ORIGINAL

Clerk's stamp:

QUESTIONING OF HAVEN EBONI EDWARDS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

BY MS. E. PAPLAWSKI

SWORN DECEMBER 2, 2022

HELD DECEMBER 19, 2022

VIA REMOTE VIDEO

COURT FILE NUMBER 24-2806171

COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE

BANKRUPTCY OF ECO-INDUSTRIAL

BUSINESS PARK INC.

JUDICIAL CENTRE EDMONTON

APPLICANT MNP LTD., in its capacity as

the TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY OF

ECO-INDUSTRIAL BUSINESS PARK

INC., and not in its personal

capacity

1 2 RESPONDENT SYMMETRY ASSET MANAGEMENT INC. 3 4 DOCUMENT QUESTIONING ON AFFIDAVIT 5 Taken before Claire Forster, Official Court Reporter, 6 7 pursuant to Rules 5.26, 6.20, and 13.46 of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta. 8 9 10 FOR THE APPLICANT: 11 E. Paplawski 12 Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP 13 2700, 225-6 Avenue SW Calgary, Alberta 14 15 403-260-7000 16 17 FOR THE RESPONDENT: S. Roberts 18 Roberts O'Kelly Law 19 20 403, 10113-104 Street NW Edmonton, Alberta 21 22 780-760-6752 23 24 25 26 27

```
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:
 1
 2
         Claire Forster, CSR(A)
 3
         Dicta Court Reporting Inc.
 4
         760, 1015-4 Street SW
 5
         Calgary, Alberta
         403-531-0590
 6
 7
         (PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 9:57 AM)
 8
         HAVEN EBONI EDWARDS, Affirmed, Cross-examined by
 9
10
         Ms. Paplawski
         THE COURT REPORTER:
11
                                    Please state and spell your
12
         full name for the record.
         Haven Eboni Edwards. H-A-V-E-N E-B-O-N-I
13
     Α
14
         E-D-W-A-R-D-S.
15
         THE COURT REPORTER:
                                   Thank you.
         MS. PAPLAWSKI:
                                 Good morning, Ms. Edwards.
16
     O
17
     Α
         Good morning.
         So just before we get going here, I will just put on
18
19
         the record that we are conducting this
20
         cross-examination by Zoom. So if there's any
         technological glitches as we go along here, if you
21
22
         can't hear me, you need me to repeat anything, please
         let me know and we'll do our best to get through this,
23
24
         okay?
25
     Α
         Okay.
         So, Ms. Edwards, I confirm that you have been affirmed
26
     Q
27
         this morning to tell the truth; correct?
```

- 1 A Correct.
- 2 Q And that affirmation is binding on your conscience?
- 3 A Correct.
- 4 Q And you understand that you are here to answer some
- 5 questions about an affidavit that you swore in Alberta
- 6 Court of King's Bench of Alberta, Action
- 7 Number 24-2806171 on December 2nd, 2022; correct?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q And do you have a copy of that affidavit in front of
- 10 you?
- 11 A I do.
- 12 Q Perfect.
- If I can ask you to turn to page 3 of your
- affidavit, you will see that there's a signature above
- the typing "Haven Eboni Edwards". I presume that's
- 16 your signature?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 O And you reviewed your affidavit prior to swearing it,
- 19 affirmed that it was accurate?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 O Thank you.
- Now, Ms. Edwards, I understand that you are a
- 23 legal assistant with Roberts O'Kelly Law?
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q Okay. And so is it correct, then, that you are not a
- lawyer?
- 27 A Yes.

1 Okay. Let's start with paragraph 6 of your affidavit. 0 2 So at the lead-in to paragraph 6, you say: (as read) 3 I am informed by Sharon Roberts, counsel 4 for Symmetry in this proceeding, and believe 5 that ... 6 And then following there's seven subparagraphs: (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g). 7 Do you see that? 8 9 Yeah. Α And Ms. Roberts advised you of all of the statements 10 made in these subparagraphs; is that correct? 11 12 Α Yes. 13 Okay. Let's start with subparagraph (a). In 0 14 subparagraph (a) you say: (as read) 15 The damages claim was increased to 16 100 million when the pleadings in the Eco v 17 ADT litigation were amended. If you look at Exhibit 6 to your affidavit. 18 M-hm. 19 Α 20 Is this a copy of the statement of claim filed in what 21 you refer to as "the Eco v ADT litigation"? 22 MS. ROBERTS: The document says what it 23 says, Ms. Paplawski. 24 (OBJECTION) 25 MS. PAPLAWSKI: Well, it's not defined, "Eco v 26 ADT", so I want to make sure we're talking about the same thing. 27

- Is this the Eco v ADT 1 MS. PAPLAWSKI: 0 2 litigation? 3 Yes. Α 4 0 Now, you'll see at the top of this statement of claim the Court File Number 1303-16983. 5 Do you see that? 6 7 Yeah. Α So just make a note of that file number as we're 8 Okay. 9 going to come back to it today. 10 So if you could go back to paragraph 6 now, and 11 subparagraph (b) you state: (as read) 12 The amendment occurred as a result of a 13 contested application brought by 14 Roderick Payne, then of Hustwick Payne LLP, in 2018 in his capacity as litigation counsel 15 for Eco in the Eco v ADT litigation. 16 17 Am I correct, Ms. Edwards, that your only information 18 about this statement in subparagraph (b) is what 19 Ms. Roberts told you? 20 Correct. Α Ms. Roberts wasn't counsel for Symmetry in 2018; 21
- 22 correct?
- 23 A Correct.
- 24 O And Ms. Roberts wasn't counsel for Eco in 2018?
- 25 A Correct.
- 26 Q Ms. Roberts wasn't involved in this contested
- 27 application?

