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(The following proceedings were held at 10:44 a.m.)
THE COURT: Vivian Katsantonis and Joanne Katsantonis versus Shechtman and Honey Sherman, Case Number 13-21482-Civil. On behalf of the plaintiffs, who do we have?

Use the microphone right over here, the one that the prosecutor had.

MR. HARRIS: Good morning, Your Honor. Christopher Harris on behalf of the plaintiffs, and I have with me Mariela Malfeld.

THE COURT: On behalf of the defendant.
MR. SOTO: Alexander Soto and I have Dale Evans here as well.

THE COURT: My goodness gracious. Three emergency motions were filed.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor, based --
THE COURT: On Friday after the calendar call, right before trial, right?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor, because they had pertained to matters that were ordered at the calendar call.

THE COURT: Do we have that rule -- were they filed conventionally or electronically? You may want to have local counsel next to you because -- did you state your name, too, or not? I'm sorry.

MS. MALFELD: Mariela Malfeld.
THE COURT: Were they filed conventionally or
electronically?

MS. MALFELD: One was filed conventionally. The second one was filed electronically.

THE COURT: Why was the second one filed in contravention to the local -- it's not really the local rules, but our electronic filing system that says emergency motions should not be filed electronically. They have to be hand-delivered, and the reason for that is you all are so quick on the trigger. For a lawyer, everything is an emergency. And now, electronically, you just go, "beep beep," electronically. Everything is an emergency.

What happens when everything is an emergency, judges start believing that nothing is an emergency and we kind of get jaded.

But the first one was done correctly because it was sealed and ex parte, though the local rules on motions to seal was not followed. You filed a motion to seal without seeking permission to seal and all on the Friday before trial.

MS. MALFELD: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Did I misstate anything? Correct me if I misstated anything.

MS. MALFELD: I believe that's accurate.
THE COURT: Okay. Why?
MS. MALFELD: It was due --
THE COURT: Not why is it accurate, why did you do it.

MS. MALFELD: Due to the time frame that we were working with and we had --

THE COURT: So when you have shortness of time, we throw out the rules.

MS. MALFELD: No, Your Honor. There would have been no way to physically actually get the second motion filed conventionally because I was in Fort Lauderdale, and I would have never made it to the courthouse on time to file it in time for consideration.

THE COURT: And if you file it electronically -- at what time did you do that?

MS. MALFELD: I don't recall off the top of my head.
THE COURT: So if I had been in Fort Lauderdale, I would have to rush back in here or I could have done it in the computer.

I think in the future if you want to violate the rules, you should seek permission. But, you know, teenagers always say, hey, we'd rather seek pardon than permission. That way they get to do the things that they want to do anyway. But I don't like the way it's been done.

Now, let's put context to this case. We all had a calendar call. I granted the plaintiffs' motion to add an exhibit to this breach of contract involving the sale of a condominium, late, right, right around the calendar call time? Didn't I do that?

MS. MALFELD: Your Honor, I want to --
THE COURT: Did I do that or not?
MS. MALFELD: Yes.
THE COURT: I did that. But then I said, well, out of fairness to the defendants because the plaintiffs waited so long, take the deposition. And I said, when do you all want it? And you all picked a time, date and place.

MS. MALFELD: The circumstances that gave rise to needing to postpone it was --

THE COURT: Was that one of the plaintiffs is a lawyer and had an emergency dealing with a law firm in Virginia.

MS. MALFELD: Generally, yes.
THE COURT: Right?
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, the nature of the emergency was set forth in the confidential affidavit.

THE COURT: I understand. Which was filed without permission.

MR. HARRIS: Understood, Your Honor. There was a misinterpretation of the rules that was made under the extreme circumstances we were working under. So we apologize to the Court.

I would note that the third emergency motion that we filed, we did seek permission from the Court.

THE COURT: And I granted it.
MR. HARRIS: Yes. Well, through your clerk, he asked


MR. HARRIS: Conventionally, I guess.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: Although we would not have had time to do that.

THE COURT: Because you all waited until the end. MR. HARRIS: Well, because it was in response to an order that was issued at 2:00 or that we received at noon.

THE COURT: The order was issued to the last emergency motion.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I mean, yeah. I'm quick, too. All right.
MR. HARRIS: And, Your Honor --
THE COURT: The deposition was taken, I take it.
MR. SOTO: One was.
THE COURT: One was, of one of the sisters.
MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: The nonlawyer sister, or are they both

## lawyers?

MR. HARRIS: They're both lawyers at different firms.
THE COURT: They're both lawyers. So both plaintiffs
are lawyers. So you have added -- oh, my goodness. And all of this with a condominium, unbelievable.

So one was taken, the other one was not. So what should I do?

My order said we'll go to trial with one plaintiff
sister lawyer with the new exhibit, and with the other one with the old exhibit. So we'll have kind of bifurcated -- and then we don't even know if it's a jury trial or not. The last time we were together you said, we'll waive. Now you say you're not even entitled to one. What's the situation with jury or non-jury?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, when I got involved in this case, it was about midway through the proceeding. My first conversation with Mr. Soto, I called him up to say, what's this case about? Where are we going? He gave me his thoughts and began his conversation with, I think the jury --

THE COURT: It's going nowhere.
MR. HARRIS: -- the jury is going to do this, the jury is going to do that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: Okay. As an officer of the Court, I came in here -- and my associate can say that Mr. Soto had similar conversations with her.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: They had advised us that they had requested a jury.

When I came in here --
THE COURT: You waived it.
MR. HARRIS: -- I accepted his representation, and I advised Your Honor that I believed that the defendants had
requested a jury. Mr. Soto did not contest that at the time, but we both agreed to proceed without a jury. Your Honor said, I think you're going to go --

THE COURT: I'd rather have a jury decide this condominium dispute, but now you're telling me no one demanded. So no one is entitled to it.

MR. HARRIS: Right. Mr. Soto went back and checked and confirmed that he had not requested.

THE COURT: And all of this we find out after calendar call.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Because people wait until the last minute to really do things, because you don't think you're going to go to trial. Unbelievable.

So you didn't ask for a jury trial as plaintiffs --
MR. HARRIS: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- and you don't want a jury trial.
What say the defendant?
MR. SOTO: We didn't ask for one, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And you don't want one.
MR. SOTO: No, Your Honor. We don't think it's appropriate in this matter.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, then I'll agree with you. So what do we do with the deposition? Did she finally arrive after 5:00?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What time?
MR. HARRIS: The flight was delayed. And after
receiving your order --
THE COURT: I'm shocked that a flight was delayed.
From where, Washington?
MR. HARRIS: Washington, D.C., by about a half an hour.
But we advised Mr. Soto's office that she would try to be there by 4:45. She ended up getting there a few minutes after 5:00.

THE COURT: And you were gone already?
MR. SOTO: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Are we going to fight about when she got there?

MR. SOTO: Yeah.
THE COURT: We are?
MR. SOTO: We are.
THE COURT: About when she got there?
MR. SOTO: She got there at --
THE COURT: You want me to conduct an evidentiary hearing on when someone got there.

MR. SOTO: Judge --
THE COURT: That may take longer than the 15 -minute deposition I'm entitling you to.

MR. SOTO: Judge, you can look at it any way you'd like to, but the statements that they put into the emergency motion

Go ahead.
MR. SOTO: So --
THE COURT: Your clients are not lawyers, I take it?
MR. SOTO: They are not.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SOTO: I stayed at the office because they said they would be there at 4:45. I received an email, I believe -I didn't see it till the next day.

THE COURT: When did you leave your office?
MR. SOTO: I left at 5:06 right after I filed my opposition.

THE COURT: I long for those private --
MR. SOTO: I'm sorry, Judge?
THE COURT: -- private law days.
So you left Friday at 5:00. Okay.
MR. SOTO: I did, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, good for you.
MR. SOTO: And my associate was present.
THE COURT: And he stayed till 7:00.
MR. SOTO: I believe that he stayed till at least 6:00.
THE COURT: Okay. Yeah.

MR. SOTO: And he can testify as to --
THE COURT: And no one showed up.
MR. SOTO: No, they showed up.
THE COURT: Oh, they showed up, but there was no court reporter or did the associate take the depo?

MR. SOTO: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: He took the depo?
MR. SOTO: He did not. There was no court reporter present.

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. SOTO: The court reporter told us at 2:00; it's
Friday at 5:00, I'm not going to be here.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm glad everybody leaves before 5:00 on Fridays. So much for the Protestant work ethic that America had. All right.

Okay. We're going to have this dispute. What do you have there?

MR. HARRIS: I have the email that Ms. Vivian Katsantonis sent that her flight was delayed at 4:57 p.m.

THE COURT: She sent it to whom, to Mr. Soto?
MR. HARRIS: Mr. Soto.
THE COURT: Look at that. So the plaintiff communicates directly to the defense lawyer. Wow.

MR. HARRIS: Under the emergency circumstances.
THE COURT: That's what happens when the plaintiff is a
lawyer. All right.
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I'd also -- I'm sorry.
THE COURT: It's tough representing one lawyer, let alone two, isn't it?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, it is, Your Honor.
I would also like to say that Mr. Soto made very clear when we advised him that Vivian had got on a plane at about $1: 45,1: 30--$

THE COURT: Well, they had to come here anyway, right?
MR. HARRIS: -- that he would not take the deposition under any circumstances.

THE COURT: Under any circumstances?
MR. HARRIS: Well, unless she magically -- I believe he said unless she magically appears at 2:00, which is impossible because she's in Washington, D.C. on a plane.

THE COURT: Okay. And, of course, you don't know what the affidavit says because it was filed under seal without permission and returned to --

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor --
THE COURT: In fact, I'm going to return it right now.
MR. HARRIS: I have disclosed the substance of the affidavit.

THE COURT: I'll return it to you. I have not disclosed it.

MR. HARRIS: No, we disclosed it to Mr. Soto, in fact,
at the time that Ms. Katsantonis boarded the plane.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: We described the nature of the emergency, which I submit I would not like to publicly disclose because many people's livelihoods depend on it.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm not. Even though the rules weren't followed, I'm not doing it.

Okay. So the motion for correction of the jury trial to a bench trial without objection will be granted, and we'll have a bench trial.

Now, is it Vivian Katsantonis, the one who was not present for the depo?

MR. HARRIS: At the time appointed, correct.
THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to take her deposition or not?

MR. SOTO: At this point, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Well, what other point -- I can't go back.
MR. SOTO: I understand. At this point, Your Honor, I assume --

THE COURT: Federal judges have a lot of power, but that isn't one of them.

MR. SOTO: Next year it'll be in the budget.
THE COURT: Maybe. I'm not complaining. We got our cost of living adjustment, so -- finally.

MR. SOTO: Your Honor, I don't want to delay this any
more, and I assume that we are going to trial as soon as you are done.

THE COURT: All these people came over just to watch the trial.

MR. HARRIS: As soon as you are done with your other hearings this morning. So if we can do it for 15 minutes -- I don't have a court reporter with me. I can probably get it done in five minutes. If we can do it right before we begin the trial, it's your discretion, Judge.

THE COURT: What say the plaintiff?
You're ready to go, right?
MR. HARRIS: We are ready to go, Your Honor. I would like to advise the Court that the exhibit that's in question was an exhibit that was signed and initialed by Joanne Katsantonis.

THE COURT: This is Exhibit C?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, the replacement Exhibit C. It was signed and initialed by Joanne Katsantonis, which she testified to. Mr. Soto took approximately three minutes of questions from her on the exhibit.

THE COURT: Oh, when I said 15 minutes, it's just to be safe.

MR. HARRIS: And Ms. Katsantonis' testimony would essentially be that her sister had the authority to sign the contract on her behalf. There's really no issue. But, you know, we're ready to go to trial now.

If the defendant requires a deposition to ask those questions, that's fine. But since we're in a bench trial, he could certainly ask the same questions during trial, and he'll get the same responses.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know. A lot of people don't get the same responses at trial that they do at the deposition.

MR. SOTO: Judge, if they're --
THE COURT: In 27 years as a judge, I see that all the time.

MR. SOTO: Judge, if they're stipulating on the record that Vivian never signed it and it was signed by her sister, I have no problem with that. I don't need to take her deposition.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. HARRIS: We're stipulating that --
THE COURT: No, no. Just what he said.
MR. HARRIS: Well, with her sister's authority. Joanne signed with Vivian's expressed authority to sign her name to the contract -- I'm sorry -- initialed the contract.

THE COURT: Is that sufficient?
MR. SOTO: That is very sufficient.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. So we will see you at 2:00, and we'll begin trial then.

I'm making you wait, right? I can't believe it, right? Look at that. See what happens? When you're late, I have to even things out. So we'll see you at 2:00.

You don't want to come back at 2:00? It's
inconvenient. There must be another emergency.
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor --
THE COURT: I can't believe that, right?
MR. HARRIS: -- one of our witnesses --
THE COURT: Should I assess the cost of the jury for
today -- what should I do with that? -- based on the representations from last week or not? Should I do that?

MR. HARRIS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Because?
MR. HARRIS: Well, I was relying on representations --
THE COURT: I wonder what the Fourth Circuit, what the Eastern District of Virginia would do, huh? They would have finished this case a long time ago.

Should I assess the fact that jurors would have to be brought in based on the representations from you all last week? Should I do that or not?

MR. HARRIS: I don't believe you should, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Because?
MR. HARRIS: Well, for one, we had asked the Court to -- well, we had stipulated that we didn't want a jury and we specifically cited the reason that we didn't want to tax the Court's resources or the jurors themselves.

THE COURT: Yeah, you did that. Should I assess them and let you split them?

MR. SOTO: No, I don't believe so, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Because?
MR. SOTO: Because immediately when we did learn and we did the research when I was obviously --

THE COURT: When was that, Friday afternoon?
MR. SOTO: You realized that Tuesday when we met for calendar call.

THE COURT: That's when I had my calendar call, so that we had three days to resolve it and the weekend. It didn't work out.

MR. SOTO: It didn't work that way. I notified the Court, obviously, of the two mediations that I was present in on Wednesday and Thursday. As soon as I got back to the office and had a chance to review the pleadings and correct the --

THE COURT: You filed something.
MR. SOTO: I filed something immediately.
THE COURT: When did you do that?
MR. SOTO: Friday morning first thing.
THE COURT: Friday morning as opposed to the afternoon.
MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: All right. Well, I canceled the jury
anyway, see? So that's why I won't assess the cost.
MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: But then I didn't know what was going to happen this morning, and I have other people here who are
waiting.
MR. SOTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So I want to hear from them.
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, may I --
THE COURT: I'll see you at 2:00.
You don't want to come back at 2:00.
MR. HARRIS: I do, Your Honor. May I raise one
procedural issue or one substantive issue?
THE COURT: You may.
MR. HARRIS: We have a third-party witness who is under subpoena. His wife is newly pregnant and they asked us if they could testify in the morning because he needs to take her to a doctor's appointment.

THE COURT: What time? Who is this third-party witness?

MS. MALFELD: The appointment is actually --
THE COURT: I'm sorry, you've got to use the microphone, otherwise, the court reporter can't hear it.

MS. MALFELD: The appointment is at 2:30.
THE COURT: Who is it? Who's the witness?
MS. MALFELD: Oh, Raul Santidrian.
THE COURT: What's he going to say?
MS. MALFELD: He's going to testify to the negotiations with Sean Joseph who's the agent for the defendants.

THE COURT: The negotiations in a breach of contract
case. I can hear that? The parol evidence rule does not bar that.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, the issue is that --
THE COURT: Are you saying there was a contract?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: A written contract.
MR. HARRIS: But the issue is they're saying that there was no authority and there was no acceptance and there was no offer. So it's really about contract formation.

THE COURT: Okay. So you want this witness as a rebuttal witness after the defendants testify.

MR. HARRIS: No, absolutely not, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Because you don't have a written contract.
MR. HARRIS: We do have a written contract, but he's the one who sent it and he's the one who received representations from the other side.

THE COURT: So can I allow oral representations on a written contract?

MR. HARRIS: About the authority. The issue of whether it's --

THE COURT: He's going to say what about the authority? I missed that.

MR. HARRIS: The law on --
THE COURT: No, no. What's he going to say, the witness who has to go to the hospital or the doctor with his

MR. HARRIS: Essentially he's going to say --
THE COURT: Tell me exactly what he's going to say.
MR. HARRIS: He's going to say in terms of authority that he --

THE COURT: About anything. That's all he's going to testify to.

MR. HARRIS: That all of the communications between the two parties were conducted through the real estate agents, that the real estate agent for the seller --

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on. Give me names.
MR. HARRIS: Sorry. Okay. Raul Santidrian is the buyers' agent. He is the one who has the medical issue.

THE COURT: He's the buyers' agent?
MR. HARRIS: Correct.
THE COURT: And the buyers are?
MR. HARRIS: Vivian --
THE COURT: Your clients.
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And they're not going to testify.
MR. HARRIS: They are going to testify.
THE COURT: Of course. So what's he going to add?
MR. HARRIS: Well, we anticipate objections about who actually sent the email and when. The issue of --

THE COURT: So you want him as rebuttal. So tell him
to take his wife to the doctor this afternoon, and he can come in on Tuesday or Wednesday. We'll figure out a time.

How's that? He doesn't want to do that?
MR. HARRIS: I don't know. We didn't anticipate a
later schedule, but I believe he can be ready Tuesday.
THE COURT: Okay. I mean, the doctor's appointment can't be more than an hour, right? Is everything okay?

MS. MALFELD: I'm just going to let him know so that he doesn't come up here.

THE COURT: Well, I don't -- it's up to him if he wants to come, but it's up to you. I don't really think you need him, but it's up to you. They're your witnesses. But he should take his wife to the doctor.

Okay. What else?
MR. HARRIS: That's the only issue, Your Honor.
THE COURT: From the defendants.
MR. SOTO: We have nothing pending in front of you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll see you all --
MR. HARRIS: Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor. We'll have one preliminary motion before trial starts.

THE COURT: Really?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Before the bench trial starts. Okay. What would be the preliminary motion before the bench trial?

MR. HARRIS: Well, we can address it at the beginning of the bench trial.

THE COURT: Well, what is it? No, I don't like --
MR. HARRIS: The issue is also at calendar call we raised the outstanding issue of our motion to compel documents from the defendants.

THE COURT: You want to resolve a discovery dispute right before opening statement.

MR. HARRIS: We want to resolve a failure to obey your discovery order dispute. You ordered at that time that defendants were required --

THE COURT: You see, I'm very lenient with failure to obey orders. So should I be strict on this one?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, it's prejudicial. We have not ever gotten the emails that they promised to provide for this case.

THE COURT: Oh, we're back to that. You didn't give him the emails?

MR. SOTO: Your Honor, I provided all the emails having to do with the unit to them prior to 5:00 on Thursday pursuant to your order.

THE COURT: How many were there?
MR. SOTO: There was one.
THE COURT: You don't believe that there was only one.
MR. HARRIS: If you recall, Your Honor, Mr. Soto asked
for three days to go through thousands of emails, and you said anything related to the property, anything. I have extensive testimony from the defendants themselves and the real estate agent saying they communicated by email relating to the transaction that we're here to discuss today. Thirty, 40, 50 emails alone --

THE COURT: You have those.
MR. HARRIS: I have the testimony right here.
THE COURT: No, but you have emails.
MR. HARRIS: No, I do not.
THE COURT: You don't?
MR. HARRIS: No.
THE COURT: And there were the emails between whom?
MR. HARRIS: Presumably there were emails between the two sisters about the property.

THE COURT: With each other.
MR. HARRIS: They emailed frequently, yes. They email all the time.

THE COURT: Which two sisters?
MR. HARRIS: The defendants, Mary Shechtman and Honey Sherman.

THE COURT: We have sisters versus sisters. Okay. I want to make sure. The nonlawyer sisters who are being sued by the sister lawyers. Okay.

MR. HARRIS: And they also emailed frequently, 30, 40,

50 times. One defendant testified 30, 40, 50 emails about -THE COURT: Between each other.

MR. HARRIS: -- about the property.
No, with their real estate agent.
THE COURT: Who's the real estate agent?
MR. HARRIS: Sean Joseph.
THE COURT: And he doesn't have emails, either. He didn't bring them over.

MR. HARRIS: He provided some emails, but not everything.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: And we had a motion to compel documents from him as well.

THE COURT: Okay. So you want me to grant the motion to compel.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I would like to have sanctions imposed.

THE COURT: What do you want me to do?
MR. HARRIS: I would like the Court to make a finding that Honey Sherman, defendants Honey Sherman and Mary Shechtman gave full authority in issuing a counteroffer that is --

THE COURT: That's what the case is all about.
MR. HARRIS: Correct. And we don't have the emails.
THE COURT: So you want me to grant judgment as a
matter of law because of failure to supposedly disclose emails.

That would make the trial real quick, wouldn't it?
MR. HARRIS: Well, Your Honor, the defense is that they did not give instructions to their agent to transmit a counteroffer. They testified in deposition that they communicated those instructions via email.

THE COURT: So you're going to bring that up, right, and you're going to say --

MR. HARRIS: I will bring that up.
THE COURT: -- where are the emails? I mean, that's
what lawyers always say in front of the jury. You can say it in front of the judge. Where are the emails? Are you going to say that they're not being truthful?

MR. HARRIS: I think that --
THE COURT: Are you going to say they're not truthful?
MR. HARRIS: Yeah.
THE COURT: I'm shocked that the plaintiffs' lawyer is
going to say that the defendants aren't truthful.
What is the defendant going to say, that they're telling the truth, right?

MR. SOTO: Of course, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And I guess I'll make a decision then.
MR. HARRIS: Okay, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What do you think? I mean, what am I missing?

MR. HARRIS: We can proceed under that framework.

THE COURT: That I can make a decision? That's what you all wanted, right?

MR. HARRIS: We will address the issue at trial.
THE COURT: If you wanted a jury trial, then I would do more about it because the jurors would have to all decide. You want a bench trial? You're stuck with me.

MR. HARRIS: Understood. We will proceed --
THE COURT: Yeah, unless I -- you know, I can recuse.
I can't think of a reason. Where was the condominium? Maybe I'll buy a condo there or something.

Okay. 2:00.
MR. SOTO: See you then, Judge.
THE COURT: See you then.
MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And you all never discussed settlement here, right?

MR. HARRIS: We've attempted many times, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And failed miserably. Okay. See you at
2:00. Wonderful.
Philadelphia is the city of brotherly love. I want to know what the city of sisterly love is. Does anybody know?

MR. SOTO: Miami.
THE COURT: Miami? Yeah.
There is an attorney conference room with Internet on the 14th floor across from the library, too --

MR. SOTO: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: -- that is not used a lot. It has copies of our local rules and everything else, too, in case anybody wanted them.

The cafe is on the 7th floor, too.
MR. SOTO: Found that earlier, Judge. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: People can reach deals. Okay.
(There was a recess taken at 11:10 a.m.)

## AFTERNOON SESSION

(After the luncheon recess, the following proceedings were held at 2:30 p.m.:)

THE COURT: We're back in the case involving the Katsantonis sisters and the Shechtman and Sherman sisters. Okay? The plaintiffs are present, defendants are present, counsel for both sides.

Does the plaintiff wish to make an opening statement?
MR. HARRIS: If it pleases the Court, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Everyone else sit down and make an opening.

## OPENING STATEMENTS

MR. HARRIS: Good morning. My name is Christopher Harris. I represent the plaintiffs in this case, Vivian and Joanne Katsantonis, who are sisters. This case is about my
clients' frustrated attempt to purchase a condominium unit from the defendants. The evidence in this case will show that my clients, the plaintiffs, began looking for a place in South Florida for their parents to spend the winter months and ultimately they decided to purchase a condominium that they could also have as an investment.

The evidence will show that the defendants, Mary Shechtman and Honey Sherman, who are also sisters, as co-trustees of the trust, are the legal and beneficial owners of a condominium unit in Sunny Isles, specifically Unit 3807 at TDR Tower III, and that in their capacity as co-trustees and on behalf of the trust, the defendants listed the property for sale in December 2012 for 1.35 million.

The evidence will show that the plaintiffs through their real estate agent, Raul Santidrian, issued an initial offer to purchase the property on February 4th, 2013 for a purchase price of $\$ 1.2$ million. The evidence will show that the defendants through their real estate agent, Sean Joseph, responded the next day with a signed counteroffer for $\$ 1.33$ million. That counteroffer was executed on behalf of the defendants as the seller by one of the two defendants, Mary Shechtman.

The evidence will then show that on the same day, February 5th, 2013, the plaintiffs issued a new second offer to purchase the defendants' condo for 1.23 million.

The evidence will show that the defendants rejected that second counteroffer and through their real estate agent, Sean Joseph, advised plaintiffs that their minimum price was \$1.3 million.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me interrupt you for a second. You said there was a counteroffer for 1.33 million?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And that was not accepted.
MR. HARRIS: Correct. Rather than working with that document, they issued a new offer.

THE COURT: The new offer was?
MR. HARRIS: The new offer was for 1.23.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry.
MR. HARRIS: So I had said I believe the evidence will
show the defendants rejected that second counteroffer and through their real estate agent, Sean Joseph, advised the plaintiffs that their minimum price was $\$ 1.3$ million.

So then the evidence will show that the plaintiffs on February 6, 2013 then gave a third written and signed counteroffer for $\$ 1.27$ million. The evidence will show the plaintiffs' real estate agent, Mr. Santidrian, after being advised once again that the sellers would not agree to a price below $\$ 1.3$ million, told the sellers' agent, Mr. Joseph, that if he could provide a written counteroffer for that price, he could probably -- that Mr. Santidrian could probably get the
plaintiffs to accept it.
The evidence will show that in response, on February 7th, 2013, the defendants returned the counteroffer, again, signed and initialed by defendant Mary Shechtman, on behalf of the seller, for $\$ 1.3$ million. The evidence will show that the plaintiffs decided to accept that signed counteroffer, and on that same day, February 7, 2013, initialed the changes that the defendants had made and returned the fully executed contract to the defendants. They then wired the $\$ 50,000$ initial deposit required by the contract into escrow, and that, again, was on February 7, 2013.

So why are we here? The evidence will show that about the same time the plaintiffs accepted the defendants' counteroffer, two other units in the same tower and in the same line were listed for sale, one for $\$ 1.7$ million and the other for $\$ 1.65$ million. The evidence will show then that on February 8, 2013, the day after defendants had already returned the fully executed counteroffer and wired into escrow the initial deposit, the defendants began to disavow the contract. Specifically, the sellers' agent claimed for the first time ever that as a requirement of the trust -- and mind you, they have never provided a copy of the Trust Agreement until after the lawsuit was filed -- both of the defendants were physically required to execute the contract in order to have a binding agreement.

The evidence will show that although the plaintiffs
thereafter continued to attempt to perform and complete the contract, the defendants made clear that they had no intention of honoring the sellers' obligations under the contract and ultimately repudiated the contract entirely.

