVENT --
23
           THE COURT: YOU MAY PROCEED.
24
           Q BY MR. BARENS: YOU SAY IT DIDN'T HURT HIS
25
    IMAGERY IN YOUR EYES AS FAR AS THE FACT THAT HE HAD
26
    OSTENSIBLY DONE THIS FOR THE GROUP?
27
                IT DID NOT HURT HIS IMAGE IN MY EYES. NO.
28
                 YOU MENTIONED HE DIDN'T SEEM ASHAMED BY THIS,
```

DID HE? 1 2 NO, HE DIDN'T. А 3 DID THAT SEEM UNUSUAL TO YOU? NO. 5 WHY DOES THAT NOT SEEM UNUSUAL TO YOU? BECAUSE I DID BELIEVE THAT JOE DID, YOU KNOW, 6 7 HE FULLY BELIEVED PARADOX PHILOSOPHY SO I DIDN'T CONSIDER 8 HE WOULD FIND KILLING ANOTHER HUMAN BEING OFFENSIVE OR SOME-9 THING HE SHOULD BE ASHAMED OF. 10 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU. 11 THE COURT: ANYTHING FURTHER? 12 13 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. WAPNER: 15 DID YOU BELIEVE HIM WHEN HE TOLD YOU THAT HE 16 TOOK CARE OF RON LEVIN? 17 А WITHIN A MINUTE, I BELIEVED THAT HE HAD MURDERED 18 RON LEVIN. 19 WHY DID IT TAKE YOU A MINUTE TO FIGURE THAT OUT? 20 A . BECAUSE MY INITIAL REACTION WAS THAT WHEN HE 21 SAID "TOOK CARE OF, DEALT WITH" WHATEVER IT WAS THAT HE SAID. 22 THAT HE MIGHT ALSO HAVE KIDNAPPED HIM. HE MIGHT HAVE DONE 23 OTHER THINGS TO HIM OTHER THAN MURDERED HIM. 24 Q AFTER THAT MINUTE PASSED, WHAT HAPPENED? 25 WELL, I REALIZED THAT --26 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, COULD WE GET A CAUTION, BECAUSE 27 WE ARE HAVING AN AFFIRMATIVE STATEMENT ON THE ULTIMATE FACT

BASED ON A BELIEF THIS WITNESS HAS.

THE COURT: YES. MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, IT IS THIS WITNESS' OPINION AS TO WHAT HAPPENED, HIS INTERPRETATION OF THE STATEMENT, IT IS NOTHING MORE OR NOTHING LESS, AND THAT IS JUST ABSOLUTELY SIGNIFICANT FOR THE JURORS TO BE ABLE TO EVALUATE THE BASIS FOR THE STATEMENT THAT HE HEARD. THE COURT: WELL, LET'S NOT DO IT ANY FURTHER. I WILL OVERRULE THE OBJECTION. YOU GO AHEAD. MR. BARENS: MIGHT WE APPROACH? THE COURT: NO, THERE IS NO NECESSITY AT THIS POINT.

BELIEVE IT, THAT IS OBVIOUSLY PROBATIVE AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE JURY CAN BELIEVE THE STATEMENT WAS TRUE OR WAS NOT TRUE.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, NUMBER ONE, I HAVE NEVER
REPRESENTED TO THIS COURT NOR DO I NOW REPRESENT THAT MR.
HUNT'S STATEMENT WAS A JOKE, IF IN FACT HE MADE THE STATEMENT.
THAT IS NOT THE DEFENSE THAT I AM GOING TO ASSERT IN THIS
CASE NOR IS THAT THE DEFENSE I ASSERTED IN MY OPENING STATEMENT
OR HAVE I TRIED TO INDICATE TO THE JURY IN ANY RESPECT THAT
MR. HUNT WAS JOKING IN THAT STATEMENT.

THE ONLY TESTIMONY WE HAVE HAD AT ALL WAS THE WORD "KIDDING" THAT WAS INTRODUCED RELATIVE TO MR. RAYMOND'S DESCRIBING A SUBSEQUENT CONVERSATION ASSOCIATED WITH THE EXECUTION OF THE CHECK AND/OR THE OPTION BY MR. LEVIN AND THAT THERE WAS SOME IMPLICATION THAT MR. HUNT MIGHT HAVE BEEN KIDDING WHEN HE SAID THAT, BECAUSE AS YOUR HONOR WILL RECALL, I HAD PRIOR TESTIMONY WHERE MR. RAYMOND HAD USED THAT SPECIFIC WORD IN PRIOR TESTIMONY AT THE PITTMAN MATTER.

IN ANY EVENT, AS WE ARE HERE, I BELIEVE HISTORICALLY, THE COURTS HAVE BEEN VERY SENSITIVE ABOUT TESTIMONY
ON THE ULTIMATE FACT BEFORE THE JURY AND SOLICITING A QUESTION
FROM A WITNESS WHICH GOES TO THEIR OPINION ON THE UILTIMATE
FACT.

NOW WHAT MR. WAPNER HAS CONSTRUCTED HERE IS TO TRY TO EVADE THAT SENSITIVITY THE LAW HAS IN THAT AREA BY SAYING TO HIM, "DID YOU BELIEVE THE STATEMENT WAS TRUE WHEN HE SAID THAT?" THEREFORE, THE WITNESS GETS TO TESTIFY, "YEAH, I BELIEVE HUNT KILLED LEVIN".

MR. WAPNER: NO, NO.

MR. BARENS: AND HE IS NOW ASKED TO RECITE THE ULTIMATE FACT.

MR. WAPNER: NO.

THE COURT: AS I UNDERSTAND, ALL HE IS TRYING TO DO

IS GET THE REACTION BY THE WORDS WHICH WERE USED BY THE

DEFENDANT, "HE DID AWAY WITH HIM OR WE DID SOMETHING, GOT

RID OF HIM OR WHATEVER," WHATEVER THE REACTION OF THE PERSON

WAS IN THE CONTEXT OF THAT DISCUSSION.

MR. BARENS: SURE --

MR. WAPNER: THAT IS EXACTLY RIGHT. IT IS NOT, DOES

THE WITNESS BELIEVE THAT HE KILLED HIM BUT --

THE COURT: HE IS NOT EXPRESSING ANY OPINION THAT HE DID OR DID NOT, ON THE FACTS, INDEPENDENTLY OF ANYTHING.

