	Proceedings
10:47:44 1	JUDGE FAHEY: Good morning. I'm Judge Eugene
10:47:46 2	Fahey. I'm the Chairperson of the Commission. I want
10:47:49 3	to apologize to anyone out there who is watching. We
10:47:53 4	had some transportation difficulties this morning
10:47:57 5	because of train delays, and so we're starting a
10:48:01 6	little bit late today. I anticipate that the
10:48:05 7	Commission will look at our ultimate purpose today, at
10:48:12 8	least on some of the issues.
10:48:15 9	First, I would like to introduce all of the
10:48:19 10	Commission members and ask them to introduce
10:48:21 11	themselves, starting with Mr. Megna on my left.
10 40 00 10	10 1000 D 1 14

MR. MEGNA: Bob Megna.

MS. FONTAINE: Nadine Fontaine.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Jeremy Weinstein.

Helene Blank. MS. BLANK:

MS. EGAN: Theresa Egan.

Good morning. Victor Kovner. MR. KOVNER:

JUDGE FAHEY: Thank you.

First, I want to acknowledge that at the last meeting an issue took place that was discussed about raising housing court judges and judges out in city court, outside New York City from a 90 percent rate of reimbursement, based on the State Supreme Court salaries being 100 percent and administrative housing court judges in New York City, moving them all to

10:49:14 25

10:49:17 1	
10:49:23 2	
10:49:26 3	
10:49:29 4	
10:49:35 5	
10:49:38 6	
10:49:42 7	
10:49:46 8	
10:49:53 9	
10:49:57 10	
10:50:02 11	
10:50:06 12	
10:50:08 13	
10:50:13 14	
10:50:16 15	
10:50:23 16	
10:50:26 17	
10:50:30 18	
10:50:32 19	
10:50:35 20	
10:50:38 21	
10:50:41 22	
10:50:42 23	
10:50:46 24	

10:50:52 25

93 percent where all the other city court judges in the city and Long Island are.

We did receive a letter from Judge Zayas outlining the numbers for the Commission, which I think everyone has had a chance to review. Judge Zayas is the Chief Administrative Judge from OCA has also advocated for the Commission to adopt that particular modification to their request. So that writing will be made part of the record, and ask that we include that with the submissions to the Commission. So that will be done.

The second point today is we're going to begin discussions on a draft report which I forwarded to all of my colleagues. I'm just going to briefly outline the draft report proposal A, B, and C. The purpose of that, for those who don't have it in front of them, is they will know what we're talking about.

In the draft report that was done, we sent out the members of the Commission an introduction, the statutory mandate - the findings are not complete, and that's why the report is still in its draft stage - and then recommendations.

The recommendations that I sent to my colleagues are as follows: Recommendation A, No. 1, effective April $1^{\rm st}$, 2024, New York State Supreme Court

10:50:57 1 justices' salaries shall be set at \$232,600.

Recommendation 2 is the salaries of all other state judges - this includes appellate and administrative judges - shall be adjusted to reflect their present proportion to the salary of State Supreme Court judges, effective April 1st, 2024. That means at the end of this coming budget.

Recommendation 3: No county court judge, family court judge or surrogate court judge shall earn less than 95 percent of a State Supreme Court justice's salary. Any such judicial position now being paid a percentage of a Supreme Court judge's salary that is greater than 95 percent shall continue to be paid at that same percentage.

No. 4: Judges of the New York City Civil Court, the New York City Criminal Court, District Court, Housing Court of the New York City Civil Court and full-time city court judges outside New York City shall receive 93 percent of the State Supreme Court justices' salary. Part time city court judges shall earn the same proportion of the salaries of full-time city court judges that they now earn. That is recommendation A.

Recommendation B was, No. 1, that everything remains the same in A, except that the city court

10:51:03 2 10:51:06 3 10:51:09 4 10:51:12 5 10:51:16 6 10:51:21 7 10:51:24 8 10:51:28 9 10:51:32 10 10:51:37 11 10:51:41 12 10:51:44 13 10:51:48 14 10:51:50 15 10:51:54 16 10:51:58 17 10:52:01 18 10:52:06 19 10:52:09 20 10:52:15 21 10:52:19 22 10:52:24 23 10:52:26 24

10:52:29 25

judges and the housing court judges shall continue to earn 90 percent of the Supreme Court justices' salary, which is the present systems. That recommendation, if adopted, would take place April 1st, 2024.

