SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES NO. 134, ORIGINAL

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,)	
Plaintiff)))	ORIGINAL
V.)	
STATE OF DELAWARE,)	
Defendant)	

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE before SPECIAL MASTER RALPH I. LANCASTER, JR., ESQ., held at the law offices of Pierce Atwood at One Monument Square, Portland, Maine, on September 6, 2006, commencing at 10:00 a.m., before Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine.

APPEARANCES:

For the State of New Jersey:

RACHEL J. HOROWITZ, ESQ. DEAN JABLONSKI, ESQ.

EILEEN P. KELLY, ESQ.

For the State of Delaware:

DAVID C. FREDERICK, ESQ. SCOTT H. ANGSTREICH, ESQ.

SCOTT K. ATTAWAY, ESQ. COLLINS J. SEITZ, JR., ESQ.

MATTHEW F. BOYER, ESQ. MAX B. WALTON, ESQ. RYAN P. NEWELL, ESQ.

Also Present: MARK E. PORADA, ESQ.

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 SPECIAL MASTER: Counsel, Mark Porada and 3 Claudette Mason are with me. And we'll start as we usually do with appearances. 5 New Jersey, would you tell us who is present 6 or on line, even though they're not going to have 7 a speaking role. 8 MS. HOROWITZ: Yes. This is Deputy Attorney 9 General Rachel Horowitz. And also present are 10 Deputy Attorney General Eileen Kelly and Deputy 11 Attorney Dean Jablonski. 12 SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, New Jersey. Delaware? 13 David Frederick, Scott 14 MR. FREDERICK: 15 Angstreich and Scott Attaway as well as C. J. 16 Seitz. 17 MR. SEITZ: And, Special Master, this is C. J. Seitz. I also have in my office some of the 18 19 budding historians who have been working on this 20 case, Max Walton, Ryan Newell and Matt Boyer. 21 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Thank you very 22 much, counsel, and thank you both for your progress reports. Once again, we seem to be on 23 24 track.

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason & Lockhart

I do note Delaware's continuing frustration

25

with New Jersey's production problems. And we'll discuss those in a moment. But, first, putting those items to one side momentarily, let me ask New Jersey, Ms. Horowitz, do you have anything to add or that you wish to discuss in addition to those items and what you have reported?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. HOROWITZ: Yes. In addition to what we reported, we did also send out yesterday to Delaware some additional documents, a further response clarifying the documents that were sent and addressing the various document production issues that Delaware had raised. We have gone through and compared what was produced in July versus what was produced in August. And I think I wouldn't be too off target by -- in our view there's very, very -- the differences are minute in terms of what was sent out in July versus August. And we think that, with all due respect to Delaware, they are to a certain extent exaggerating the issue.

SPECIAL MASTER: Well, parsing for a moment -- I intend to come back to the issues raised in Delaware's progress report; and we'll discuss those in a little more detail. But other than those, do you have anything else to add to

your progress report or that you want discussed?

MS. HOROWITZ: Well, I think that you also should be aware that we did object to Delaware's production on August 31. We did get a response on September 1. In our view it was not fully responsive to our concerns.

SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.

MS. HOROWITZ: But we are continuing to try to work on those issues with Delaware.

SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Frederick, again, putting aside for a moment the issues raised in your letter, is there anything other than that that you wish discussed or added to your report?

MR. FREDERICK: No, I don't think so, Mr. Lancaster.

SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Now, let's turn for a moment to the items listed in Delaware's progress report. And I'm not suggesting that we have extensive argument or try to resolve them through this process today; but I note that New Jersey reported that there was a letter sent on August 31. I just heard Ms. Horowitz say that she has sent another letter, which I'm assuming you haven't had an opportunity to review. So we're

going to be talking a little bit without a full deck here.

But would you, just so we -- we're on the same page, Mr. Frederick, would you list -- just list now, not discuss in detail or not argue or -- but just list for me the items which were mentioned in your report and which are still outstanding. Just give me a list of them, if you would, if that's possible, or someone else on your behalf.

MR. FREDERICK: Well, I can certainly start the list; and I'll also call on Mr. Seitz to supplement that.

I would say the first is that we are concerned about the different productions that New Jersey has made that contain a range of issues and matters. And I have not had a chance to review Ms. Horowitz's letter of yesterday, but have had it summarized. And we have some continuing issues.

For instance, New Jersey has said that they will produce a number of additional documents, but they have not said when they will make those productions. And they said that they will produce -- that they are reserving the right to

produce more documents; but they're not giving a timetable by which they will do so. And we're a month away from the close of discovery, and we're about to begin the process of taking depositions and we don't have a full set of documents to work with; nor do we have — and perhaps this has been corrected by CD's that New Jersey sent out yesterday that we have not yet received. But as of yesterday, we didn't have a set of documents that was a sequentially-numbered set of documents from the beginning of this case up to now.

SPECIAL MASTER: Right. So you have got timetable and Bates numbers, right?

MR. FREDERICK: That's correct.

SPECIAL MASTER: Those are two.