ALL HE IS SAYING FROM WHAT HE SAID IS HE GOT THE IMPRESSION OR THE REACTION THAT HE KILLED HIM.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, WHEN I ASKED LEAVE TO APPROACH
THE WITNESS, WHAT I HAVE DONE UNIFORMLY, WHEN I SAID, "DID
YOU BELIEVE MR. HUNT WAS TELLING THE TRUTH WHEN HE MADE THOSE
STATEMENTS," AND THE WITNESS WOULD RESPOND YES OR NO AND THE
WAY MR. WAPNER HAS CONSTRUCTED THE QUESTION, THE WITNESS NOW
HAS TO SAY "I BELIEVE HE KILLED RON LEVIN" AND TO UTTER THOSE
WORDS --

THE COURT: NO, DON'T ASK ANY QUESTIONS WHERE YOU MIGHT ASK HIM WHETHER OR NOT THEIR OPINION IS THAT HE DID OR DIDN'T KILL HIM.

ALL YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO DO IS WHAT YOU HAVE

BEEN DOING, WHICH IS ELICITING FROM THE WITNESS THEIR REACTION
.
TO THE STATMEENTS WHICH WERE MADE BY THE DEFENDANT AND WHAT

THEY UNDERSTOOD HIM TO MEAN BY THAT.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, AS AN OFFER OF PROOF, YOUR HONOR,

I EXPECT THAT THIS WITNESS WILL SAY THAT WHEN HE HEARD THE

STATEMENT, HE WASN'T SURE IF THAT -- AND THE STATEMENT THAT

HE SAYS HE HEARD WAS "I TOOK CARE OF RON LEVIN" AND HE WILL

SAY THAT "WHEN I FIRST HEARD THE STATEMENT, I DID NOT KNOW

WHETHER THAT MEANT KILLED OR KIDNAPPED OR WHATEVER AND THAT

ABOUT A MINUTE PASSED" AND HE WILL SAY THAT HE, IN THINKING

ABOUT IT, REALIZED THAT "TOOK CARE OF" MUST HAVE MEANT KILLED

AND HE BELIEVED THAT THAT STATEMENT MEANT KILLED.

-A-1

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: WASN'T THERE ALSO A QUESTION? WASN'T THERE TESTIMONY THAT HE SAID THAT IT WAS A PERFECT CRIME AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME?

MR. BARENS: NO, YOUR HONOR. NO, YOUR HONOR. IT WAS LATER ON.

EXCUSE ME, MR. WAPNER. THE TESTIMONY WAS --

THE COURT: LATER ON, HE SAID?

MR. BARENS: THE TESTIMONY WAS -- MR. RAYMOND'S TESTIMONY WAS TO THAT EFFECT.

THE COURT: DIDN'T HE SAY ANYTHING AT THE MEETING ABOUT IT BEING A PERFECT CRIME?

MR. BARENS: NO. WE HAVE HEARD TO MY KNOWLEDGE --I HAVE NEVER READ ANY POLICE REPORT THAT THAT STATEMENT WAS EVER UTTERED AT THAT MEETING. I THINK MR. RAYMOND SAID IT WAS TWO WEEKS LATER AT THE OFFICE THAT THE STATEMENT WAS MADE.

THE COURT: I GET IT.

MR. BARENS: BUT NOT AT THIS TIME.

THE COURT: I SEE. I SEE. ALL RIGHT, WELL, GO AHEAD.

YOU CAN ASK HIM WHAT HIS REACTION WAS TO THE LANGUAGE WHICH WAS USED.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY.

THE COURT: HE HAS A RIGHT TO WHAT HE UNDERSTANDS THAT TO MEAN.

> (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT:)

BY MR. WAPNER: MR. DICKER, AFTER THAT MINUTE PASSED, WHAT WAS IT THAT YOU UNDERSTOOD THAT STATEMENT OF MR. HUNT TO MEAN?

26 27

A THAT HE HAD KILLED RON LEVIN.

MR. BARENS: WE OBJECT TO THAT STATEMENT BASED ON THE CONVERSATIONS AT THE BAR, WHICH I DON'T NEED TO REPEAT AT THIS TIME.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

THE WITNESS: ACTUALLY, THAT HE AND JIM GRAHAM HAD KILLED RON LEVIN.

Q BY MR. WAPNER: AND THAT HE WAS SAYING THAT HE
HAD KILLED RON LEVIN, AS OPPOSED TO KIDNAPPED HIM OR SOMETHING
LIKE THAT?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

Q WAS THERE SOMETHING THAT HAPPENED IN THAT MINUTE
THAT MR. HUNT SAID WHAT HE DID THAT CAUSED YOU TO CHANGE YOUR
MIND OR WAS IT SOMETHING THAT YOU THOUGHT ABOUT?

A SOMETHING I THOUGHT ABOUT.

Q WAS IT SOMETHING THAT YOU THOUGHT ABOUT BASED ON YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF MR. HUNT?

A YES.

Q ALL RIGHT. AND WAS THAT KNOWLEDGE OF HOW YOU BELIEVED MR. HUNT MIGHT ACT IN A GIVEN SITUATION?

A' YES.

Q AND WAS THAT BASED ON ANYTHING MR. HUNT HAD DONE OR SAID?

MR. BARENS: EXCUSE ME. WE ARE NOW INTO THE WITNESS'S CONCLUSIONS BASED ON A HYPOTHETICAL SITUATION ASCRIBED TO MR. HUNT IN A GIVEN SITUATION. I DON'T BELIEVE IT IS PERMISSIBLE TESTIMONY. IT IS CALLING FOR SPECULATION IN THE FIRST INSTANCE AND THEREFORE, CONCLUSIONS BASED ON THIS

SPECULATION ON THE HYPOTHETICAL. THE COURT: WELL, ALL RIGHT. I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION. MR. BARENS: THANK YOU. MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. Q NOW, AFTER THAT MINUTE PASSED, YOU BELIEVED THAT HE HAD TOLD YOU THAT HE AND JIM GRAHAM HAD JUST KILLED SOMEBODY, RIGHT? A YES.

Q BY MR. WAPNER: YOU NEVER DID SEE MR. LEVIN AFTER
THAT MEETING, DID YOU?