And then Recommendation C deals with the years after 2024. And there's one recommendation which we can discuss and modify however the Commissioners deem appropriate. For years 2025, 2026 and 2027, there will be a 2 percent increase for each year.

Those were the four recommendations that I forwarded to the Commissioners. I thought that the Commissioners -- it would be all right if we would just open it up for discussion and maybe go through everyone first, and then after that, we could have a back-and-forth. Would that be all right? Would that be acceptable to everyone?

So I will start with Commissioner Blank.

In considering the recommendations MS. BLANK: that were given to us, in light of our discussions and the testimony, I'm in favor of Recommendation A in its totality in raising the lower court judge's salaries, because I think we have heard overwhelming evidence as to the need for that.

I'm also in favor of Recommendation C. I think it's our Commission's power to increase or consider

10	:	5	2	:	3	4		1
10	:	5	2	:	3	7		2
10	:	5	2	:	4	0		3
10	:	5	2	:	4	4		4
10	:	5	2	:	4	8		5
10	:	5	2	:	5	1		6
10	:	5	2	:	5	6		7
10	:	5	3	:	0	0		8
10	:	5	3	:	0	7		9
10	:	5	3	:	1	0	1	.0
10	:	5	3	:	1	3	1	.1
10	:	5	3	:	1	8	1	.2
10	:	5	3	:	2	3	1	.3
		_	_		_	_	_	

10:53:28 14

10:53:33 15

10:53:36 16

10:53:39 17

10:53:44 18

10:53:46 19

10:53:49 20

10:53:56 21

10:53:59 22

10:54:03 23

10:54:05 24

10:54:08 25

giving the judges an annual raise for the three other years of this Commission, so that when we get to 2028 or '27, it will be given in the next Commission for four years. You're not behind the eightball again for three years by keeping their salaries stagnant at the — just raising it, the bump from next year. I think that's what will be fair and that's what should be done.

JUDGE FAHEY: Thank you. I will go to my left. Commissioner Weinstein.

MR. WEINSTEIN: We listened to all of the association presidents, OCA, in view of the fact that the increase — the recommendation increase basically comes very close to mirroring raises that the rest of the state workers have gotten over the last four to five years. I think that's a good number, and I'm supportive of it. I support all the other recommendations as well.

I do have one question that I'm -- first of all, as you know - I have spoken about this before - the New York City Housing Court judges, having been a housing court judge for two months, as I think Commissioner Egan reminded me when I was voluntold to take that position, I now have a healthy respect for the work they do, the calendars they deal with, the

10:54:16 1 10:54:20 2 10:54:26 3

10:54:29 4

10:54:33 5

10:54:36 6

10:54:41 7

10:54:44 8

10:54:44 9

10:54:50 10

10:54:51 11

10:54:56 12

10:55:03 13

10:55:09 14

10:55:12 15

10:55:16 16

10:55:22 17

10:55:24 18

10:55:28 19

10:55:33 20

10:55:35 21

10:55:38 22

10:55:44 23

10:55:52 24

10:55:54 25

7

10:55:58 1 10:56:01 2 10:56:06 10:56:10 10:56:13 5 10:56:20 6 10:56:22 10:56:27 8 10:56:31 9 10:56:35 10 10:56:36 11 10:56:41 12 10:56:44 13 10:56:47 14 10:56:49 15 10:56:52 16 10:56:56 17 10:56:59 18 10:57:02 19 10:57:05 20 10:57:09 21 10:57:13 22 10:57:15 23 10:57:20 24

10:57:22 25

volatility of the court. Raising that number to the same as the rest of the lower courts, if you will, is something we must do.

I have a little -- one minor concern as to the percentages of the lower courts because -- and I know Commissioner Egan -- excuse me, Commissioner Fahey, you'll be able to verify this or not, is that 93 percent number. I read somewhere a different number. And I want to be accurate. I want to be quite frank about this.

I would raise all of the lower courts -- having served in the lower court, knowing again their value and all of that, I would raise them to the same as the Supreme Court, but I know that's not going to happen. I think at the very least we should consider raising them to the 95 percent level so that the gap between the two courts do not continue to grow.

Having said that, I do want to be careful about what the current percentage is so that we don't inadvertently increase that gap. Other than that, excellent draft report, and one that I could support wholeheartedly.

