

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE:	.	Case No. 09-50026-mg
	.	
MOTORS LIQUIDATION COMPANY,	.	Chapter 11
et al., f/k/a GENERAL	.	
MOTORS CORP., et al,	.	(Jointly administered)
	.	
Debtors.	.	
	.	
MOTORS LIQUIDATION COMPANY	.	Adv. Proc. No. 09-00504-mg
AVOIDANCE ACTION TRUST, by and	.	
through the Wilmington Trust	.	
Company, solely in its capacity	.	
as Trust Administrator and	.	
Trustee,	.	
	.	
	.	
Plaintiff,	.	
v.	.	
	.	
JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.,	.	
individually and as	.	
Administrative Agent for	.	
Various lenders party to the	.	One Bowling Green
Term Loan Agreement described	.	New York, NY 10004
herein, et al.,	.	
	.	Wednesday, November 2, 2016
	.	1:17 p.m.
Defendants.	.	
	.	
	.	

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE, ON THE RECORD,  
REGARDING DISCOVERY DISPUTE  
**BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARTIN GLENN**  
**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE**

Audio Operator: Karen Cappiello, ECR

Transcription Company: Access Transcripts, LLC  
10110 Youngwood Lane  
Fishers, IN 46038  
(855) 873-2223  
[www.accesstranscripts.com](http://www.accesstranscripts.com)

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording,  
transcript produced by transcription service.

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

For Motors Liquidation  
Company Avoidance  
Action Trust:

Binder & Schwartz  
By: ERIC FISHER, ESQ.  
366 Madison Avenue, 6th Floor  
New York, NY 10017  
(212) 510-7008

For JPMorgan Chase  
Bank, N.A.:

Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz  
By: MARC WOLINSKY, ESQ.  
51 West 52nd Street  
New York, NY 10019  
(212) 403-1000

For JPMorgan Trust  
Bank, N.A., et al:

Kelley Drye  
By: NICHOLAS J. PANARELLA, ESQ.  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178  
(212) 808-7897

For Certain Term Loan  
Investors:

Hahn & Hessen LLP  
By: MARK T. POWER, ESQ.  
488 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
(212) 478-7350

For Group of  
Term Lenders:

Jones Day  
By: CHRISTOPHER DIPOMPEO, ESQ.  
51 Louisiana Avenue Northwest  
Washington, DC 20001-2113  
(202) 879-7686

Munger, Tolles & Olson  
By: MATTHEW A. MACDONALD, ESQ.  
355 South Grand Avenue #3500  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
(213) 683-9231



TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (Continued):

For Ad Hoc Group of  
Term Lenders:

Kasowitz, Benson, Torres,  
& Friedman LLP  
By: ANDREW K. GLENN, ESQ.  
1633 Broadway  
New York, NY 10019  
(212) 506-1747



1 (Proceedings commence at 1:17 p.m.)

2 THE COURT: All right. This is Judge Glenn. I'm on  
3 the lectern in Motors Liquidation Company Avoidance Action  
4 Trust v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., et al., Adversary  
5 Proceeding Number 09-00504. I have a list of lawyers who are  
6 appearing on CourtCall this hearing. It is entirely on  
7 CourtCall.

8 Mr. Fisher, you requested the hearing. Is that  
9 correct?

10 MR. FISHER: -- with the defendant (indiscernible).

11 THE COURT: You'll have to speak up because you're  
12 not coming through clearly.

13 MR. FISHER: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Is this better?

14 THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

15 MR. FISHER: Jointly requested a conference with the  
16 defendants (indiscernible) and I'm --

17 THE COURT: This is really not coming -- are you on  
18 speaker?

19 MR. FISHER: I am, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: You're going to need to pick up the phone  
21 because it's almost impossible to hear you, and there is --  
22 this is on the record, there is a transcript being made, so I  
23 have to hear you clearly.

24 MR. FISHER: I apologize, Your Honor. If this is not  
25 better, then I'm going to have to go to my office and dial back



1 in. Is that any better, Your Honor?

2 THE COURT: Hold on, let me check with the -- all  
3 right, you're being picked up, but make sure you keep your  
4 voice up when you talk.

5 Let me ask who else is appearing. I know there's a  
6 reasonably long list of people, but, Mr. Fisher, which parties  
7 does this discovery dispute involve?

