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Affirmation of Michael A. Rollin in Support of Order to Show Cause Why The Court Should Not Continue The Trial Following The September Trial Dates to Allow Discovery Concerning Newly Disclosed Evidence

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK : PART 39

In the Matter of the Application of

THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON, (As Trustee Under Various Pooling and Servicing Agreements and Indenture Trustee Under Various Indentures) et al,
.

8 For an Order Pursuant to CPLR Section 7701, Seeking Judicial Instructions and Approval of a Proposed Settlement.

Index No. 651786/11
October 12, 2012
60 Centre Street New York, New York

BEFORE: HONORABLE BARBARAR. KAPNICK, JSC
APPEARANCES:
MAYER BROWN
Attorneys for Bank of NY Mellon (Trustee)
1675 Broadway
New York, New York 10019
BY: MATTHEW D. INGBER, ESQ.
GIBBS \& BRUNS LLP
Attorneys for Institutional Investors
1100 Louisiana, suite 5300
Houston, Texas 77002
BY: KATHY PATRICK, ESQ. ROBERT J. MADDEN, ESQ.

KELLER ROHR BACK LLP
Attorneys for Intervenor 1201 Third Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101 BY: DEREK W. LOESER, ESQ.

Rachel C. Simone, CSR, RMR, CRR

Bank of New York, but the people that Mr. Reilly represents were not there, and the people that Mr . Loeser represents were not there, and, I guess, there were some other people not there too.

So lawyers, being the suspicious group as we are, may say, Well, we weren't there, how did they get to this? We really want to know how they got to this.

As Mr. Loeser said, after the 26 depositions and the experts and whatever, they say, You know what? I think this turned out pretty well, we think it is a good settlement, Judge, sign off. That would be a nice way for it to end. I might be a little optimistic, but okay.

I understand, and Bank of America is paying everybody's fees, and your fees, and Mayer Brown fees, and expert fees and they weren't there. So I get why there is concern. I bet you I would feel that way too. And, I dare say, maybe if you ever were on that side you might feel that way too. You are usually on that side, so maybe you don't know. So I can see what is fueling the problem.

I also see that you want me to sign a very, very comprehensive order approving, rubber stamping after the fact your negotiations your investigations, everything you did as being okay, good, excellent, you get an A plus.

I have to see things. So to the extent that you objected to every single question through this deposition, Rachel C. Simone, CSR, RMR, CRR
many, many, many of the questions. I mean, everything you guys read to me had objections that were longer than the answers. It is going to be a long process. It is going to be problematic.

I think you might have to rethink just a little bit what you might think might be more reasonable to let him answer, and you have to think about how you may want to conduct it so that you get the most out of the depositions.

I understand, I think, where you are coming from. And, I mean, I am boiling it down to, sort of, almost like layman's language; but that's kind of what I think this is all about.

Ms. Patrick said at one point, I don't want people to know my negotiation strategies. That's why I get what I get, or what do what I do. But some of it is going to have to come out because that's what they want to know because they weren't there, right?

MS. PATRICK: Well, your Honor, with regard to who was and wasn't there, let me just make a couple of points.

THE COURT: Sure.
MS. PATRICK: You will remember that we were here some time ago when Mr. Karlinsky up for AIG. AIG was not uninformed about what was going on here. AIG was trying to hijack this process for its own securities claim.
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