The defendants have asserted in this case that the contract is invalid because only defendant Mary Shechtman signed it and not Honey Sherman. This claim is based in part on the terms of the Trust Agreement. We will look at the Trust Agreement, and you will hear testimony confirming that the Trust Agreement nowhere requires that both co-trustees are required to physically sign a legal document or real estate contract for it to be binding on the co-trustees.

The defense is also based on defendants' claim that Honey Sherman never authorized Mary Shechtman to make the $\$ 1.3$ million counteroffer and deliver it to the plaintiffs, but the evidence will show that Honey Sherman did, in fact, authorize Mary Shechtman alone to sell the condo for $\$ 1.3$ million and authorized her to instruct their real estate agent, Sean Joseph, to make the counteroffer to the plaintiffs. I'm talking about the February 7, 2013 counteroffer for $\$ 1.3$ million.

The evidence will also show that Honey Sherman authorized her sister, Mary Shechtman, alone to sign other legal documents related to the condo, including at least one of the two Lease Agreements that the defendants entered on this very same property.

The evidence will show that as a matter of course, Honey Sherman in her role as trustee, basically left her sister, Mary Shechtman, by herself, to manage the trust property and only got involved when a major decision regarding renovation, lease or sale of the condo property was required. In those instances the evidence will show that Honey and Mary would have a discussion and then come to an agreement between themselves, sometimes involving their agent, Mr. Joseph, but never recorded in writing. And then Honey would leave Mary to set about implementing that decision, giving instructions to Mr. Joseph or signing documents by herself as necessary to effectuate the decisions previously reached by the co-trustees.

In addition to all that, the evidence in the form of testimony from the two defendants themselves will show two sides of the very same critical fact. Honey Sherman has authorized and approved everything that Mary Shechtman has done in connection with the trust property, and Mary Shechtman had Honey Sherman's approval for everything she did in connection with the trust property.

We're asking this Court for specific performance of the contract, and in the alternative, damages.

Ms. Katsantonis or the Katsantonis sisters will testify that they agreed to the essential terms of the contract, that they relied on the representations delivered through the parties' real estate agents in the form of offers and
counteroffers. They will testify that they were continually willing to perform the buyers' obligations under the contract and that the defendants repudiated and breached the contract and that the plaintiffs suffered injuries and damages as a result thereof.

They will also testify to the fact that they manifested their acceptance to the contract by initialing the changes and directing the real estate agent to return it on February 7, 2013, completing the contract. They will testify that they took further acts to accept the contract by wiring the escrow funds; and they will testify to the fact that they continue to, even after the defendants disavowed the contract, attempt to perform the buyers' obligations under the contract by, among other things, arranging for an appraisal which was blocked by the defendants who claimed that there was no contract.

We'll also present the testimony of the buyers' real estate agent, Mr. Raul Santidrian. He will testify regarding the communications and negotiations that he had with Mr. Joseph, the defendants' real estate agent, specifically reflecting that Mr. Joseph had authority to make the counteroffer and that he operated on the instructions of the plaintiffs in issuing the accepted fully executed contract on February 7, 2013.

He will also corroborate the testimony that the defendants disavowed and repudiated the contract, and he can speak to the emails, correspondence and discussions that the agents had between themselves.

We'll also present the testimony of Mr. Joseph, the defendants/sellers' agent. He will testify that he had authority from both defendants to make and issue the counteroffers, including that he had authority to sign the names of one of the defendants to the various contract documents including the February 7, 2013 counteroffer. And then we will ask for the testimony of the defendants who will testify that Mary Shechtman always had the authority to do everything she did under the trust, including providing instructions to Mr. Joseph to include the making of the counteroffer.

We'll also present the testimony of Honey Sherman who will testify that she allowed Mary to handle the day-to-day operations regarding the trust property and that she spoke with Mary Shechtman every day and gave her authority to do everything that she did in connection with the trust property.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this: The Complaint has how many counts?

MR. HARRIS: It has three counts, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Count 1 is what?
MR. HARRIS: Specific performance.
THE COURT: Okay. So in Count 1 as a matter of equity, you want for the specific performance, that is, to turn over the condominium in exchange for the remainder of the money. I
assume the $\$ 50,000$ is still in trust.
MR. HARRIS: I believe that's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: That's what you want, right?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, we would like to complete the transaction for the remainder of the price.

THE COURT: And I remember from prior discussions, since it is a count in equity, there is a lease, right?

MR. HARRIS: There is a lease and the contract
documents specifically provided that the sellers would assign the lease to the purchasers and that the purchasers would assume the lease.

THE COURT: Just as it is.
MR. HARRIS: And collect the rents, the remaining rents. That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: For whatever the period of time of the lease.

MR. HARRIS: I believe there are six months remaining, Your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: All right. Count 2 is what?
MR. HARRIS: Count 2 is an alternative count for damages --

THE COURT: For what?
MR. HARRIS: -- based on the breach.
THE COURT: Breach of contract.
MR. HARRIS: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And in the breach of contract claim, the damages are what?

MR. HARRIS: The damages are the fair market value --
THE COURT: How much is that?
MR. HARRIS: That is --
THE COURT: Well, what do your clients think is the fair market value? I assume they think the fair market value is $\$ 1.3$ million, since that was their offer.

MR. HARRIS: Well, that would be a fair value, but they cannot get a comparable unit for that price. They have tried and their offers have been rejected. So they are --

THE COURT: Offers of what?
MR. HARRIS: Offers to purchase other condo units.
THE COURT: But I don't know how those condominiums are, but how do you establish what -- the contract was for $\$ 1.3$ million. So your damages are more than $\$ 1.3$ million.

MR. HARRIS: It would be the difference in the fair market value. The market has gone up since, as I indicated that very same - at that same window of time when these offers were going back and forth. Comparable units were coming on the market for anywhere from 400 to $\$ 600,000$ more than the agreed price.

THE COURT: And who's going to testify as to that?
MR. HARRIS: The plaintiffs. And also we can have the testimony of the real estate agent as well.

THE COURT: And the damages are what then?
MR. HARRIS: The difference in the fair market value.
THE COURT: Which is what?
MR. HARRIS: It's a range of 400 to 600,000.
Obviously, we would claim the high end.
THE COURT: So that's what you would get in the breach of contract if you win.

MR. HARRIS: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And what's Count 3?
MR. HARRIS: Count 3 is for promissory estoppel.
THE COURT: That's in equity.
MR. HARRIS: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Where do you want me to estop?
MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Can I go back? I had forgotten. For our damages, we're also claiming the lease payments that we lost. We were supposed to take over a lease, and at the time of closing there were six months left on the lease.

THE COURT: This is the same lease we're talking about?
MR. HARRIS: No, it's a renewal. So a new term started on September 15th, I believe, 2013.

THE COURT: This was a cash sale of the condominium, I take it.

MR. HARRIS: Yes. And it provided for an assignment of the lease. So we would have been entitled to all the lease
payments.
THE COURT: How much was that?
MR. HARRIS: It was $\$ 5,900$ per month with six months remaining on the lease and now they have renewed.

THE COURT: And how much are the taxes?
MR. HARRIS: The taxes?
THE COURT: Yeah, remember? And I assume this is not an unusual condominium where there's no assessment.

MR. HARRIS: The assessments and fees are provided in the Lease Agreement.

THE COURT: No, what I'm saying is -- oh, the tenant pays the assessment and the taxes or the owner? The owner pays that, right?

MR. HARRIS: Well, property ownership taxes, I'm not super familiar with Florida property tax law.

THE COURT: Okay. But wait a second. If your clients owned it, they would have to pay it.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, we would --
THE COURT: But you're asking for the lease payments. Well, you've got to subtract the taxes that they would have to pay, right, because the defendants have been paying the taxes and the defendants have been paying the typical maintenance fee that condominium owners pay, right?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor, the lease provides for an assessment, a specific assessment that I believe covers fees and
covers taxes.
THE COURT: Well, I don't know. If you want damages, we're in a trial, you've got to give me real numbers. What real numbers are we talking about? Because you want me to give you an award of money, but that would have to be reduced by whatever the taxes are, no? Or they would pay for the taxes and you would get the rent payments. Obviously, that's not equitable, agreed?

MR. HARRIS: Agreed.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: But I believe it would be the defendants' burden to show that they paid taxes on the property.

THE COURT: Well, they obviously paid taxes. If they didn't pay taxes, then it would already be taken over by the county. The county was here while you guys were gone arguing a lot about the water quality and all this stuff on a consent decree. So, obviously, it would have to be deducted from that, right?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'm asking to see whether it's about the same.

MR. HARRIS: I mean, I have the Lease Agreements.
We've asked for all of their documents related to the property, and we've been provided no financial data whatsoever.

THE COURT: But the taxes on a condominium is easy
enough. You can get right now on the computer on the Internet and figure out what the taxes are, right? You don't need discovery or subpoenas for that. In today's world, you just get on the Internet. Nobody has privacy anymore and certainly public records are public records. Everybody knows what it is. Now, the assessment also. So taxes and assessments. So if the taxes and assessments are more or less what the rent is, sometimes that's true, sometimes it's not, then that takes care of that, doesn't it?

MR. HARRIS: If that assumption is correct and we could certainly explore with the defendant what they pay on taxes.

THE COURT: Well, it's time to -- this is it. As Judge Kehoe -- may he rest in peace -- used to say, it's time to fish or cut bait. Can't keep on. This is it. Okay. So that's what you want.

The promissory estoppel means you want me to estop what? You want me to estop them receiving the rent that they got already.

MR. HARRIS: We want them to --
THE COURT: But they pay the taxes. Your client didn't own the condominium. Let's say you couldn't rent it. You do know what the rental is. The rental was what, how much?

MR. HARRIS: \$5,900, Your Honor.
THE COURT: How much is it now?
MR. HARRIS: $\$ 6,000$. And I do have the tax figures.

THE COURT: Okay. What are the taxes?
MR. HARRIS: 18,509 a year. That was for 2013.
THE COURT: And what's the maintenance fee?
MR. HARRIS: The maintenance fee is $\$ 1,008$.

THE COURT: A month.
MR. HARRIS: Per month, correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So that's \$12,000 a year.
MR. HARRIS: Roughly, yes.
THE COURT: So that's $\$ 30,000$ of money they put out and the rental is like $\$ 72,000$. So it's $\$ 42,000$ that you want.

Okay. Anything else?
MR. HARRIS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. From the defense.
Thank you, Mr. Harris.
MR. HARRIS: Thank you.
MR. SOTO: Thank you, Your Honor. Alex Soto for the defendants, Mary Reich Shechtman and Honey Sherman.

Your Honor, this dispute rises out of a contract for the purchase and sale of Unit 3807 in Sunny Isles. The contact which has now been amended as Exhibit $C$ has been stipulated by the plaintiffs that Vivian Katsantonis actually did not sign it, that she had full authority -- that Joanne received full authority from Vivian to execute that contract. And this whole case revolves around who had authority to do what, when and where.

In this particular contract, at no time did Honey Sherman give her authority to enter into this contract; so much so that Sean Joseph sent it over to the plaintiffs to let them know that they're seeking 1.3 million and that he had no authority to accept an offer for 1.3.

Sean Joseph will testify that he sent over a counteroffer for 1.3. He also had a conversation with Raul Santidrian, too, that the signature of Honey was not on the contract and that needed to be put on the contract; so much so that it was followed up with a text message the next morning, which Mr. Santidrian also excluded text messages which he's never produced under subpoena to give you the other conversation in between, that he disagreed with Sean and that Sean told him there was no executed contract.

Under the statute of frauds in the state of Florida, a transaction involving real property must be executed by the individual to be charged. That authority cannot be given but in limited circumstances.

As for their claim of promissory estoppel, the Supreme Court has stated because it deals with a contract that is governed under the statute of frauds, you cannot have promissory estoppel. There's a 2013 case that just came out from the Florida Supreme Court that stated that.

Going back to the contract where the plaintiffs allege that Mary signed the Notice of Commencement, that she did it on
her own and under penalties of perjury, she wrote down that she was the owner. She didn't write down that she was the owner. The contractor filled out the Notice of Commencement for her and asked her to sign at the same meeting that her and Honey were present at to go ahead and authorize the construction for that. Honey followed up by issuing a check to the condo association for this property.

These two sisters are heavily involved in everything the family trust does. They communicate on a daily basis about what they're going to do, when they're going out to lunch, when they're going to go shopping or when they're going to meet with their family at certain places. They do everything together. They're sisters.

In this particular contract, the testimony will be from the defendants that Honey never authorized the contract. The only thing that the ladies did was allow Sean Joseph to list the property and set parameters for a contract that they may execute, not that they would; so much so that Mr. Joseph felt it prudent to put it in email to Mr. Santidrian, which was then forwarded to Joanne and Vivian Katsantonis.

The plaintiffs in this matter are over 20-year lawyers. One does construction litigation, the other does mergers and acquisitions. These are two individuals that are very adept at reading contracts. The contract is very simple. It lists both Honey Sherman or Honey Shechtman -- Honey Sherman and Mary

Shechtman as the sellers with the initials TRS. It was apparent to anyone in first year law school that it had to be executed by both. One did not give authorization and stated such in her testimony consistently.

The damages that are being sought here are speculative at best. We have no disclosure of experts. We are allowing -you are allowing the owners' prospective buyers to testify as to the value. The value that they're going to put on this unit is two listings for 1.7 and 1.9 million, not closed sales in the building. You will see from the testimony of Sean Joseph of the closed sales in the building are nowhere near 1.6 or 1.9 million of the last five sales of identical units.

You will also see that the prospective purchase of the unit was to be financed and they were using the rents that were to be assigned to them under the contract to help pay and offset the finance. They never got financed, so they have no finance damages. The rent was only for six months because that's when the lease terminated, which was on September 14th. So the damages under the breach of contract are way too speculative. They cannot ask for damages from 400 to 900 with no evidence whatsoever of those prices if those units sold. It's too speculative; can't be given.

But firstly, there is no contract. The statute of frauds is very specific. There is case law out there after case law that anybody that's listed on the sales contract must sign
the sales contract. Honey did not assent to the contract. Therefore --

THE COURT: Why did her sister sign it?
MR. SOTO: Excuse me?
THE COURT: Why did her sister agree?
Mr. SOTO: Her sister did not sign.
THE COURT: Nobody agreed.
MR. SOTO: It was signed by Sean Joseph.
THE COURT: And who does he represent?
MR. SOTO: He is the real estate agent for the defendants.

THE COURT: And who is the defendant; your client.
MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: He has no authority to do that.
MR. SOTO: He was not given authority to do that.
THE COURT: Okay. But do you disagree with the history of the offers and counteroffers mentioned by plaintiffs' counsel now in opening statement? Did that happen where it was going back and forth, or is that all made up?

MR. SOTO: The counteroffers did happen.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SOTO: They went back and forth.
THE COURT: So obviously your clients wanted to sell
the condominium; right or wrong?
MR. SOTO: They were looking to sell the unit; hence,
why they listed it.
THE COURT: They put a price of what? How much was the price?

MR. SOTO: It was listed at 1.35 .
THE COURT: And eventually, you would concede, there was a counteroffer for 1.3, eventually?

MR. SOTO: There was a counteroffer sent to Raul Santidrian.

THE COURT: For $\$ 1.3$ million.
MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: The counteroffer was by whom?
MR. SOTO: The counteroffer was sent by Sean Joseph putting down Mary Shechtman's initials.

THE COURT: Okay. So someone did that --
MR. SOTO: Yes.
THE COURT: -- saying we're willing to sell it for 1.3 million, right?

MR. SOTO: Sean Joseph did that and he will testify to that.

THE COURT: Okay. He didn't have the authority to do that.

MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: So all the other offers have been rejected.
MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: So your clients didn't want to sell the



MR. SOTO: They were seeking offers.
THE COURT: They were seeking offers.
MR. SOTO: Correct. And that's what Sean Joseph was doing, was negotiating. It is at the middle --

THE COURT: But the offer that eventually came was minimally below the original purchase price, right?

MR. SOTO: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: The offer that they got at the last moment was close to what they were asking for in the first place, true?

MR. SOTO: Well, it was $\$ 500,000$ less or $\$ 50,000$ less.
THE COURT: 50,000 is a big difference.
MR. SOTO: It was 1.35.
THE COURT: 1.35 was what they were asking.
MR. SOTO: That was --
THE COURT: Eventually they got an offer for 1.3, right?

MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: So it's \$50,000.
MR. SOTO: Less.
THE COURT: Traditionally, $\$ 50,000$ from a 1.3 million in the real estate business, that's a pretty good deal for the seller, no?

MR. SOTO: Well, other than the tax implications because they are foreign citizens.

THE COURT: And the tax implications were present when
they put it up for sale.
MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: What's the difference of the $\$ 50,000$ ?
MR. SOTO: Well, that it wouldn't be the only thing.
The other things that were taken into account would have been the taxes which Honey had to discuss with her accountant, which is another email that was sent.

THE COURT: But that they would have to do with 1.35
million. In other words, if they had accepted the $\$ 1.35$ million offer in the first place --

MR. SOTO: They still would have had to pay, yes.
THE COURT: Pardon?
MR. SOTO: They still would have had to pay it, correct.

THE COURT: It's over. 1.35 million -- if someone would have said, done, we're buying the condo for $\$ 1.35$ million, it doesn't matter whether one or the other had changed their minds because that was the offer, right?

MR. SOTO: Well, that's not true, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then why put it up for sale?
MR. SOTO: You can list a building for 1.3 million and if you get an offer for that, if you don't sign it, it's not an effective contract.

THE COURT: So why would you do that?
MR. SOTO: Because you're either testing the market --

THE COURT: And that's what they were doing.
MR. SOTO: I didn't say that.
THE COURT: Well, I want to know about this case.
MR. SOTO: In this particular case because of the
circumstances Mary had --
THE COURT: But those circumstances existed when it was put up for sale.

MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: Did they both agree to put it up for sale?
MR. SOTO: They agreed to both put it up for sale as long as it met certain parameters.

THE COURT: The parameters were what, 1.35 million?
MR. SOTO: At least 1.3 million and that --
THE COURT: Which was the eventual offer anyway.
MR. SOTO: Correct, and that Mary had another unit to purchase under the trust.

THE COURT: And that was an agreement that was done in writing between the two of them?

MR. SOTO: No.
THE COURT: Just an oral agreement.
MR. SOTO: That is an email that was sent to
Mr. Joseph.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Which he ignored, in your view.

MR. SOTO: Who?

THE COURT: Joseph.
MR. SOTO: Apparently.
THE COURT: All right. Okay.
MR. SOTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Call your first witness,
please.
MR. HARRIS: Plaintiffs call Vivian Katsantonis.
THE COURT: Okay. Raise your right hand.
VIVIAN KATSANTONIS, PLAINTIFF HEREIN, SWORN.
THE COURT: Have a seat. State your name when you sit down and spell it for the court reporter, please.

THE WITNESS: It's Vivian Katsantonis, K-a-t-s-a-n-t-o-n-i-s.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we have some courtesy copies of the exhibits for the Court.

THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead.
MR. HARRIS: At least one.
THE COURT: That's okay. Just give it to him and he'll give it to me. It saves you the trip. He's young and he still works out.

MR. HARRIS: And Your Honor, I have a copy for the witness to refer to as they're introduced.

THE COURT: It's up to you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Ms. Katsantonis, do you understand we're here regarding the attempted purchase and sale of the condominium unit located at TDR Tower III condominium, address 15811 Collins Avenue, Sunny Isles, Miami-Dade County, Florida, Zip 33160?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is there a unit number associated with that property?
A. It's Unit 3807.
Q. Okay. And when did you first learn about that unit?
A. I believe it was some time in January 2013.
Q. Okay. Any reason you were looking at the -- or I'm sorry. And how did you specifically hear about the property?
A. We had been looking for a long time for a place for my parents. My parents are getting older and we were looking for a place for them to spend winter months and we were also looking for an investment. We started looking at least a year beforehand. We started off in Aventura and eventually moved to Sunny Isles.

We had been renting beforehand, and our agent, Raul Santidrian, he's the one who first introduced us to the Trump buildings. And so I believe this specific unit was a unit that he introduced us to.
Q. Okay. And did you visit any online sites to check prices or anything like that?
A. My sister and I were online daily, especially when we were in serious mode for finding a place and actually putting offers down. So yes, we were constantly on the sites. We were looking at different MLS listings and different other Realtor sites that listed the properties available for sale.
Q. Okay. And when, if ever, did you visit the condo 3807 unit?
A. I believe it was some time in late January.
Q. Okay. And when, if ever, did you consider or decide to make an offer to purchase the property?

MR. SOTO: Objection, leading.
THE COURT: If you have an objection, you must stand up. If you don't stand up, I'll overrule the objection, under my local rule.

MR. SOTO: Objection, leading, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Overruled. I have already ruled.
THE WITNESS: Our first offer was made on February 4, 2013.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Okay. And why did you decide to make an offer on this particular unit?
A. We had been looking, as I said, for a long time.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this: Does it matter?
MR. HARRIS: Well, Your Honor, because of the equitable nature of specific performance, one thing that the courts generally look at is whether it's a unique piece of property and

SO --

THE COURT: And your argument is that this condominium in Sunny Isles is a unique piece of property. If I disagree with you, you lose.

MR. HARRIS: I don't believe that you have to make that finding as a requirement of specific performance. However, that is how the case law has evolved, that specific performance treats real estate as unique property and, therefore, that's why it's an appropriate remedy for a --

THE COURT: For a condominium. There's no condominium like it.

MR. HARRIS: That's what I was trying to elicit from the witness, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that's your argument.
MR. HARRIS: Correct. Well --
THE COURT: In all of Sunny Isle and Aventura, there's no condominium like this one.

MR. HARRIS: It's a very personal decision.
THE COURT: And if you don't convince me of that, you lose.

MR. HARRIS: I don't believe that I need to convince you of that. I just --

THE COURT: So why bring it up if you don't need it? I'm on a need-to-know basis.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.

THE COURT: I don't want to know anything unless it's necessary.

In other words, if the condominium were for the parents, for the uncles, for the children, for the cousin, because we're from this state or that country, if it doesn't make any difference, why am I hearing it, especially since there's no jury? And they wouldn't hear it either because the specific performance is equitable.

Why do I need to know that?
MR. HARRIS: I guess I was attempting -- I don't think you need to know it. I mean, you said need-to-know, but because equity requires consideration of all facts and circumstances, that would just be one tick on the side of the particular --

THE COURT: So if it was for a disabled parent, you would win. But if it's just for them to use and rent out, you would lose.

MR. HARRIS: I don't agree with that, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then it doesn't make any difference. I took two kind of extremes. So if it doesn't make any difference, I don't want to hear it.

MR. HARRIS: If you don't --
THE COURT: Right? The "why" they purchased it, it doesn't matter. It's irrelevant, isn't it?

MR. HARRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: Isn't it?

MR. HARRIS: If the Court believes it's irrelevant -THE COURT: Well, you think it's relevant.

MR. HARRIS: I think it's one tick in the column in
favor of specific performance, but it's not dispositive.
THE COURT: Because if it was for five disabled
children, I would grant it. But if it's for a selfish single person, I would deny it. It doesn't matter why.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: Does it? Or you still think it matters?
MR. HARRIS: I do not think it matters based on --
THE COURT: Then if it doesn't matter, I don't want to hear it.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, if I may --
THE COURT: I'm sorry. You're a witness. If you want to represent yourself and be a lawyer, I'll hear from you. But you're a witness, which means you answer the questions posed by the lawyers or the Court.

Is there a question pending?
THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then don't talk.
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. You don't have to thank me. Just follow my orders for a change.

Okay. Go ahead.
MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. So about how much was the property listed for when you made your initial offer?
A. $\quad 1.35$ million.
Q. Okay. So how much did you offer to purchase the property for on February 4, 2013?
A. We offered \$1,200,000.
Q. Okay.
A. And at the time that was in line with being one of the highest offers for a condominium unit in the 07 lines.
Q. Okay. I'd like you to look at Exhibit 10. You should have a binder in front of you, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 10.

THE COURT: Are you introducing all of these exhibits?
MR. HARRIS: We can do it that way, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Which exhibits are you introducing with this witness? Give me numbers.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I'm not prepared to tell you which specific exhibits I would get with this witness like that.

THE COURT: Why not? How else do you do it?
MR. HARRIS: Well, I just don't have a list with me. I can go through my testimony --

THE COURT: Oh, here, I'll give you my list then. But I need one, too. You don't have an extra list?

MR. HARRIS: Exhibits 10 --
THE COURT: 10. Any objection to 10 ?

MR. SOTO: None, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Admitted.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 10 was received in evidence.)
THE COURT: Next. What else?
MR. HARRIS: 12.
THE COURT: Any objection to 12?
Admitted.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 12 was received in evidence.)
THE COURT: Next.
MR. HARRIS: 16.
THE COURT: Any objection to 16?
Admitted.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 16 was received in evidence.)
MR. HARRIS: 22.
THE COURT: Any objection to 22?
MR. SOTO: Hang on, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Admitted.
MR. SOTO: No objection.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 22 was received in evidence.)
THE COURT: Any other one?
MR. HARRIS: Exhibit 24, Your Honor.
MR. SOTO: Objection.
THE COURT: Okay. These are the comparables?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Where is this from?

MR. HARRIS: The Internet.
THE COURT: What's the objection?
MR. SOTO: Your Honor, these comparables are listing agreements. They are not for sold units. Both 24 and 25 are the same.

THE COURT: Is that true, Mr. Harris? These are sold units or up-for-sale units?

MR. HARRIS: Some of them are up for sale, Your Honor. Some of them --

THE COURT: Separate the ones that are up for sale and only include sales. How many do we have, actual sales?

MR. HARRIS: The second unit, 4207, was a sale.
THE COURT: 4207. What else?
MR. SOTO: Which exhibit is that?
THE COURT: 24.
MR. HARRIS: It's the second one. It's a compilation of comps.

THE COURT: Exhibit 24,4207 . What else? We'll call that 24A.

What else? Next. Let's go.
MR. HARRIS: And 4307, which is the last.
THE COURT: 4307, we'll call that B. What else?
MR. HARRIS: The other speak to the motive of the sellers because of the proximity of the time when they came --

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: You can use it to impeach if you want.
Okay. 4207 is a sale and purchase price of how much?
How much?
In the same building, I take it, right?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: How much, 4207?
MR. HARRIS: 1.48 million.
THE COURT: Okay. And 4307 is what?
MR. HARRIS: 1.45 million.
THE COURT: Same square footage?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Same view?
MR. SOTO: Yeah, all of the 07s, to my understanding, are in a straight line with the same view, but you have to go to a certain level --

THE COURT: Okay. I'll admit those exhibits. Any other exhibits?

And we'll mark them as 24 A and B .
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Numbers 24A and 24B were received in evidence.)