8 MR. FISHER: It really involves all of the parties,  
9 Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MR. FISHER: We had a -- so we --

12 THE COURT: All right. Let me do this then in light  
13 of that. Let's go through and let me get the appearances. So,  
14 Mr. Fisher, you're appearing on behalf of the trust.

15 Let's one at a time -- counsel should go through and  
16 make your appearances on the record.

17 MR. WOLINSKY: Your Honor, this is Marc Wolinsky from  
18 Wachtell Lipton for JPMorgan, and I'll be addressing one of the  
19 two issues that are on the table for today.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. DIPOMPEO: Your Honor, this is Christopher  
22 DiPompeo of Jones Day. We represent a group of the term loan  
23 lenders. I'll be addressing the appropriateness of a pencil  
24 stay of discovery.

25 THE COURT: All right.



1 MR. DIPOMPEO: I believe my --

2 THE COURT: Thank you. I'm sorry, Mr. DiPompeo, I  
3 have your appearance.

4 Okay. Who else?

5 MR. MACDONALD: Your Honor, this is Matt MacDonald  
6 from Munger Tolles. I represent the same group of term lenders  
7 that Mr. DiPompeo does.

8 THE COURT: All right.

9 MR. GLENN: Good afternoon, Judge. It's Andrew  
10 Glenn, Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman on behalf of one of  
11 the defendant groups.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 MR. PANARELLA: This is Nicholas Panarella from  
14 Kelley, Drye & Warren for JPMorgan Chase.

15 THE COURT: All right.

16 MR. POWER: Your Honor, this is Mark Power from Hahn  
17 & Hessen. We have a separate group of approximately 80 term  
18 lenders.

19 THE COURT: Anybody else?

20 All right. Mr. Fisher, go ahead.

21 MR. FISHER: Your Honor, the first issue is one of  
22 enforcing the fact discovery cutoff in the case. We were last  
23 in front of the Court on September 28th, and at that status  
24 conference, we jointly proposed extending fact discovery until  
25 October 31st, and the Court approved that extension. We have,



1 of course, taken many depositions leading up to the fact  
2 discovery cutoff, and then before the cutoff, which was this  
3 past Monday, there were four depositions that we had all agreed  
4 could take place the week after the cutoff this week. So two  
5 of those, two wild 30(b)(6) depositions occurred yesterday and  
6 two are scheduled to occur tomorrow. Our view is that should  
7 be it, that should be the end of discovery, but -- of fact  
8 discovery.

9           But what has happened is since the cutoff, we're now  
10 in discussions with the defendant about their desire to  
11 schedule an additional seven fact depositions, and we oppose  
12 any of these depositions going forward after the fact discovery  
13 for a number of different reasons. For one thing, we all have  
14 initial expert report deadlines on November 21st, and we don't  
15 want to do anything that would jeopardize that next deadline or  
16 jeopardize our ability to prepare our expert reports.

17           Just this past Monday, the defendant identified their  
18 21st expert, and before that, they had -- since the status  
19 conference, they had identified another. So there are two  
20 additional experts they identified since September 28th. We  
21 think that this is an attempt to go looking for fact discovery  
22 to support these new experts, and it's just not a proper use or  
23 a proper reason to have discovery spill over past the fact  
24 discovery cutoff.

25           And a couple of weeks ago, we told the defendant that



1 with the deadline coming up, it's time for everyone to start  
2 paring things down to meet the deadline, and we ourselves  
3 voluntarily withdrew efforts to seek seven depositions that we  
4 otherwise ourselves would have wanted to seek, but we didn't  
5 because we recognized there was no realistic way to get that  
6 done before October 31st. So we engaged in a kind of triage.  
7 And so we just feel as though we've reached a point where we  
8 need the Court to enforce on all the parties the deadline so  
9 that we can all continue to move the case forward on the  
10 schedule that the Court has laid out for us.

11 THE COURT: All right. Who wants to speak first for  
12 defendants?

13 MR. WOLINSKY: Your Honor, this is Marc Wolinsky.  
14 There's a lot of things that Mr. Fisher said that I disagree  
15 with. You know, as you're going back to when we were in front  
16 of Your Honor, there have been a number of discovery cutoffs  
17 and a number of extensions in the cutoffs, and it's all been  
18 driven by the same problem, obtaining cooperation from third  
19 parties that no one controls, and actually that's a little bit  
20 of an overstatement, but I'll come back to that.