A NO I DID NOT.

24

25

26

27

28

Q THIS SYSTEM OF REWARDS BASED ON PERFORMANCE, DID
THAT HAVE TO DO WITH PROFITS OF THE COMPANIES, MICROGENESIS
AND WESTCARS AND ALL THAT STUFF?

A THAT WOULD BE CONSIDERED, YES.

Q ALL THIS BUSINESS OF SHOWING YOU THE STOCK

CERTIFICATES AND THE PERCENTAGE, ALL OF THAT WAS A BUNCH OF

NONSENSE, BASICALLY?

A YES.

Q BECAUSE NONE OF THE MONEY WAS GOING TO BE DISTRIBUTED, BASED ON WHO HAD WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE STOCKS, WAS IT?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

Q IT WAS GOING TO BE DISTRIBUTED BY JOE HUNT, BASED ON PERFORMANCE, RIGHT?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

Q WHICH BRINGS ME TO THE QUESTION -- MAYBE I ASSUMED THE ANSWER IN THE LAST QUESTION. THIS SYSTEM OF REWARDS BASED ON PERFORMANCE, WHO WAS SUPPOSED TO MAKE THE DECISION AS TO THE REWARDS AND WHAT THE PERFORMANCE WAS?

A IT WOULD HAVE BEEN -- IF IT WAS A MATTER OF
DEALING WITH PARADOX PHILOSOPHY, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN MADE BY
THE PARADOX COURT.

IT WAS A MATTER DEALING WITH THE PARTICULAR

BUSINESS, IT WOULD PROBABLY BE MADE BY THOSE PEOPLE IN CHARGE

OF THAT BUSINESS.

Q WHO WAS IN CHARGE OF ALL OF THE BUSINESSES?

A JOE WAS.

Q SO IN PRACTICAL EFFECT, WHEN IT COMES DOWN TO

IT, JOE HUNT WAS GOING TO DECIDE WHO GOT WHAT MONEY FOR WHAT

WORK?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

INCLUDING HOW MUCH HE WOULD KEEP FOR HIMSELF? Q 1 A THAT'S CORRECT. 2 MR. WAPNER: NOTHING FURTHER. 3 THE COURT: ANYTHING FURTHER? 4 MR. BARENS: JUST A MOMENT, IF I MIGHT. 5 6 FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. BARENS: 8 Q WE SPENT QUITE A BIT OF TIME WITH YOUR RESPONSE 9 TO THIS 6-24 ANNOUNCEMENT. YOU SAID THAT YOU PAUSED A MOMENT. 10 IT TOOK YOU A MOMENT OR SO, TO COME TO A CONCLUSION AND THEN 11 I THINK YOU SAID YOU UNDERSTOOD FROM THIS COMMENT. THAT 12 GRAHAM AND HUNT HAD KILLED LEVIN? 13 THAT'S CORRECT. 14 15 NOW, YOU HAD GONE THROUGH THAT INTELLECTUAL EXERCISE BECAUSE IN FACT, NO ONE SAID, "WE KILLED HIM," OR 16 "HE IS DEAD"? 17 A THAT'S CORRECT, AT THAT TIME. 18 19 RIGHT. AT THAT POINT IN TIME, YOU HAVE STATEMENTS 20 THAT SUGGEST TO YOU, THAT THAT IS WHAT THE FACTS ARE? 21 THAT'S CORRECT. 22 23 24 25 26

27

28

1	Q NOW, IF LATER HUNT COMES TO YOU AND SAYS, "I		
2	LIED AT THE 6-24 MEETING ABOUT WHAT I SAID TO YOU," WHAT		
3	HAPPENS TO HIS STATUS?		
4	A PROBABLY IT DEPENDS ON WHY.		
5	Q OKAY, THEN WE HAVE TO GO BACK TO A PARADOX		
6	PHILOSOPHY ANALYSIS, DO WE?		
7	MR. WAPNER: THERE WOULD BE AN OBJECTION IN TERMS OF		
8	ONLY IN TERMS OF TIME, BECAUSE THE TIME FRAME HE SAID "NOW		
9	LATER," AND I DON'T KNOW WHEN HE IS ASKING ABOUT.		
10	MR. BARENS: OH, LET'S SAY 30 DAYS LATER TO GIVE YOU		
11	A TIME FRAME.		
12	THE WITNESS: SO IT IS ASSUMING AT THE TIME WHEN I		
13	WAS STILL GUIDED BY THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY?		
14	A BY MR. BARENS: ASSUMING SOMETIME 30 DAYS LATER,		
15	WHETHER YOU ARE GUIDED BY IT, YOU CAN PUT THAT AS PART OF		
16	YOUR ANSWER IF YOU LIKE.		
17	A THAT IS PART OF MY ANSWER, YES.		
18	Q THAT IF HE COMES TO YOU AND SAYS TO YOU, "I LIED		
19	ON 6-24," DOES HE RISK WITH YOU ANY CASUALTY IN TERMS OF HIS		
20	STATUS?		
21	A OF COURSE, HE RISKS IT AND DEPENDING UPON WHY		
22	HE LIED AND WOULD DEPEND UPON WHAT HE WOULD SUFFER OR HOW		
23	HE WOULD SUFFER.		
24	Q AND THAT IS SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE INTERPRETIVE		
25	ON YOUR PART, SIR?		
26	A I AM THE ONLY ONE WHO DETERMINES HOW SOMEBODY'S		

STATURE, WHAT STATURE I HOLD SOMEBODY IN.

Q RIGHT. SO THAT WOULD BE SELECTED TO THE INDIVIDUAL.