JUDGE FAHEY: Commissioner on Recommendation C.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Again, if we don't do something

going forward, we're only putting ourselves back in

the same position four years from now. A modest increase, again mirroring what state employees have gotten over the course of the years, will avoid that.

And I'm also concerned -- I want to make this point too. I have made it before. But it's very important to me having seen what has happened when judges who go long periods of time without raises and they are forced to retire. And mandatory retirement means they cannot fold any of the increases that are done in subsequent years because there's no, you know, retroactivity. And they lose considerably on their pension, so modest increases going forward also avoids that as well. So I would like to see that accomplished.

JUDGE FAHEY: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Egan.

MR. EGAN: Thank you.

First, Judge Fahey, thank you very much for very clearly setting forth the options here.

We have heard a lot of testimony over several days from a lot of different sources. As our fellow Commissioners have noted, there's been ample evidence presented to support a raise. And I think that as we've talked about what that number actually is, looking at what has occurred with the coequal arms of

10:57:33

10:57:38

10:57:41 5

10:57:44 6

10:57:47 7

10:57:51 8

10:57:55 9

10:57:58 10

10:58:01 11

10:58:05 12

10:58:10 13

10:58:12 14

10:58:13 15

10:58:14 16

10:58:17 17

10:58:21 18

10:58:25 19

10:58:28 20

10:58:32 21

10:58:35 22

10:58:38 23

10:58:42 24

10:58:46 25

New York State government, together with what the people who work for our judges have received over the last few years, and again looking forward, I'm supportive of the recommendations in A.

I will also say — again, unfortunately, I don't have that experience with the housing court situation. But certainly there has been ample testimony not only from people we have heard, but also from our colleagues who are sitting here as part of the Commission, in regard to increasing that housing court judge percentage, in particular, together with the city, you know, outside of the city court judges.

In regard to Recommendation C, I certainly — and again, I'm anxious to hear what everybody's thoughts are on the percentage increases. And again, I have always looked at that to say what else of those folks that are here in the State of New York receiving, i.e, through the negotiated either CSEA PATH contracts, or otherwise. Certainly we would not want to penalize our judges who are at the pinnacle of our judicial system in regard to that. But certainly, as I think we have all recognized, New York requires the best and the brightest. In order to do that, we have to be willing to reward that based on standards that we have here within the State of New York.

10:58:51 1 10:58:55 2

10:59:00 3

10:59:06

10:59:10 5

10:59:14 6

10:59:17 7

10:59:20 8

10:59:24 9

10:59:26 10

10:59:31 11

10:59:33 12

10:59:38 13

10:59:42 14

10:59:45 15

10:59:47 16

10:59:51 17

10:59:54 18

10:59:56 19

11:00:02 20

11:00:05 21

11:00:08 22

11:00:14 23

11:00:17 24

11:00:22 25

10

11:00:24 Thank you.

11:00:25 2 JUDGE FAHEY: Thank you.

Commissioner Fontaine.

MS. FONTAINE: I share everyone's sentiment. think I indicated during our last meeting that raises are definitely warranted given the length of time that judges have -- said since they have received an increase. Again, we did talk about the need to provide increases in salary so we maintain and retain judges and to reduce attrition from judges for this very admirable position that they have to do with respect to handling a multitude of cases. We have had a lot of testimony with regard to that.

I am in favor of the increase. I just would like to have more clarity on the percentages.

The 232,600 amount that's referenced in Recommendation A, what percentage increase would that be from the current? I want to be careful.

JUDGE FAHEY: It's a little over 10 percent. It's the number that OCA recommended. I think it was 10.03.

MR. KOVNER: I think it may be 10.3.

JUDGE FAHEY: Is it? I would have to look at the report. We will take a break.

MR. MEGNA: What on average per year is the

11:00:35 6

11:00:39 7

11:00:32 5

11:00:28

11:00:30

11:00:41 8

11:00:50 9

11:00:54 10

11:01:02 11

11:01:05 12

11:01:09 13

11:01:11 14

11:01:15 15

11:01:17 16

11:01:22 17

11:01:29 18

11:01:33 19

11:01:35 20

11:01:38 21

11:01:48 22

11:01:52 23

11:01:53 24

11:01:56 25

11:01:59 1

11:02:02 2

11:02:05

11:02:14

11:02:17 5

11:02:21 6

11:02:23 7

11:02:27 8

11:02:28 9

11:02:30 10

11:02:33 11

11:02:33 12

11:02:35 13

11:02:36 14

11:02:46 15

11:02:51 16

11:02:54 17

11:02:57 18

11:03:02 19

11:03:06 20

11:03:09 21

11:03:13 22

11:03:17 23

11:03:23 24

11:03:24 25

percentage, or is it just a number?