21 Every witness, with one exception, that we're seeking  
22 to get deposed has been on the table long before October 31st,  
23 and the problem that we've had is obtaining the cooperation  
24 from -- and the lawyers on the other side, they have clients,  
25 they had issues, but we've had difficulty getting cooperation



1 from General Motors, Treasury, and the accounting firms that  
2 worked on the valuation of GM's assets, and I can go through  
3 each witness and explain the situation as to each, but frankly,  
4 Your Honor, what we think is going on here is gamesmanship.  
5 Every witness that we're seeking has been on the table, with  
6 one exception, for months, and now the plaintiffs are saying  
7 because you couldn't get a behind in a chair by October 31st,  
8 it's too late.

9           Your Honor, the reason why I say this is gamesmanship  
10 is because in light of Your Honor's ruling on -- we went out  
11 and identified 12 experts on the assets that are involved in  
12 this case. We retained them, we prepared them, and Your Honor  
13 ruled that they should be deposed as fact witnesses, which was  
14 -- you know, we understand the ruling. And over the past -- in  
15 October, we scheduled and produced 12 fact witnesses, former GM  
16 people, and if they had been in the position of having to work  
17 through GM to find people -- to find witnesses at the level of  
18 expertise that the 12 that we identified did, they would never,  
19 never have been able to accomplish that discovery by October  
20 31st.

21           So because of our industriousness and our  
22 cooperation, they find themselves in the position of having  
23 everything that they believe they need, and we find ourselves  
24 in the position because General Motors itself has not been as  
25 cooperative, because Pricewaterhouse hasn't been cooperative,



1 and KPMG hasn't been cooperative, we find ourselves in the  
2 position that we need another week or two to complete these  
3 additional depositions.

4 THE COURT: Mr. Wolinsky, did you serve subpoenas for  
5 the depositions of these third parties?

6 MR. WOLINSKY: Let me go through each one. And I'll  
7 start with, frankly, the one that we have the thinnest record  
8 on. One witness is Jennifer Weigel at Visioneering, and she --  
9 we have not served a -- we did not serve a subpoena for her  
10 returnable before October 31st because we only located her  
11 recently. We've been working with Visioneering for a long time  
12 to try to find a witness.

13 But the reason why -- one of the reasons why I say  
14 this is gamesmanship, if Your Honor looks at the plaintiff's  
15 pretrial brief --

16 THE COURT: Can we -- Mr. Wolinsky, before you go on  
17 with that, are all -- the total number of witnesses is how  
18 many, seven?

19 MR. WOLINSKY: He says seven. I actually think it's  
20 six because I think the seventh is a person in a category that  
21 everyone agrees can go through to November 21st. There are  
22 witnesses who are relevant to the constructive trust issue and  
23 who are overlapping that I understood were going to slip over.  
24 But my --

25 THE COURT: So who -- let's assume for this



1 discussion that it's six witnesses, and Ms. Weigel is one of  
2 the six, did you serve the other five with subpoenas for their  
3 depositions?

4 MR. WOLINSKY: We either served them as 30 -- these  
5 are either witnesses that were 30(b)(6) and the 30(b)(6) failed  
6 to come through with the information we expected or they were  
7 subpoenaed in their individual capacity. So for KPMG, we  
8 served a 30(b)(6) and a subpoena. One witness, the 30(b)(6)  
9 witness turned out to be insufficient on one issue, so we  
10 worked with KPMG to find an additional witness. And the second  
11 KPMG witness, Eric Greenwald, was subpoenaed long before  
12 October 31st and noticed before -- and subpoenaed to appear  
13 before October 31st, and we've been working with KPMG, and the  
14 best they can do is November 9th.

15 THE COURT: Well, when you say the best they can do,  
16 subpoenas are enforceable. I don't know where they're located,  
17 but you can either -- you know, you normally have to enforce it  
18 in the district where the deposition's going to be unless the  
19 court in that district, under the circumstances provided by the  
20 rules, transfers the issue to this court, but you know, when I  
21 set a discovery cutoff, I mean it. And my -- I didn't go back  
22 to look at the case management order here, but I think every  
23 case management order I enter provides that for any party  
24 that's going to seek an extension, you need to do it at least  
25 five days before the discovery cutoff occurs, okay.