THE COURT: Any other exhibits through this witness?
MR. HARRIS: The Court's indulgence.
I believe that's it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Is there a contract signed on

February 7th?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor. We can introduce the contract.

THE COURT: Which one is that? That's kind of like the big one.

MR. HARRIS: Exhibit 1.
THE COURT: Exhibit 1. Okay. Who signed that contract?

MR. HARRIS: Joanne Katsantonis signed with express authority from Vivian.

If you look at it --
THE COURT: And who signed it for the seller?
MR. HARRIS: Who signed it for the seller? Mary
Shechtman has ratified that as her own signature.
THE COURT: Any objection to 1 ?
MR. SOTO: No objection to the contract, Your Honor, just the soliloquy that Mary Shechtman signed it.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we have a pretrial stipulation.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll admit it.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 1 was received in evidence.)
THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. Ask her questions if you need to.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. So we were looking at Exhibit 10.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you identify this document for me, please?
A. This is the offer we made to the trust on February 4, 2013 and it's for 1.2 million, and it also includes on paragraph 20 that the existing lease with the tenant who's paying 5,900 per month, that those payments would be part of the transaction that would go to the purchaser.
Q. And who prepared this offer?
A. My understanding is the contract is a Florida Bar form and then --

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this: What difference does it make?

MR. HARRIS: I'm just trying to get to the relationships between the parties.

THE COURT: The relationship between what parties?
MR. HARRIS: The defendants -- well, the plaintiffs, their agent, the sellers' agent and the defendants.

THE COURT: Because none of those people are going to testify.

MR. HARRIS: They will --
THE COURT: So you want her to tell you who the real estate agent was who signed it, who represented who?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I'm just trying to --
THE COURT: And she would know because someone told her.

MR. HARRIS: I'm just trying to get a foundation for the --

THE COURT: Oh, we don't need foundation. For what? The exhibit is in. You don't need a foundation. It's in.

MR. HARRIS: Understood, Your Honor. I will move on.
Okay?
THE COURT: It's up to you. I'm a move-on guy. Think
you're in the Eastern District of Virginia.
MR. HARRIS: I feel that, Your Honor.
THE COURT: We're almost as good.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Who is Raul Santidrian?
A. That's our agent.
Q. Okay. And what did you hire him to do?
A. Mr. Santidrian represented us with regard to this
transaction. When we would sign and initial the contract, we would deliver it to him for him to convey to the sellers' agent. Q. Okay. So with this initial offer that you're looking at, Exhibit 10, how was that communicated to the defendants?
A. Our agent, Raul, communicated it and conveyed it to their agent, Sean Joseph.
Q. Okay. How did you come to find out that Mr. Joseph was the sellers' agent?
A. Mr. Joseph initially showed us the property on behalf of the seller, and Raul would send us the emails back and forth with
him and Sean. Some of them.
Q. Okay. And did you ever communicate directly with

Mr. Joseph?
A. Not during the transaction. He showed us the property initially.
Q. Right. Okay. So in the course of early February 2013 when the offers and counteroffers were going back and forth, did you ever communicate with Mr. Joseph directly?
A. No. No, I did not.
Q. Okay. And to the best of your knowledge, did your sister ever communicate directly with Mr. Santidrian -- I mean, with Mr. Joseph? I'm sorry.
A. No.
Q. Okay. What about the actual owner of the property; do you have an understand as to who that is?
A. It's a trust.
Q. Okay. And the trust is -- do you understand who the defendants are in this case?
A. They are trustees on behalf of the trust. It's Mary Reich Shechtman, trustee; Honey Sherman, trustee.
Q. Okay. And did you ever communicate directly with either of the two defendants?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Okay. To the best of your knowledge, did your sister ever communicate directly with either of the two defendants?
A. No, she did not.
Q. Okay. So who, if anyone, instructed Raul Santidrian to send your February 4, 2013 offer to Mr. Joseph?
A. I did, along with the authority from my sister.
Q. Okay. And looking back at Exhibit 10 , does it identify the property that we're here to discuss today?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. And it is, in fact, a contract between the plaintiffs and the defendants?
A. That's correct. We sent this offer and if they had signed it, it would have been a binding contract.
Q. And what does it provide for the purchase price?
A. 1,200,000.
Q. Okay. And it requires an initial deposit. What is that?
A. $\$ 50,000$.
Q. Okay. And what does it provide for a closing date?
A. I believe it was March 15, 2013.
Q. And did the seller respond to your $\$ 1.2$ million offer?
A. They did. They gave us a counteroffer.
Q. Okay. And when did you receive that counteroffer?
A. I believe it was the same day.
Q. Okay. And how much was that counteroffer for?
A. They provided us a counteroffer of $1,330,000$.
Q. So if you would look at Exhibit 12, please.
A. Yes, that's the counteroffer. And it was initialed by MS,

Mary Shechtman, and it's signed by Mary Shechtman.
Q. Okay. And it's also signed by -- do you recognize the signatures on the second page?
A. Those are my sister and I -- our signatures. I signed with express authorization of my sister. And then Mary Shechtman's signature.
Q. Okay. Now, you referenced some initials and changes.
A. Right. The changes were the purchase price they had lined out or crossed through our 1,200,000 offer, added the counteroffer of $1,330,000$, initialed it, and then crossed out the balance which originally was 1 million 50 and struck through it and wrote balance. And then they initialed just the changes. Q. Okay. Were there any other changes to the February 4, 2013 offer that they were sending back?
A. No, there were no other changes to the terms of the contract.
Q. Do you have an understanding of how this counteroffer came to the plaintiffs?
A. My understanding is that Sean Joseph, on behalf of the seller, transmitted it to our agent, Raul Santidrian.
Q. And did you have a belief at the time as to whether this formed a complete contract or a complete offer?
A. I understood that if we had signed it, it would be a binding contract and that the offer was complete as presented.
Q. So did you accept this counteroffer?
A. No, we did not. We provided another offer.
Q. Okay. And how much was that offer for?
A. $1,230,000$.
Q. And that was for the same unit, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did that offer alter any of the contract terms such as the initial deposit requirement, closing date, the other terms we've looked at?
A. No, it did not.
Q. How did the defendants respond to that offer?
A. They rejected it.
Q. Okay. How did you come to that understanding?
A. We were advised by our agent, Raul Santidrian, and he also forwarded us an email that Mary Shechtman had written to Sean Joseph in which she advised she needed 1.3 million.
Q. Okay. So did you receive a counteroffer?
A. Not to the 1.23. Our agent had discussions with Sean Joseph. I think they had discussions about maybe going -MR. SOTO: Objection, Your Honor, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained means you can't answer the question. Next question.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. So what did you do next?
A. We made another offer.
Q. A third offer, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And when was that?
A. That was on February -- I think we signed it on February 6th, but it was transmitted the morning of February 7, 2013.
Q. Okay. And how much was that offer for?
A. 1,270,000.
Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 16, please?
A. Okay. Exhibit 16 is a copy of the offer we conveyed for 1,270,000. It has all of the exact same terms, the initial deposit of 50,000 with the balance showing the same. It has the same terms with regard to the rental property and that we would get the lease. All the terms stayed exactly the same. The only thing that was changing was the price and that was for $\$ 1,270,000$.
Q. And did the defendants accept this offer?
A. No, they did not.
Q. Were there any more offers or counteroffers after this?
A. We received the counteroffer from the defendants for the 1.3 million. We felt that we were going as high as any unit on a dollars per square foot for the Trump Building III. We were offering the highest amount on a dollar per square foot. So for us it was really -- it was a lot to keep going up in price, and we were already getting pulled way beyond where we wanted to be.

So, again, they advised -- my agent advised us or advised me that they wanted 1.3 and we didn't want to make
another offer of 1.3 and have that rejected. So we felt like we kept getting pulled up higher and higher in prices. So we advised our agent that if they were willing to sell for 1.3 , we needed them to put a binding counteroffer to us of the 1.3 so that we would accept it if we had a binding counteroffer.
Q. Okay. So what instructions did you give to Mr. Santidrian, if any, in that regard?
A. I advised Mr. Santidrian --
Q. Raul, we'll call him.
A. -- Raul to procure a signed and complete counteroffer of 1.3 million, and if that was obtained, then we would accept it and have a sale of the property and purchase it.
Q. Do you know if Mr. Santidrian followed your instructions? A. He did. I know he advised Sean Joseph, and we received a counteroffer fully executed for $\$ 1.3$ million.
Q. Okay. And did you review that counteroffer at the time?
A. I did.
Q. When was that counteroffer, did you say?
A. We received it on February 7th. I think we received it around noon.
Q. Okay. I'll ask you to look at Exhibit 1.
A. Exhibit 1 is -- it's their counteroffer for the 1.3 million and then we initialed the changes. So this was the final binding contract.
Q. Okay. And what changes were made?
A. The seller had crossed out --
Q. I'm sorry. Can I stop you there?
A. Sure.
Q. This document has some edits to it, and initials, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So what was it based off of, if you know? What was the original document before it was changed?
A. The original document was our offer of $1,270,000$.
Q. Okay. When did you make that offer?
A. We made it February -- we wrote it and signed it February 6th, but it was conveyed February 7th at 7:30 in the morning.
Q. Okay. And so you received that offer back; is that right?
A. We received a counteroffer of $\$ 1,300,000$ from the seller.
Q. Okay. And what changes were made to the offer that you had sent on February 6th or 7th that you received now on February 7, 2013 back from the seller?
A. The seller crossed out the purchase price of 1.27 million and wrote $1,300,000$ and initialed it. They crossed out the bottom and wrote balance and initialed it and then they initialed every single page of the contract and signed.
Q. So how did you respond to this counteroffer?
A. We responded by initialing the changes and sending the entire contract back to the seller.
Q. And how was that transmitted back to the seller?
A. Our agent, Raul Santidrian, transmitted the executed
contract back to the sellers' agent, Sean Joseph.
Q. When did that occur?
A. That occurred February 7th in the evening.
Q. And did you authorize or instruct him to do that?
A. We instructed Raul Santidrian to send the executed contract back. I believe we executed the contract early afternoon, like by 2:00, and then we wire transferred the $\$ 50,000$ deposit early afternoon as well.
Q. All on February 7, 2013?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. So then did the parties proceed to closing on March 15, 2013?
A. No, we did not. The next day on February 8th, the sellers began to disavow the contract.
Q. Okay. What do you mean by that, that they disavowed the contract?
A. For the first time after we had gone back and forth and had these counteroffers with Ms. Shechtman's signatures, we were told for the first time that the seller was taking the position that they needed also the signature of Ms. Sherman as trustee.
Q. Okay.
A. And we advised that we did not think that was correct, that we thought we had a binding contract, we understood we did, and we anticipated and planned to go forward.

We subsequently sent our appraiser to the property, and
the appraiser was denied admission to the property, even though the agreement provides that we would have access to the property. And we continued to receive emails saying there was -- at first they were trying to drag us along. At first they said, well, Ms. Sherman hasn't signed it, but she's coming into town. So if you want to wait another week, we can see if she'll sign it, and we basically responded that we had a binding contract. Certainly, if she was going to sign it, we didn't want to create an issue if there wasn't one, but that we expected them to fully comply with the binding contract.

About days later when we started sending in the appraiser for the property, they expressly wouldn't allow him in and said, we don't have a contract, why are you sending the appraiser, and continued to disavow the contract.

Finally, about a week after that, they told us to just move on.
Q. Okay. So when was it that you first learned that the sellers were taking the position that both signatures of the defendants, both of the two defendants, were required on the contract?
A. I believe I learned about it around some time in the afternoon of February 8th.
Q. February 8th you said?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So that's after you sent the counteroffer initialed
back to the seller, the February 7, 2013 initial counteroffer? A. That's correct. February 7th we all thought we had a binding contract. We were sending congratulations all around and had, you know, by my understanding of all legal terms, a binding contract.
Q. Okay. And how many times prior to February 8, 2013 had you ever heard anything to indicate that the seller was requiring the signatures of both co-trustees on the document?
A. We were never apprised of that, never told that and never had any indication.
Q. Okay. And prior to February 8, 2013, what reason, if any, did you have to think that both co-trustees were required to sign the contract?
A. We never had any reason to believe that. I dealt with trusts before also. It's common to have one person sign on behalf of the trust. There's no basis to believe anything more than one signature would be required.
Q. Anything connected with the prior counteroffer that they had sent, that the defendants had sent earlier on or about February 5th? Was there anything on that that indicated that you didn't think that both signatures were required?
A. All of our transactions showed that it was only Mary Shechtman and that one person needed to sign it. We had offers and counteroffers back and forth with Mary Shechtman.

Simultaneously, we were being provided with emails from Sean

Joseph that said she -- you know, my buyer, she wants 1.3. She will not go higher. He sent, he forwarded the email from Mary herself who said, I need 1.3 million.

So all of the back and forth, all the transactions and the emails indicated that Mary Shechtman singularly had the authority.
Q. Do you know whether the contract provides the buyer with a remedy in the event that the seller fails to perform its obligations under the contract?

MR. SOTO: Objection. It call for a legal conclusion, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the contract say something about it?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Do you think I'm literate and I can read it? Do you think you're literate and you can read it? That's the easier question.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor, I think we're both fully capable of reading it.

THE COURT: Then you can read it to me. It doesn't matter whether the witness can read it or not.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: It says what it says. Whatever it says, it is.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Now, in connection with your negotiation of the contract for
the sale of the subject condominium, how did you determine what is an acceptable price?

THE COURT: Does that matter? What difference does it make whether she believes it's an acceptable price? If the contract were for $\$ 900,000$ and the same parties would have signed it, whoever signed it, and putting aside the issue of authority, would that make any difference or would you still win?

MR. HARRIS: I'm not sure I understand the purpose of the hypothetical.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's put it this way: You're asking the witness what, how she came up with the $\$ 1.3$ million offer?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And my question to you is, what difference does it make? She thought that's what she should pay, that's as high as they would go, let's get this thing done. What difference does it make?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I was simply leading into the fact that the plaintiffs were trying to buy a condo at the price that they contracted for and that after that in terms of --

THE COURT: Doesn't the contract speak for itself? Is this a binding contract, in your view?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, absolutely, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What does it say?

MR. HARRIS: \$1.3 million.
THE COURT: Why does it matter how they got to 1.3
million?
MR. HARRIS: It doesn't matter how they got there. I was merely leading into the fact that she, as she has testified, was watching the market daily and then --

THE COURT: But what difference does that make if you're watching the market daily or you're a fool and you offer too much or too little? Isn't a contract a contract no matter what?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And then if it's a contract, it's a contract no matter what. That's really the dispute in this case, isn't it?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, it is, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So it doesn't matter whether the defendant sisters made a mistake in offering a condo for too little or the plaintiff sisters offered too much. It doesn't really matter. It's whether it's a binding contract. And what's going to dictate if it's a binding contract or not in this case?

MR. HARRIS: Whether there was an offer and acceptance by duly authorized agents.

THE COURT: That's it, and that's what the case is about, not whether someone got a good deal or a bad deal, right? Do I determine whether someone got a good deal or a bad deal?

Do I go around checking on the Internet whether this was a good deal or not?

MR. HARRIS: I was merely getting into the damages aspect of our alternative count for damages.

THE COURT: Okay. And the way you would get to the damages is by the comparables, I take it.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. She obviously thought she was getting a good enough deal for 1.3 million, right?

MR. HARRIS: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And the comparables I already -- in response to my questions, you said how much they were and they're a little bit more, for 1.4 , right?

MR. HARRIS: Those comparables, yes.
THE COURT: So you want to get to other comparables that are not purchase prices, but just listing prices, right?

MR. HARRIS: Correct, Your Honor, because --
THE COURT: So if there was a listing price for $\$ 10$ million, I'm supposed to consider that? Someone was crazy enough to say, or you know, a spouse says to the other spouse, okay, Honey, I'll put it up for sale.

MR. HARRIS: Right, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'll put it up for $\$ 10$ million. No one will buy it. Does that mean anything? No. Not even to the spouse, right?

MR. HARRIS: Well, the issue was that the plaintiffs were damaged because they could not buy a comparable unit at the $\$ 1.3$ million price. So they went looking --

THE COURT: So if they bought another unit in another building for $\$ 1.4$ million -- let's say that -- or in the same building, do you still have a breach of contract claim?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So it doesn't matter if they bought five condos in the same building. If they're good business women and they said, this is a steal, we're buying them, or if they're bad business women and they buy five and they overpaid for it, it doesn't matter, does it? Right?

MR. HARRIS: It does not matter. It only speaks to the value of the property.

THE COURT: But the value of the property is the contract price, right?

MR. HARRIS: Well, the damages are what they could get in the alternative.

THE COURT: Now. Now, right?
MR. HARRIS: Correct.
THE COURT: Okay. But it would have to be the same unit.

MR. HARRIS: Well, I believe that it's measured from the time that they went to contract.

THE COURT: Okay. To now. And you have two
comparables. Isn't that the best evidence? Not under the best evidence rule, but I'm talking about good evidence.

MR. HARRIS: I don't think it is, Your Honor, because the --

THE COURT: Oh, the two comparables is not good evidence.

MR. HARRIS: It's good evidence. It is good evidence, absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: Is it the best evidence?
THE COURT: What is the best evidence, what I think I could get for my house or what someone actually paid for a house that is similar? What do you think is the best evidence between the two, the better evidence? What would you think; what I think I could get for my house or what a comparable sold for? What is the better evidence?

MR. HARRIS: Well, what a comparable sold for, but there are --

THE COURT: I agree with you. See, I'm agreeing with you. That's why I let those exhibits in.

MR. HARRIS: And I agree with you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You probably would have liked to try this in front of a jury. I wouldn't be bothering you so much.

MR. HARRIS: No, Your Honor. We're happy in front of you.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: I think that Ms. Katsantonis, because of watching the market, had some knowledge about circumstances as to why some units may have sold and some others did not.

THE COURT: I won't accept that.
MR. HARRIS: For instance, some units are furnished, some are not, and there's a difference in price.

THE COURT: Are these two that were sold, are they furnished or unfurnished?

MR. HARRIS: Can we have testimony from Ms. Katsantonis?

THE COURT: You don't know.
MR. HARRIS: I couldn't tell you right now.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and ask her. The two units, are they furnished or unfurnished?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, the 4307, which is --
THE COURT: I just want to know if they're furnished or unfurnished. That's all I want to know.

THE WITNESS: Okay. This is --
THE COURT: I just want to know if those two units --
THE WITNESS: I understand.
THE COURT: -- are furnished or unfurnished. One or the other.

THE WITNESS: 4307 is unfurnished and --
THE COURT: 4207, is it finished or unfurnished?

THE WITNESS: 4207 I believe was unfurnished.
THE COURT: Okay. So they're both unfurnished.
THE WITNESS: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Was this a sale of an unfurnished condo?
MR. HARRIS: Can we ask the witness?
THE COURT: You don't know that.
MR. HARRIS: I don't know, Your Honor. I believe it was.

THE COURT: Okay. I think so. All right. Next question.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Do you have any understanding of what --

THE COURT: Whenever you ask a witness, "do you have any understanding," the chances are 90 percent that it's objectionable, because our understanding of things 90 percent of the time -- this might be the 10 percent -- but 90 percent of the time because the understanding comes from what, looking at things or hearing things.

MR. HARRIS: Correct.
THE COURT: If you hear things, it would generally be hearsay. Not always, but almost always. If you're seeing things, I don't know what she's looking at. But the only two things that I'm going to allow are these two condominiums. That's why we talked about them.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.

## V. Katsantonis - Cross

THE COURT: So it doesn't matter what she did on the Internet to justify the 1.3 and to say we got a good deal at this stage. Now, you can ask in cross-examination of the defendants why you think they are so-called reneging on their offer, if that's what they're doing.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: But not her. All right?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
I have no further questions.
THE COURT: Cross-examination.
MR. SOTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Ms. Katsantonis, which were the two units that you said were comparable?
A. Well, there are a number of units that were comparable. The ones the judge is referencing --

THE COURT: Those are the only two I want to hear about.

THE WITNESS: 4207 and 4307, I believe.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Now, do you know what the difference was between 4207 and the subject unit here, 3807 ?
A. I know it's on a slightly higher floor.
Q. It's actually the penthouse, isn't it?
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A. No, I don't know if 4207 is. 4307 is the penthouse and we actually put an offer on it at the time. The difference with Unit 4307 is it's incomplete. It had no flooring and it had no closets.
Q. 4207?
A. 4307 .
Q. Okay. I'm just talking about --
A. That was the penthouse.
Q. Yeah.
A. I don't know what 42 -- I don't know why you're calling it the penthouse, 4207. 4307 was.
Q. Take a look at Exhibit 24. I believe it's the first page, which is 4207.
A. The first page of 4207?
Q. Of Exhibit 24.
A. Oh. That's 4007. That's not 4207.
Q. Okay. I think I pulled that one out of my book because the judge wouldn't allow it.

Take a look at the listing for 4207. It's under --
A. Yeah, I have it.
Q. You got that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you go down to the line that says REM on the left side?
A. Where?
Q. Middle of the page.
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A. On the front page?
Q. Yeah. It's about three quarters of the page down.
A. Three quarters?
Q. A quarter of the page down. It says REM --
A. Remarks .
Q. It says REM, doesn't it?
A. I believe that's remarks.
Q. Okay. Now, would you read that for me?
A. It says, "Luxurious oceanfront penthouse with amazing direct views of ocean, intercoastal and downtown. Three full bedrooms, three full bathrooms, professionally decorated, featuring marble floors, Artefacto furniture, 12-foot ceilings, electronic window treatments and custom closets."
Q. And that was listed for 1.65 , correct?
A. That was listed for 1.65 .
Q. Actually sold for 1.480 ?
A. It did. It actually keep going up and down in price. If you look at the price history, it started at --
Q. I'm sorry, Ms. Katsantonis, I actually --
A. 1.8 .
Q. I think I asked you if it sold for 1.48 million.
A. Ultimately, it did.
Q. Okay. And that sold January 7th of 2014, correct?
A. Right. I don't know what the seller's motivation was.
Q. Obviously not. You didn't put an offer in on this one, did
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A. you?
A. We did not. We tried to. We had Raul call and attempt to put an offer. He offered 1.4 and at the time we offered to put in -- at the time we put in an offer, they told us it had already sold.
Q. Let's take a look at Exhibit Number 1.

Does that include furniture in the price in that contract?
A. No, it does not.
Q. Okay. Now, you stated earlier that we signed the contract. Isn't it true that you never signed or initialed this contract?

THE COURT: Which contract are we talking about?
MR. SOTO: Exhibit Number 1, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: Exhibit Number 1, I was on the phone with my sister and authorized her to sign my initials and signature. BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Now, you believe, and I think you testified earlier, that it's your --
A. So I would say, yes, I did sign it through my authorized representative.
Q. Okay. And if you hadn't given that authorization and Joanne would have initialed, would you say that that was an unauthorized contract?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. If Joanne put down your initials without your authorization,
would that be an acceptable contract?
MR. HARRIS: Objection, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: It could be if I ratified it.
THE COURT: Grounds.
MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Grounds.
MR. HARRIS: It's a hypothetical.
THE COURT: It is. I'll sustain the objection.
MR. SOTO: Okay.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Now, you say you were on the phone and you gave Joanne the explicit authority to sign that and initial it for you, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, did you ever have any conversations with Mary Reich Shechtman or Honey Sherman?
A. Not personal phone conversations.
Q. During the time of the transaction from, I think you said, the beginning of January until February, did you have any conversations, emails or anything that was sent to you directly from Mary Reich Shechtman or Honey Sherman?
A. I'd say the transaction started on February 4th and went through February 7th. But yes, I had transactions directly through -- from Mary Shechtman when she delivered the counteroffers through her agent to us and I had emails including one that was a cut and paste of Mary Shechtman's direct email to
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1

Sean Joseph.
Q. Okay. Did she communicate it to you?
A. She personally did not communicate it to me. She did through her agent.
Q. Okay. So you never received any direct communications from either of the defendants in this case, correct?
A. Not personally from them directly to me, but through their agent, I did.
Q. Okay. And it was your -- let's take a look at Exhibit Number 10.
A. Okay.
Q. Did you execute that contract?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. And are those your initials at the bottom left?
A. They are.
Q. And it's your signature on the signature line on February 4th, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, take a look at Exhibit Number 12.
A. Okay.
Q. You stated that that was a counteroffer that was sent to you, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Who was it sent to you by?
A. I believe Raul Santidrian forwarded it to me.
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Q. Okay. And Raul sent it to you. That has the initials, your initials, the same ones that appear on Exhibit 11, correct?
A. We weren't talking about Exhibit 11.
Q. Yeah, Exhibit 11 is Exhibit 12 except for some handwriting, correct?
A. Not in my exhibit book.
Q. I'm sorry. I'm actually looking at your exhibit book and it's Exhibit 10. I'm sorry. 10 and 12.
A. Okay.
Q. 10 and 12 are the exact same contract, correct, except for the price?
A. They appear to be that she struck through the price and initialed it.
Q. Okay. Do you know who actually put that MS down?
A. Only by attending Mr. Joseph's deposition.
Q. Up until the time that you received this on February 8th, did you know how that got on that paper?
A. I understood that Ms. Shechtman or her authorized representative signed and transferred it.
Q. Well, I'm asking a simple question. How do you know that?
A. Well, I guess I believed in the truth of the representation made by her agent.
Q. Well, what representation did Mr. Joseph make to you?
A. My understanding is that Realtors can't transmit offers or counteroffers without express authorization.
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Q. Okay. Let me ask you this question again: What representations did Mr. Joseph make to you?
A. He sent me the signed counteroffer by Ms. Shechtman.
Q. Did he send it to you or did he send it to Raul?
A. Well, I guess if it's going to my agent, I believe it's going to me.
Q. So Mr. Joseph sent something to your agent which was then --
A. On behalf of --
Q. -- which was then forwarded to you, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Does your agent have authority to enter into a contract for you?
A. I authorized my agent to transmit my agreement.
Q. Okay. That wasn't the question I asked. Can you read back the --
A. He could, if I asked Raul to sign my name or initial my name, he could have my authority.
Q. He could --
A. Yes.
Q. -- if you asked them to do that, correct?
A. That's one scenario.
Q. Okay. But you never transmitted anything to Raul giving him any authority, correct?
A. Well, no, that's not correct. I transmitted lots of things to him with authority to convey my offers.
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Q. But did you give him authority to sign on your behalf?
A. On these particular contracts, that instance didn't come up with me.
Q. Okay. The only person that you authorized to execute these contracts on your behalf was your sister, correct?
A. For these contracts, correct.
Q. Correct. Well, these are the only ones -- you didn't sign it?
A. I'm just saying in general. I mean, these are --
Q. Okay. But on all of these, Joanne signed for you, correct?
A. Not on all of them.
Q. Okay. Which ones didn't she; which exhibits?
A. We just talked about Exhibit 10. I signed that. That's my signature and those are my initials.
Q. What about 12?
A. On Exhibit 12, those are my initials also and my signature.
Q. But you didn't re-sign them, correct?
A. I'm sure I ratified them. I'm not sure if I -- I don't recall specifically.
Q. You ratified them on Exhibit 12?
A. Well, I think we did a counter of 1.23. That's on the same document. You know, we crossed through the 1.33 and then we added 1.23.
Q. That's Exhibit Number 14, not 12, correct?
A. That's Exhibit 14, correct.
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Q. Okay. So on Exhibit 14, those are your new initials, correct?
A. I don't know if they're my new initials, old -- they're my initials. This one has my initials and my signature.
Q. Well, those aren't the same --
A. In fact, the date and the signature line is blocked out and signed or initialed.
Q. Well, if you take a look at the first page and compare it with Exhibit Number 12, your initials on the right side don't appear anywhere, correct?
A. Pardon?
Q. Your initials don't appear on the right side of Exhibit 12, correct?
A. Right, I initialed the changes.
Q. Correct. On Exhibit 14 they do exist, correct?
A. Right, because it was a counteroffer.
Q. The initials on the bottom of the page are the same, correct?
A. I can't tell exactly, but they're initialed.
Q. And your testimony today is that you actually made those initials at the bottom, correct?
A. I think that's correct.
Q. Okay. And the initials on the right side of Exhibit 14, those are your initials, too, correct? You put them there?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Okay. Was that Joanne again?
A. That was Joanne who initialed those.
Q. Okay. And you gave her your authority over the phone?
A. I gave her my authority over the phone.
Q. Okay. Now, take a look at what you have as Exhibit 1 --
A. Okay.
Q. -- in your book. Now, that's the contract that you allege
is in effect at the present time, correct?
A. That's the binding contract.
Q. Take a look at the parties. Can you tell me who is listed on parties on Line Number 1?
A. The trust is listed as the seller, the trustees.
Q. Is that what it says?
A. That's what it says, Mary Reich Shechtman, trustee; Honey Sherman, trustee.
Q. And when you reviewed this agreement the first time -- which would have been when you made the offer of 1.27 , correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I believe that is Exhibit Number 16 -- what was your understanding of who those people were?
A. I understood there was one trust that owned the property.
Q. Okay. And you understood that the trust was called the Mary Reich Shechtman TRS, Honey Sherman TRS?
A. I don't know if I specifically knew the name of the trust, but I understood that the sellers were listed as trustees for
the trust.
Q. So you just said that in the plural, "trustees." That means that the two individuals that were listed you understood were the owners of the property?
A. No, I never thought there were two individuals. I deal with -- I've dealt with trusts before. It's very common to list TRS, TRS. There's no "and," there's no "or" separating the names and it's very common that you list the TRS, TRS and only one signature is required.
Q. So it was your understanding that there was only one person or one entity that owned --
A. I only knew it was a trust. I didn't have any specific -- I didn't have the Trust Agreement. I didn't have that specific information.
Q. Then how did you know that the MS stood for Mary Shechtman?
A. You could just tell by looking at it.
Q. How could you tell just by looking at it at the time?
A. MS, and then we got emails that said Mary Shechtman. I think Mr. Joseph referred to Ms. Shechtman. I think it was part of the regular conversations back and forth.
Q. How many emails did you see from Mr. Joseph?
A. I don't recall exactly. I would have to look through the documents and see which ones I got.
Q. And you believe that Mr. Joseph had authority from his client, correct?
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A. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. Let's take a look at Exhibit Number 2, please, in your book.
A. Okay.
Q. Can you tell me what that is?