- 1 A Correct, she was not involved.
- 2 O And she wasn't involved in the amendments that were
- 3 made to the statement of claim; correct?
- 4 A Correct.
- 5 Q So who, then, advised Ms. Roberts of the reasons for
- 6 the amendments to the statement of claim as noted in
- 7 subparagraph (b) here?
- 8 A It was a call between Ms. Roberts and Mr. Payne.
- 9 Q Okay.
- 10 A But I am not aware of the details of that conversation.
- 11 Q Okay. So Mr. Payne, I understand, was counsel for Eco
- 12 at the time; correct?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q That is my --
- 15 A And so --
- 16 Q Oh, sorry. Keep going.
- 17 A Oh, that's all. That's my understanding.
- 18 O And so Mr. Payne advised Ms. Roberts of the reasons for
- 19 the amendment, and Ms. Roberts then advised you of such
- 20 reasons?
- 21 A That's my belief.
- 22 Q Okay. You weren't privy to that conversation?
- 23 A Correct. Yeah, I wasn't.
- 24 O Okay. Let's look at sub (d).
- 25 MS. ROBERTS: 'D' as in dog? Sorry.
- MS. PAPLAWSKI: 'D' as in David.
- 27 Q MS. PAPLAWSKI: In sub (d) you state:

(as read) 1 2 Mr. Payne informed Ms. Roberts that he was 3 also pursuing settlement negotiations in 2021 4 with counsel for Dentons pursuant to the 5 standstill agreement that Eco and Dentons had entered into, and the quantum of settlement 6 7 contemplated was within the ballpark of the original damages alleged in the original 8 statement of claim. 9 10 Do you see that? Yeah. 11 Α 12 And similar to the above paragraph we just discussed, is it accurate that your only information about the 13 14 statement in this subparagraph (d) is what Ms. Roberts told you? 15 16 Yes. Α 17 And Mr. Payne informed Ms. Roberts of what is stated in 0 18 6(d); correct? 19 Α Correct. 20 Now, it's --0 Well, that's what I'm aware. 21 Α 22 Pardon? 0 That's what I'm aware of. 23 That's all I'm aware of. Α 24 That's all you're aware of? Q 25 Yeah. Α Perfect. 26 0 27 So as stated in 6(d), Ms. Roberts advised you that

- 1 Mr. Payne advised her that he was pursuing settlement
- discussions of the claim against Dentons. Now, I just
- 3 want to make sure we're talking about the same thing.
- 4 You understand, Ms. Edwards, that there was no
- 5 statement of claim filed against Dentons?
- 6 A I'm not too involved with that part of the litigation.
- 7 Q So you just have no knowledge about what was or was not
- 8 filed against Dentons?
- 9 A Yes, I have no knowledge of that.
- 10 Q Okay. You understand that at the time Mr. Payne was
- 11 counsel for Eco; is that correct?
- 12 A That's --
- 13 Q Is that your understanding?
- 14 A Yeah.
- 15 Q Okay. And you'll agree with me that by 2021, the claim
- against Dentons had been assigned to Symmetry; correct?
- 17 A I'm not too -- I don't know.
- 18 Q So you also wouldn't know why, if the claim had been
- assigned to Symmetry, counsel for Eco was negotiating
- 20 settlement of it?
- 21 A Not sure.
- 22 O You don't know. You have no information about that?
- 23 A No.
- 24 O Okay. Let's look at sub (f). Sub (f) states:
- 25 (as read)
- 26 Mr. Payne informed the receiver manager, MNP
- 27 Ltd., through its counsel, of the fact that

- 1 settlement discussions had occurred when he
- delivered his file to counsel for MNP Ltd.
- When you say "counsel for MNP Ltd.", that's our office;
- 4 correct, Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt?
- 5 A That's my understanding, but I don't have personal
- 6 knowledge of what Mr. Payne was doing.
- 7 Q Right. But is it your understanding that when you
- 8 refer to "counsel for MNP", that that's Osler? Is that
- 9 your understanding?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q And Ms. Roberts also advised you of the information
- 12 stated in subparagraph (f)?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q And did Mr. Payne advise Ms. Roberts of the information
- 15 stated in subparagraph (f)?
- 16 A I'm not privy to the call that they had.
- 17 Q So the information in subparagraph (f), to the best of
- 18 your knowledge, was communicated by Mr. Payne to
- 19 Ms. Roberts in a telephone call?
- 20 A The information in subparagraph (f), to my knowledge,
- 21 was just communicated to me by Ms. Roberts. So
- anything that occurred before that, I'm not privy to.
- 23 Q So you have no information how Ms. Roberts became
- 24 privy to the information noted in paragraph --
- subparagraph (f)?
- 26 A Yes.
- 27 Q Yes, you have no information?