1 I got the request for this hearing yesterday, I'm on  
2 the phone today despite the fact that I have a long trial going  
3 on, okay. So when an issue comes up, the Court resolves it  
4 quickly. What I'm unsympathetic about is when, after a  
5 discovery cutoff date occurs, when parties can't agree to  
6 resolve it, coming to me and asking for relief from a discovery  
7 cutoff date that I've established. So when you were all here  
8 last time and I was told there were some difficulties  
9 scheduling some third-party witnesses, I did provide a modest  
10 extension to try and get those last depositions done.

11 You know, it's not -- and I'm not saying,  
12 Mr. Wolinsky, that that's what you're describing to me, but  
13 it's not a unilateral decision by a party that's subject to a  
14 discovery cutoff to say, well, I can't voluntarily get the  
15 witness to appear for a deposition before the discovery, but  
16 you know, I can get him within a few weeks after. Sure, as to  
17 -- and I think it was raised with me, there were a few  
18 witnesses that, for scheduling reasons, were hard to get done  
19 by the cutoff and where the parties agree and you'll say, fine,  
20 you can do those. But that's the dilemma, Mr. Wolinsky. I  
21 treat these discovery cutoff dates very seriously, and I don't  
22 want to get into whether one side or the other thinks there's  
23 gamesmanship going on. What I'm faced with is an issue of  
24 whether to modify an order that I've previously entered that  
25 required an application to extend the discovery dates at least



1 five days before the discovery cutoff occurs. So tell me why I  
2 shouldn't enforce that here. Go ahead, Mr. Wolinsky.

3 MR. WOLINSKY: And, Your Honor, the reason why is  
4 because we've been working cooperatively with the plaintiffs up  
5 until yesterday, and not once up until the time we were working  
6 cooperatively up until yesterday did they say, sorry, you're  
7 too -- it's too late, five days has passed, and we're not going  
8 to talk to you anymore. To the contrary, we consensually were  
9 agreeing to schedule depositions for this week with them up  
10 until the end of last week.

11 So I -- you know, I think there's an element of  
12 fairness here and an element that we're getting hung up on our  
13 effort to work consensually and cooperatively with the  
14 plaintiffs to get the discovery done.

15 For example, Your Honor, let's focus specifically on  
16 the Treasury deposition. The witness was subpoenaed long ago.  
17 Treasury took the position that we should take a different  
18 witness first, and if we were unsatisfied with that different  
19 witness, we could seek -- we could get the witness that we  
20 specifically had asked for, Mr. Malik. The plaintiffs are  
21 agreeable to take the Treasury deposition of the individual  
22 that Treasury has pushed us to take, Mr. Feldman. What the  
23 plaintiffs are saying is if Mr. Feldman doesn't know -- have  
24 the answers to the questions, we're stuck and  
25 notwithstanding -- and we can't hold Treasury to its word that



1 it would produce a witness that would actually be  
2 knowledgeable.

3 THE COURT: Well, you can hold them to it because  
4 that's what subpoenas are about.

5 MR. WOLINSKY: Well, we can if you permit us, Your  
6 Honor. That's really the core issue here. We all agree  
7 that --

8 THE COURT: Well, you know, you're in a different  
9 position if this issue had been raised with me before the  
10 discovery cutoff, and I would say, try and work out a mutually  
11 convenient date. If it's shortly after the discovery cutoff, I  
12 consider extending it, but I'm hearing about all of this now  
13 after the discovery cutoff. But let me --

14 MR. WOLINSKY: Now, Your Honor, and I don't mean to  
15 be --

16 THE COURT: Hold on a second, Mr. Wolinsky.

17 MR. WOLINSKY: Sure.

18 THE COURT: So you said it's a total of six  
19 witnesses, including Jennifer Weigel?

20 MR. WOLINSKY: Yes.

21 THE COURT: And Weigel is the only one who's not  
22 under subpoena?

23 MR. WOLINSKY: She is not, but we did not issue the  
24 subpoena until October 30 -- October 27th.

25 THE COURT: Okay. How long do you anticipate each of



1 these depositions taking?

2 MR. WOLINSKY: I think some are as short as 15 to 20  
3 minutes. Ms. Weigel fits in that category. The others are an  
4 hour -- all the others are less than half a day.

5 THE COURT: Tell me what's the issue on which you  
6 wish to depose Ms. Weigel.

7 MR. WOLINSKY: Your Honor, Ms. Weigel is -- it's a  
8 very interesting issue. There's a -- one federal court case in  
9 Michigan applying Michigan law to the kind of asset that is  
10 involved specifically in this case, a milling machine. She  
11 works at a company called -- she worked at a company called  
12 Visioneering. Visioneering had milling machines of exactly the  
13 same type or essentially the same type as you'll find in any  
14 General Motors factory. The Court in that case held that the  
15 machine was a fixture.