THE COURT: Now, are you introducing that into evidence?

MR. SOTO: We believe we are going to introduce it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection to Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number
2?
MR. HARRIS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It will be admitted.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 2 was received in evidence.)
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. SOTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes. It's an email chain between Mr. Santidrian and Mr. Joseph who is the sellers' agent.
Q. Take a look at the email dated Thursday, the 7th of February 2013 at 11:21:35, middle of the page.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell me what that email says?
A. "Sean, as per our phone conversations, please have your
seller sign the counter for 1.3 and send it to me tonight. I'm meeting with my clients tomorrow and I'll bring the signed counteroffer by your seller in person and twist their arms, at least I will give it my best shot. I'm very confident that I may be able to make it happen once I see them in person."
Q. And that's in response to an email that Mr. Joseph sent to Mr. Santidrian, correct?
A. No. No. First of all, I think the email was written in response to a phone conversation, but the email below that is Sean forwarding Ms. Shechtman's email.
Q. And it says, "here is the response," correct?
A. Um-hum.
Q. Can you read that response, please?
A. "Hi. As discussed in the past, the minimum I would be willing to sell for at this time is 1.3. I would also need to know there was some place else I had to move into down the road."
Q. And that's what you believe is an email from Mary Shechtman to Sean Joseph, correct?
A. I know that it was.
Q. Okay. And you believe that's the authorization that Mr. Joseph --
A. No, I --
Q. I'm sorry?
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A. I don't believe that this email was the authorization.
Q. You believe the authorization came some time before that?
A. That's something you -- I don't have direct -- I know what I believe the authorization came from by sitting through depositions and everything else. I don't have personal knowledge.
Q. Up until February 8, 2013, did you have any knowledge about any authorization that Mr. Joseph had or didn't have?
A. Sure.
Q. Okay. What was that?
A. I understood Mr. Joseph had authorization on behalf of the seller every time he submitted the counteroffer and every time he responded to our offers.
Q. Go to Page 2 of that email thread.
A. Okay.
Q. Take a look at February 6, 2013 at 4:42 p.m.
A. Okay.
Q. Can you read me what Raul --
A. It's Sean Joseph's email. He says, "Raul, I'm at a family function this evening. I really don't have anything further to add. If you have another offer, send it over. However, keep in mind that my seller will not sell for less than 1.3 million. In fact, she has not been agreed to that, obviously. She is tough. If your buyer is not willing to come up at least that number, then it will not work."

Again, all these emails refer to the seller in the singular.
Q. Let me ask you this question: Doesn't it appear right there that Sean Joseph is telling Raul that, I think 1.3 will get it done, but I don't have authority from my seller?
A. No, I don't read that at all.
Q. You don't read that on the second line?
A. No, I think both Mr. Joseph and Raul were writing to each other trying to coax each other up or down in price.
Q. You think they were trying to keep the deal going and negotiate it between themselves?
A. No, I think -- some of my knowledge is blended from sitting in the depositions, but I think Mr. Joseph had authority at 1.3 million and was trying to get Mr. Santidrian to go up, to get us to go up to 1.3 million.
Q. Now, you didn't have any direct communication with Mr. Joseph, correct?
A. I did. I met him. He showed us the property.
Q. When did he show you the property?
A. I believe it was some time in January 2013.
Q. Are you sure it wasn't his mother, Ellen Joseph?
A. No, I personally met him before.

I think we viewed the property several times.
Q. Can you tell me who's address is 8218 Berlin Way, Richmond, Virginia?
A. Bevlynn Way.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Sorry, it's Bevlynn. It's a V. Bevlynn Way.
Q. Whose address is that?
A. Joanne Katsantonis.
Q. And again, I think it's your testimony that you initialed and signed the contract for 1.27, correct, Exhibit Number 16, or was this the one --
A. On the 1.27, my sister, Joanne Katsantonis, signed and initialed with my expressed authorization.
Q. And on Exhibit 1, again, none of those signatures are actually yours. They are those of your sister with your authorization?
A. On Exhibit 1 my sister expressly signed my name and my initials with my authorization.
Q. And nowhere on this entire contract is there a signature for Honey Sherman?
A. I don't think one is required, but no, there's not. Her HS isn't here.
Q. It's not there, and it doesn't say Honey Sherman on the signature line on the sellers' line either at the back of the contract, correct?
A. No, obviously it wasn't needed.
Q. Okay. And it does say Honey Sherman TRS, as one of the sellers?
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A. I don't agree with the way you're reading that. It's the name of a trust and then you list the trustees. I don't think that means how you're trying to interpret it.
Q. Well, let me ask you this question: You sued somebody, correct?
A. We did.
Q. Who did you sue?
A. We sued Mary Reich Shechtman and Honey Sherman as co-trustees of the Shechtman Family Trust.
Q. So --
A. We sued the trust.
Q. You sued the trust?
A. You have to sue the trustees.
Q. What's the name of the trust?
A. The Shechtman Family Trust.
Q. Is that the name that appears on that contract?
A. Mary Shechtman signed it. What do you mean?

The trustees are listed. That's what's required.
Q. So the two trustees are listed?
A. I think they got the name --

THE COURT: I can't have two people speaking at once.
So I'll interrupt because the court reporter cannot take that down. So you all have to give each other a little bit of space. Otherwise, we won't make it.

Go ahead.

BY MR. Soto:
Q. So there are two names listed as the seller, correct?
A. It's TRS, TRS. The trustees are listed from the deed, I believe.
Q. Okay. Who are the trustees of the trust?
A. Mary Reich Shechtman and Honey Sherman.
Q. And those are the same names that are printed on Line 1, correct?
A. Line 1 says Mary Reich Shechtman TRS; Honey Sherman TRS. There's no "and/or" or whatever separating them. I think that's taken straight from a deed or something. I didn't prepare the names in that line.
Q. You didn't do it. Do you know who did?
A. I believe Raul Santidrian did.
Q. He prepared this contract, correct?
A. Again, $I$ believe the contract is a form from the Florida Bar.
Q. But he filled in the blanks, correct?
A. I believe so. You'll ask him when he's here.
Q. And he would have taken that information from where, do you know?
A. I don't know.
Q. Were you ever provided with a copy of the Notice of Commencement prior to executing -- actually, prior to filing suit in this matter?
A. I think prior to filing suit.
Q. Prior to February 10th?
A. I don't believe prior to February 10th. I'm not sure of the exact date that $I$ saw that.
Q. Did you ever see a copy of the lease or any documents having to do with Unit 3807 prior to February 10th?
A. You mean not including the contracts back and forth?
Q. Correct.
A. Prior to February 10th? I don't know why you're picking the 10th day. I think the 7th, 8th, I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. Do you know if you saw anything by February 10th?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. But you obviously didn't see anything before you had your sister initial the contract for you?
A. When you say I didn't see anything, you mean the Notice of Commencement?
Q. You didn't see that, did you?
A. Not before signing this document.
Q. Okay. Before --
A. Or having Joanne, my sister, authorized or --
Q. You didn't see the leases prior to having Joanne initial the contract?
A. No, I did not see the leases.
Q. I think you testified earlier you said that it was 4307 ?
A. We put offers on both 4207 and 4307.
Q. Did you ever produce a copy of those offers here in court to the defendants?
A. Some of them were verbal. I don't know if you asked for that, but 4207 was -- Raul called. 4307 is by the developer. It was being released by the developer and we had discussions about putting offers down at 1.35 and 1.4. My understanding was the seller wanted 1.45 or 1.5 , but as I said earlier, it's an unfinished unit. There's no flooring at all in the entire unit as well as on the balcony and there were no closets and we estimated it would be another $\$ 100,000$ for that unit. So that if we paid 1.45 or more for that unit plus 100,000 , we were looking at paying 1.55 million when we had already purchased the unit we wanted at 1.3.
Q. And that was sold on May 17, 2013?
A. I think that's right.
Q. The 4307?
A. Let me look at it. Was that tab 24?

4307 appears to have been sold, yeah, May 17th. So we had made offers before that.
Q. And do you have any photographs to back up that there was no floor in that unit?
A. We could bring in the agent. I mean, it was completely -and Mr. Santidrian took us to it. He can corroborate that.
Q. And it's your understanding that was a penthouse unit as well?
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A. I don't know as well, but $I$ understood that 4307 was a penthouse.
Q. Okay. And that would have been on a higher floor, correct, from the unit that we have?
A. Yes. What's important here to know is that they were building the floor --
Q. I'm sorry. Please answer the question that I asked.
A. Yes. What was that?
Q. Was that on a higher floor than 3807?
A. Yes. We had to have a floor higher than 37 because they were building next door, and everybody knew that the building next door may go as high as at least 35 floors. So in reality there's only a few units in the 07 line that you could get; 3707, 38, 39, 40, 1, 2 and 3 . There's only 8 units I think. Q. You're telling me there's no other unit that sold for 1.3 million on that same line?
A. No, that's not what I'm saying at all. I think -- what I'm saying is there's only eight units that you could get on the exact same line that was above the 35th floor because they're building a building next door. So it was very important to get very high up because the whole view could be obstructed by the building that was going on next door. So that's why we specifically were looking at that line, but at a high floor.

And no, that's not true. There was one unit that sold right before any of us knew, prior to all of our offers in the
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07 line that did go for 1.3 .
Q. Do you know what the date of that unit was?
A. I think it closed -- now the closing shows some time in January or February of '13, but that was not public information until some months later.

But on the date of February 7th, the reason we went up to the 1.3 is because two units in the 07 line were listed at 1.7 million and then an 02 , which is similar, came out on February 8th for 1.72. So we knew the prices were going up right away. That was why we thought they disavowed the contract.
Q. Let me ask you a question. Do you have any evidence that that is why they disavowed the contract?
A. No, I don't.
Q. You never talked to them other than at their deposition, correct?
A. I didn't even attend their depositions.
Q. Okay. So you've never talked to them, ever?
A. I said hello when I saw them.
Q. Okay. And they never told you, we reneged on this contract or we did this or anything else about the contract with respect to any listing prices, correct?
A. They did not advise me of their reason.
Q. You assumed this, correct?
A. I did assume that.
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Q. Okay. Because in actuality, neither of those units that you talk about sold, true?
A. That's not true. 4207 sold and then 4307 sold. But the two that came on the market -- one was 4007. That one has not sold. It's now listed at 1.95 million. So that one has not sold yet. We called and tried to put an offer on that one at the same time as well, and we were told that unless we had 1.6 million or higher, they wouldn't even talk to us.
Q. So the only ones that have been listed and sold are the two that you've talked about and included as exhibits and the highest price was 1.48 that it sold for, correct?
A. Well, no, because the one that sold for 1.45 , which is 4307 , needed $\$ 100,000$ more of work to finish the flooring and closets. So that comparable would be 1 million 5.5, not 1.45. And I think another -- I thought another one had sold, but I have not located that.
Q. Okay. But the 4207 , which is 1.48 , sold and it included all of the furniture, correct, as you've read on the remarks already?
A. You know, it did. I don't know the circumstances of that sale. I have some understanding that they're doing deals where they do the property or the furniture separately, and so when they sell it, they have a price that goes in the MLS of how much it sold for and then they have separate contracts for the furniture. I don't know how this went down.
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Q. Ms. Katsantonis, you graduated from college, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You went to law school?
A. That's correct.
Q. You've been a practicing lawyer for over 20 years?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you're telling me that that listing that you just read, which is your Exhibit 24, doesn't include furniture?
A. I don't know whether it does or doesn't. I don't think you can tell from this document. This document just says it sold for 1 million 480. It doesn't say --
Q. No, ma'am.

In your document it says, "Remarks: Luxurious oceanfront penthouse with amazing direct views of ocean, intercoastal and downtown. Three full bedrooms, three full bathrooms, professionally decorated, featuring marble floors, Artefacto furniture, 12-foot ceilings, electronic window treatments and custom closet."
A. Just so I can correct you --
Q. Is that true what it says?
A. That's only what the listing says. The document that says Lazaro Solis, Miami-Dade property appraiser, that's what shows the sale, and it doesn't show whether furnishing was included or not.
Q. Ms. Katsantonis --
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A. It says $1,480,000$, but you can't tell from this document whether or not furniture was included.
Q. Ms. Katsantonis, you entered this exhibit. I did not.

Is this the exhibit that you put into the record as
Exhibit 24?
A. Yeah, there are several documents.
Q. Okay.
A. It's the listing and the price. The first document is the listing. That's what the agent wrote. The remarks are made by the agent. The next page is the Property History View that shows that the price was listed in early -- or July 2013 at 1.8 million and then went back and forth down to $1.7,1.6 / 5,1$ million 650 and then sold --
Q. Ms. Katsantonis, under remarks it does say what I just said, correct?
A. Under remarks of the listing from the listing agent, that's what it writes.
Q. And on the bottom right it says, SP 1.480, correct?
A. Where is that?
Q. The bottom right. SP stands for sale price.
A. Right. That's just what they enter when it's sold.
Q. Okay. So that's put in sometime after the sale?
A. Again, I don't think this document -- well, the only document that says the sales price is the Miami-Dade County document.
Q. Well, I'm --
A. And that doesn't show whether or not it included the furnishings or not.

In fact, for the listing that we bought, 3807 , if you went and looked, and we have it as an exhibit, if you looked at their listings, I believe they said furnishing --
Q. Is that in the contract that you allege is the binding contract?
A. No, no, no. I'm talking about the listing, comparing apples to apples.
Q. That's not in the evidence here, Ms. Katsantonis.

So let's take a look at the exhibit that we were just talking about --
A. I think it's a furnishing option.

MR. SOTO: Your Honor, will you direct the witness to answer the questions that are posed?

THE COURT: Well, we all have to give each other a little bit of time. Ask the question, give the answer.

Remember, you've got a jury of one.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Looking at Exhibit Number 24, that was a document that you had Raul, I assume, print out for you on February 8, 2014, correct?
A. No, that's not correct.
Q. Who printed this out?
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A. On Exhibit 24?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. I believe Mariela did, our counsel.
Q. Does she have access to the MLS?
A. She does.
Q. Okay. So she printed this out.

And I'll show you the document so we know we're talking about the same one.
A. That's the listing document. Tab 25 is the listing document for our condo, 3807.
Q. Okay. The one I'm talking about is 24.
A. I know, but I'm comparing apples to apples. 38 says, "turn key, move in right away," meaning it included the furniture, but it didn't.
Q. That's because the contract that you have doesn't include furniture, right?
A. Right. My point is, you don't know whether furniture is included in the final contract or not by just looking at this listing. If you look at the listing for 4207 that you're trying to -- 4207 that you're looking at, yes, the agent wrote "luxurious oceanfront penthouse." But if you compare it to Exhibit 25, which is our unit that we put the contract on, 3807, it similarly says that it's to be furnished. It says, "turn key, move in."
Q. Ms. Katsantonis, you put in Exhibit 24, correct?

## V. Katsantonis - Cross

A. Our counsel did, correct.
Q. Your counsel did for you?
A. That's correct.
Q. So Exhibit 24 was put into evidence as a listing and a sale price for Unit 4207, correct?
A. It shows the listing and then it shows -- it shows the Property History View and then it shows the sale.
Q. You don't know whether it included furniture or not, correct?
A. I do not know.
Q. All you know is that it says Artefacto furniture, professionally decorated in the remarks, correct?
A. I know that the listing agent wrote that, correct, but I don't know if the sale included the furniture or not.
Q. But it appears in the document you put into evidence.
A. What appears?
Q. Professionally decorated Artefacto furniture.
A. The listing agreement says that, that's correct.

MR. SOTO: Thank you. No further questions.
THE COURT: Redirect.
MR. HARRIS: No redirect, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. You're excused.
Call your next witness, please.
MR. HARRIS: Plaintiffs call Joanne Katsantonis to the stand, please.

THE COURT: Okay. You know where the witness stand is. Raise your right hand. JOANNE KATSANTONIS, PLAINTIFF HEREIN, SWORN. THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat and tell us your name, please.

THE WITNESS: My name is Joanne Katsantonis.
THE COURT: Go ahead.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Now, Ms. Katsantonis, you've sat here for this. I'm going to show you some of the exhibits that the prior witness looked at, and I just have a couple of questions on each one.
A. Sure.
Q. If you have a witness notebook in front of you, could you turn to Exhibit 10, please?
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. And do you recognize this document?
A. Yes. This is the offer that we made for 1.2 million.
Q. Okay. And did you sign this document?
A. I believe my sister signed this one with my expressed authorization.
Q. Okay. I'd like you to look at Exhibit 12, please.
A. This is the counteroffer from seller for 1.330 .
Q. Okay. And then if you turn to Exhibit 14.
A. Yes, this is the counter we then made of 1.230 initialed by
myself and my sister's initials that $I$ did with her expressed authorization.
Q. Okay. So -- I'm sorry, I heard a vibration.
A. I don't know where that came from. I don't know if I hit something.
Q. Did you authorize the issuance of this counteroffer?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. And who's initialing and signing on behalf of the plaintiffs on this document or who did?
A. The initialing by plaintiffs, that would be by myself, my initial and my twin sister's initial on the changes with her expressed authorization.
Q. Okay. If you could, look at Exhibit 16, please.
A. Right. That's the offer for 1.27 million that we put in.
Q. Okay. And so this is an offer that you sent to the defendants?
A. Yes. And I signed it and initialed it for myself and my sister with her expressed authorization.
Q. Okay. And if you could turn to Exhibit 1, please.
A. This is the final binding contract that was sent by seller, Mary Shechtman, for 1.3 million that $I$ then initialed, myself, and my sister's initials on the changes, on two change lines, accepting the offer and sending it to Raul to convey to the seller.
Q. Okay. And did you have authority to sign on behalf of

Vivian in this instance?
A. Yes, I did, expressed authorization.
Q. How did she communicate that authority to you?
A. We were always on the phone together. We're always on the phone together.
Q. Okay. Now, you said that this was the counteroffer that you sent. How did that actually get transmitted?
A. I PDF'ed it to Raul to convey to the seller.
Q. Okay. And you instructed him to do that?
A. I instructed him to do that and that was an accepted offer and then I wired actually that day the money into the Sotheby Trust.
Q. Okay. And how much money was that?
A. $\$ 50,000$.
Q. Okay. And what was the purpose of that wiring?
A. That was the initial deposit required to be placed into escrow on our acceptance.
Q. Okay. And I'm sorry, you did that on what date?
A. I did that on the 7th, and the escrow is required upon acceptance.
Q. Now, after this time you're aware that the defendants are contending this is not a contract, correct?
A. Yes, I found that out afterwards, of course.
Q. Okay. And what steps did you take, if any, to continue to perform the contract?
A. Well, we, first of all, of course, advised that we have a binding contract and asked Raul to please, you know, make sure that the seller was aware of that, that we had accepted the offer and we had conveyed that.

I then had a discussion with my bank about moving forward. We were on an extremely tight deadline to close this by March 15th. In fact, my bank wanted a little more time, but we were on a tight deadline. So we moved forward with that. The bank sent over an appraiser, and the appraiser was denied access to the property.
Q. Okay. And how did you come to understand that the appraiser had been denied?
A. My bank called me. Actually, I think it was the first time my bank called me and said, what's going on? The appraiser couldn't get in, and then we called Raul to find out what was going on.
Q. Okay. And where is the $\$ 50,000$ that you deposited at this point?
A. It's still in that trust.
Q. In the escrow?
A. In the escrow, um-hum.
Q. Was there ever a time that you wanted to get out of this contract or --
A. Never.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, we had, you know, like my sister said, looked for a long time for a property and so really, you know, wanted this property, went back and forth, went as high as the seller wanted and stood ready to perform the contract.
Q. Okay. And do you want to purchase that property today?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And are you capable of doing that?
A. Absolutely. I've actually even talked to my bank again just to make sure that I had their approval and they stand ready and I have the cash that's required. So I'm ready to perform.
Q. Okay.

MR. HARRIS: No further questions.
THE COURT: Cross-examination.
CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Good afternoon, Joanne.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I think you testified in your direct that on Exhibit Number 10, you didn't actually sign that?
A. No, my sister, Vivian, signed on my behalf.
Q. Okay. And you gave her expressed authority over the telephone, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. While she was signing it?
A. Yes.
Q. And --
A. It wasn't in her office, but $I$ believe she was signing it right then.
Q. And then on Exhibit Number 12, who signed that? Was that you signing for your sister or your sister signing for you?
A. Exhibit 12 is -- wait, this is just their counteroffer.
Q. Okay.
A. So that's not us.
Q. Let's take a look at Exhibit Number 14.
A. Exhibit 14 is me initialing the changes on behalf of myself and my sister.
Q. So those are your initials on the right?
A. Right.
Q. Let me ask you this question -- and your sister made the initials on the bottom left of 14 ?
A. Yeah. We, you know, quite often ratify it just by sending it. We didn't trace back over it.
Q. Let me ask you this question, because I'm looking at these initials on Exhibit 14 and they appear to be different. Why would your sister write them differently, do you know?
A. What do you mean, why would she write them differently? This was our original offer, and we ratified it and initialed the changes.
Q. Well, let's take a look. Let's take a look at Exhibit Number 12.
A. Right.
Q. It's a clear copy, I think.
A. Right.
Q. Would you agree, because it was the first iteration?
A. Yeah, we're, of course, fully committed to this executed contract.
Q. Okay. Let's go back even farther. Let's go back to Exhibit Number 10.
A. Okay.
Q. You testified that Vivian signed this contract on your behalf, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Why are the initials different?
A. On this one?
Q. Yes, bottom left.
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay, because it says JK, the first one, correct?
A. Oh, you mean why -- yes, because she was -- there's two individuals. So I guess she's putting my initials and her initials.
Q. But why did she try to make them look different?
A. I don't think she was trying to make them look different.

MR. HARRIS: Objection, Your Honor. It's assuming
facts.
THE WITNESS: In fact, we can't tell the difference
between our own handwriting half the time.
MR. SOTO: You've got to let the Judge talk when he's ruling on an objection.

BY MR. SOTO:
Q. So you're telling me that the JK, which is vertical, is similar to the VK, which is more left, bottom left to top right?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. That's fine.

And then we go to Exhibit Number 12, and that's the same one. I think you testified to that earlier, correct?
A. Correct. It looks that way.
Q. And then we take a look at Exhibit Number 14.
A. The semi-offer is going on. Go ahead.
Q. Now, this is your handwriting on the right side, the initials, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And those initials, do they appear to be the same style of handwriting?
A. You know, yes and no. I mean, yes, they are the same, but, you know, I can see little differences if I was trying to nitpick.
Q. They don't look identical to each other, do they, in the same style of handwriting?
A. Wait. Are you talking about the two changes? I mean, I made those.
Q. Yes, correct, on the right.
A. Yeah, I made those.
Q. We know you made those. You've already testified to that, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And let's take a look at Exhibit Number 16. Now, I believe this is your handwriting on this document, correct?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. Okay. And you signed JK on the first one?
A. Right.
Q. And then you've got VK on the right, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And both those signatures slant the exact same way, don't they?
A. Yeah, but --
Q. So that we're pretty sure that you did both of those from the slant?
A. I did, but I also did the ones that you were talking about in Exhibit 14. If you look at the first one on the changed price, mine looks vertical, and I did that one. So I don't know, maybe sometimes I do it vertically and sometimes I do it slanted, but those are my initials.
Q. Well, I think you testified earlier that you didn't do 10 , right?
A. I'm not talking about 10. I was talking about 14, but 10 I
didn't do.
Q. Did you do the initials on Exhibit 1?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, what's your profession?
A. Business transactional lawyer. I'm not a litigator.
Q. Okay. You do business transactions, purchases and sales of businesses, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that also involve land?
A. Sometimes. We have real estate experts who deal with that.
Q. Okay. You don't deal with that?
A. No. I mean, I get involved in certain issues that come up, but I don't get involved in the details of that.
Q. Okay. Take a look at paragraph 1 of Exhibit 1. Line 1, I'm sorry.
A. Right.
Q. Can you tell me what line 1 says for parties?
A. It says, Mary Reich Shechtman TRS, Honey Sherman TRS without an "and" --
Q. Do you know --
A. -- and --
Q. Go ahead.
A. It's without an "and" and these are trustees. Well, I deal with trusts sometimes as parties to contracts. Sometimes we'll have 15 trustees and it has got to be approved by a majority,
which is eight, and we don't have eight signatures. And you can list them all and just have one signature. This was not odd at all to me.
Q. Let me ask you a question. Does it list two trustees?
A. It just says -- I frankly -- it says, Mary Reich Shechtman TRS, Honey Sherman TRS. Again, like I just said, we sometimes have 15 trustees and we have one signature.
Q. Does it list two people, to your knowledge?