JUDGE FAHEY: I'm not sure, Bob. I thought it was just a number. We will take a break before we talk about the out years, because everybody seems to be leaning towards a number but has questions about the out years. And I will dig that out of the report and have it for you. Is that all right?

MS. FONTAINE: Yes.

JUDGE FAHEY: You all set?

MS. FONTAINE: Yes.

JUDGE FAHEY: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Kovner.

MR. KOVNER: I support the recommendation as set forth in A. I would like to note I was reluctant to propose a change in the percentages — the comparative percentages between the courts, but I found the testimony regarding the housing court particularly persuasive, particularly that of Justice Lebovitz who was testifying not on behalf of the housing court, but describing his years in the housing court, which echoed my own recollection of the challenges in that court. And then would lift also the full-time city court judges upstate is a good balance.

I want to say doing this I believe confirms and

11:03:31 vindicates the widespread judgment that the New York 11:03:36 2 State Judiciary is the premier state judiciary around 11:03:42 the nation. We ought to as a society recognize it 11:03:47 appropriately. This I believe meets that high standard.

> JUDGE FAHEY: Thank you, Commissioner. you for your eloquence, too, in advocating for the judges.

> > Commissioner Megna.

Thanks. I guess, again, I'm okay MR. MEGNA: with, I think, the appropriateness of Part A. Though, again, to get to the 10.3, it would be -- it's interesting that 10.3 percent, consistent as other people have said with the raises of the unions, to then extend -- I'm okay with Part A, I guess, and that immediate increase. I'm going to defer to others in the group about any adjustments that need to be made within the judiciary with one caveat: Which is if we agree to do that, I would like to know how much it's going to cost OCA.

JUDGE FAHEY: It's in the numbers from OCA. It's a letter that I --

> I saw it. MR. MEGNA:

JUDGE FAHEY: So it's there.

MR. MEGNA: And then, again, I think the only

11:03:50 5 11:03:52 6

11:04:01 8

11:03:56 7

11:04:02 9

11:04:04 10

11:04:10 11

11:04:17 12

11:04:24 13

11:04:31 14

11:04:35 15

11:04:41 16

11:04:45 17

11:04:50 18

11:04:54 19

11:04:57 20

11:04:59 21

11:05:06 22

11:05:09 23

11:05:10 24

11:05:12 25

11:05:14 11:05:19 2 11:05:22 11:05:26 11:05:30 11:05:34 11:05:39 7 11:05:41 8 11:05:46 9 11:05:49 10 11:05:53 11 11:05:56 12 11:06:00 13 11:06:02 14 11:06:05 15 11:06:08 16 11:06:15 17 11:06:18 18 11:06:21 19 11:06:25 20 11:06:29 21 11:06:29 22 11:18:26 23 11:18:28 24

11:18:33 25

place that I would deviate from what -- the sentiment I have heard around the table is I don't think I would be willing to say that we need to do a percentage adjustment for the next life of the period. There may be an adjustment. I think when we start talking about adjustments in excess of certain percentages, again it goes well beyond the standard we have talked about in terms of what the unions have gotten and other folks.

So I think I would be uncomfortable committing to that. But I'm sure there's someplace I would be comfortable.

JUDGE FAHEY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner.

All right. So I will open it up for general discussion now if there's anything that we need to add. I would like to take a break for about five minutes because I'm an old man, and you have to be patient with an old man's needs sometimes. If it's okay, we will take about a five minute break. I would ask everyone to turn off their microphones and then we will come back after that.

(There was a recess.)

JUDGE FAHEY: We're back from our bathroom break. We are back on the record.

The Commission has -- is it fair to say to

14

Proceedings

everyone that we have reached a consensus on

11:18:41 2 Recommendation A? Can I say that the Commission is

11:18:44 3 unanimous on that?

11:18:47 4 (A chorus of yes.)

(A Chorus or yes

JUDGE FAHEY: Everyone agrees with that.

