FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 08/30/2013

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 932

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 08/30/2013

INDEX NO. 651786/2011

Exhibit 6

to

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

In The Matter Of:

Bank of New York Mellon v.

Oral Argument April 12, 2013

Supreme Court State of New York - Civil Term
60 Centre Street, Room 420
New York, New York 10007
(646) 386-3012
Harristshams@aol.com

Original File Apr-12 Bank of Mellon.txt

Min-U-Script® with Word Index

Proceedings

THE COURT: If they don't prove it to me they are not getting that finding. That's the risk they are going to bear. I don't know if it's going to fall apart if half of

those findings aren't able to be made or not.

MR. INGBER: (The risk is up, there is a proposed) final order of judgment, your Honor is going to hear the evidence, it's going to involve nonprivileged information. You are going to go through the proposed final order of judgment and decide which of those findings your Honor is going to accept.

A few just very quick points. You are exactly right, there is a disconnect between arguing that an indemnity, which we're contractually entitled to, presents a conflict relating to settlement agreement. How does an indemnity that we're contractually entitled to incentivize us to take a bad deal. Indemnities are a good thing.

Indemnities are baked into these contracts because trustees are getting paid cents on the dollar compared to other parties of the deal. They are not going to incur the legal expenses and fees associated with getting involved in a negotiation or getting involved in a litigation unless there is indemnity. That is why the contracts are so clear, that the trustee is entitled to an indemnity and the trustee is entitled to any indemnity that it believes is satisfactory to it.