1 THERE IS NO PRESET FORMULA WE FOLLOW ON THAT. IS THERE. SIR? 2 A THAT'S CORRECT. 3 IF HE WOULD HAVE EARLIER ON, LET'S SAY, BEFORE 4 JUNE 7TH WHEN HE TOLD YOU WE HAD AN INTEREST IN THE SHOPPING 5 CENTER, THAT WE ARE LOOKING FOR TITLE DOCUMENTS ON. IF HE 6 TOLD YOU HE LIED WHEN HE TOLD YOU THAT ON JUNE 1ST, HOW WOULD 7 THAT AFFECT HIS STATURE? 8 IT AGAIN DEPENDS UPON THE REASON. 9 I CAN'T SAY DEFINITIVELY ONE WAY OR THE OTHER 10 WITHOUT KNOWING WHY HE PURPORTEDLY LIED. 11 Q DO YOU THINK THERE IS, AS YOU UNDERSTOOD THE 12 WAY THINGS OPERATED THERE AT THE BBC, IF HE CAME ALONG AND 13 TOLD YOU THAT HE LIED ABOUT ONE OF THESE MAJOR FINANCIAL 14 TRANSACTIONS TO YOU GENTLEMEN THAT THAT WOULD BE DONE WITHOUT 15 A RISK TO STATURE? 16 MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION. THAT CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 17 THE COURT: OBJECTION SUSTAINED. 18 LET'S GO ON TO SOMETHING ELSE IF YOU HAVE ANY-19 THING MORE. 20 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, YOUR HONOR. THERE IS ONE 21 IN CLOSING I WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS. 22 Q YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT THERE WAS NO SPECIFIC 23 PARADOX PHILOSOPHY. 24 A IT WAS NEVER LAID OUT TO US IN BLACK AND WHITE. 25 PRECISELY, AND WE TALKED ABOUT THAT BEFORE. YET, 26 YOU SAY YOU WERE GUIDED BY IT; WHAT IS IT YOU WERE GUIDED 27 BY?

A MY PERCEPTION OF IT.

```
1
           Q YOU HAD AN EVAN DICKER-ON-PARADOX-PHILOSOPHY
 2
    CONCEPT OF IT?
 3
           A YES.
           MR. BARENS: THANK YOU.
 5
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
 6
                    FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION
8
    BY MR. WAPNER:
9
           Q THE CONCEPT YOU HAD WAS EXPLAINED TO YOU BY THE
10
    DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE?
11
           A HE WAS THE ONE WHO I GOT THE CONCEPT FROM, YES.
12
                HAD YOU EVER HEARD OF THE WORDS PARADOX
13
    PHILOSOPHY BEFORE YOU MET JOE HUNT?
14
           A NO, I DID NOT.
15
           O DID YOU EVER READ IT IN ANY BOOKS YOU STUDIED
16
    IN COLLEGE?
17
           A NO, I DID NOT.
18
           Q IT NEVER EXISTED ANYWHERE EXCEPT IN JOE HUNT'S
19
    MIND, DID IT?
20
           A THE PARADOX PHILOSOPHY, NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE.
21
           MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER.
22
           MR. BARENS: I BEG YOUR PARDON. I WOULD LIKE TO
23
    ADDRESS THAT LAST POINT.
24
           THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
25
26
                     FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION
27
    BY MR. BARENS:
28
           Q SIR, YOU HAD BEEN TO COLLEGE, HAD YOU NOT?
```

1	A YES, I HAD.	
2	Q AND HAD YOU READ ANYTHING BY CAMUS?	
3	A NOT THAT I RECALL.	
4	Q HAD YOU READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT EXISTENTIAL	
5	THINKING IN THE 20TH CENTURY?	
6	A ONLY SARTRE, WHO I NEVER REALLY UNDERSTOOD.	
7	Q DID YOU READ SOME OF THAT SARTRE STUFF?	
8	A I READ SOME OF HIS PLAYS, YES.	
9	Q DID SARTRE TALK ABOUT ANY CONCEPT THAT YOU COULD	
10	ASSOCIATE WITH PARADOX PHILOSOPHY?	
11	MR. WAPNER: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE.	
12	THE COURT: I WIL PERMIT HIM TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION.	
13	THE WITNESS: I THINK SARTRE WAS IN MANY WAYS OPPOSITE	
14	TO PARADOX PHILOSOPHY BECAUSE YOU WOULD SACRIFICE YOURSELF	
15	FOR THE GROUP TO AN INDIVIDUAL ACT OF BAD FAITH.	
16	Q INDEED, THE CONCEPT THAT YOU GOT OUT OF SARTRE	
17	WAS THAT THE INDIVIDUAL IS SELF-EFFACING IN ORDER TO OBTAIN	
18	SOME GREATER PRINCIPLE.	
19	MR. WAPNER: SAME OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.	
20	THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION. I THINK WE	
21	HAVE HEARD ENOUGH ABOUT IT.	
22	MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.	
23	THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. YOU MAY STEP DOWN.	
24	MR. WAPNER: TOM MAY.	
25	THE CLERK: IF YOU WOULD RAISE YOUR RIGHT HAND TO BE	
26	SWORN, PLEASE.	
27		

1	TOM FRANK MAY,			
2	CALLED AS A WITNESS BY THE PEOPLE, WAS SWORN AND TESTIFIED			
3	AS FOLLOWS:			
4	THE CLERK: YOU DO SOLEMNLY SWEAR THAT THE TESTIMONY			
5	YOU MAY GIVE IN THE CAUSE NOW PENDING BEFORE THIS COURT SHALL			
6	BE THE TRUTH, THE WHOLE TRUTH, AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH,			
7	SO HELP YOU GOD.			
8	THE WITNESS: I DO.			
9	THE CLERK: IF YOU WILL BE SEATED THERE IN THE WITNESS			
10	STAND.			
11	NOW WOULD YOU STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD,			
12	PLEASE?			
13	THE WITNESS: TOM FRANK MAY.			
14	THE CLERK: THANK YOU.			
15				
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION			
17	BY MR. WAPNER:			
18	Q MR. MAY, DO YOU KNOW THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE?			
19	A YES, I DO.			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

1	Q H	OW DO YOU KNOW HIM?
2	A I	HAD MET HIM IN HIGH SCHOOL.
3	Q W	HAT HIGH SCHOOL WAS IT?
4	A H	ARVARD HIGH SCHOOL.
5	Q W	HERE WAS THAT HIGH SCHOOL LOCATED?
6	A 0	N COLDWATER CANYON, LOS ANGELES.
7	Q D	ID YOU GRADUATE FROM HARVARD HIGH SCHOOL?
8	A Y	ES, I DID IN '77.
9	Q 1	977?
10	A Y	ES.
11	Q A	ND DID MR. HUNT GRADUATE THE SAME YEAR?
12	Α Υ	ES, HE DID.