16 The plaintiffs, in their pretrial brief, have said to  
17 you when assessing intent, the key inquiry is whether an asset  
18 has been moved or may be moved by the annexing party, and then  
19 they specifically distinguished this case, this leading  
20 Michigan case, Cincinnati Insurance, on the ground that there  
21 was a lack of evidence that the machine was ever moved.

22 THE COURT: Tell me who the other five witnesses are.

23 MR. WOLINSKY: The other five -- do you want me to  
24 finish what she's going to say or -- she's going to say the  
25 machine has been moved. So you're going to have a fact witness



1 who will specifically establish that an asset of the type  
2 involved in this case has been moved.

3           So the other witnesses, Your Honor, KPMG, two  
4 witnesses, Jovan Cruz and Eric Greenwald. Mr. Cruz prepared a  
5 single spreadsheet that we need -- we want to understand that  
6 lays out the evolution of KPMG's valuation of New GM, and we  
7 need to -- we want to depose him just to explain the one  
8 spreadsheet. Mr. Greenwald from -- Mr. Greenwald of KPMG, we  
9 would only pursue with him, depending on what we see in the  
10 PricewaterhouseCoopers (indiscernible). Mr. Greenwald was the  
11 senior engagement partner on the KPMG engagement. We have one  
12 area of inquiry of him. Treasury, Mr. Malik. Mr. Malik was  
13 the -- he was the numbers guy in the auto -- Treasury auto  
14 industry task force. The Treasury has told us to take a  
15 gentleman named Matt Feldman, who is a lawyer on the auto  
16 industry task --

17           THE COURT: Oh, I know Mr. Feldman. You're talking  
18 about at Willkie Farr?

19           MR. WOLINSKY: He's -- yes, we're working with  
20 Willkie Farr.

21           THE COURT: Right.

22           MR. WOLINSKY: We've got Willkie Farr now, yeah. And  
23 Mr. Feldman --

24           THE COURT: He was at Willkie Farr before, he's back  
25 at Willkie Farr now.



1 MR. WOLINSKY: Treasury told us that Mr. Feldman  
2 should be able to cover the universe, and -- but from the  
3 documents, we believe Mr. Malik will be the better, more  
4 knowledgeable witness, and our understanding with Treasury is  
5 that if Mr. Feldman can do the job, great, we don't need Mr.  
6 Malik. If Mr. Feldman can't do the job, we'd like to get Mr.  
7 Malik, and they've told us Mr. Malik is not available until  
8 November 16th.

9 THE COURT: When is Mr. Feldman -- did you agree on a  
10 date for Mr. Feldman?

11 MR. WOLINSKY: Yes. We'll all -- we've all agreed  
12 that we're going to proceed with Mr. Feldman tomorrow.

13 THE COURT: That's one of the two that's agreed?

14 MR. WOLINSKY: Yes. Yes.

15 THE COURT: All right. What's -- who's next?

16 MR. WOLINSKY: One witness from New GM. Actually, on  
17 that subject, we originally had a 30(b)(6) witness to New GM  
18 for six subject matters. We dropped six and then focused just  
19 on one. I believe the witness going to be the chief economist  
20 from New GM, and he's going to testify about the reasonableness  
21 of the projections that we've prepared in connection with the  
22 reorganization, which is an important issue in the valuation.  
23 We've been pursuing that deposition for a very long time with  
24 GM, and --

25 THE COURT: Have they indicated when he's available



1 for deposition?

2 MR. WOLINSKY: They have not pinned down a date yet.

3 THE COURT: Is he under subpoena?

4 MR. WOLINSKY: Yes.

5 THE COURT: Did you put a date in the subpoena?

6 MR. WOLINSKY: Yes, for -- the date of the subpoena  
7 was for October 31st.

8 THE COURT: Who else?

9 MR. WOLINSKY: PricewaterhouseCoopers -- at the KPMG  
10 deposition, we -- which took place at the end of September, we  
11 learned for the first time that PricewaterhouseCoopers would --  
12 had some involvement in the fresh-start accounting. Actually,  
13 we didn't learn until when we were in front of you last time.  
14 We were not aware about PricewaterhouseCoopers's involvement --

15 THE COURT: There a specific person from PwC who's  
16 under subpoena?

17 MR. WOLINSKY: A 30(b)(6) witness under subpoena.  
18 The return date for the subpoena was --

19 UNIDENTIFIED: Toward the end of October.

20 MR. WOLINSKY: I don't have the date, but it would  
21 have been, yeah, end of October. And we've been working with  
22 PricewaterhouseCoopers lawyers at Reed Smith to identify a  
23 witness and get a date. We've been calling them every -- twice  
24 a day to get their documents and to get a witness, and they've  
25 told us that the documents would be produced this week.