MR. HARRIS: Objection, Your Honor, asked and answered. THE COURT: It has been, but go ahead and answer. Does it?

MR. SOTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I didn't hear the answer. I'm sorry.
Does it?
THE WITNESS: It doesn't list two individuals. I can't tell if this is one trust and this is how it's styled or if these are two individual trustees. I mean, from the facts now, you know, maybe they're co-trustees, but it says, Mary Reich Shechtman TRS and Honey Sherman TRS. But there's no "and." It's a run-on, one thing. I wouldn't have assumed anything different other than it was the trust.

BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Do you know who filled that out?
A. I assume Raul from the MLS listing, but I have no idea. You can ask him.
Q. Okay. But it's your signature on it?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever have any conversations with either of the defendants in this case?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Did you ever see the Notice of Commencement prior to --
A. I actually wish we had, but --
Q. Have you ever seen the Notice of Commencement prior to you putting down the signature for both you and your sister?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever see a copy of the lease prior to signing your name on Exhibit 1?
A. No.
Q. You never saw any of those documents --
A. No.
Q. -- prior to entering your sale?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Did you ever have any conversations or negotiations with Sean Joseph?
A. No. I mean, I met him. Like Vivian said, I believe I met him at some point, but no.
Q. Did you ever have any direct communications with Mr. Joseph regarding the contract?
A. No. I mean, through my agent, Raul, but not me directly.
Q. Never directly. Your sister didn't have any communications
with him directly, either?
A. As far as I know, other than through Raul.
Q. Okay. Now, you've attached what is Exhibit Number 2 and what's been entered into evidence. Can you flip through Exhibit Number 2, Page 2?
A. Sure. Page 2.
Q. If you're looking at Page 2, you're looking at an email from Sean Joseph to Raul on Wednesday, February 6, 2013.

Did you ever see that from Raul prior to February 7th at 7:24 a.m.?
A. No, not that I recall. I mean, I don't remember seeing this beforehand.
Q. Okay. Can you read that?
A. Are you talking about the one at 8:56 a.m.?
Q. No, on Wednesday, February 6, 2013 at 4:42 p.m.
A. Oh, I'm sorry. I think I'm looking at the wrong one.
Q. I think it's the second page of Exhibit Number 2.
A. At four -- there's a 7:24 a.m.
Q. Right in the middle.
A. That's 8:56 a.m. Oh, 4:42. I'm sorry.
Q. It's okay.
A. I don't remember seeing this before then.
Q. Okay. Do you know if you've seen it --
A. I don't remember seeing this email.
Q. Up until February 10th, do you remember seeing it anytime
before then?
A. I really don't remember seeing this email.
Q. It does say in there, "however, keep in mind that my seller will not sell for less than 1.3--"

THE COURT: Oh, don't read so fast when you want it on the record.

MR. SOTO: I apologize, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The court reporter can't get it that fast.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. "However, keep in mind that my seller will not sell for less than 1.3 million. In fact, she has not been agreed to that, obviously."

It says that in there, correct?
A. That's what it says.
Q. Now, when was the first time that you found out that Sean Joseph communicated to Raul that he didn't believe there was a binding contract?
A. I think Raul informed us -- I mean, I think it's me personally. It must have been the night, evening or night of the 8th. I can't remember if it was later than the 8th.
Q. Isn't it true that he was notified some time the morning of the 8th --
A. I don't know.
Q. -- via a text message?
A. I don't know. I don't know what time he was notified.

He'll be here. You can ask him.
MR. SOTO: Your Honor, may I approach?
THE COURT: Sure, with what?
MR. SOTO: Thank you.
THE COURT: With what?
MR. SOTO: With an exhibit, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Which exhibit?
MR. SOTO: They are test messages --
THE COURT: No, no. What number does it have?
MR. SOTO: Oh, in my binder I believe it's Number 6.
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I don't have a copy of the binder.

THE COURT: Hold on.
MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: One person at a time. We'll make it.
Do I have that binder?
MR. SOTO: You will have that binder in one second, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. What's the number?
MR. SOTO: 6, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection to 6?
MR. HARRIS: I have an objection to introducing it through this witness, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. This is a text message between the two Realtors; is that right, Mr. Soto?

MR. SOTO: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Are these two Realtors going to testify?
MR. SOTO: Yes, they are, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then I'll sustain the objection and you can use it when they testify.

MR. SOTO: Okay.
THE COURT: Next.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Did you know of any communications between Raul and Sean --

THE COURT: How would she know unless someone told her? What difference does it make what she knows between the two Realtors?

MR. SOTO: It doesn't. I'll move on.
THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. You believe that when you found out, it was from Raul on the evening of February 8th?
A. I don't remember exactly when it was.
Q. Okay. And do you remember what Raul told you?
A. He said that --

THE COURT: Raul is whose agent?
MR. SOTO: Their agent.
THE COURT: And you're trying to convince the plaintiff that her agent said what to her? What difference does it make to you?

MR. SOTO: None, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then next question.
MR. SOTO: Judge, I have no further questions.
THE COURT: Redirect.
MR. HARRIS: None, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down.
Who's your next witness?
MR. HARRIS: Mr. Joseph.
THE COURT: Okay. Raise your right hand, please, sir.
SEAN JOSEPH, PLAINTIFFS' WITNESS, SWORN.
THE COURT: Have a seat. Tell us your name. Spell
your first and your last name, please.
THE WITNESS: Sean Joseph. S-e-a-n, J-o-s-e-p-h.
THE COURT: Thank you. Go ahead.
MR. SOTO: Judge, before we start, can we take a three-minute restroom break?

THE COURT: Not yet. We've only been at it for what, a couple of hours, right? A little bit more, but we'll be here.

How long do you think this witness is going to be?
MR. HARRIS: About 45 minutes in direct.
THE COURT: 45 minutes?
MR. HARRIS: Maybe 30.
THE COURT: Oh, my goodness gracious.
MR. HARRIS: It may go very quickly.
THE COURT: Give me the four things that you want to
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prove; four, starting with the most important.
MR. HARRIS: That Mr. Joseph received express authority from the two defendants --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: -- to issue the counteroffer that formed the contract in this case.

THE COURT: All right. That's number one.
MR. HARRIS: Okay. It establishes a pattern and a course of conduct through which actual authority can be derived.

THE COURT: From past experiences.
MR. HARRIS: Yes, other transactions.
THE COURT: How many transactions?
MR. HARRIS: We have a lease transaction.
THE COURT: How many; the number?
MR. HARRIS: I think -- well, two.
THE COURT: Two transactions.
MR. HARRIS: Yes.
THE COURT: And whatever they told him for this unit sale, right?

MR. HARRIS: That's the third.
THE COURT: That's three.
MR. HARRIS: Right.
THE COURT: What else?
MR. HARRIS: Well, they have a long-standing relationship. He testified generally about the whole --
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THE COURT: No, no, no. What's he going to testify is the important thing, not what he has testified at the deposition without a judge. That's the reason they go on forever.

Okay. So it's three transactions, and you want to talk about three transactions for 45 minutes. Wow.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, it could go very quickly.
THE COURT: Well, three transactions. What else?
That's the second thing and that's it, right?
MR. HARRIS: That he participated in the exchange of counteroffers, that he received and issued them.

THE COURT: Is that in dispute, what he did?
MR. HARRIS: Well, through that --
THE COURT: Is it in dispute?
MR. HARRIS: The authority aspect is in dispute.
THE COURT: The authority aspect. You want him to make the decision whether he had the authority or not, or you want me to make the decision?

MR. HARRIS: I want you to make the decision based on his actions.

THE COURT: Okay. So, and what would you say -- his conduct took how many minutes?

MR. HARRIS: His conduct? I don't understand.
THE COURT: What he did in this case. How long did he do whatever he did?

MR. HARRIS: Back to the sales transaction?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. HARRIS: He had any number of conversations with the defendants.

THE COURT: Conversations. What else?
MR. HARRIS: He exchanged emails with our agent.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: He transferred --
THE COURT: How long do you think that took for him to do all of that, more or less?

MR. HARRIS: I mean, I know what you're asking.
THE COURT: Then give me the answer. The answer is a few minutes, right?

MR. HARRIS: I don't know how he does his work, but --
THE COURT: Well, how long are the texts?
MR. HARRIS: -- his conversations could have been hours.

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you. Remember, that means you have to shut up when I interrupt you.

MR. HARRIS: Sorry.
THE COURT: How many emails are we talking about, text messages, conversations; 10?

MR. HARRIS: Under 10.
THE COURT: Under 10.
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Under 10, three transactions, and you want
to talk with him for 45 minutes. Wow.
MR. HARRIS: It may go less than that, Your Honor.
THE COURT: How much time do you think he spent with the parties in question here, both your clients and the defendants?

MR. HARRIS: Well --
THE COURT: How much time do you think he spent with them?

MR. HARRIS: Hours.
THE COURT: Hours, because he showed them units or something?

MR. HARRIS: He had lengthy calls with the defendants where they gave him instructions.

THE COURT: Lengthy calls. Okay.
MR. HARRIS: Lengthy emails, phone, text messages.
THE COURT: Lengthy. Okay. Go through it. Let's go.
MR. HARRIS: Okay.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Mr. Joseph, can you state your profession, please?

THE COURT: He's a Realtor. I know that already. Next question.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. How long have you maintained the real estate license?

THE COURT: What difference does it make? If he was a

Realtor for six months, would you lose the case or win the case? MR. HARRIS: It goes to the authority issue that he -THE COURT: You mean, you cannot give authority to a new Realtor. You can only give authority to a Realtor who's been around for a long time. If the guy has been around for a long time, you win. If that's his first client, you lose.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, there's been an argument in this case --

THE COURT: Does it matter?
MR. HARRIS: There's been an argument in this case by the defendants that Mr. Joseph was mistaken.

THE COURT: Was mistaken.
MR. HARRIS: That he made a mistake.
THE COURT: That he made a mistake in hearing.
MR. HARRIS: In what he did in connection with the sales transaction.

THE COURT: Okay. And if he is an expert Realtor, he didn't make a mistake. But if he's a new Realtor and the defendants said, do this for us, does it make any difference?

MR. HARRIS: I believe if he was brand-new, that he would be more prone to making mistakes.

THE COURT: Oh, this is a mistake.
MR. HARRIS: This is not a mistake.
THE COURT: Because you say that the defendants did what?

MR. HARRIS: Expressly authorized him to issue a counteroffer.

THE COURT: Either they did or they didn't, right?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So whose mistake is it?
MR. HARRIS: I don't believe there is a mistake, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So it doesn't matter whether he's new or old.

MR. HARRIS: Well, it would establish --
THE COURT: Who is not telling the truth, in your view?
MR. HARRIS: Who is not telling the truth? The defendants, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Is he a defendant?
MR. HARRIS: He is the defendants' agent.
THE COURT: Is he telling the truth?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then it seems like your questioning should be very short and maybe the cross-examiner has a chance, which is why I interrupt a cross-examiner a lot less than I do the direct.

MR. HARRIS: Right, Your Honor. As the defendants' agent, he is a hostile witness.

THE COURT: He's a hostile witness who's telling the truth. Why is a hostile witness who's telling the truth --

MR. HARRIS: Well, I took his deposition. If he -THE COURT: If he told the truth.

MR. HARRIS: If he sticks with his deposition
testimony, it will go very smoothly.
THE COURT: Okay. Then ask him the most important things first, and if you like what you hear and he hasn't changed it, that should take five minutes.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Mr. Joseph, with regard to purchase and sale of real property, do you always require a written offer from the buyer to provide more certainty?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. And once you receive an offer, you review it to make sure everything is exactly what you asked for, to make sure that --

THE COURT: You're asking leading questions. Is that for any particular reason?

MR. HARRIS: Because he is an adverse witness, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And every time you have an adverse witness, you ask leading questions even though he's telling the truth.

Why is someone an adverse witness?
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Which rule is that that says you can do
that? What rule, do you know?
I probably shouldn't get involved in this because it's easier and faster to ask leading questions, but --

MR. HARRIS: It would, Your Honor, and it would just --
THE COURT: That's why you were doing it, to be fast?
MR. HARRIS: Yes.
THE COURT: Really?
MR. HARRIS: I'm trying. I'm getting a message from the Court that you want to move quickly, and I'm doing everything I can.

THE COURT: Oh, you got that message last week. You don't need to wait for today. But we still have to follow the rules of evidence.

Which rule says that you can do that?
MR. HARRIS: I believe it's Rule 611.
THE COURT: Pardon?
MR. HARRIS: I believe it's Rule 611.
THE COURT: 611. Oh, I like that rule. Look what it says:

It starts out with; "The Court should exercise reasonable control over the mode and order of examining witnesses and presented evidence so as to make those procedures effective for determining the truth, avoid wasting time and protect witnesses from harassment or undue embarrassment."

So I like that subsection A.
And subsection $C$, which is the one you wanted me to read, not A, but I wanted to read A; "Leading questions should not be used on direct examination except as necessary to develop the witness' testimony. Ordinarily, the Court should allow leading questions on cross-examination when a party calls a hostile witness, an adverse party or a witness identified with an adverse party."

Now, how do I determine that he's a hostile witness? What you've told me so far is, I like what he said on the depo. That's why I'm calling him. He's going to help my case, and he told the truth.

That's not hostile, agree?
MR. HARRIS: Agree.
THE COURT: Okay. An adverse party, he's not that because he's not the co-trustee of the Shechtman trust. So that's out. So he is a witness identified with an adverse party.

MR. HARRIS: Correct, Your Honor. He is their agent.
THE COURT: He's their agent for all purposes.
MR. HARRIS: For purposes of everything we're here for today.

THE COURT: For today. If he now said, I'm settling this case, he would have the authority to do that.

MR. HARRIS: I don't think his authority goes beyond
that, no, but I don't know.
THE COURT: No, it doesn't. He's a Realtor.
MR. HARRIS: Well, it depends what the scope of
authority was that was conferred on him by the defendants. I think it's highly unlikely.

THE COURT: How about if we ask him.
You were the Realtor for the defendants?
THE WITNESS: I am, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What authority did you have from them about this particular unit that's in question?

THE WITNESS: I did not have authority from both of these sellers. I had authority only by email of which she would like to get for price of her unit.

THE COURT: Who?
THE WITNESS: One of the defendants.
THE COURT: Which one?
THE WITNESS: Ms. Shechtman.
THE COURT: Okay. She gave you authority to do what?
THE WITNESS: She just told me what she would like to
get for her price, which was 1.3 million.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. HARRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: We kind of skipped a lot, didn't we?
You can fill in the rest.
MR. HARRIS: Okay.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. When you represent sellers in an instance where the seller is presenting a counteroffer --

THE COURT: Oh, you want him to tell you what he does with other clients that he has.

MR. HARRIS: His general practices, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Why? Why, is this a negligence case? Do I look at general practice, or is that what he does with these people, these defendants?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we have arguments for actual and apparent authority.

THE COURT: Okay. And that has to do with what he's done with other people, not what he's done with these defendants? It's not what he does with other people, right? It's what he's done with these individuals, what they said to him, what they did with him in this case and other cases.

You can go with other cases as long as it involves these defendants.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: Right?
MR. HARRIS: Yes.
THE COURT: So you can ask him what his relationship has been with these defendants, who he talked to, who spoke for whom, what he knew regarding that, but not what he's done with -- how many clients do you think you have, Mr. Joseph?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: How many clients do you think you have or have you ever had?

THE WITNESS: Hundreds.
THE COURT: Hundreds. You want me to go through hundreds of other people who live throughout Dade County?

MR. HARRIS: Absolutely not.
THE COURT: Okay. So let's talk about the Shechtman trust and these two trustees.

Go ahead.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. When did you first meet the defendants?
A. The year -- I don't remember the exact year, but probably 2006, maybe.

THE COURT: Okay. Speak real loudly.
THE WITNESS: 2006, maybe. 2007.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. And you were retained by the defendants Shechtman and Sherman as a real estate agent for the property that is the subject of this dispute, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you understand that property to be generally described as TDR Tower III?

THE COURT: Oh, we know which one it is. The unit, the unit in question.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. And you entered into an oral agreement with defendants

Shechtman and Sherman for the sale or lease of the unit, correct?

MR. SOTO: Objection, leading.
THE COURT: I'm going to overrule it.
Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Initially it was to lease the unit and then, you know, basically put it up for a high price. If we can get, you know, the prices at the time, then they would consider selling it if they chose to.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Okay. But your agreement was oral, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You never had a written agreement with them?
A. Not for listing.
Q. Okay. And with regard to your agreement, the defendants purchased and leased many properties through you, correct?
A. Two properties --
Q. Okay.
A. -- for sale, yeah.
Q. I want you to look at Exhibit 4, please.

THE COURT: Plaintiffs' 4?
MR. HARRIS: Plaintiffs' 4, Your Honor, yes.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. This is a Property History View, and I would assume it's on this property that's in question.
Q. Okay. And this reflects two different types of
transactions, doesn't it?
A. Just like I said, sale and lease, correct.
Q. Okay. And --

THE COURT: Are you introducing this?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. SOTO: No.
THE COURT: It will be admitted.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 4 was received in evidence.)
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. And these are all transactions that you handled; is that right?
A. Our office, correct. As you can see, it's with the same office.
Q. Are you saying that you didn't personally handle these transactions?
A. Most of the time, correct, and I also have my partner.
Q. Okay. Which of these transactions were you not involved with?
A. This is a Property History View of the listings of when it's listed on the MLS. It's not really a transaction list.
Q. Okay. But this references two lease transactions, correct?
A. There's rental listings and there's sale listings and it gives you property history of what dates they came on the market, if they had been active, inactive, if they were rented, if they were pending sales. It's just a history of the MLS.
Q. How many leases did you represent the defendants for that actually resulted in consumated transactions on the subject property?
A. Four.
Q. For Unit 3807?
A. Four.
Q. Oh, four. And you understand that the leases from this property were requested from you?
A. What do you mean by that?
Q. You received a subpoena to bring your documents to the deposition, correct?
A. Yes. We could not find those documents. Some of them were just one-month rentals. We did not do paperwork on them. It was a summer thing when people are just coming, and you couldn't have a transaction. The billing didn't allow it. So we just did like a one-month for 10,000 for the month for the first -when it first got sold and we did another one like that. And then the last lease I did provide, which was the long-term
lease.
Q. Okay. But the lease term on that was September 2013.

You're referring to that?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. I'd like you to look at Exhibit Number 3, please.

THE COURT: Plaintiffs' 3 ?
MR. HARRIS: Plaintiffs' 3, Your Honor, yes.
THE COURT: Are you introducing it?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. SOTO: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It will be admitted. This is the leasehold agreement for Unit 3807.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 3 was received in evidence.)
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Is this the lease transaction that you were just referencing?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Now, there was a prior Lease Agreement in this case, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And it was for the year immediately preceding this lease term?
A. Same tenant, correct.
Q. Okay. So essentially from September 2012 to August 2013 was
the lease term?
A. Correct. In the state of Florida you can do a year at a time.
Q. Right. And that Lease Agreement was specifically requested from you at your deposition, correct? Do you recall?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you haven't produced that, correct?
A. Unable to find it. It's not that I wouldn't produce it.

I've searched for it.
Q. Right. And, actually, you're under an obligation to retain that lease for a certain number of years, correct?
A. The broker is, correct.
Q. The broker is. Okay. And who's the broker?
A. Ellen Joseph is her name.
Q. Is that your mother?
A. It is.
Q. Okay. And you work for the same company?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And did you make any effort to get your mother to give you a copy of that lease?
A. Absolutely. We tried to find it.
Q. So Ms. Joseph has made a full attempt to find that lease?

MR. SOTO: Objection, hearsay, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I can't speak on behalf of how --
THE COURT: Well, whenever you hear objection, you have
to wait. Otherwise, there's no point in me ruling.
So what was the question?
MR. HARRIS: The question was, as far as he knows, did Ms. Joseph, who works with him, make a full investigation to determine whether she had a copy of the prior lease?

THE COURT: And this is someone else.
MR. HARRIS: This is his mother who works at the same company.

THE COURT: And the mother who works for the same company meets what hearsay exception? Is there a mother who works in the same company exception to the hearsay rule?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I'm not asking for a -there's no hearsay here. I'm not asking for the truth of the matter asserted.

THE COURT: What was the question about the mother then?

MR. HARRIS: Do you believe that your office, through your mother, made a full exhaustive search for the lease?

THE COURT: And that would prove what?
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we've had this dispute and we've raised --

THE COURT: We're trying a discovery dispute. I thought we were trying a breach of contract case. We're still talking about discovery.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we believe that the Lease

Agreement -- you recall we asked for an adverse inference to be drawn from the fact that we don't have the Lease Agreement.

THE COURT: Why don't you have the Lease Agreement?
THE WITNESS: Our office had closed down. My mother -we moved everything into storage units. My mother had breast cancer, has been dealing with it for the last two years. A lot of things have been misplaced and difficult to find.

THE COURT: You think that's true or not true?
MR. HARRIS: I don't have an opinion or I have no reason to doubt that.

THE COURT: So then I shouldn't draw an adverse inference from that, right?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I think --
THE COURT: Right?
MR. HARRIS: Not from that specific statement, but the fact that we have no lease.

THE COURT: Next question.
MR. HARRIS: Okay.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Did you ever provide copies of the lease --

THE COURT: Now, hold on a second. Didn't he just say why he didn't?

MR. HARRIS: Yes. I'm going --
THE COURT: Is he telling the truth or not?
MR. HARRIS: I don't know, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, when do I draw an adverse inference from someone?

MR. HARRIS: I'm trying to go about it another way, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, but when do I draw an adverse inference, when someone destroys documents, doesn't produce it? It has to be intentional, right?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.
THE COURT: Right. If it's not intentional, then we don't draw an adverse inference, right?

MR. HARRIS: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Do you think this is intentional or not?
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we asked him about the lease on --

THE COURT: No, no. What do you think? What do you want to prove, that it was intentional or not?

MR. HARRIS: I believe that --
THE COURT: Was it intentional or not?
MR. HARRIS: Intentional by the defendants, Your Honor.
THE COURT: No, no. He's the witness.
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor. He's their agent and I wanted to ask him if he ever provided a copy of the lease to the defendants.

THE COURT: Did you ever give a copy of the lease to the defendants?

THE WITNESS: A copy of this lease, I know for a fact it was emailed at the time. I don't recall on the first one, and we went back and tried to look for it.

THE COURT: Next question.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Is that your standard practice to email copies of the fully executed lease to your clients?
A. In most instances.
Q. Okay. So it's very likely that you emailed the prior lease to the defendants, correct?
A. It's likely.

MR. HARRIS: Okay. And, Your Honor --
THE COURT: No, keep asking questions. Don't ask me questions. I'm not a witness. I don't even own a condo. BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Looking back at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 3, when were you asked to provide this lease?

THE COURT: Asked by whom? By you?
MR. HARRIS: We asked --
THE COURT: We're still fighting discovery. What difference does it make? He just told you about his mother.

MR. HARRIS: I will move on, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: I would have moved on before.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Who prepared this lease?
A. I prepared this lease.
Q. Okay. And it says, owner of the property. Do you see that?

THE COURT: Okay. This lease, what is this lease going to accomplish?

MR. HARRIS: This is the conduct I was talking about.
This shows a course of conduct. It shows that --
THE COURT: Who gave you authority on this lease?
THE WITNESS: Well, it was a renewal lease. It's a renewal.

THE COURT: Okay. And who gave you the authority?
THE WITNESS: The tenant asked me to renew the lease.
THE COURT: Who asked you?
THE WITNESS: The tenant.
THE COURT: Who's the tenant?
THE WITNESS: Jonathan Kamhazi.
THE COURT: Who do you represent, the tenant or the landlord?

THE WITNESS: Both.
THE COURT: You represent both?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
THE COURT: Okay. And who is the landlord?
THE WITNESS: Honey and Mary Shechtman.
THE COURT: Did you talk to both of them or just one?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall who I spoke to on this. Actually --

THE COURT: Would you normally speak --
THE WITNESS: Actually, when they came down -- we normally speak to both or one or the other.

THE COURT: Sometimes one, sometimes two?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
THE COURT: Anyone in particular over the other or whoever was around?

THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, I spoke to Mary more often than I spoke to Honey only because Honey travels all over the world and she's not available as much.

THE COURT: Next question.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. All right. And who is listed as the owner of the property on this lease?
A. Mary Reich Shechtman TRS and Honey Sherman TRS.
Q. Okay. And how many of the defendants signed and initialed this lease?
A. Neither.
Q. Okay. Who signed and initialed this lease on behalf of that entity you just read?
A. I signed the lease.
Q. Okay. And you had authority to do that?
A. On this lease, yes.
Q. Okay. And how is that authority communicated to you?
A. Just through an email.
Q. Okay. And where is that email?
A. It was given to you all, the attorneys.

MR. SOTO: Judge, is it possible to take a two-minute bathroom break while we're waiting for --

THE COURT: Well, what are we waiting for?
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we don't believe we were ever
provided with that email. So I've asked my associate --
THE COURT: Okay. Keep asking questions. Let's go.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Okay. And you believe that you had authority to sign this lease on behalf of both defendants, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And that was because you got an email, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And who gave you that email?
A. That was from Ms. Shechtman.
Q. Ms. Shechtman. Okay. Did Honey send you an email giving you authority?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And you didn't sign Honey's name to the Lease Agreement, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Even though it provides -- it lists Mary Reich Shechtman TRS
and Honey Sherman TRS, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you believe this is a binding Lease Agreement, correct?
A. Not in the eyes of the law.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Not in the eyes of the law.
Q. So is it in your practice of 20 years to execute Lease Agreements that are not binding?
A. It's not in my practice to execute things without Power of Attorney, no. This was a lease renewal. They both agreed that they were staying. It was just paperwork.
Q. You think the Lease Agreement is just paperwork?
A. In this instance, correct.
Q. So this is not a binding contract in your eyes?
A. It is not.
Q. Okay. And why isn't it a binding contract?
A. Because I don't have Power of Attorney.
Q. So in your view -- do you normally attach the Power of Attorney to the Lease Agreement?
A. Absolutely, if I had Power of Attorney. I have other contracts where I've had Power of Attorney where we have to attach it to all documents signed.
Q. Okay. So what is this document if it's not a binding contract?
A. Paperwork.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. The witnesses decide whether something is a binding contract or not?