13	Q A	ND WHAT WAS THE NATURE OF YOUR RELATIONSHIP
14	OR FRIENDSHIP WITH HIM, IF ANY, IN HIGH SCHOOL?	
15	A N	ONE.
16	Q D	ID MR. HUNT HAVE ANYTHING THAT HE PARTICIPATED
17	IN IN HIGH SCH	OOL AT WHICH HE EXCELLED?
18	Α Υ	ES, HE DID.
19	Н	E WAS AN EXCELLENT DEBATER AND SPEAKER.
20	MR. BAR	ENS: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. RELEVANCY ON THAT
21	AND I BELIEVE THAT GOES TO CHARACTER EVIDENCE.	
22	THE COURT: OVERRULED.	
23	MR. BAR	ENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
24	Q B	Y MR. WAPNER: AS A STUDENT AT HARVARD HIGH
25	SCHOOL, WERE Y	OU REQUIRED TO TAKE DEBATE?
26	A Y	ES WELL, YOU ARE REQUIRED TO TAKE SPEECH
27	AND I ALSO TOO	K DEBATE.
28	Q A	ND DID YOU ALSO KNOW A PERSON AT HARVARD HIGH
	I .	

```
1
    SCHOOL NAMED STEVE TAGLIANETTI?
 2
          A YES, I DID.
           Q WAS HE IN YOUR SAME CLASS?
                YES, HE WAS.
           А
 5
                WE DEBATED TOGETHER. WE WERE KNOWN AS THE
 6
    MAY-TAG TEAM.
 7
           Q AND DID YOU PARTICIPATE IN DEBATES IN THE SCHOOL
 8
    AS WELL AS OUTSIDE OF THE SCHOOL?
 9
           A WELL, IT WAS -- THE WHOLE SYSTEM WAS GEARED TO
10
    DEBATE AGAINST OTHER TEAMS FROM OTHER SCHOOLS.
11
           Q AND HOW WERE YOUR DEBATING SKILLS, WOULD YOU
12
    SAY, IN TERMS OF WHERE YOU WERE IN THE CLASS AS OPPOSED TO
13
    WHERE MR. HUNT WAS IN THE CLASS?
14
          A WELL, MR. HUNT WOULD BE UP HERE AND MINE WOULD
15
    PROBABLY BE UNDER THE DESK SOMEWHERE. HE WAS A MUCH BETTER
16
    DEBATER THAN I WAS.
17
           Q OTHER THAN KNOWING HIM AS A DEBATER, DID YOU
18
    HAVE ANY SOCIAL FRIENDSHIP WITH HIM AT THAT TIME?
19
          A NO.
20
                THE TEACHER ONCE REFERRED HIM TO ME TO REARRANGE
21
    MY EVIDENCE FILES BUT THAT WAS THE ONLY TIME I EVER MET HIM.
22
23
24
25
26
27
```

THE FIRST TIME WE MET WAS AT THE HARD ROCK.

CHICAGO.

```
Q
                 WHAT IS THE HARD ROCK?
 1
                 IT IS A RESTAURANT, BAR IN THE BEVERLY CENTER
 2
      IN LOS ANGELES.
 3
                 AND WHEN YOU MET HIM AT THE HARD ROCK, WHO WERE
 4
     YOU THERE WITH?
5
            А
                 I WAS THERE WITH MY BROTHER.
6
                 WHAT IS YOUR BROTHER'S NAME?
            Q
7
            Α
                  DAVID MAY.
8
                  AND DID YOU FIRST MEET MR. HUNT OR SOMEBODY ELSE
9
     THERE AT THE HARD ROCK?
10
           Α
                 WE MET DEAN KARNY THERE.
11
            Q
                 WHO WAS DEAN KARNY?
12
              WELL, PREVIOUS TO THAT DAY, I HAD ONLY KNOWN DEAN
13
     KARNY AS A TENNIS PLAYER WHO WAS IN MY SAME CLASS AT USC.
14
     WE BOTH PLAYED TENNIS ON THE TEAM TOGETHER.
15
                  PLAYED ON THE TENNIS TEAM AT USC?
16
            0
            Α
                  NO, I MEAN HARVARD. SORRY.
17
                  HOW WELL DID YOU KNOW DEAN KARNY IN HIGH SCHOOL?
18
            Q
19
                 NOT VERY WELL.
            Α
                  WHEN YOU WENT TO THE HARD ROCK CAFE WITH YOUR
20
            0
21
      BROTHER IN APRIL OF 1983 AND YOU SAW DEAN KARNY, WHAT HAPPENED?
22
                  DEAN SAID THAT HE HAD HOOKED UP WITH JOE HUNT,
23
     WHO HAD GOTTEN BACK FROM CHICAGO AND HAD BEEN TRADING
24
     THERE RATHER SUCCESSFULLY.