Hearing no objection, we're unanimous on

Recommendation A.

On Recommendation C, I am going to recommend a modification to that:

That in the year 2025, there be no increase.

O percent.

In the year 2026, there be a 2 percent increase to the numbers set out in Recommendation A.

And in 2027, there be a 0 percent increase.

So there will be a one 2 percent increase in the three-year period, and that will be in -- based on Recommendation C in 2026.

I think we should take a vote on this. We will start with Commissioner Megna.

MR. MEGNA: I would vote yes.

JUDGE FAHEY: Commissioner Fontaine.

MS. FONTAINE: Yes.

JUDGE FAHEY: Commissioner Weinstein.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Yes.

11:18:52 8 11:18:54 9

11:18:47 5

11:18:48 6

11:18:49 7

11:18:58 10

11:19:01 11

11:19:05 12 11:19:08 13

11:19:12 14

11:19:16 15

11:19:21 16

11:19:24 17

11:19:28 18

11:19:33 19

11:19:35 20

11:19:37 21

11:19:40 22

11:19:43 23

11:19:44 24

11:19:46 25

11:19:47 1 11:19:49 2 11:19:56 3 11:19:58 11:20:01 5 11:20:03 6 11:20:03 7 11:20:03 8 11:20:08 9 11:20:11 10 11:20:13 11 11:20:20 12 11:20:24 13 11:20:31 14 11:20:37 15 11:20:39 16 11:20:47 17 11:20:51 18 11:20:54 19

11:20:57 20

11:20:59 21

11:21:07 22

11:21:11 23

11:21:14 24

11:21:19 25

JUDGE FAHEY: Commissioner Blank.

MS. BLANK: Yes.

JUDGE FAHEY: Commissioner Egan.

MR. EGAN: Yes.

JUDGE FAHEY: Commissioner Kovner.

MR. KOVNER: Yes.

JUDGE FAHEY: Thank you.

All right. So we have done a lot of work here. The Commissioners have done a lot of work. I want to thank you all for the time and effort you have put in so far. We're not complete, however. Unfortunately, we have to finalize the report and forward it to -- per our statutory duty to the Governor, to the Chief Judge and to the Speaker and to the Majority Leader.

What I would recommend is the report needs findings put in. I would recommend that by 11/28 I would submit to the Commissioners a draft final report. That would give you time to look at it and make any recommended changes. I have gotten some recommended changes from Commissioner Blank, Commissioner Kovner already which I will incorporate. And I have discussed them with Commissioner Weinstein.

Whatever changes you get to me, whenever you can, that would be good. I will get you my proposed finalized version for the findings of the Commission.

11:21:23 1 My suggestion is after that, I get that to you on the 28th, I would like to submit the report in writing 11:21:28 2 11:21:32 3 to -- pursuant to our statutory duty on December 4th, if the Commission is all right with 11:21:38 4 11:21:44 5 that, and then release it on the website on December 5th so it's available to the public. Give 11:21:46 6 11:21:50 7 the recipients of the letter one day to have it and 11:21:53 8 review it in case there is any problem. Would that schedule be acceptable to everyone?

Would that schedule be acceptable to everyone?

(A chorus of yes.)

JUDGE FAHEY: Okay. Well, this has been an interesting trip to New York.

As I said before, I want to thank the Commissioners.

I'm not sure if we need to have another public meeting on the judicial pay raise issue. We will see what happens. If we can, if we're just finalizing the final report, I am going to see if we can do it by Zoom, if that's acceptable. I know we had some tough times getting in and out of the city for this meeting. So my proposal is to try and do that and I will let you know.

The other issue that we have in front of us is our future responsibilities which have to do with the

11:21:56 9 11:21:59 10 11:21:59 11

11:22:00 12

11:22:06 13

11:22:10 14

11:22:14 15

11:22:14 16

11:22:17 17

11:22:26 18

11:22:29 19

11:22:34 20

11:22:38 21

11:22:41 22

11:22:44 23

11:22:45 24

11:22:49 25

	Proceedings 17
11:22:53 1	pay raise used with the legislature and exempt
11:22:57 2	employees for 169 Chapter 169 state laws, which,
11:23:03 3	for public purposes, that involves state commissioners
11:23:05 4	such as DEC, public works, DMV, whether or not they
11:23:11 5	will be entitled to raises in a similar discussion and
11:23:15 6	hearings that have to take place.
11:23:18 7	I was thinking that we should let things resolve
11:23:22 8	until after the holidays and try and schedule
11:23:24 9	something for the first week in February. Would that
11:23:28 10	be because I know sometimes people are out of town.
11:23:31 11	Can we target the first week in February?
11.02.22 10	MC DIANT. I think I will be out of town

MS. BLANK: I think I will be out of town.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Me too.