MR. HARRIS: It goes to the credibility of the witness, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You think he's lying by saying it's not a binding contract.

MR. HARRIS: That it's his view as a Realtor for 20 years that this is not a binding contract.

THE COURT: What difference does it make whether it's a binding contract or not? Am I going to try that lease or just this contract?

MR. HARRIS: No, you're right, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Next. Next. Let's go.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Now, when you signed this lease, you understood you had authority on behalf of both trustees, correct?
A. No. I just stated earlier, I said Mary.
Q. So your testimony is that you only had authority from Mary to sign this lease?

MR. SOTO: Objection, asked and answered, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Didn't he say yes before? Why do we need to repeat that? Sometimes he spoke with one. Sometimes he spoke with another. One was more often here. Where are we going?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, this lease looks exactly like
the contract.
THE COURT: Okay. You make that argument to me, but not to him. You're not here to convince him. Remember, he's their Realtor. You're here to convince me.

So let's go. Next question. Next area. Not this
lease. What's the next area?
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Is it a common practice with Shechtman and Sherman and you to provide verbal authority to sign on their behalf on deals? A. No.
Q. I'd like you to --

MR. SOTO: Judge, I really have to --
THE COURT: Pardon?
MR. SOTO: I really have to use the restroom.
THE COURT: Go ahead. We'll wait for you.
MR. SOTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. SHECHTMAN: Can we all go at the same time?
THE COURT: Go ahead. We'll wait for you.
(There was a brief recess.)
THE COURT: Go ahead. The court reporter is back.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Just to get back to where we were, you said it was not common practice for you to sign with verbal authority on behalf of both defendants with the Lease Agreements?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And do you recall that your deposition was taken in this case on November 4, 2013?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And if you could turn to tab 30 in your exhibit binder, you should find the transcript of that deposition testimony. If you could please look at Page 51?
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. And if you look at line 14:
"And who ended up signing the rental agreement? Let me refer specifically to the October 1st, 2011 listing.
"Answer: Actually, I have an email from the parties asking me to sign on their behalf. So I signed it.
"Question: You signed on behalf of Shechtman and Sherman?
"Answer: Correct.
"Question: So you had authority to sign?
"Answer: I did not have Power of Attorney. I just had their verbal authority to sign on their behalf. It was a one-and-a-half-month rental, and they asked me to sign it. They were traveling. I don't know where they were. They travel a lot. Actually, I do remember that one now.
"Question: And this was common practice for the seasonal rentals?
"Answer: It's common practice with them with me on a lot of deals. Correct.
"Question: Can you give me an example of what type of deals?
"Answer: Purchasing units."
Does that refresh your recollection that you often, as common practice, had verbal authority from both defendants to sign transactions on their behalf?
A. Verbal authority to sign does not give me the legal right to sign. But yes, verbal authority to maybe negotiate some things or to have leeway.
Q. Okay. So it's fair to say that your common practice with the defendants was to get verbal authority from both defendants to sign contract documents on their behalf, correct?
A. Again, to have leeway to negotiate in good faith deals. When I say sign, to negotiate deals. Signing an actual agreement, as you know, is a legal document, which I would have to have Power of Attorney.
Q. Okay. But in any event, you signed this Lease Agreement on behalf of the defendants, correct?
A. Correct. It was a formality, this Lease Agreement. Just paperwork for the building for the next year.
Q. And yet, you only signed one name to the instrument, correct?
A. Correct, because I did not have authority.
Q. Sorry?
A. Correct, because I didn't have authority.
Q. You did not have authority to sign this lease? That's what you're telling me now?
A. Not by both parties, correct.
Q. Okay. So when you testified that you had authority to sign some leases, the one that you provided, you're saying you didn't have authority from both defendants; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Even though you testified that it was common practice on a lot of deals to get authority from both defendants to sign on their behalf?
A. On some instances, yes. On some instances, no.

THE COURT: What's the difference? Some instances yes, some instances no. Tell me the difference.

THE WITNESS: Are you speaking to me, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Pardon? Yeah, I'm speaking to you.
THE WITNESS: On some instances it was negotiations.
It's all about leeway. They gave me leeway to negotiate certain prices or terms. But as far as final signatures, like I told the plaintiffs, if I needed to get an executed contract, we would send copies to get hard copies signed by all parties in the end.

THE COURT: And you didn't do that in this case.
THE WITNESS: In this particular -- on that particular
lease, no.
THE COURT: And did you do it in this case?

THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: Why not?
THE WITNESS: It never got to that point.
THE COURT: Why not?
THE WITNESS: Because we never had a complete meeting of the minds by all four parties.

THE COURT: Who are the four parties?
THE WITNESS: The two sisters and the two sisters.
THE COURT: And isn't there just one trust?
THE WITNESS: As far as I know, it's the two sisters that I deal with.

THE COURT: But sometimes you only got approval from one sister and that was enough for you, and I want to know the difference.

THE WITNESS: And that was, again, leeway in negotiating terms.

THE COURT: Well, what do you mean by leeway in negotiating terms? If you're negotiating with someone and someone says, yeah, we'll go along with that, what's the difference between that and this contract here?

THE WITNESS: Well, because, again -- if you want to talk about this contract, you want me to elaborate on that, then I certainly will.

THE COURT: No, I want to know the difference, why sometimes one sister's word is enough and other times you need--

THE WITNESS: It's not enough. They both would have to sign.

THE COURT: But why did you say you could negotiate with only one?

THE WITNESS: Well, they would speak to each other and let me know that we want $\$ 7$ million for the property. Try to get me $\$ 7$ million.

THE COURT: Okay. So if you made an offer -- if they said, we want 7 million, would you convey an offer of $\$ 7$ million from one sister who said, look, make an offer of $\$ 7$ million?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: And if the person says, we accept the \$7 million?

THE WITNESS: Then I would say, we need to get this signed by all parties.

THE COURT: So then you didn't make an offer of \$7 million. That was just talking about it.

THE WITNESS: That's part of negotiating. That's correct, negotiating.

THE COURT: So you have no authority to even say \$7
million. They don't say yes.
THE WITNESS: I guess --
THE COURT: They could say, oh, we're just kidding.
Not 7. We really meant 5 .
THE WITNESS: That's absolutely true. In the end, they
could change their minds. That's absolutely correct.
THE COURT: When is the end?
THE WITNESS: When all parties sign and initial a
document.
THE COURT: So one cannot speak for the other?
THE WITNESS: In essence, no.
THE COURT: Okay. And what did you say at the
deposition? How do you answer?
THE WITNESS: The same way I just did, saying that I --
THE COURT: You think it's identical to what you said.
THE WITNESS: Maybe not identical in words.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. Next question. Go ahead.
Let's go. Any other questions?
MR. HARRIS: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's go.
MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's look at Exhibit 12, please.
THE COURT: I'm sorry?
MR. HARRIS: Exhibit 12. Plaintiffs' 12, please.
THE COURT: What about Exhibit 12? Let's go.
MR. HARRIS: I'm asking the witness to take a look at
it.
THE COURT: Okay. Take a look at it. Next question.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And did you transmit -- well, what is this document? It's a counteroffer, isn't it?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Now, as a Realtor, you're under an ethical obligation that precludes you from issuing an offer without authority, correct?

MR. SOTO: Objection, leading, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Overruled.
Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Many clients will give you parameters on which to negotiate on their behalf.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Okay. But my question is, you're a licensed real estate agent?
A. Correct.
Q. And you have to subscribe to a code of ethics, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And one of those terms of the code of ethics is that you cannot deliver an offer without authority, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So this is a counteroffer that you transmitted to the plaintiffs, is it not?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And did you have the authority of the defendants to make this counteroffer?
A. For negotiating terms, I made the counteroffer based on the parameters that they gave me.

THE COURT: What were those parameters?
THE WITNESS: That she would like 1.3 million, but again, that she was not going to sell unless she found some place else to move, which was stated to the other party.

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. When was that stated to the other party?
A. It's been read here several times. Sometimes on the phone and I think once through an email.
Q. Is that something that you understood the defendants were asking the plaintiffs to come up with as a term of this deal?
A. It has nothing to do with them.
Q. Correct. Right, it has nothing to do with them?
A. It has nothing to do with them selling.
Q. Okay. But when you present this to the plaintiffs, you're not expecting a term of this deal -- this isn't an incomplete deal, is it?
A. It is incomplete. It doesn't have all signatures. It was negotiating terms and price.
Q. Okay. But aside from signatures, this contains all the terms of a purchase contract, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So you presented a counteroffer that was complete as to all terms to the plaintiffs, correct?
A. Terms that they -- correct.
Q. Okay. And you are required as a real estate agent to have authority before presenting a counteroffer to another party, correct?
A. Correct. In many instances I can have authority. You could tell me you want to sell your property for 300,000. I tell the other party, they sign it, it comes back to you and all of a sudden you speak to your wife or a friend and you say, you know what, I think I don't want to sell it for 300,000 anymore, after you've already agreed to me verbally.
Q. Well, I'm not talking about --
A. But none of this means anything until it's all signed.
Q. I'm not talking about --

THE COURT: I can't have interruptions of a witness.
You all have to yield to each other. You've got to do that.
MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Please, please.
Go ahead.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Okay. The situation you just described, you're not talking about a written counteroffer. You're talking about some suggestion, kind of a negotiation, right?
A. No, I'm absolutely talking about written counteroffers. I've had many offers back and forth that were agreed to and then before signatures come on, they fall apart or people decide they
don't want to sell it for whatever reason.
THE COURT: So the written offer is meaningless, in
your view.
THE WITNESS: Until it's signed by all parties.
THE COURT: And that written offer wasn't signed by one party?

THE WITNESS: Which, this one?
THE COURT: Yeah. The one --
THE WITNESS: It was signed by me.
THE COURT: Pardon?
THE WITNESS: It was signed by me. It wasn't signed
by --
THE COURT: And your signature is totally worthless.
THE WITNESS: That's correct.
THE COURT: So why do you do it?
THE WITNESS: Well, there was a lot of instances why I did it; again, to negotiate the deal in good faith.

THE COURT: So it's totally meaningless, your signature. You're not acting as an agent for them.

THE WITNESS: They had no means of electronic communication at this time. They had power outages for days. There was miscommunication. One of the parties was traveling and unreachable. So --

THE COURT: So it's meaningless, what you did. Your signature was totally worthless. It didn't mean anything --

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
THE COURT: -- whether you signed it or not.
Do you do that often?
THE WITNESS: I have done that before in the past.
THE COURT: And it's all meaningless. So why do you do
it if it's meaningless? What does it mean?
THE WITNESS: In good faith, in essence keeping the deal going because my clients are unable to reach them to get --

THE COURT: But you tell the other person, my signature is meaningless. This does not mean that it's an offer. Do you tell them that?

THE WITNESS: What I told them --
THE COURT: Do you tell them that?
THE WITNESS: In some instances, yes.
THE COURT: You say, this is not an offer. This is
what they're thinking of.
THE WITNESS: No. I say that this is not an executed contract.

THE COURT: So you're lying to the other person to try to hook them into -- and then it's meaningless.

THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor, I tell them --
THE COURT: Isn't that unethical?
THE WITNESS: It could be unethical, but that's not
what --
THE COURT: It seems totally inappropriate.

THE WITNESS: That's not what happened here. They were always told that they're --

THE COURT: So you're telling me you do that in other occasions. You sign something when you really don't have the authority to do so because your signature --

THE WITNESS: I have done so in the past, yes.
THE COURT: Without authority.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: So you tell someone you have authority, but you really don't?

THE WITNESS: Well, if I'm told to do something or given parameters and then a client changes their mind, because I don't have anything in writing from them, that has happened before.

THE COURT: So they say, we're willing to sell it for 1.3 million. And you said, yes, I'm going to make an offer, and you put your signature and the other person says, yes, I accept. You tell the purchaser, well, it's really not an offer. I'm just kidding. I think I can work this out for you. That's what you do?

THE WITNESS: No, that's not what I do.
THE COURT: Okay. So what happened here?
THE WITNESS: If somebody tells you that they want 1.3 million for a place, we still have to find another place before we finally agree. We're negotiating terms of an agreement --

THE COURT: If both of them had signed and they hadn't found a place to live --

THE WITNESS: Then it would be a fully executed contract.

THE COURT: So it doesn't matter whether they find a place to live or not. The important thing is whether they themselves are bound to the contract --

THE WITNESS: Right. If they were just --
THE COURT: Don't interrupt me.
Not the reason, right?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
THE COURT: So it doesn't matter what the reason is?
THE WITNESS: That's absolutely correct.
THE COURT: So why do you mention that as the reason? It doesn't matter whether they find -- that would be so ridiculous. Oh, we don't find a good apartment, so the contract is no good. That would be ridiculous, wouldn't it?

THE WITNESS: That's why they didn't sign it.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, you don't know why they didn't sign it, do you?

THE WITNESS: That's part of the reason why they didn't sign it.

THE COURT: They told you?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Who told you that --

THE WITNESS: Both parties.
THE COURT: -- that that's the reason?
THE WITNESS: Both parties.
THE COURT: When did they tell you that?
THE WITNESS: We actually told the other parties that.
THE COURT: No, no. Tell me who told you what when.
THE WITNESS: February 7th, 6th or 7th I was told.
THE COURT: By whom? Tell me the name.
THE WITNESS: By Ms. Shechtman, that she would not sell
unless she was able to find another place.
THE COURT: Okay. And did she sign anything in this case?

THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: She didn't sign anything?
THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. So we're talking about the counteroffer that was delivered for 1.33 --

THE COURT: Why don't we talk about the final offer?
MR. HARRIS: We can get to that, Your Honor, but --
THE COURT: Well, isn't that what this case is about?
MR. HARRIS: Well, I just heard some testimony that is inconsistent with his deposition testimony regarding this offer.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's talk about this case.

Did Ms. Shechtman sign anything?
THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: Never?
THE WITNESS: Never.
THE COURT: At any time?
THE WITNESS: At any point.
THE COURT: About this unit at all?
THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: That's what you think, too.
MR. HARRIS: Your question was, did she sign anything?
THE COURT: Yeah. Did she?
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we have a pretrial stipulation that says --

THE COURT: Did she sign anything?
MR. HARRIS: She's ratified it. No. What the testimony from Mr. Joseph is, is that he signed her name to the agreement with explicit authority.

THE COURT: Okay. From whom?
MR. HARRIS: Ms. Shechtman and Honey Sherman.
THE COURT: Okay. He says no now, right?
MR. HARRIS: Correct, yes.
THE COURT: Okay. So is he telling the truth or not in your view?

MR. HARRIS: He is not telling the truth, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Are you going to be here until what
time to try to convince him?
MR. HARRIS: As long as it takes, I guess.
THE COURT: To convince him. We could be here till midnight.

MR. HARRIS: Well, no, I want to convince Your Honor.
THE COURT: This is not Perry Mason. You're not going to convince -- you're too young to remember that.

You're not going to convince him, right?
MR. HARRIS: I'm trying to convince the trier of fact.
THE COURT: Okay. So move on. Anything else?
Are you still the representative of the defendants?
THE WITNESS: There is no current -- no.
THE COURT: When was the last time you spoke with them, either one?

THE WITNESS: When we renewed the lease.
THE COURT: When was that?
THE WITNESS: Back in September.
THE COURT: Okay. And they've been your clients for how long, Honey Sherman and Mary Shechtman?

THE WITNESS: Well, Honey a little bit longer than
Mary. I'll say 2007, but it could be 2008.
THE COURT: Okay. It's been a good relationship?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: You want to continue to have them as

THE WITNESS: I would love to have them as clients. THE COURT: Go ahead. Any other questions?

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Let's look at Exhibit 1.

Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And it bears the initials and signature of Mary Shechtman, correct?
A. An MS, which is my signature, but yes.
Q. MS for Mary Shechtman, not for Sean Joseph, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you conveyed this counteroffer to the plaintiffs, correct?
A. No, to their agent.
Q. Okay. But to the plaintiffs' agent, Mr. Santidrian?
A. With the instruction that we also needed to have another party sign in order to have an executed contract.
Q. Well, didn't you wait until after you had received the return counteroffer before you advised them of that?
A. That's not -- no, because we had phone conversations and then the next day when I sent it in writing was because -- and even Mr. Santidrian says in emails that we were surprised to hear from a bank that they wanted to get in to do an appraisal. So I called him in a frantic saying, why is an appraiser calling us when we don't have the fully executed contract? And then he
said to me, I don't know. Let me speak to my clients. I didn't order the appraisal.

So that's why I put it in writing.
Q. Okay. So just to be clear, your testimony is you had
advised the buyers that two signatures were required before they returned the counteroffer?
A. I did not speak to the buyers during any negotiations.
Q. Okay. Through their agent.
A. Correct. And also, we did not provide -- they had asked for condominium documents. I did not provide those, either, at the time of the contract because $I$ said that we didn't have an executed agreement yet. So I did not provide any condo docs, either, at that time.
Q. Okay. I'd like you to look back at Exhibit 30, which is your deposition transcript, Page 101, please.

THE COURT: You want him to read a whole deposition?
MR. HARRIS: I would like him to look at Page 101 of his deposition testimony, Exhibit 30, Plaintiffs' 30.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. And you see beginning of line 5;
"Question: After you received back the signatures of the Katsantonises?
"Answer: Once they agreed to come up to 1.3 , I had a telephone conversation with him --"

THE COURT: Slow down when you read.
MR. HARRIS: Sorry.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. "-- with him, which I said --" and him is Raul, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay -- "which I said, him and I had several telephone conversations before and even after this, regarding, yes, that I needed now to get Honey's approval.
"Question: But that was after you received back the signed -- the offer signed by --
"Answer: Correct. To let him know that we needed to have an executed contract.
"Question: Did you -- and it had to be signed -- after it had been signed by the Katsantonises?
"Answer: Yes."
Weren't you testifying at that time that you had not advised Mr. Santidrian that a second signature was required until after you had received the signed document from the Katsantonises?
A. What I just said is I think it was on the 7th. So it was the same day.
Q. After you --
A. Once they agreed to it, then I let him know because like the Judge had just said, that what $I$ was doing was signing myself. Once they agreed to it, I told them that we did not have an
executed contract and that we needed to get one.
Q. Exactly. So it was after they had signed it and returned it that you advised them --
A. At the time.
Q. Right, after. After they accepted, you advised them for the first time that you needed Honey's signature as well?
A. Well, I also told them that she wasn't -- in the email prior, that she is not fully agreeing to this until she finds some place, you know --
Q. Well, that's not Honey, right, that's Mary?
A. That's both of them.
Q. Well, no. The email was that Mary needed a place to live. Honey already had a place, right?
A. This is not a place to live.
Q. Okay. My question is, wasn't it Mary that advised you that she singularly needed another place to live?
A. No, that they both needed -- they talked to each other. So they needed to -- and as a matter of fact, in the email trail you'll see where they were coming down together to look together at residences.
Q. For a place for who to live?
A. It wasn't for either one of them to live. This is an investment property.
Q. So they needed another property. That was the term, that was the parameter that you're relying on, that they needed
another property to have as an investment property before they would be willing to sell?
A. Eventually she would probably move into it, eventually; maybe use it. But I don't know what's going to happen in the future.
Q. It wasn't really a solid term of any deal, right? It was just kind of an idea to get another investment property?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. It wasn't really a set deal then, was it? It wasn't a requirement of the contract, right?
A. Well, of course we didn't put it in the contract, but it was conveyed to them prior to.
Q. Okay.
A. No, it wasn't like, I need to sell my place in order to buy this place or anything like that. It wasn't in the contract. But someone's state of mind to selling a place would be, I would sell it for 1.3 million. Unless I could find another place that I like, I don't want to sell this place, regardless of price. That was her mindset. It didn't matter if I got 1.5 million. She needed to be able to put the money somewhere else that she felt comfortable that she wanted to purchase.

THE COURT: How much did you think the condo was worth?
THE WITNESS: At that time, that would have been the highest price.

THE COURT: The 1.3?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
THE COURT: You don't think it was worth more than that?

THE WITNESS: What I think and what the market bears are two different things.

THE COURT: Well, I meant what you thought as a
Realtor. Not what you think --
THE WITNESS: My personal opinion is I think it's worth -- that it was worth probably more.

THE COURT: How much more?
THE WITNESS: I mean, it's hard to say because the market was very volatile.

THE COURT: Well, in February, how much? If someone were to ask you, hey, we want to put it up for sale. What do you think we can get for it? What would you say?

THE WITNESS: Well, what you can get for it? I would have told them what they can get for it, not what I think.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm not understanding what the difference is, what you think versus what you get for it. What's the difference?

THE WITNESS: The differences are on comparables. And this is my opinion versus facts.

THE COURT: So your opinion is inconsistent with the facts?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: You don't know what you're talking about then.

THE WITNESS: No. My opinion would be -- if you asked me my opinion of what I think it would be worth versus what the actual sales prices are, we were just talking about this earlier.

THE COURT: So your opinion is not based on comparables even though you're a Realtor.

THE WITNESS: No. You're twisting my words, Your Honor. You asked me what my opinion was at first and then I said to you my opinion is different than what the actual comps are.

THE COURT: Well, you told me your opinion is different than what the actual value would be. How could that be different? I'm asking you what you think.

THE WITNESS: Because the market didn't bear what the property should be worth.

THE COURT: Pardon?
THE WITNESS: The market hadn't beared what the property should be worth, in my opinion at that time yet.

THE COURT: But the market is what directs what the value of something is?

THE WITNESS: Correct. We're saying the same thing, correct.

THE COURT: Okay. But you're not saying it very well,
are you?
THE WITNESS: Then I'm not saying it well.
THE COURT: No. What do you think the market dictated that the value of that condominium was --

THE WITNESS: One point --
THE COURT: Excuse me -- in February?
THE WITNESS: 1.2 million to 1.25 million.
THE COURT: Not more?
THE WITNESS: That's correct.
THE COURT: And you told them that?
THE WITNESS: Told who that, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Your clients. Who were your clients?
THE WITNESS: They knew what the comparables were.
THE COURT: Did you tell them what you thought it was worth or you're the only Realtor who did not tell your clients, this is what you can get for it?

THE WITNESS: No, not with -- I listened to what she wanted to do.

THE COURT: You don't tell them as a Realtor what you think it's worth?

THE WITNESS: What I told her really didn't matter because she wanted what she wanted.

THE COURT: So your normal practice is not to tell someone, this is what it's worth. If someone comes to you as a client and says, I want $\$ 5$ million for that, you say, we're
going for it. You don't say --
THE WITNESS: No, I wouldn't waste my time.
THE COURT: Okay. So in this case with your
relationships since 2007, you didn't tell them what you thought it was worth?

THE WITNESS: Again, I didn't tell them -- I'm getting confused with the word "thought." I told them what the market would bear. That's not my thought.

THE COURT: What did you tell them the market would bear?

THE WITNESS: 1.2 to 1.25 , but we've had this property on and off the market at different various prices for a very long time, just kind of fishing.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Now, Exhibit 1 is the -- it's accepted by the defendants with their initials, but before that you had sent this counteroffer to Mr. Santidrian, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you thought you had the authority to deliver that from your client, correct?
A. Again, I had the authority to negotiate certain parameters based on what she said that she wanted for the unit.
Q. Okay. But my question is, you thought you had authority to issue the counteroffer that led to this document, the $\$ 1.3$
million counteroffer, correct?
A. I sent it.
Q. And you thought you had the authority from your clients based on --
A. Based on the terms, yes.
Q. -- based on the discussion --

THE COURT: Don't interrupt, folks.
MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. -- based on the discussions that you had had with both Mary and Honey, correct?
A. I didn't have discussions with Honey at that time because she was traveling.
Q. Well, you had had previous discussions with Honey and Mary where you understood that you were authorized to sell the property for $\$ 1.3$ million, correct?
A. At this particular time I did not have authority from Honey to do anything.
Q. Well, who was your client?
A. Both of them.
Q. Okay. So I would like you to look again at Exhibit 30, Page 96.

MR. SOTO: What page?
MR. HARRIS: 96.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Are you there?
A. Um-hum.
Q. Okay. You see here starting on Line 5:
"Question: In response to the 1.27, afterwards there was a counteroffer from Mary Shechtman for 1.3 , correct?
"Answer: Correct.
"Question: And at the time that you conveyed that 1.3, did you believe that you had the authority to make the offer for 1.3?
"Answer: Again, I did what my client asked me to do." Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So weren't you acting on instructions from your client to issue the $\$ 1.3$ million counteroffer to the plaintiffs?
A. Again, in negotiations, yes.
Q. Again, in negotiations --
A. For negotiation purposes, yes.
Q. Right, in negotiation, exchange of offers and counteroffers, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So you had the authority to issue that counteroffer from both defendants?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay.
A. No, I did not speak to Honey. I only spoke to Mary.
Q. Okay. So when you say that you had the authority from your client, now you're mincing, and sometimes you have one client and sometimes you have another client?
A. Correct. We said that earlier. Sometimes I speak to both, sometimes I speak to one or the other.
Q. Okay. But you had Mary's authority, right, to sign her name to this counteroffer, $\$ 1.3$ million counteroffer?
A. I did not have authority to sign her name. I had authority to negotiate on her behalf.

I made a mistake to be honest with you. I made a mistake. You know, I was trying to negotiate a contract. I never thought they would even come close to 1.3 million. I kind of got caught, as Your Honor has kind of pointed out, in doing something that I shouldn't have been doing.
Q. Okay. Well, let's go back to the prior counteroffer that you issued, the $\$ 1.33$ million counteroffer. That's Exhibit 12. Can you look at that, please?
A. I'm sorry. Which exhibit, 12?
Q. Exhibit 12 .
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when you sent this counteroffer, you did send this counteroffer to the plaintiffs' agent, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And when you sent this counteroffer, at the time you signed MS and Mary Shechtman's signature, you did so with the
understanding that you had the authority to do so from Mary Shechtman, correct?
A. Again, I don't have the authority to sign her name. I did.