1 THE COURT: So, you know, by my count, Weigel is  
2 number one. There are two people at KPMG, one at Treasury, one  
3 at New GM, and a 30(b)(6) at Pricewaterhouse, that's what  
4 you're talking about?

5 MR. WOLINSKY: Yes, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Do any of the other defendants wish to be  
7 heard?

8 MR. DIPOMPEO: Yes, Your Honor. This is Christopher  
9 DiPompeo of Jones Day. We represent a group of term loan  
10 lenders. I'm primarily going to speak about a different topic,  
11 which is what to do about affirmative defenses that have  
12 nothing to do with the represented assets trial.

13 THE COURT: I'm not dealing with that. I'm dealing  
14 with a discovery dispute now. I'm not dealing with what you  
15 think should be done with affirmative defenses. I've got a  
16 trial that's supposed to resume in five minutes, so if you --  
17 what is it that -- tell me what it is -- quickly what it is  
18 your beef is about the affirmative defenses.

19 MR. DIPOMPEO: Sure. And this is, Your Honor, to be  
20 clear, a discovery dispute over whether the affirmative  
21 discovery -- fact discovery and the affirmative defenses should  
22 also be subject to the October 31st deadline. As it was, very  
23 briefly, Your Honor, the plaintiffs requested several weeks  
24 ago, as you probably remember, to have defendant's specific  
25 affirmative defenses put off until after the \*(indiscernible



1 23:47) assets trial. We initially resisted that, but at the  
2 status conference, Your Honor said that there was really no  
3 rush on that, those weren't going to be dealt with during the  
4 trial, and so they could be put off.

5 Defendant set up a list of those defendants' specific  
6 affirmative defenses, which originally we had anticipated was  
7 just going to be your conduit to potentially solving any of  
8 those kind of issues, and what ended up coming back was a list  
9 of 32 affirmative defenses, which are essentially all defenses  
10 except constructive trust and your marking.

11 So then when the plaintiff asked to put a firm end  
12 date to the discovery that's going on now, we think it doesn't  
13 make sense to make that distinction because defendant-specific  
14 affirmative defenses and other affirmative defenses, which are  
15 also not going to be part of -- represented at trial. We  
16 actually think that's fundamentally unfair.

17 THE COURT: All right. I'm not going to deal with  
18 that issue today.

19 MR. DIPOMPEO: Okay.

20 THE COURT: Anybody else wish to be heard?

21 MR. MACDONALD: Your Honor, this is Matt McDonald  
22 from Munger Tolles representing the same group of term lenders.  
23 I just wanted to -- I definitely do not need the Court to  
24 address this now. I just wanted to alert the Court that there  
25 is a separate fact discovery cutoff for cross-claims and for



1 certain effectiveness issues.

2 THE COURT: Right.

3 MR. MACDONALD: I just want to make sure that nothing  
4 today that happens today affects that deadline and to alert the  
5 Court that the parties are currently negotiating a schedule  
6 extension. I think we'll be able to resolve that amicably, and  
7 we'll come back to the Court with a stipulation to that effect  
8 that will move that deadline between --

9 THE COURT: Well, we'll see whether the Court agrees  
10 to it, but we'll put that for another day.

11 Anybody else want to be heard?

12 MR. FISHER: Your Honor, it's Eric Fisher again.

13 THE COURT: Let me see whether any of the other  
14 defendants want to be heard, Mr. Fisher, and then I'll give you  
15 another chance.

16 MR. FISHER: Thank you.

17 THE COURT: Any of the other defendants' counsel wish  
18 to be heard?

19 All right. Mr. Fisher, go ahead.

20 MR. WOLINSKY: Your Honor, it's Marc Wolinsky.

21 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Wolinsky.