You're going to be out of town. JUDGE FAHEY:

How about the last week in January?

I'll be here. MS. BLANK:

MR. EGAN: You'll be here.

I will not. MR. WEINSTEIN:

JUDGE FAHEY: All right. Second week in

February?

MR. WEINSTEIN: Yes.

MR. MEGNA: Yes.

Nadine. JUDGE FAHEY:

MS. FONTAINE: Yes.

JUDGE FAHEY: Commissioner Blank.

1 1 11:23:33 12

11:23:37 14

11:23:36 13

11:23:37 15 11:23:40 16

11:23:40 17

11:23:41 18

11:23:41 19

11:23:43 20

11:23:46 21

11:23:48 22

11:23:48 23

11:23:50 24

11:23:50 25

MS. BLANK: I'll have to -- you know what, I

11:23:55 2 can't tell from my calendar.

MR. EGAN: I should be fine.

MR. KOVNER:

JUDGE FAHEY: Let's target the second week in February for our first meeting in the next phase. I will forward this stuff and what our responsibilities are. I don't think it's going to be as onerous in terms of your time as this was, because I think we can do the public hearing — we can do the public hearing on both legislature and exempt employees, and then from there we can determine how we want to proceed after we hear from the principals involved. I don't think we need to do two separate ones. They can come in and do it once, I think.

I should be fine.

We're going to need your help because we're going to need a budget on the exempts. I refer to you, I'm referring to Commissioner Megna on that to set them up. I'd like to hear from them on that because they're going to know.

All right. So the second week in February.

Is there anything else we need to discuss today?

Hearing none, then I will adjourn the meeting of the Commission. I will forward a draft proposed final report to all Commissioners by 11/28 and we'll again

11:23:55 11:23:58 11:24:00 11:24:01 5 11:24:03 6 11:24:06 11:24:11 8 11:24:14 11:24:17 10 11:24:23 11 11:24:28 12 11:24:30 13 11:24:34 14 11:24:36 15 11:24:38 16 11:24:39 17 11:24:48 18 11:24:50 19 11:24:50 20 11:24:52 21 11:24:57 22

11:25:03 23

11:25:06 24

11:25:11 25

11:25:14 1	meet in the future.
11:25:14 2	I want to thank you all. It's been a privilege
11:25:16 3	to serve with all of you. You're great public
11:25:19 4	servants. New York state is lucky to have your
11:25:23 5	service. I appreciate it. Thank you on behalf of the
11:25:26 6	Governor, the Chief Judge, the Speaker, and the
11:25:30 7	President Pro Tempore and the Majority Leader of the
11:25:36 8	Senate. Thank you.
11:25:37 9	MR. KOVNER: We should thank the Chair.
11:25:41 10	MS. BLANK: Fantastic, Judge.
11:25:44 11	MR. EGAN: Really well done, Judge.
11:25:46 12	MS. FONTAINE: Thank you.
11:25:49 13	JUDGE FAHEY: Thank you very much.
11:25:49 14	
11:25:49 15	(Proceedings concluded.)
11:25:49 16	*****
11:25:49 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

11:25:49 1

11:25:49 2 11:25:49

11:25:49

11:25:49

11:25:49

11:25:49

11:25:49 5

11:25:49

11:25:49 11:25:49

11:25:49

11:25:49

11:25:49 8

11:25:49

11:25:49 9

11:25:49

11:25:49 10

11:25:49

11:25:49 11

11:25:49

11:25:49 12

11:25:49

11:25:49 13

11:25:49

11:25:49 14

11:25:49

11:25:49 15

11:25:49

11:25:49 16

11:25:49

11:25:49 17

11:25:49

11:25:49 18

11:25:49

11:25:49 19

11:25:49

11:25:49 20

11:25:49

11:25:49 21

11:25:49 22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I, ANTHONY ARMSTRONG, a Senior Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in this action.

Anthony Armstrong

Anthony Armstrong, CSR Official Court Reporter