What I did was I had the authority to negotiate within certain parameters.
Q. Well, didn't she explicitly direct you to sign her name and initial the document?
A. She did not explicitly direct me to sign her name.
Q. Okay. I'd like you to look again at your deposition testimony, Exhibit 30.
A. Okay.
Q. Page 84, Line 4:
"Question: At this time, did you advise Raul that this was -- at the time that you signed the "MS," you did so with the understanding that you had the authority to do so from Mary Shechtman, correct?
"Answer: She asked me to do so, yes.
"Question: She asked you to do this.
Okay. And this is your signature --
"Answer: Correct.
"Question: -- on the back as well?
"And you understood that you had her authority to sign her name as well?
"Answer: Correct.
"Question: She told you explicitly?

## "Answer: Correct."

So your testimony then was that you had explicit
authority from Mary Shechtman to sign her name and initials, but your testimony today is that you had no authority. That's what you're telling me?
A. I know I did something wrong. I was trying -- I never thought that this without a fully executed contract would ever get this far and I was trying not to get myself into a heap of trouble knowing that I had signed her name without expressed authorization or a Power of Attorney.
Q. Well, I'm more interested in the testimony you gave. You remember you were under oath at that deposition, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You took an oath to swear to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Do you remember that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Is this testimony that we just read into the record the truth?
A. Not 100 percent.
Q. Okay. So you gave false testimony in support of this -- or in this case, correct?
A. Apparently.
Q. What do you mean, "apparently"?
A. Well, I'm saying yes.
Q. Are you saying it's open to debate?
A. I'm saying yes.
Q. And why did you give that false testimony back when we took your deposition?
A. I just told you I knew that -- my client had asked me to negotiate on her behalf. I signed her name on behalf of one of my clients. Okay. If we had a meeting of the minds, it would have been signed by all parties. It was not. So I did something unethical.
Q. Okay. And so when you testified that she explicitly told you to sign her name to a counteroffer in this case, that's false. Is that what you're telling me?
A. Correct. Maybe I inferred wrong, you know. She asked me to negotiate certain parameters. I signed her name. I was never specifically told, you know, go ahead and sign my name. You know, this would be binding if you signed my name.
Q. Okay. And the lease we looked at before that you said as per email, did you sign that with authority?
A. That I had an email saying to just go ahead and sign it.
Q. Okay. One that we don't have in discovery?
A. Well, it wasn't -- again, that had nothing to do with this contract. It was a totally separate transaction. I don't know if you have it or not.
Q. But you gave it to -- your testimony is that you produced it to --
A. I'm not 100 percent sure if $I$ did or I didn't.
Q. Well, who did you give the document to?
A. Again, I'm not 100 percent sure.
Q. So it's possible that you never gave us that email?
A. It's possible.
Q. Okay. Do you think you have that email?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And did you hold it back?
A. I didn't hold it back. It has nothing to do with this
transaction, this contract. When I was asked to provide documents, I was asked to provide documents pertaining to this contract.
Q. Okay. So before when you said you produced it in discovery, that's not true?
A. Again, I don't recall.
Q. Okay.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I'm almost finished, if you can just indulge me for a minute.

Your Honor, I wanted to move some documents into evidence through this witness.

THE COURT: Give me the numbers.
MR. HARRIS: I can't remember if we moved in Number 3, which is the lease.

MR. SOTO: We did, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Hold on.
MR. HARRIS: Number 8 would be the --

THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on.
MR. HARRIS: Oh, I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Hold on. Number 3 has been admitted.
Next.
MR. HARRIS: Number 13 -- sorry, Number 8.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. SOTO: Yes, Your Honor. There are several emails in here that are also from Raul Santidrian. He's not here to authenticate them and they are the last --

THE COURT: Is he going to be here tomorrow?
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, it's an exchange of emails
between Mr. Santidrian and --
THE COURT: I'm sorry, my accent must be getting worse as the hour gets late. Is he going to be a witness tomorrow?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You think this is a made-up email and it's false, Mr. Soto? Is that what you think, it's a made-up email?

MR. SOTO: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then I'll admit it.
MR. SOTO: Okay.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 8 was received in evidence.) THE COURT: Next.

MR. HARRIS: Number 13.
THE COURT: Any objection to that email?
MR. SOTO: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Admitted.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 13 was received in evidence.) THE COURT: Next.

MR. HARRIS: 22.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. SOTO: It's already been admitted, Your Honor.
MR. HARRIS: I believe that's been admitted, actually.
THE COURT: It has been admitted. Next.
MR. HARRIS: 28.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. SOTO: No.
THE COURT: It will be admitted.
MR. SOTO: Actually, Your Honor, it's being admitted
twice. It's already in Exhibit 3 --
THE COURT: It won't be the first time I get to see or hear something twice.

MR. SOTO: -- or 8.
THE COURT: Unfortunately. Next.
MR. HARRIS: Is it admitted, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. HARRIS: Okay.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 28 was received in evidence.)
MR. HARRIS: I believe that's it.
THE COURT: All right. Cross-examination.
How long are you going to be?

MR. SOTO: 15, 20 minutes at most, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It's up to you. You want to do it now or tomorrow?

MR. SOTO: I'd rather do it today just so we don't have to call him back tomorrow.

THE COURT: Okay. It's up to you.
MR. SOTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Mr. Joseph, did you ever have authority, express authority from Honey Shechtman or Honey Sherman?

THE COURT: I'm sorry, you have to use the mic because the court reporter can't hear you.

MR. SOTO: I apologize.
THE COURT: No problem.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Mr. Joseph, did you ever have express authority to enter into a contract from Honey Sherman?
A. No.
Q. In your opinion -- let me rephrase that. Why did you execute the contract, the counteroffer for Mary Shechtman?
A. In good faith to negotiate the deal, to get it going, until I was able to speak to both parties and both parties were able to do whatever they needed to do.
Q. And didn't you convey that to Raul the first thing in the
morning on the 8th?
A. I did.
Q. Did you ever have a conversation with him that evening of the 7th and also tell him that?
A. I did.
Q. Now, did you create what is Exhibit Number 1? I believe it should be right there in front of you.
A. No.
Q. Do you know who did?
A. It was provided to me by Raul Santidrian. Whether he did it or someone in his office, an assistant or something, I really can't answer that, but it was provided to me from him.
Q. Okay. Did you know that the initials of Joanne Katsantonis and Vivian Katsantonis were done by the same person?
A. No.
Q. Did you just find that out for the first time today?
A. I just found that out today.
Q. Did you ever receive a copy of this executed contract with the initials on the right side?
A. No.
Q. Take a look at what's been marked as Exhibit Number 2, the second page.
A. Yes.
Q. Wednesday, February 6, 2013 at 4:42 p.m. Do you see that email --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in the middle of the page?

Did you send an email to Raul?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the email that you sent to him?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't it true in that email on February 6th --

THE COURT: Which exhibit are we talking about?
MR. SOTO: Exhibit Number 2, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs' 2?
MR. SOTO: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SOTO: Second page.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Isn't it true that you told Raul at that time that you hadn't gotten any authority?

MR. HARRIS: Objection, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Overruled.
MR. HARRIS: He's leading.
THE COURT: Overruled. He's cross-examining.
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor --
THE COURT: He's cross-examining.
MR. HARRIS: He's a favorable witness called in or an
adverse witness called in our case in chief.
THE COURT: I didn't see that in the rule. Remember when I read the three things? It didn't say, and then when you cross-examine an adverse witness, you cannot lead. It didn't say that. Get on a committee; maybe it should say that. But see, that's the danger in calling a so-called adverse or hostile witness. The other side can, indeed, lead.

MR. HARRIS: There are authorities that say the opposite, Your Honor, that --

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what Eleventh Circuit case says that.

MR. HARRIS: I knew that was going to be your next question. I will bring them tomorrow.

THE COURT: Oh, well, today is when I need it.
Tomorrow is too late.
You know, see, the problem with all of that is we're missing the point. The reason people shouldn't lead is because when you lead as a lawyer, the witness doesn't get the chance to explain. So you generally lead a witness who is not with you because you just want him to say yes, no; yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, in front of the jury.

When you're in front of the judge who asks a lot of questions, all of that is kind of almost meaningless. So if I were to say, your name is Mr. Harris, that would be a leading question, but no one would care if it's leading because
everybody agrees that that's the truth, right?
Now, your theory of the case here regarding this
witness is what? Is he changing his testimony?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, he is, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So you think by your opposing counsel leading him, it make him seem more credible or less credible?

MR. HARRIS: Less credible, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Why would you object to that then? I'm not understanding.

MR. HARRIS: I will sit down, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'm not saying I'm making a finding as such. I'm just trying to figure out why you all do what you do.

MR. HARRIS: I'll withdraw the objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Next question.
MR. SOTO: Judge, I think I learn more in this courtroom than I ever did in law school.

THE COURT: I teach a class tomorrow at 7:00 in the morning on that. You're welcome to go.

MR. SOTO: I think I'm going to be here.
THE COURT: Not at 7:00 in the morning, you're not, because I won't.

Next question.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Mr. Joseph, isn't it true that at that time you told Raul that you didn't have authority from anyone?
A. Yes.
Q. It says that?
A. Yes, that's what I'm reading.
Q. "However, keep in mind that my seller will not sell for less than 1.3 million. In fact, she has not --"

THE COURT: When was that conversation through email?
MR. HARRIS: February 6th at 4:42 p.m.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. "In fact, she has not been agreed to that obviously."
A. Correct, with a typo.
Q. And you told that to Raul?
A. Correct.
Q. Take a look -- and you should have a white binder -- you know what, I actually didn't provide it to you.

MR. SOTO: Judge, may I approach the witness?
THE COURT: Sure. With what?
MR. SOTO: Exhibit Number 6, text messages.
THE COURT: Defense or plaintiffs?
MR. SOTO: Defense.
THE COURT: Okay. It's always good to say that, so we know which book we're looking at.

MR. SOTO: It's in the white one, Judge.
THE COURT: Defendants' 6.
Do you want to introduce it?

MR. SOTO: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. HARRIS: I only object to the document in the sense that it's unclear whether this -- the third and fourth pages, especially the third page, doesn't have a date or a time.

THE COURT: You think it's fake, made up?
MR. HARRIS: I don't know, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You don't know.
MR. SOTO: He gave it to me.
THE COURT: So who would know? Would Raul Santidrian know whether it's fake or not?

This is email correspondence between the two Realtors, Sean Joseph and Raul Santidrian.

MR. SOTO: No, sir. Text messages.
THE COURT: Text messages, I'm sorry. Correspondence, we'll call it.

Is it true or not true? Would those two individuals know whether this is what they text messaged or whether someone is hacking?

So is this true or not true or someone is just making this up?

MR. HARRIS: I believe that the emails were sent, that the texts were sent. It's just that you can't really tell on some of them when they were sent, and they're ordered a certain way here.

THE COURT: Okay. Who would know when they were sent? MR. HARRIS: Raul.

THE COURT: Raul would know. Are you going to call? MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So do you want to ask him?
MR. SOTO: Mr. Santidrian?
THE COURT: I'm sorry. I'm talking to your opposing counsel first.

You're going to ask him, when did you get these?
MR. HARRIS: I would like to ask him if they're in the right order.

THE COURT: Well, ask him, look at Exhibit 6. Is this in the right order? Now, if he says, no, they're trying to fool me. This was really February 9th and not 6th. This is after the fact, boy, we've got a real dispute. If he says, yeah, he told me that. I made a mistake or I didn't do it or he's lying, then we've got a trial, don't we? So we'll wait till then and I'll admit 6.
(Defendants' Exhibit Number 6 was received in evidence.)
MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Next.
BY MR. SOTO:
Q. Mr. Joseph, take a look at Exhibit Number 6. Is that a text message that was sent to you by Raul Santidrian?
A. Yes.
Q. And his appear on the right and yours appear on the left, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And on the very first page, he says, "Sean. We have an executed contract. I will send it to you tonight when I get home. They are wiring the 50,000 to Sotheby's. I will send you an escrow letter tomorrow. Can you send me seller's disclosure and the condo docs tomorrow."

## Correct?

A. Correct.
Q. And you responded to that, correct?
A. In text, yes.
Q. "I need to get all that and speak seller."
A. Correct.
Q. Now, if we take a look at that next page, it actually does have a date on it, doesn't it, in middle of the page.
A. Yes.
Q. It says February 8, 2013, 8:55 a.m., correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, text messages, would everything that above it, appears above that date, have occurred prior to that time and date?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So your conversation above February 8, 2013 all occurred prior to that time?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then you sent him, "I need to talk. I need to get all that and speak seller."

That's the same text, just a different picture.
A. It looks that way.
Q. Okay. And then at the bottom, "I sent the agreement to seller attorney Joel Piotrowski. Spoke to him yesterday and asked me --" and it continues on the next page, but we don't have any more, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You didn't produce these, correct?
A. No.
Q. These came from Raul Santidrian, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you attempt to get your text messages?
A. I did.
Q. Did you ever produce them to anybody in this case?
A. No, I was unable to obtain them.
Q. Okay. And this is all that Mr. Santidrian, to your knowledge, has provided?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, it says, "Well, we have an executed contract, fully effective. That is just a request by her attorney. But that's fine, send it to him if he is requesting it."

Do you recall what you had said to him before that led Raul to text that to you on February 8th in the morning?
A. Correct, that the day prior we had a conversation, a telephone conversation where I explained to him that we did not have an executed contract. I needed to get all parties to sign the contract. I also told him that I was not going to provide the condo docs to him because we did not have an executed contract at that time and I also told him that I would be speaking to my clients.
Q. And the reason that we know that occurred on February 8th prior to 10:45 a.m. is because if you flip to the next page, it actually is another snapshot of that previous screen with his response to you, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And at the bottom it says February 2013, 10:45 a.m.
A. Correct.
Q. So we know that everything before this for the preceding three pages occurred prior to 10:45 a.m.?
A. Correct.
Q. On the 8th?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And again, you had no authority from Mary Shechtman or Honey Sherman to enter into this final agreement that they consider a counteroffer in this matter, correct?
A. Correct.

MR. SOTO: Thank you. No further questions.
THE COURT: Any redirect?

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. I'd just like you to look quickly at Exhibit 2.

THE COURT: Plaintiffs' 2.
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 2.
THE WITNESS: Which book would that be, the same book
that I was looking at?
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. The black one.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. And you said you received this email, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And the last email on the chain in time is the top one.
"Sean, per as our phone conversation earlier, I'm sending you the fully executed contract."

Do you see that?
THE COURT: Slow down.
MR. HARRIS: Oh, I'm sorry.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. Let me read that again.

It says, "Sean, as per our phone conversation earlier, I'm sending you the fully executed contract at Trump Tower III, Unit 3807." Right?
A. Correct.

Joseph - Redirect
Q. And if you flip to the last page of the exhibit, you see there's an icon there for an attachment.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. So there was an attachment to this email, right?
A. On my --

THE COURT: Where are we going now?
MR. HARRIS: The very last page, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Of Exhibit 2?
MR. HARRIS: It's Exhibit 2.
THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. There's a PDF attachment. It says Trump Tower III, Unit 3807. Do you see that?
A. I do see that.
Q. Okay. And so he said he was sending you the fully executed contract?

THE COURT: That's what he said, right?
MR. HARRIS: That's what the email says.
THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. HARRIS:
Q. And on February 7, 2013, 8:26 p.m., right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And so what was that document that he sent you? What was that attachment?
A. That's a very interesting question because when we went
through my emails, there was no attachment on it. There was no record on the chain that said attachments or anything of that nature.
Q. Well, you testified he received this email.
A. You testified that $I$ received what I'm reading here and then on the back you're showing me on his that he provided -- it shows an attachment. On mine it did not show an attachment. Q. Okay. But even though we had all this testimony before where you said that you had received the executed contract from the plaintiffs, and we can go back to the deposition if need be, but now you're saying that you didn't receive an executed contract; is that right?
A. We just found out recently after discussing with the attorneys, trying to get me to provide more emails and we were going through everything you requested, the attorney noticed that there was no attachment on mine.
Q. When did that conversation take place?
A. A couple of weeks ago.
Q. Okay. And how many emails did you produce a couple of weeks ago or since a couple of weeks ago?
A. One email I think it was that we found, another one that pertained.
Q. So you had a big meeting where you discussed one email?
A. We were going through everything to see if there was anything that I missed, that's correct, because you were
requesting information.
Q. Okay.

MR. HARRIS: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You're excused. Have a good day.

Who's your next witness?
MR. HARRIS: Raul Santidrian, Your Honor.
MR. SOTO: You can go, Mr. Joseph.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You're excused. Have a good day.

Leave the exhibits there.
(The witness was excused.)
MR. HARRIS: Do you want a witness now or --
THE COURT: I just want to know who the next witness is.

MR. HARRIS: Well, Mr. Santidrian is not here. He would have been the next in my case.

THE COURT: He's not here? Why?
MR. HARRIS: We discussed this this morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Oh, he's the one with the wife?
MR. HARRIS: Yes.
THE COURT: Oh, okay.
MR. HARRIS: And at the time you said he could go

THE COURT: Did you find out what the story is with his wife?

MR. HARRIS: I did not, personally.
THE COURT: Okay. Now, you're going to call him as a witness to identify the emails that are not really in dispute, right?

MR. HARRIS: To identify the emails. I would like him to --

THE COURT: That are really not in dispute. They are what they are, right?

MR. HARRIS: Well, no. Mr. Joseph just denied that he received the executed contract. So I would like to get that testimony.

THE COURT: Other than the attachment, does it really matter? Let's think about this, okay? Help me out.

Raul Santidrian thought this was a contract, right? That's what he wanted. Obviously, a Realtor always wants a contract because they get a commission. I assume he wasn't working for nothing, right? So he thinks it's a contract, right?

MR. HARRIS: Yeah, that's not why I would be calling him, but that's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's what he thinks. Now, that's irrelevant, right, what he thinks?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So he's not going to testify about that. He's going to identify emails that really say what they say. They are what they are. We know what he said, what he texted, what he wrote, and we know what Mr. Joseph texted, right? So how does that help me decide this case?

He's the Realtor for the purchasers.
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor. He received all the communications from the defendants.

THE COURT: From whom, from the defendants themselves?
MR. HARRIS: Through their agent.
THE COURT: Okay. See, that's really what the case is about, though.

What do I do with this Defense Exhibit 6? That doesn't help you.

Use the lectern to help me out. Use the lectern to help the court reporter out. She's ready to go home, but she's sorry that this was not a jury trial because I would send the jurors home earlier.

But Joseph says, I made a mistake. I really didn't have authority. I made a boo-boo. Now, you say he's covering up because he wants what?

MR. HARRIS: More business from the defendants.
THE COURT: From the plaintiffs -- from the defendants.
From the defendants. Okay.
Now, what if he really did make a mistake? He also
wants this to go through, right? He testified that this was worth 1.3 -- even less than 1.3 million.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And many Realtors always -- I probably can't take judicial notice of this, but maybe $I$ can. I don't know. But a lot of Realtors would say to a client, oh, your house is not worth a million bucks. Your house is worth $\$ 900,000$. Why? Because it would sell quicker for $\$ 900,000$ and they get 6, 7 percent. That's why Realtors are agents. But look at that, they're agents sometimes of both purchasers and sellers. So, I mean, we as lawyers think, wait, that might be some kind of a conflict. But they travel under different rules.

So now he says, since he's not going to get a commission -- though that would be an interesting thing. Query if I grant specific performance, the Realtors are entitled to a commission. I don't know. I don't know. And query as to whether a Realtor who says he made a mistake, and if both of them made a mistake individually, whether they can be sued for what they did as Realtors.

See, look at all the stuff that could happen with this case. Maybe if they lose, if either side loses, maybe you could sue your own Realtor, I don't know, and spend even more time and money. That's something that $I$ don't know if mediators consider when you guys do the numbers. Since I've never been to a mediation, I don't know.

So he's going to come in and say, I sent all these emails. That's not in dispute, is it, Mr. Soto?

MR. SOTO: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: No. So what else is there?
MR. HARRIS: Well, it is in dispute that he sent the executed contract.

THE COURT: Well, you call it an executed contract. That begs the question.

MR. HARRIS: Exhibit 1.
THE COURT: See, I would sustain -- if this were in front of a jury, I would sustain objections to that because that's the issue. Is this a contract? Did the individuals who signed it have the authority to sign it? That's what the case is about.

The case is not about whether people are making up these e-mails and text messages, right?

MR. HARRIS: Correct.
THE COURT: I mean, some cases are about that, but not this case. The question is whether the ladies from the defense actually gave the Realtor the authority to do that. He says now no, but he said yes in the deposition. Right, that's really what it is?

MR. HARRIS: That's one issue, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What if he was wrong? And even though they said, go ahead, what does the law say about Realtors? Can a

Realtor do that?
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, the law says that when the parties conduct negotiations through their respective agents exclusively, if they are not cloaked with actual authority, which is what's being suggested, then they are certainly cloaked with apparent authority.

THE COURT: Even if he acknowledges he made a mistake.
MR. HARRIS: Well, Your Honor, after the fact, you know, in trial for the first time.

THE COURT: And cases on agency, you have cases on agency involving purchases of property?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Realtors?
MR. HARRIS: Yes. I have a case -- I believe it's Benson v. Seestrom cited in our summary judgment opposition in which the principal created an offer, gave it to her agent and said, it's only good for $X$ number of days; and the real estate agent, the seller's agent, took the offer and sat on it for a couple of days. And then after the time --

THE COURT: Took the offer where? I didn't hear what you said. I'm sorry.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: Took the offer where?
MR. HARRIS: He had received the offer from his client, the principal, and he sat on it for a couple of days.

## Bench Trial

THE COURT: Why did he do that? Are you kidding? He would be quick on the trigger.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, my contact lens just popped out. So forgive me if I'm a little --

THE COURT: Okay. Did you find it? Go ahead. Well, find it.

MR. HARRIS: It may be in my eye somewhere.
THE COURT: You won't be the first lawyer who cries here, nor the last.

MR. HARRIS: Can I get some help?
THE COURT: You okay?
Well, I don't know if it falls within the parameters of her local counsel duties.

MR. HARRIS: It's in my eye, off the eyeball. I can try to argue this, but I would like a bathroom break.

THE COURT: That's more than pro hac vice for 75 bucks.
Are you okay?
MS. MALFELD: It's way up there. It's way up there.
MR. HARRIS: I see it.
THE COURT: You got it?
MR. HARRIS: Yeah, it's in my eye. I can try to argue
this but I would like a bathroom break.
THE COURT: What did you do? What do you do with that
when it's in your eye?
MR. HARRIS: I can push it back down onto the --

THE COURT: Do you want to do that here or in the restroom?

MR. HARRIS: I need to use a mirror in a restroom.
THE COURT: Okay. Then permission to go to the restroom is granted.

MR. HARRIS: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
(Christopher Harris, Esq., retired from the courtroom.)
THE COURT: We've got lawyers on both sides anyway here.

I don't know where you all think you're going to end up with this case because I don't know what I'm going to do. It just seems like you're all like gerbils in a cage. You know, have you ever seen those gerbils in cages? They go around and around and around and they don't get anywhere. They lose a lot of weight, I guess, but something some of us could --

MR. SOTO: People are forced to be the gerbil on the merry-go-round.

THE COURT: Yeah. I wonder why that is, you know?
I wonder what would happen if you all ended up living next to each other in a condominium, and you were, all four of you, elected to be on that condominium board.

Maybe that's what we should do, if I had the power to do that, and see what would happen, right?

MR. SOTO: Luckily there is only one condo in issue here, not two.

THE COURT: Well, you know, I don't know. There are all kinds of equitable powers, no? There seems to be money, you know? At least we're not talking about super poor people.

MR. SOTO: How long have you been in this courtroom, Judge?

THE COURT: Since the building was opened. What is that, five years? Something like that.

MR. SOTO: And they put the lawyers on top of you. How did that happen?

THE COURT: What do you mean they put the lawyers on top of me? They put the things that count; the library, and yeah, the lawyers. Yeah, they deserve to be in the penthouse.

MR. SOTO: There's a lawyer's --
THE COURT: Lounge.
MR. SOTO: -- lounge up there.
THE COURT: Yeah, I made it, the Judge Spellman Lounge. He was a great judge. Oh, I could just imagine what he would do with this case. May he rest in peace. He had a good Irish wit to him.
(Christopher Harris, Esq. entered the courtroom.)
THE COURT: See, the problem with this case is by the end of it, whatever I decide, one side or the other can appeal. That takes a year. Of course, by then maybe we'll have a real estate -- I personally think there's going to be another crash. The reason I think there's going to be another crash is because

I go to lunch to Brickell sometimes and dinner and they're building everywhere. Not as far north as where you all like to live, you know, near Bal Harbour and Sunny Isles and all that, but there are so many condominiums. So by then everything will be worth less.

So if I order specific performance, how does that get enforced? They have to do a closing, right?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Within 30 days. And if they don't do a closing -- if you win on specific performance --

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- they have to close, and it's a cash deal. So they get the money, $\$ 1.3$ million. The defendants don't want $\$ 1.3$ million. Only in my courtroom do the defendants not want money, but that happens.

Okay. You want 1.3? No, we don't. We don't want $\$ 1.3$ million. Okay. You're the defendants, not the plaintiffs. So they don't want $\$ 1.3$ million.

Let's say the closing doesn't occur within 30 days of the order. Then I guess I could enter final judgment in the amount of $\$ 1.3$ million, right?

MR. HARRIS: No, Your Honor. I would hope that you would enforce the --

THE COURT: Well, how do I enforce --
MR. HARRIS: You would hold them in contempt.

THE COURT: You want me to throw them in jail and then they would have a place to live. That would kind of do it, and it would be free. So there will be more money.

That's what you want me to do, throw them in jail?
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor --
THE COURT: No, but see, I think about what happens in the future. Well, see, what lawyers do is, they look at the immediate thing because you all do a good job, you fight for your clients, but you're looking at what's right before you.

What I look at is what's going to happen at the end if either side wins, and I don't know who's going to win. I really don't. I really don't.

But even if I do rule in favor of someone, and I will, the Court of Appeals could say -- they don't usually, but every once in a while they send it back and they say, you blew it, Moreno. You know what, that's not enough for apparent authority and it's different and you really do need the signature. They look at that trust and it says majority. It's not majority of one. They might think it's the two of them.

I mean, you could have arguments. This is a triable case. That's why I denied summary judgment. I make credibility findings, but even if I make credibility findings, there's going to be something missing in this case, right?

Something happened and I still don't know because I haven't heard from everybody yet exactly what happened.

But if the plaintiffs win, I order specific performance. They have to sell the condo, respecting the rights of the tenant, of course, who's there. And if they don't do it, what do I do, throw them in jail, fine them?

MR. HARRIS: I suppose you could have the marshal seize the property.

THE COURT: Seize the property. Whenever the marshal -- they're great, but they're a lot better at seizing prisoners than property.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I'm sure there are a number of legal remedies.

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. HARRIS: It's not the first time specific performance has been ordered for the sale.

THE COURT: I know.
MR. HARRIS: In fact, the case that I was describing, that was the remedy.