25
                  HE HAD TURNED MILLION DOLLAR ACCOUNTS OVER IN
26
     CHICAGO AND WAS NOW BACK IN LOS ANGELES, TRYING TO PUT
27
      TOGETHER AN INVESTING POOL TO REDO WHAT HE HAD DONE IN
```

AND DEAN SAID THAT WE MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN 1 MEETING UP WITH JOE HUNT AND LISTENING TO WHAT HE HAD TO SAY. 2 AND WAS JOE HUNT PRESENT WHEN THIS CONVERSATION 3 WAS GOING ON? A NO. DEAN REINTRODUCED US TO JOE HUNT LATER ON 5 THAT EVENING. 6 Q WAS THAT AT THE HARD ROCK? 7 Α I THINK IT WAS. 8 AND WHEN DEAN KARNY SAID THAT JOE HUNT WAS 9 TRADING, DID HE SAY WHAT HE WAS TRADING? 10 А COMMODITIES. 11 Q DID HE SAY HOW THEY WERE DOING? 12 HE SAID THEY WERE DOING INCREDIBLY WELL. Α 13 AND WHAT HAPPENED AFTER HE TOLD YOU THAT? 14 WELL --15 IN TERMS OF HOOKING UP WITH JOE HUNT, I MEAN. 16 DID JOE HUNT SHOW UP AT THE HARD ROCK? DID YOU GO SOMEWHERE 17 TO MEET HIM? HOW DID THAT HAPPEN? 18 NO. MY BROTHER AND I WERE RUNNING A NIGHTCLUB 19 Α DOWN IN DANA POINT. SO IT WAS A COUPLE OF WEEKS LATER THAT 20 THEY CAME DOWN TO THE NIGHTCLUB AND SAW OUR OPERATION DOWN 21 22 THERE AND SAW IT WAS DOING VERY WELL. THEN THEY INVITED US UP TO A MEETING IN LOS ANGELES 23 WHERE JOE WAS STARTING UP THE BBC. 24 25 Q SLOW DOWN A LITTLE BIT, ALL RIGHT? 26 Α OKAY. 27 FIRST OF ALL, I THINK THERE IS A LITTLE BIT OF

CONFUSION AT THE MOMENT. THE FIRST NIGHT WHEN YOU RAN INTO

DEAN KARNY AT THE HARD ROCK CAFE, WAS HE WITH JOE HUNT OR BY HIMSELF? A I BELIEVE HE WAS WITH JOE HUNT. Q DO YOU KNOW WHETHER YOU TALKED TO JOE HUNT THAT NIGHT? A I DON'T REMEMBER TALKING TO JOE HUNT THAT NIGHT BUT I REMEMBER SPECIFICALLY TALKING TO DEAN. 3 F

Q WHEN YOU TALKED TO DEAN, WAS THAT AT A TABLE WHERE 1 JOE HUNT WAS SITTING THERE OR WHAT? 2 IT WAS AROUND THE BAR. 3 AND SO YOU DON'T RECALL TALKING TO JOE HUNT THAT Q 4 NIGHT? 5 Α NO. 6 AND THEN YOU SAY IT WAS A COUPLE OF WEEKS LATER Q 7 THAT MR. KARNY CAME DOWN TO A NIGHTCLUB THAT YOU WERE 8 RUNNING WITH YOUR BROTHER? 9 Α (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.) 10 IS THAT YES? Q 11 IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN AFTER WE WENT -- WE WERE 12 INVITED TO A MEETING THAT MR. HUNT WAS CONDUCTING. THEY CAME 13 DOWN AFTERWARDS. I THINK THAT IS THE CORRECT CHRONOLOGY. 14 OKAY. SO YOU WERE TOLD BY MR. KARNY AT THE HARD Q 15 ROCK THAT HE WAS INVOLVED WITH MR. HUNT IN TRADING 16 COMMODITIES AND THEY WERE DOING WELL? 17 Α YES. 18 19 Q ALL RIGHT. AND WERE YOU ASKED TO GO TO SOME KIND 20 OF A MEETING? 21 Α YES. 22 AND WHAT KIND OF A MEETING WAS THAT? Q 23 Α IT WAS A MEETING FOR A GROUP OF YOUNG GUYS LIKE 24 MYSELF, WHO WERE INTERESTED IN GETTING INTO BUSINESS AND WHO 25 THIS FELLOW JOE HUNT, IS TRYING TO GET TOGETHER ALL UNDER 26 ONE ROOF TO TRY TO PUT TOGETHER BUSINESSES. 27 WHEN YOU SAY THAT IT WAS A GROUP OF YOUNG GUYS

28

LIKE YOURSELF --

28

DOSTI?

Α

I MET HIM THERE.

A WELL, THEY WERE ESSENTIALLY GUYS MY OWN AGE, OUT 1 OF COLLEGE, WHO HAD DIFFERENT TYPES OF AMBITIONS. SOME OF 2 THEM WERE IN MARKETING. SOME OF THEM WERE IN SECURITIES AND 3 WHATEVER. 4 AND I GUESS FROM WHAT DEAN SAID, JOE WAS TRYING 5 TO GET THEM ALL TOGETHER UNDER ONE ROOF, SO HE COULD START 6 7 NEW BUSINESSES. WAS THAT THE REASON YOU WENT TO THIS MEETING THAT 0 8 9 DEAN ASKED YOU TO COME TO? YES. I WANTED TO HEAR WHAT HE HAD TO SAY. Α 10 AND DID YOU GO TO THE MEETING? Q 11 YES I DID. Α 12 ALL RIGHT. WHEN WAS IT AND WHERE WAS IT? Q 13 IT WAS PROBABLY IN MAY OF 1983 OR LATE APRIL. Α 14 IT WAS AT DEAN KARNY'S PARENTS' CONDO IN THE VALLEY. 15 DID YOU GO THERE BY YOURSELF OR WITH SOMEBODY? 16 0 Α I WENT THERE WITH MY BROTHER. 17 WHEN YOU WENT THERE, WHAT HAPPENED? 18 Q 19 THERE WAS A GROUP OF GUYS THERE THAT WERE MY AGE. Α HOW MANY WERE THERE? 20 Q 21 I WOULD SAY ABOUT 15. Α 22 WHO RAN THE MEETING? Q 23 Α JOE HUNT RAN THE MEETING. 24 WAS DEAN KARNY THERE? Q 25 DEAN KARNY WAS THERE. Α 26 DID YOU KNOW SOMEBODY NAMED AT THAT TIME, BEN

Q WAS THAT THE FIRST TIME YOU HAD MET HIM? Α YES. AND WHAT DID JOE HUNT TALK ABOUT WHEN YOU MET HIM AT THAT MEETING? A HE TALKED ABOUT STARTING UP THE NEW BUSINESSES AND IF ANYBODY IN THE GROUP HAD ANY IDEAS, THAT HE WOULD PROBABLY BE ABLE TO PUT EVERYTHING TOGETHER, SO THE PIECES COULD FINANCIALLY WORK AND BECOME SUCCESSFUL. AND SO BASICALLY, THIS WAS ALL ABOUT TALKING ABOUT NEW BUSINESSES AND TALKING ABOUT HIS COMMODITIES.