All I want is a list at this point.

MR. FREDERICK: Okay. There are -- there is some confusion about documents from October. And we're studying New Jersey's letter, and we will obviously meet and confer with New Jersey to clarify their meaning; but it appears that New Jersey is taking the position that documents that were made available to Delaware in October are not going to be produced even if they are responsive to requests that we have made. And we are

1 concerned about that because we don't think that 2 it complies with the rules for discovery. 3 I would say those are the three principal 4 issues that we have had. And we have specified in the progress report on page 2, you know, five 5 6 specific items that we don't know have been 7 corrected by New Jersey's latest production of 8 yesterday. 9 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Are you saying 10 that you don't know because you haven't seen the 11 production? 12 MR. FREDERICK: That's right. We haven't 13 received it, Mr. Lancaster. 14 SPECIAL MASTER: Right. Okay. 15 MR. FREDERICK: We received from Ms. Horowitz 16 a letter that she e-mailed; but the documents are 17 following separately. 18 SPECIAL MASTER: Right. So is it fair to 19 say, Mr. Frederick, on that score that until you 20 have seen that additional production, you don't know whether it's been satisfied or not? 21 22 MR. FREDERICK: That's correct. 23 SPECIAL MASTER: So I'm -- I'm -- for 24 purposes of discussion here, I'm scratching that 25 issue at the moment.

1	The Bates numbers and the timetable, Ms.
2	Horowitz, would you comment on those two for me in
3	either order, please?
4	MS. HOROWITZ: Yes. On the additional
5	documents, we're working to get some of them out
6	by the end of this week and the rest next week.
7	They are documents that we do not have. They are
8	coming from third parties. And we have been
9	trying to get them, but it was at the end of
10	August when we were focused on that issue. And
11	obviously there were not some people just were
12	not available. So that's what we're talking
13	about. We're not talking about things that we
14	have in-house.
15	SPECIAL MASTER: So on that production then,
16	those documents will be produced either this week
17	or by the end of next week?
18	MS. HOROWITZ: Yes. That's the time frame
19	that we're shooting for and looking at.
20	SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
21	MS. HOROWITZ: Certainly, whatever we do have
22	in our hands we will get out as quickly as we can.
23	SPECIAL MASTER: All right. On the Bates
24	numbers?
25	MS. HOROWITZ: On the Bates numbers, in our

view this is a nonissue. We had sent Delaware in July items that were Bates numbered and then some that were not Bates numbered. We went back in August and Bates numbered everything. There is one -- we sent new CD's out last night with those same Bates numbers in a format that should be easier to retrieve on the computer.

But the documents that we're talking about Delaware has had, some of them since last fall, and pretty much all of them since July. What they haven't had are things that we're still in the process of retrieving, as I just mentioned.

Mr. Frederick that the concern here -- limited concern here is the numbering of those documents, the ordering of those documents; and I -- I gathered that -- from something that Mr. Frederick wrote, that there were some problems perhaps with your IT contractor. But do I understand from what you have just said that by one means or another, you believe that the Bates numbering problem has been resolved?

MS. HOROWITZ: Yes, we do.

SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. And Mr. --

MS. HOROWITZ: Yes, we believe it's been

1 resolved.

SPECIAL MASTER: And, Mr. Frederick, am I correct that until you see the documents, you won't know the answer to that?

MR. FREDERICK: That's correct. Although I would add that we have a continuing question with respect to the documents from October of 2005 based on the way Ms. Horowitz referred to that in her letter of yesterday, and there appear to be documents that were made available to us. In that process, Mr. Lancaster, Delaware -- New Jersey made available certain documents. We sent a team up to review and copy those documents.

This, of course, was before the full Supreme Court process had fully unfolded before you as Special Master. But there are documents, we believe, from that that are responsive to our requests; and it's unclear whether they have been produced by New Jersey. And it's also unclear what happened to documents that had been numbered in October, but not subsequently produced, and documents that were subsequently produced were given the same Bates numbers as documents that had been produced last October.

And that's what we're attempting to clear up.

SPECIAL MASTER: Right. Well, let me say, counsel, that I perhaps inadvertently last time used the word ministerial for these sorts of things; but it seems to me that you have made some progress since last we talked. I don't think there's anything that I can resolve today because of the fact that there's -- there are documents -- there apparently is a disk in the mail or disks in the mail. And until those are resolved or seen or reviewed, you're not going to be able to address whether the -- the question of whether there continues to be any problems with them.

I have been continually impressed by the cooperation between counsel in this process. I told you last time I understand the frustration here, but it seems to me that competent counsel can confer and probably resolve them. If you can't and if there are specific issues as a result of your conferences that remain unresolved, I, of course, am available under the processes set forth in the Case Management Plan. But I urge you to try to resolve them together.

And I -- let me -- at the risk of sounding like a broken record here, I do want to commend all counsel on your continuing cooperative

approach to getting this matter teed up for resolution.