THE COURT: That's what they did in that case?
MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: They ordered the sale and the sale didn't go through?

MR. HARRIS: No, they ordered specific performance because it was very similar.

THE COURT: And then what happened?
MR. HARRIS: Well, they don't report if they had to
enforce the ruling of the Court. They granted specific performance.

THE COURT: In a district court case.
MR. HARRIS: It was a Florida district court -- for a State court case.

THE COURT: A Court of Appeals case?
MR. HARRIS: Yes.
THE COURT: So they ordered that, and we don't know what happened. But you care what happens because you just want your clients to resolve the issue.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor. If we were going to respect the integrity of the judicial system, then we assume people are going to follow orders or have consequences, and I don't know what the full arsenal of the Court is to enforce those decisions.

THE COURT: What am I going to do with Mr. Joseph's testimony?

MR. HARRIS: Well, I think we had his admissions in deposition. You have to make a finding between whether he's telling the truth then or telling the truth today.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HARRIS: I don't know if you have to, but you can weigh his testimony in the grand scheme of the entire testimony. You're going to hear testimony from the defendants where they will tell you that, or they did, unless they're changing their
testimony as well, that they gave Mr. -- well, that Mary had authority to sell the property and they were all in agreement and that everything that Mary did, Honey approved and vice versa.

THE COURT: And how are they going to change their testimony about that, Mr. Soto?

MR. SOTO: They didn't testify to that, Judge.
THE COURT: Pardon?
MR. SOTO: They didn't testify.
THE COURT: Okay. They did not say that?
MR. SOTO: No.
THE COURT: What did they say?
MR. SOTO: They specifically said that they did not give Sean Joseph authority, specifically.

THE COURT: Okay. And you say they said they did give him authority.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Wow.
MR. SOTO: Show us. We have their depositions here.
THE COURT: Well, the problem with depositions is, see, depositions, once we go to trial, it's not substantive evidence.

MR. HARRIS: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It's whatever they say here.
Now, you can, of course, impeach them, attack their credibility with a prior inconsistent statement, and then I can
accept or reject their testimony, right? I could do that.
MR. HARRIS: Yes.
THE COURT: But there's always a reason why people change their testimony and perhaps don't tell the truth, right?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Usually, it's to avoid something negative or to gain something positive, right?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The gain here is what, that the condominium now is worth a lot more?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: But in reality the condominium, if it's worth more, it's only worth $\$ 120,000$ more.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we would dispute that.
THE COURT: Well, you would dispute that, but you don't really have proof of that because I can't consider --

MR. HARRIS: Well, if the plaintiffs tried to buy it, they tried to make similar offers at the time for the same price and more, and they were not able to get a unit.

THE COURT: But there are a lot of reasons why people don't.

MR. HARRIS: There are a lot of reasons why people come down. They might have been in a pinch and sold for anything -THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. HARRIS: -- and sell way below what the value was.

THE COURT: That, too, but a comparable that is an actual purchase price is more valuable than a listing or an offer, true?

It's tough coming here, but the answer is yes, even if it hurts your clients. It's true, isn't it? And the comparables --

MR. HARRIS: Assuming it's apple to apple, yes.
THE COURT: And the comparables are $\$ 120,000$ more. Now, there may be some differences with them. One of the differences with those two condominiums, I assume they're higher.

MR. HARRIS: I believe in the 40 s they would be higher.
THE COURT: They would be higher. The tradition is the higher it is, the higher it is, right? The higher the condominium, the higher the price, right? No one has vertigo anymore, but most people love being in the penthouse. That's why the 13th floor is considered better than the 12th, and that's why I'm on the 13th floor, right?

So it's \$120,000 difference.
MR. HARRIS: I would dispute that, Your Honor. The reason that there are so many variables with comps and different locations and views and all those things, this is exactly why the Court allows specific performance for land deals, real estate deals. That's precisely the reason.

THE COURT: And I could see that if it was unique.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I can't see a Sunny Isles condominium being that unique. I mean, I don't want to disrespect anybody who loves the condominium that much, but it's not unique like the house you've had for 40 years or the grandfather's house, the homestead, right?

MR. HARRIS: It's a lot of money, Your Honor. It's $\$ 1.3$ million.

THE COURT: Oh, it's a lot of money. No kidding.
MR. HARRIS: So it's not a decision made lightly.
THE COURT: So it's the money. It's not because it's unique.

MR. HARRIS: Well, for that price you want to make sure you're getting exactly what you want, and there are differences.

THE COURT: Do I have the authority, if you win, to issue a final judgment if they don't sell for $\$ 1.3$ million?

MR. HARRIS: If we win --
THE COURT: If you win and they don't perform within 30 days --

MR. HARRIS: Yes.
THE COURT: We could say March, just a different year, 2014. Do I have the authority to issue a final judgment since they're not doing what I'm telling them to do? Okay. Then pay them $\$ 1.3$ million. That's the value of the condo. Do I have the authority to do that?

MR. HARRIS: I believe --
THE COURT: I give you food for thought for the night.
MR. HARRIS: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. Now, what happens to the other two counts? The promissory --

MR. HARRIS: Right, the promissory --
THE COURT: But the damages are for -- what did we say before, $\$ 40,000$, the difference between the maintenance and the real estate taxes. You could make 40 grand, assuming you can really rent it.

MR. HARRIS: Right. I think what I was saying was the Count 2 is the alternative. Our first choice, if the actual remedies were to present themsleves, would be the specific performance.

THE COURT: So you can't get both.
MR. HARRIS: Correct.
THE COURT: Okay. And the third count is what?
MR. HARRIS: Promissory estoppel.
THE COURT: Which you can't get if you win the first one.

MR. HARRIS: Correct.
THE COURT: So it doesn't really matter.
MR. HARRIS: Right.
THE COURT: Okay. But if you lose the first one, the specific performance, you can't have a breach of contract -- but
it seems like they both merge, don't they? Either you got a contract or you don't. If you have a contract --

MR. HARRIS: Right. It's the same theory, but a different remedy, is essentially what it is.

THE COURT: So it really should be one count with two different remedies.

MR. HARRIS: It could be styled that way, yes.
THE COURT: Okay. I just want to understand it to help the Court of Appeals.

MR. HARRIS: Because you don't want to make damage claims in your specific performance count and set it up for an exclusive remedy type argument. So that's why we divide them up.

THE COURT: And there are no attorneys' fees here.
MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we had made a claim, but we're withdrawing that.

THE COURT: Based on what? The contract says that?
MR. HARRIS: Yes. We're withdrawing that claim.
THE COURT: As a negotiating tool or because there's no --

MR. HARRIS: We're not going to present evidence on that.

THE COURT: Because the law doesn't allow you to.
MR. HARRIS: No, that's not true. Under the facts, I think it would be a little difficult.

THE COURT: Well, now you've --
MR. HARRIS: To prove with, you know --
THE COURT: -- got my curiosity. You know, whenever a lawyer doesn't ask for attorneys' fees -- you're related to the plaintiffs.

MR. HARRIS: We work at the same law firm.
THE COURT: Oh, my goodness gracious. Okay.
MR. HARRIS: So while the firm has incurred -- and she is an owner of the firm -- the firm has incurred a number of legal expenses using our time to do this, she will sustain a loss, but we didn't want to get into trying to prove all that up.

THE COURT: I got it. I didn't catch it before. All right.

And the defendants, what they want is, they want to continue renting this apartment to someone else.

MR. SOTO: No.
THE COURT: Well, that's what they're doing now.
Get to the microphone. See what we can do here.
MR. SOTO: They are, Your Honor.
THE COURT: They are what? They're going to live
there? They live together there?
MR. SOTO: They live at Honey's unit currently.
THE COURT: Which is a nicer unit.
MR. SOTO: I believe so.

THE COURT: Honey thinks so anyway.
MR. SOTO: Of course.
THE COURT: Okay. Now, they live together.
MR. SOTO: They do.
THE COURT: Okay. And this one --
MR. SOTO: Is rented.
THE COURT: It's an investment property.
MR. SOTO: No.
THE COURT: They just rent it, but not as an
investment.
MR. SOTO: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SOTO: The unit originally was rented because Honey was going to do more traveling. When her --

THE COURT: Okay. I hear she does a lot of traveling.
MR. SOTO: Well, I mean Mary. I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Oh, Mary does a lot of traveling.
MR. SOTO: Mary's -- no, she was going to. Mary's
daughter had an illness.
THE COURT: Was ill. You told me that before.
MR. SOTO: They got it resolved and she wanted to spend more time with her because --

THE COURT: Okay. Here in Miami.
MR. SOTO: Correct. And that's when they planned --
THE COURT: He lives there, too.

MR. SOTO: When she comes down, now they stay at Honey's, but they were going to stay at her unit until this whole issue came around and she said, I'm just going to rent it. I don't want to do anything else with it because I don't want to mess anything up because of the litigation, but her plan is not to release it after this term.

THE COURT: To have it for her daughter.
MR. SOTO: For her and her daughter and her son.
THE COURT: Because there's no other condominium --
MR. SOTO: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: For what?
MR. SOTO: Her sons, two sons and one daughter.
THE COURT: For the children.
MR. SOTO: Well, that's who the beneficiary of this
trust is.
THE COURT: And they're not adults yet.
MR. SOTO: I believe one is 21.
MS. SHECHTMAN: One will be 22 next week and the other two, they're twins, they are turning 20 in two months. And my husband, but he's not a beneficiary.

THE COURT: No, I always like to find out why people do what they do and that's all.

So if you lose in this case and I order specific performance, what are your clients going to do?

MR. SOTO: That's a good question. One, probably fire
me, but I believe it would be appealed, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, there's nothing wrong with appealing it. And firing you, that's up to them. But, you know, you get the case as you find it. That's the way it is.

But then they still have to obey the order --
MR. SOTO: They do --
THE COURT: -- Or would I stay it pending appeal?
MR. SOTO: That would be your decision or they could post a supersedeas bond.

THE COURT: Of $\$ 1.3$ million.
MR. SOTO: In excess of 1.3 million.
THE COURT: Okay. Which they have handily.
MR. SOTO: No, which they could bond off.
THE COURT: Okay. By paying 15 percent and wasting more money.

MR. SOTO: More money.
THE COURT: Gosh, there's so much money here for people. Now, and the mediator in this case was who?

MR. SOTO: Judge Richard Eade.
THE COURT: Yeah, we went through that.
And he didn't go through all these factors with you
all.
MR. SOTO: We did.
THE COURT: And it was totally useless.
MR. SOTO: We were separated, and I can't really tell
you any of it, Judge.
THE COURT: No, I don't want you to tell me the substance.

MR. SOTO: We were very far apart.
THE COURT: But you can tell me how it worked. At mediation do you get all four together?

MR. SOTO: We did at the beginning.
THE COURT: They weren't talking to each other.
MR. SOTO: No, actually, the clients --
THE COURT: Get along.
MR. SOTO: Towards each other, no. They've been civil.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, they look like reasonable people.

MR. SOTO: There was no finger-pointing or anything like that. We all sat in the same room. No real talking on my clients' behalf. You know, their lawyer said they talk a lot more. We get paid to talk. So that's the way that it came about, and then we were separated and -- two extremes, Judge. Two extremes.

THE COURT: Now, what about this case that your opponent has; how are you going to distinguish that case?

MR. SOTO: It's completely been distinguishable.
THE COURT: How?
MR. SOTO: Well, let's start with -- will you pull that case up for me?

Can we start with promissory estoppel?
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SOTO: I have a Supreme Court case --
THE COURT: No, no, but his case. Where is the case that you had? Do you have a copy of it?

That's the one, because a promissory estoppel is, is there a contract, is there not a contract. But that, you know, begs the whole question. But the case that says a real -- in that case a Realtor acted on behalf of a seller. That's what you're telling me. Okay?

MR. SOTO: Hang on, Judge. I'm going to pull it up right now.

MR. EVANS: The case was Benson versus Seestrom, correct?

MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: Okay. Let me have a copy of it.
MR. EVANS: May I approach?
THE COURT: Yes, of course. The only way to give me a copy is that way, unless you make a paper airplane.

Boy, that was a judgment for $\$ 1,546$.
See, this is the issue here:
"A principal is responsible for the acts of his agent even where an agent's act is unauthorized. The principal is liable if the agent had the apparent authority to do the act and that apparent authority was reasonably relied upon by
the third party dealing with the agent."
That's a correct statement of the law, right?
MR. SOTO: That's correct.
THE COURT: Okay. So here the principal are your clients.

MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: The agent just testified, Mr. Joseph. So let's assume that it's true that he acted -- that his testimony is truthful here. He made a mistake. He didn't have the authority. He was just very enthusiastic about this and it was not authorized. If the purchasers believed he had the authority and there was evidence that that was reasonable, then you lose, too, right?

MR. SOTO: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You don't?
MR. SOTO: No.
THE COURT: Why not?
MR. SOTO: Because even though he had the authority, he did not send it over to the principals or the party that relied upon it.

THE COURT: Because of these text messages.
MR. SOTO: Correct.
THE COURT: Okay. How do the plaintiffs counter these text messages, Defendants' Exhibit 6?

MR. HARRIS: They were exchanged after the fully
executed document was transferred.
THE COURT: All of them? I thought one of them was before.

MR. SOTO: It was, Your Honor.
MR. HARRIS: All of them, Your Honor.
THE COURT: How do you know that?
See, the lawyer is saying that you need both
signatures, right?
MR. SOTO: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Is the lawyer right or wrong?
MR. SOTO: I believe I'm right.
THE COURT: I know, but were you the lawyer at the time on February 8th?

MR. SOTO: No, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's a different lawyer. See, we got a problem there, don't we?

MR. HARRIS: What's that, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Well, on February 8th they're saying, hey, you need both signatures. We don't really have a contract. So by February 8th your clients knew there was a problem.

MR. HARRIS: The rule in Florida is if you drop an acceptance in the mail, it's official. It was emailed. We saw the email, Exhibit 2. At 8:26 on February 7th they sent the fully executed contract.

THE COURT: Well, you don't know if it's a fully
executed contract. That's the problem.
MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Exhibit 1 was
forwarded at 8:26 on February 7th. The text messages at the end of that day say, "Congrats to us both!" "Yes."

THE COURT: Well, that's by your agent.
MR. HARRIS: Everything after that is when they -- it's the next day, February 8th. No, that's both. Raul says, "Congrats to us both!"

THE COURT: But who says that? Your agent.
MR. HARRIS: Raul. The text message says, "Congrats to us both!"

THE COURT: That's your agent. He's very enthusiastic about this. He disagrees. Is there a disagreement between the two agents?

MR. HARRIS: No. Sean Joseph says, "Yes."
THE COURT: But there seems to be disagreement.
MR. HARRIS: Well, we have changed testimony today, SO --

THE COURT: No, but on February 8th there was disagreement within one day between the two.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, because they changed their position on February 8th. But the contract was complete as of the evening of February 7th, and the money was escrowed on February 7th.

THE COURT: Well, but the money is escrowed to the
agent who is on your side. You get the money back, if you want to.

Is the money still there?
MR. HARRIS: Yes.
THE COURT: Earning interest, right? One percent or whatever.

MR. HARRIS: I don't know. I mean, I assume escrow usually pays out interest.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SOTO: They actually refused the money.
MR. HARRIS: They refused the money.
MR. SOTO: Their agent asked Sean Joseph to execute a release, which he took to Mary who executed a release of the funds so there wouldn't be an issue, and they refused it.

THE COURT: So Sean Joseph has it?
MR. HARRIS: No, it's Raul.
MR. SOTO: No, Raul.
Well, it's actually his old real estate company,
Sotheby's. He no longer works there.
MR. HARRIS: They didn't want to take it back because they were insisting that it was a completed contract.

THE COURT: All right. Other than your Realtor, who else are you going to call?

MR. HARRIS: The two defendants.
THE COURT: You're going to call the two defendants.

Now, are the defendants going to call themselves in their case?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Let's find out.
MR. SOTO: No. It's pointless, Your Honor. I can do it all on cross.

THE COURT: Well, I know. Why would you want him to do it on cross?

MR. HARRIS: I will cede and let him call his own defendants.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're going to rest after the Realtor.

MR. HARRIS: Do I have to make that decision this evening?

THE COURT: You can't tell me now?
Who else are you going to call?
MR. HARRIS: It's a decision between calling the defendants or not.

THE COURT: Okay. If he doesn't call the defendants, the defendants are going to call themselves, right?

MR. SOTO: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Oh, why don't we have them tell their story, and you can cross-examine them.

MR. HARRIS: That's sounds perfect, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Isn't that better for you?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. So that's how we'll do it, which means any motion for judgment as a matter of law would wait until the end of the whole case, in any event.

MR. SOTO: Do you want to do that, Judge, because --
THE COURT: Yeah, that's what I want to do.
MR. SOTO: -- we were going to raise it before their testimony.

THE COURT: Pardon?
MR. SOTO: We were going to raise it before their testimony.

THE COURT: You can raise it and I will deny it without prejudice to reargue at the end of the case because, see, what this case is about is who's telling the truth and what's behind everybody's motivation. That's what this case is about.

MR. SOTO: I thought all cases were like that.
THE COURT: No, some cases I can throw out immediately and early on, but not this one.

So that means that you'll rest. And I still don't understand why you want the Realtor.

MR. HARRIS: Because there's a dispute now as to whether --

THE COURT: The attachment.
MR. HARRIS: Yes, whether he sent it on February 7th.
THE COURT: Okay. And the attachment says what? What
is the attachment?
MR. HARRIS: Exhibit 1.
THE COURT: Okay. And Sean Joseph is --
MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry, Your Honor. And also he would contradict and deny the testimony Sean Joseph gave that they had had multiple conversations where he had told them that they needed two signatures, which was inconsistent with Mr. Joseph's own testimony.

THE COURT: And that's important because?
MR. HARRIS: Because we have apparent authority.
THE COURT: Apparent authority.
MR. HARRIS: We reasonably relied on everything we had heard to the point when we dropped that in the mail.

THE COURT: Which is easier to prove than actual authority.

MR. HARRIS: It may be, but we have a wealth of evidence that I think we can prove.

THE COURT: All right. So you call the agent tomorrow at 9:30. Is that okay?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And then the trustees can testify on behalf of the defendant, and then do you have any rebuttal?

So we'll finish tomorrow, right?
MR. HARRIS: I believe that that's very likely.
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SOTO: Are we going to be starting at 9:30 or is there a calendar call?

THE COURT: No, no. I'll be teaching, remember? You're welcome to go there at 7:00.

MR. SOTO: Where is it at, Judge?
THE COURT: The University of Miami. And I finish at 9:00. So hopefully with traffic, I can get here by 9:30. But that's my goal.

You can leave your stuff here or you can take it with you, whatever you want.

MR. SOTO: Can we leave it strewn around?
THE COURT: You can leave it just like that. Okay? But you can take it, too. You can put it in the room outside if you want to unlock it since you're working overtime here. Okay? What else is new?

MR. SOTO: If no one else is coming in the courtroom until us at 9:30 in the morning, I'd rather leave it.

THE COURT: Okay. Whatever you want. See you at 9:30 tomorrow. Thank you.

MR. SOTO: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You can take your midafternoon break.
MR. HARRIS: Thank you.
(The trial adjourned at 6:51 p.m.)
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Wow 15:23 134:5 136:1 221:18
write 47:2 121:20,21
writes 112:17
writing 9:11,13,2 $136: 9$ 55:18 102:8 171:13 176:21 177:3
written 23:6,13,14,18 33:19,24 72:14 100:9 139:11 145:16 168:21,23 169:2,5
wrong 49:24 128:16 189:6 190:12 212:24 230:2 234:10
wrote 47:1 71:12 75:10,18,19 112:9 114:20 115:13 210:4


| Z |
| :---: |
| Zip 57:6 |
| \$ |
| \$1,008 45:4 |
| \$1,200,000 62:7 |
| \$1,270,000 73:14 |
| \$1,300,000 75:13 |
| \$1,546 232:20 |
| \$1.2 32:17 70:18 |
| \$1.27 33:20 |
| \$1.3 33:4,17,23 34:5 35:14,17,20 |
| 40:8,15,16 50:9 52:2 74:15 |
| 80:12 81:1 83:3 184:25 |
| 185:16 186:14 187:7 217:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 217: 14,16,18,21224: 8,16,24 \\ & 230: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
|  |
| \$1.35 54:9,16 |
| \$1.4 83:5 |
| \$1.65 34:16 |
| \$1.7 34:15 |
| \$10 82:18,23 |
| \$100,000 107:10 110:13 |
| \$12,000 45:7 |
| \$120,000 222:13 223:8,19 |
| \$30,000 45:9 |
| \$40,000 225:8 |
| \$42,000 45:10 |
| \$5 183:25 |


| \$5,900 42:3 44:23 | 11 93:2,3,4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| \$50,000 34:9 39:1 53:10,18,20 | 11:10 31:9 |
| 54:3 70:15 76:7 118:14 | 11:21:35 99:22 |
| 119:17 | 116 3:9,10 |
| \$500,000 53:10 | 12 4:6 63:5,6,8 70:24 92:19 93:4 |
| \$6,000 44:25 | 93:8,10 95:15,16,20,24 96:9 |
| \$600,000 40:21 | 96:12 116:22 121:4,6,25 |
| \$7 164:6,7,9,10,12,16,20 | 123:9 165:16,18,18,19 187:16 |
| \$72,000 45:10 | 187:18,19 |
| \$900,000 80:5 211:8,8 | 12th 223:17 |
|  | 12-foot 89:12 111:17 |
| 0 | 120 3:11 |
| 02 109:8 | 1200 1:20 |
| 07 62:10 108:13 109:1,7 | 13 4:7,15 109:4 192:5,23 193:2 |
| 07s 65:14 | $\text { 13th } 223: 17,18$ |
| 1 | 13-21482-CIV-MORENO 1:3 |
| 1 4:10 38:21,23 66:6,7,15,21 | 13-3 1:6 2:7 $241: 6$ $1363: 12,13$ |
| 71:11 74:21,22 90:6,13,14 | 136 3:12,13 <br> 14 4:11,13 95:24,25 96:1,15,23 |
| 97:5,11 103:11,14 105:7,9 $108 \cdot 14110 \cdot 14111 \cdot 11112 \cdot 12$ | $116: 24121: 9,10,15,19123: 12$ |
| 117:19 125:2,14,14,14,17 | 124:19,25 160:8 |
| 127:12 176:4 184:16 195:6 | 14th 30:25 48:18 |
| 212:9 235:2 239:2 | 146 4:12 |
| 1st 160:10 | 148 4:13 |
| 1,200,000 70:13 71:9 | 15 4:12 18:6,20 70:17 76:12 |
| 1,230,000 72:3 | 125:25 126:7 194:1 230:14 |
| 1,270,000 73:6,9 75:8 | 15th 41:21 119:7 |
| 1,300,000 75:18 | 15-minute <br> 1581157.5 |
| 1,330,000 70:23 71:10 |  |
| 1,480,000 112:1 | 16 4:7 63:10,11,13 73:7,8 97:19 |
| 1.2 67:4 116:18 183:7 184:11 | 103:7 117:13 124:6 |
| 1.23 32:25 33:12 72:17 95:21,23 | 17 107:14 |
| 1.230 116:25 | 17th 107:18 |
| $\mathbf{1 . 2 5} 183: 7184: 11$ | 18,509 45:2 |
| 1.27 75:17 97:17 103:7,9 117:14 | 1800 1:21 |
| 186:4 | 19 4:8,17 |
| 1.3 46:4,5,7 50:6,16 53:15,20 | 192 4:14 |
| 54:21 55:13 72:15 73:18,25 | 193 4:15,16 |
| 74:1,3,4,10,2 2 79:1,3 81:2 | 194 3:14 |
| 82:9 87:2 100:1,16 101:22 | 2 |
| 102:4,13,15 107:13 108:15 | 2 |
| 109:1,7 117:21 129:4,11 | 2 4:11,15 39:19,20 99:2,11,14 |
| 142:20 167:4 171:16,23 | 101:14 108:14 128:3,5,5,6,7 |
| 177:24 180:17,25 186:5,7,9 | 128:17 195:21 196:9,10 205:3 |
| 187:12 199:5 211:2,2 217:16 | 205:4,5 206:8,9 225:12 |
| 230:11 | 234:23 |
| 1.33 33:695:22 173:19 | 2:00 10:7 15:11 16:14 19:22,25 |
| 1.330 116:23 | 20:1 22:5,6 30:11,19 76:7 |
| 1.35 32:13 50:4 53:12,13 54:8,15 | 2:30 22:19 31:13 |
| 55:12 62:4 107:6 | 20 4:9 67:4 111:5 157:7 158:7 |
| 1.4 82:13 90:3 107:6 | 194:1 229:19 |
| 1.45 65:10 107:7,11 110:12,14 | 20-year 47:21 |
| 1.48 65:8 89:21 110:11,17 | 2006 144:14,16 |
| 1.480 89:16 112:18 | 2007 144:16 175:21 184:4 |
| $1.5107: 7180: 19$ | 2008 175:21 |
| $1.55107: 12$ | 201 4:17 |
| 1.648:11 110:7 | 2011 160:10 |
| 1.6/5 112:12 | 2012 32:13 148:25 |
| 1.65 89:14,15 | 2013 32:16,24 33:19 34:3,7,11 |
| 1.7 48:9 109:8 112:12 | 34:17 35:20 37:9,22 38:7 |
| 1.72 109:9 | 41:21 45:2 46:22 57:11 58:17 |
| 1.8 89:20 112:11 | 62:6 67:3 69:6 70:3,17 71:13 |
| 1.9 48:9,11 | 73:4 75:16 76:9,12 78:1,6,11 |
| $1.95110: 5$ | 99:22 101:7,16 102:20 107:14 |
| 1:30 16:8 | 112:11 128:8,15 148:2,25 |
| 1:45 16:8 | 160:2 195:24 202:18,23 |
| 10 1:8 4:5 62:11,12,24,25,25 | 204:13 206:21 |
| 63:3 66:25 68:19 70:5 86:16 | 2014 1:8 89:23 113:22 224:22 |
| 92:10 93:8,8,10 95:13 116:15 | 205 3:15 |
| 120:19 122:8 124:23,25,25 | 21 4:10,14 229:17 |
| 135:21,22,23,25 | 22 4:8,16 63:14,15,19 193:4 |
| 10th 106:2,3,6,9,10, $11128: 25$ | 229:18 |
| 10,000 147:23 | 24 63:21 64:4,15,18 88:12,15 |
| 10:44 5:1 | 107:17 111:8 112:5 113:21 |
| 10:45 204:9,13,16 | 114:1,11,25 115:4 |
| 100 1:17 189:19 190:25 191:2 | 24A 4:9 64:19 65:19,20 |
| 100,000 107:11 | 24B 4:9 65:20 |
| 101 177:15,17 | 2400 2:2 |