22 MR. WOLINSKY: I went back -- yeah, I just -- I don't  
23 see anything in the case management order that provided -- that  
24 has a provision along the lines you outlined. I'm not saying  
25 it's not there. We haven't gone back and looked through every



1 single case management order, but frankly, we don't see it.

2 THE COURT: Okay. I haven't gone back to look back.  
3 My standard case management order requires any party who wants  
4 to seek an extension and they can't agree on -- actually, even  
5 if they agree on, they have to seek an extension within, you  
6 know, more than five days before, at least five days before the  
7 time period runs out. Let me hear from Mr. Fisher.

8 MR. WOLINSKY: Or it could be an accident of history  
9 because of how this case wound up in front of us.

10 THE COURT: Yeah, I know. I inherited it from Judge  
11 Gerber, but I'm familiar with that. That's the trial -- one of  
12 the trials that I have is another case I inherited from Judge  
13 Gerber.

14 Mr. Fisher, let me hear from you.

15 MR. FISHER: I will be very brief because I do  
16 appreciate that you're conducting a trial. Just to respond to  
17 a few of the points -- specific points that Mr. Wolinsky made  
18 about the specific witnesses. This Jennifer Weigel deposition  
19 at Visioneering, a subpoena was issued on October 27th, two  
20 business days before --

21 THE COURT: Yeah, I understand about Ms. Weigel.  
22 They were very straightforward that a subpoena just got issued.  
23 What about the other five?

24 MR. FISHER: New GM, we don't agree that they've been  
25 uncooperative. We do think it takes a lot of time sometimes to



1 work with them, and we have been working with New GM since  
2 August 2nd to coordinate deposition issues. We went out to  
3 Detroit for New GM depositions. The defendants participated in  
4 all of those discussions and made a decision, I suppose, at the  
5 time that they didn't think they needed a witness because the  
6 discussions that we had with New GM's counsel was always along  
7 the lines of, once we're flying out to Detroit, let's make sure  
8 that we get all the depositions done that need to get done, so  
9 this is an issue that has cropped up belatedly. And the KPMG  
10 and PwC witnesses, you know, it's not as though the defendants  
11 are left without discovery, I mean, on these issues --

12 THE COURT: Let me stop you, Mr. Fisher.

13 Mr. Wolinsky, what district were the subpoenas issued  
14 from?

15 MR. WOLINSKY: They were issued from the Southern  
16 District, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: You issued subpoenas from the Southern  
18 District for witnesses in Michigan?

19 MR. WOLINSKY: Yes.

20 THE COURT: Good luck. You know, a subpoena has to  
21 be issued in the district within 100 -- you know, the 100-mile  
22 bulge rule applies in --

23 MR. WOLINSKY: Yeah.

24 THE COURT: You may be out of luck, but that's -- I'm  
25 not going to decide that today.



1 MR. WOLINSKY: So, Your Honor, I -- the location of  
2 the deposition was where the witness is located.

3 THE COURT: Yeah, but go read the rules.

4 MR. WOLINSKY: All right, Your Honor. I understand.

5 THE COURT: Here is what I'm going to say -- what I'm  
6 going to -- I'm going to order, subject to the witnesses -- the  
7 ability of the proposed deponents to seek to quash any subpoena  
8 that's been served, I'm going to order that with respect to the  
9 six depositions -- there may be -- as I understand it, Mr.  
10 Wolinsky, it may be five because if you take Mr. Feldman's  
11 deposition and you're satisfied, then Mr. Malik is not going to  
12 be deposed. Is that correct?

13 MR. WOLINSKY: That's correct, Your Honor. And the  
14 same actually is true of the KPMG witness. If we get what we  
15 need from PricewaterhouseCoopers, we don't --

16 THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to order, on the  
17 record, that the depositions -- the six depositions be  
18 completed on or before 5 p.m. November 16th and that no  
19 deposition shall exceed three hours in length unless both sides  
20 agree to it. So I'm imposing the three-hour limit across the  
21 board for each deposition, and if one deposition takes 15  
22 minutes, you can't apply the time to another deposition, okay.

23 I hope their depositions are shorter than three  
24 hours, but I'm going to permit depositions -- six depositions,  
25 not to exceed three hours in length, to be completed on or





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

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Alicia Jarrett, court-approved transcriber, hereby  
certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the  
official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the  
above-entitled matter.

Alicia J. Jarrett

ALICIA JARRETT, AAERT NO. 428      DATE: November 3, 2016  
ACCESS TRANSCRIPTS, LLC