3-3

1	AND WILKE DID HE SAT HE WAS GOING TO GET THE
2	MONEY FOR THESE BUSINESSES?
3	A HE THOUGHT HE COULD GET THEM FROM HIS COMMODITIES
4	INVESTMENTS.
5	Q DO YOU REMEMBER ANY OF THE NAMES OF ANY OF THE
6	OTHER PEOPLE THAT WERE AT THE MEETING?
7	A ALEX GAON, I THINK WAS THERE. RONALD PARDOVITCH
8	WAS THERE. THAT IS ALL THAT I REMEMBER.
9	Q THOSE ARE THE ONLY NAMES OF THE PEOPLE THAT YOU
10	REMEMBER?
11	A YES.
12	Q AND DID HE DISCUSS A PHILOSOPHY OF GETTING ALL
13	OF THESE PEOPLE IN THE GROUP TOGETHER TO POOL THEIR RESOURCES?
14	A YES, HE DID.
15	Q AND WHAT WAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING ABOUT WHAT YOU
16	WOULD HAVE TO PUT INTO THIS GROUP IF YOU DECIDED TO GO INTO
17	IT?
18	A YOU WOULD HAVE TO PUT IN HARD WORK.
19	Q AND AFTER WELL, DID YOU COME AWAY FROM THIS
20	MEETING WITH ANY DECISION AS TO WHAT YOU WERE GOING TO DO?
21	A NO, NOT REALLY.
22	IT WAS VERY INTERESTING BUT AND IT LEFT ME
23	CURIOUS TO HEAR MORE.
24	Q WHAT WAS IT THAT YOU FOUND INTERESTING ABOUT IT?
25	A WELL, IT WAS A NEW TYPE OF PHILOSOPHY THAT MOST
26	BUSINESSES HAVEN'T HEARD OF OR AREN'T FOUNDED ON.
27	Q WHAT KIND OF PHILOSOPHY WAS THAT?

THE TYPE OF PHILOSOPHY WHERE WHATEVER YOU PUT

```
INTO, YOU GET AN EQUAL AMOUNT OUT OF AND THAT WAS
1
      INTERESTING.
 2
                 AND HAD YOU MADE ANY DECISION AT THE TIME THAT
 3
      YOU LEFT THAT MEETING AS TO WHAT YOU WERE GOING TO DO?
4
            А
                 NOT REALLY.
5
                  I MEAN PROBABLY TO LISTEN A LITTLE MORE AND FIND
6
      OUT MORE ABOUT IT.
7
            Q
                  DID YOU SEE MR. HUNT AND MR. KARNY AGAIN --
8
                  YES.
9
                  -- AFTER THAT?
            Q
10
            Α
                 YES, THEN THEY CAME DOWN TO THE CLUB.
11
                 THIS IS A NIGHTCLUB THAT YOU AND YOUR BROTHER
12
     HAD IN DANA POINT?
13
                 YES.
           А
14
                  WHEN MR. HUNT AND MR. KARNY CAME DOWN TO THE CLUB,
15
16
     WAS ARBEN DOSTI WITH THEM ALSO?
                  THEY CAME DOWN SEVERAL TIMES. I THINK ARBEN MIGHT
17
     HAVE COME DOWN SEVERAL TIMES.
18
           THE COURT: YOU CALL HIM BEN FOR SHORT?
19
20
           THE WITNESS: YES.
           THE COURT: ARBEN, A-R-B-E-N AND YOU CALL HIM BEN?
21
22
           THE WITNESS: BEN, THAT'S RIGHT.
23
                 BY MR. WAPNER: DID THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE,
           Q
24
     DEAN KARNY AND BEN DOSTI COME DOWN SEVERAL TIMES TO THE CLUB?
                 THEY CAME DOWN AT LEAST ONCE.
25
           Α
26
                WHAT WAS THE PURPOSE OF THOSE VISITS, IF YOU KNOW?
27
           MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, "VISITS" IS NOT CONSISTENT
28
     WITH THE TESTIMONY. I BELIEVE HE SAID "AT LEAST ONCF".
```

```
THE COURT: WELL, HOW MANY TIMES DO YOU RECALL?
1
           THE WITNESS: I SAID AT LEAST TWICE.
 2
           THE COURT: AT LEAST TWICE?
 3
           MR. BARENS: DID HE SAY TWICE? SORRY.
 4
           Q BY MR. WAPNER: DO YOU KNOW WHAT THE PURPOSE OF
5
     THOSE VISITS WAS?
6
           A DO I KNOW WHAT THEY WERE NOW OR DID I KNOW WHAT
7
     THEY WERE THEN?
8
               OKAY. WELL, THAT IS A VERY GOOD QUESTION AND
9
     I WILL DEFER THAT FOR THE TIME BEING. WE CAN COME BACK TO
10
     THAT AT THE END.
11
                 BUT I ASSUME THAT YOUR PERCEPTION, WITHOUT ASKING
12
     YOU WHAT IT IS, BUT YOUR PERCEPTION ABOUT MR. HUNT AND WHAT
13
     HE WAS UP TO THEN AND NOW IS SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT?
14
                YES, IT IS.
15
           MR. BARENS: OBJECTION TO THE REFERENCE BY THE DISTRICT
16
     ATTORNEY TO "UP TO." PERHAPS WE OUGHT TO GET TO THE
17
     EVIDENCE.
18
           THE COURT: OH, I WILL LET IT STAND.
19
20
                 GO AHEAD.
21
                BY MR. WAPNER: NOW, WHEN MR. HUNT CAME DOWN TO
22
     YOUR CLUB, WHAT DID HE SAY TO YOU?
23
           A HE THOUGHT WE HAD DONE A MARVELOUS JOB WITH IT.
24
     HE THOUGHT DAVE AND I HAD WORKED HARD TO PUT TOGETHER A
25
     SUCCESSFUL CLUB AND THAT HE WANTED TO SEE THAT KIND OF
26
     SUCCESS GO INTO THE BBC.
27
                WHERE DID THE NAME BBC -- WHEN DID YOU FIRST HEAR
           Q
```

THAT?

HE TOLD ME A STORY THAT WHEN HIM AND BEN DOST! 1 WERE TRADING IN CHICAGO THAT THEY WOULD OFTEN GO TO A PLACE 2 CALLED THE BOMBAY BICYCLE CLUB, WHICH WAS A RESTAURANT THERE, 3 AND THAT IS WHERE THEY WOULD TALK ABOUT COMING BACK TO 4 LOS ANGELES AND STARTING UP THIS ORGANIZATION OF YOUNG BOYS 5 TO COME TOGETHER AND PUT TOGETHER NEW BUSINESSES AND BECAUSE 6 OF THE NAME BOMBAY BICYCLE CLUB, THEY DECIDED TO USE THE 7 LETTERS BBC FOR THE FOUNDATION OF THE ORGANIZATION. 8 DID YOU FIRST HEAR THE NAME BBC AT THE MEETING 9 THAT YOU WENT TO AT THE CONDOMINIUM IN THE VALLEY? 10 I BELIEVE SO. 11 AND DID MR. HUNT TALK TO YOU DURING THE TIME OR 12 TIMES THAT HE CAME DOWN TO YOUR NIGHTCLUB ABOUT THE 13 POSSIBILITY OF YOUR INVESTING WITH HIM IN COMMODITIES? 14 Α YES. 15 AND WAS THAT IN THE CONTEXT OF ALSO TELLING YOU 16 THAT HE LIKED YOUR CLUB AND THE HARD WORK THAT YOU HAD PUT 17 INTO IT? 18 Α 19 YES. AND AT THAT TIME, WERE YOU LIVING SOMEWHERE DOWN 20 · NEAR DANA POINT NEAR THE CLUB? 21 22 YES, WE HAD A PLACE OVER THE CLUB. 23 AND DID HE ASK YOU TO COME UP TO LOS ANGELES TO FURTHER DISCUSS WITH HIM GETTING MORE INVOLVED IN THE BBC? 24 25 Α YES. 26 MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, MIGHT THIS BE THE APPROPRIATE 27 TIME?