Let me just tell you; I'm currently dealing with another matter in which opposing counsel have lost sight of their respective clients' best interests. They're like bantam cocks, and they can only peck and claw at each other. It's a genuine pleasure to deal with mature men and women who understand that arbitrariness serves no one's purpose and can, in fact, do damage to an otherwise valid position.

We're in the final stretch. We're right on schedule. And I'm confident -- I continue to have confidence that you will continue to work together to resolve these differences. We are coming down to the last discovery areas. We're coming down to a period where there will be some time pressures. And I understand why there's some frustration here. But, you know, when we're finished, I would love to be able to report to the Court that we processed this matter to a conclusion without any instances of petty bickering. I just think that that doesn't solve any problems. And when we start using adjectives and adverbs, then we have lost sight of what we're all trying to do.

1 So I urge you, again, to continue to 2 cooperate in this discovery process. If you feel 3 that you have reached a total impasse, call me, 4 and I will solve it for you to someone's 5 unhappiness; I can guarantee that. But I think 6 that these matters can be resolved; and we can, 7 hopefully, get on with the major issues in the 8 case. 9 New Jersey, is there anything else on this 10 matter that you want to raise? 11 MS. HOROWITZ: No, not at this point. 12 Thank you. SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Frederick? 13 14 MR. FREDERICK: No, not at this time. 15 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. We -- we have 16 scheduled progress reports and conference calls 17 for October 2, October 3; for November 8 and 18 November 9 to accommodate election day. And by 19 that time, the deposition discovery will have been 20 completed on November 3, hopefully. And we'll be 21 in order for dispositive motions on November 30. 22 So I am -- I remain very, very pleased with 23 the progress that we have made. I have to tell you that I have done -- as you know, I have done a 24 25 few of these things before. And from my

perspective, the sailing hasn't been as smooth in any of them as this one has. I'm -- I don't want to get overconfident here, and I don't want to -- I don't want counsel to -- if I were talking to my children, I would say get a swelled head. I won't say that. But I really am impressed with what you have done thus far, and I'm very comfortable that we're going to come up to the final stages of this matter in good shape.

So unless there's something else, counsel, I thank you. I particularly appreciate

Mr. Frederick getting up early on the West Coast to be able to accommodate me. And let me hear from you if you have to; but I hope that, as the saying goes, all the rest is silence until October 2.

MR. FREDERICK: Mr. Lancaster, at the risk of extending this too much further, I wonder if --

SPECIAL MASTER: It's your timetable,
Mr. Frederick. You're on the West Coast.

MR. FREDERICK: Well, we would at some point like to get some guidance from you as to process continuing on after the discovery period closes. It seems to us evident now from the exchange of discovery that there will be disputed issues of

fact that may not lend themselves necessarily to dispositive motions. And we wanted to raise this issue with you just for purposes of considering a process in getting guidance from you as to how we might proceed.

SPECIAL MASTER: Yes. Where there are disputed issues of fact, those will have to be decided before the matter can be ultimately reported to the Court.

My experience in this area leads me to believe that they will be wound into whatever the ultimate resolution is. In other words, while we're talking about dispositive motions here, we're ultimately talking about a report that I'm going to frame and file with the Court. And in the course of that, I will be resolving any disputed issues of fact, as well as ruling on issues of law. Those are then submitted to the Court. And the Court, of course, is the final arbiter as to whether my recommended decision is correct or not.

But I don't see that necessarily as a two-step process, although there is a possibility that you may tell me that you can't take a briefing position on legal issues until the

factual issues have been decided. If that happens, then we'll do it in a two-step process. But I'm not in a position to decide that at this stage, Mr. Frederick.

Is that an answer to your --

MR. FREDERICK: Yes.

SPECIAL MASTER: It's an answer to your question. Is it a satisfactory answer to your question?

MR. FREDERICK: Well, I appreciate that.

That does provide guidance. And I think as we continue through the depositions phase of the case, it may become clearer how we can narrow those issues of fact.

me try it this way. In the ordinary summary judgment motion, the first question is is there a genuine issue of material fact. If so, summary motion is not granted. In this context, that's not what we're dealing with. We're dealing with an ultimate decision based on findings of fact and conclusions of law. I have to make those decisions. How they're presented, I think by November we'll have -- we'll all have a better idea of the best posture and the way to present

1	them and the way for me to decide them.
2	Is that helpful?
3	MR. FREDERICK: Yes.
4	SPECIAL MASTER: Anything else, either
5	counsel?
6	New Jersey?
7	MS. HOROWITZ: No, nothing further.
8	Thank you.
9	SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Frederick?
10	MR. FREDERICK: Nothing further.
11	SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, all.
12	Good luck, Mr. Frederick; and we'll talk to
13	you on October 3.
14	MR. FREDERICK: Thank you.
15	MR. SEITZ: Thank you.
16	MS. HOROWITZ: Yes.
17	(The conference was concluded at 10:24 a.m.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the above-captioned Proceedings that were reduced to print through Computer-aided Transcription. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF I subscribe my hand this Staday ptember 2006. Notary Public My Commission Expires June 9, 2012.