28

THE COURT: YES.

```
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, WE WILL TAKE OUR
 1
      ADJOURNMENT AT THIS TIME UNTIL THE CUSTOMARY 10:30 TOMORROW
 2
     MORNING.
 3
                  AND THE USUAL ADMONITION I GAVE YOU WOULD STILL
 4
     APPLY AND GOOD NIGHT.
 5
            MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, IF WE COULD HAVE A MOMENT.
 6
            THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
 7
            MR. BARENS: THE JURY MAY BE EXCUSED.
8
            THE WITNESS: AM I EXCUSED?
9
            THE COURT: YES, YOU ARE EXCUSED.
10
            THE WITNESS: THANK YOU.
11
                  (THE JURY EXITED THE COURTROOM AND THE
12
                  FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD:)
13
            THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THE JURY SEEMS TO HAVE LEFT THE
14
      COURTROOM.
15
16
            MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, INITIALLY, JUST A HOUSEKEEPING
     ACTIVITY FOR YOUR CLERK. I HAD HAD THE PROXIES UNDER THE
17
     L'S AND I FORGOT TO MENTION ON THE RECORD THE LAST PROXY,
18
19
     WHICH WAS THE PROXY FOR 32 SHARES FOR HUNT, WHICH WE MARKED
     AS L-3.
20
21
            THE COURT: IT WILL BE SO MARKED.
22
           MR. BARENS: AND THEN THAT PROMISSORY NOTE I REFERENCED
23
     AFTER THAT BECOMES L-4.
24
           THE COURT: YES.
25
            MR. BARENS: I WILL BE GIVING THOSE TO THE CLERK.
26
                  WHAT I ASKED FROM YOUR HONOR FOR A MOMENT IS THAT
27
     NOW I HAVE AN INCREASING CONCERN WHEN WE GET INTO THE BBC
28
     WITNESSES. WE ARE GETTING INTO SOME SHOTGUN CHARACTERIZATIONS
```

THROUGH THESE WITNESSES.

YOUR HONOR, THE DEFENSE OBVIOUSLY HAS NOT PUT MR. HUNT'S CHARACTER IN EVIDENCE AT ALL AT THIS POINT. WE HAVE NOT PUT ON A CASE.

YOUR HONOR, YET, WE ARE GOING TO GET INTO WITH THESE GUYS WHEN THEY ARE EXPRESSING OPINIONS ABOUT MR. HUNT, AS THE OTHER WITNESSES HAVE, ABOUT THE TYPE OF FELLOW HE WAS OR WHAT HE WAS UP TO OR WHAT HE HAD ON HIS MIND OR WHETHER HE WAS A GOOD GUY OR A BAD GUY AND ET CETERA.

I DON'T SEE HOW HUNT'S CHARACTER BY LAW, IS ADMISSIBLE AS A SPECIFIC MATTER OF LAW.

I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THE CODE PERMITS THAT AT THIS TIME OF THE TRIAL.

THE COURT: WELL, THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY UNDERSTANDS

OF COURSE, THAT OPINION EVIDENCE AS TO HIS CHARACTER IS NOT

INVOLVED. HE IS NOT ASKING OPINION EVIDENCE AS TO HIS CHARACTER

ALL HE IS DOING I IMAGINE, IS JUST ASKING CERTAIN -- WHAT

THEIR CONCLUSIONS ARE AS TO VARIOUS ACTS WHICH HE PERFORMED,

IF ANY.

MR. WAPNER: YES, YOUR HONOR. I ALSO THINK THAT MR.

BARENS IS TALKING ABOUT WHAT THESE WITNESSES HAVE TO SAY ABOUT

PARADOX PHILOSOPHY AND WHAT IT MEANS AND THAT IS NOT GOING

INTO CHARACTER EVIDENCE. THAT IS, AS MUCH AS IT IS TALKING

ABOUT THE PHILOSOPHY THAT BOUND THE ENTIRE GROUP TOGETHER

AND IS INTEGRAL TO EXPLAINING THE ACTIONS THAT THE DEFENDANT

TOOK AND THE WAY THAT THE WITNESSES PERCEIVED THEM AND REACTED

TO THEM.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I DON'T UNDERSTAND IT AS BEING

CHARACTER EVIDENCE. SO FOR THAT REASON, I WILL -- COUNSEL UNDERSTANDS WHAT HIS LIMITATIONS ARE. I DON'T THINK WE HAVE TO REPEAT IT ANY MORE THAN FIVE TIMES.

MR. BARENS: WE ARE GOING TO BE SENSITIVE, AS WE GO ALONG, BECAUSE SOMETIMES YOUR HONOR, IT IS VERY DIFFICULT FOR ME. AND I WOULD THINK IT IS FOR THE JURY AS WELL, OR ANY HUMAN BEING, TO TRY TO DISCRIMINATE OUT WHAT -- WHEN WE GET INTO FACTUAL RECITATIONS VERSUS A STATEMENT ABOUT CHARACTER.

IT BECOMES INCREASINGLY BLURRED AND I THINK IT WAS QUITE BLURRED DURING TODAY'S TESTIMONY, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WELL, WE DID THE BEST WE COULD. I DON'T
THINK THERE IS ANYTHING WHICH IN ANY WAY WOULD INDICATE THAT
ANYBODY WAS EXPECTING AN OPINION AS TO CHARACTER.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.

(AT 4:33 P.M. AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN TO RESUME WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1987 AT 10:30 A.M.)