- 1 A Yes, I have no information to offer.
- 2 Q Okay. Now, you attach an Exhibit 8 to your affidavit,
- and this is in paragraph 7, copies of what you call:
- 4 (as read)
- 5 Emails exchanged in late November 2022
- 6 between Sharon Roberts of Roberts O'Kelly
- 7 Law, counsel for the respondent in this
- 8 proceeding, and Randal Van de Mosselaer of
- 9 Osler, Hoskins & Harcourt LLP, counsel for
- 10 MNP in this proceeding.
- 11 Do you see that?
- 12 A Yeah.
- 13 Q Okay. Let's look at Exhibit 8. And in particular, I
- want to start on page 34. Let me know when you have
- that up in front of you. Actually, let's -- we're
- 16 actually going to start at the very bottom of page 33
- 17 as that's the start of the email chain I want to start
- 18 with.
- 19 A Okav. I'm there.
- 20 Q Okay. So at the very bottom of page 33 is an email
- 21 from Sharon Roberts to Randal Van de Mosselaer, copied
- to a number of people, dated November 23rd, 2022.
- Do you see that?
- 24 A Yeah.
- 25 Q Okay. Let's just turn over a page to page 34, to the
- substance of that email, or to the body of that email.
- 27 And you will see it starts: (as read)

1		Forgive me, Mr. Van de Mosselaer.
2		And then in the paragraph directly below that,
3		Ms. Roberts advises Mr. Van de Mosselaer: (as read)
4		I was not requesting further
5		cross-examination via email. It has recently
6		come to my attention that there were
7		negotiations and qualifications of value in
8		the ADT lawsuit in question, of which your
9		client ought to have had some awareness.
10		Curiously, that was not disclosed to the
11		Court in any of your materials.
12		Do you see that?
13	А	Yeah.
14	Q	Okay. Let's flip forward a page, then, to page 33.
15		And you will see Mr. Van de Mosselaer's response.
16		So from Mr. Van de Mosselaer to Sharon Roberts,
17		date November 24, 2022, and immediately below
18		Ms. Roberts, "Thanks for your email," the paragraph
19		states: (as read)
20		Without addressing several of the points in
21		your email, with which we disagree, I can
22		advise the trustee really has no idea what
23		you are referring to. We are unaware of
24		anything in the nature of negotiations and
25		qualifications of value in the ADT lawsuit in
26		question, as referenced in your email.
27		Nothing was disclosed by the trustee simply

1		because there is no information to disclose.
2		If you can actually tell us what you are
3		referring to, we can then let you know if we
4		have any knowledge about such negotiations
5		and qualifications of value. But at the
6		moment the trustee has no knowledge of
7		anything of the sort.
8		And if you just flip forward one page, there's two more
9		emails I want to review with you. The first is on
10		page 32. Just let me know when you are there.
11	A	Yeah, 32.
12	Q	Okay. So this is Ms. Roberts' response to
13		Mr. Van de Mosselaer, same day, November 24, 2022. In
14		that very first paragraph, Ms. Roberts replies:
15		(as read)
16		I understood that your office received the
17		entire set of file materials from
18		Hustwick Payne. This would presumably have
19		included communications around settlement and
20		quantification for settlement, as well as
21		copies of all pleadings.
22		Are you prepared to disclose anything
23		about the foregoing?
24		If we just turn to page 31, the very last email chain
25		in this exhibit, this is Mr. Van de Mosselaer's
26		response to Ms. Roberts now the following day.
27		Do you see that? November 25th, 2022?

1	A	A Yeah.		
2	Q	And Mr. Van de Mosselaer advises Ms. Roberts:		
3		(as read)		
4		The receiver did receive approximately		
5		18 boxes of paper from Hustwick Payne for		
6		numerous ongoing litigation matters on behalf		
7		of Eco and Absolute. Only a cursory review		
8		of those matters has been conducted to ensure		
9		that no urgent steps needed to be taken in		
10		any ongoing action. The receiver/trustee has		
11		no information to suggest that files related		
12		to the claim against ADT/Dentons were		
13		included in those 18 boxes, and given the		
14		fact that these claims were assigned to		
15		Symmetry almost a year before the receiver's		
16		appointment (and Symmetry's counsel made		
17		clear it intended to pursue these claims) we		
18		would not expect that any files related to		
19		these claims would have been provided to the		
20		receiver/trustee. The receiver/trustee		
21		certainly has no information related to any		
22		communications around settlement and		
23		quantification for settlement, as you have		
24		suggested, and we take significant exception		
25		to the thinly veiled suggestion that the		
26		receiver/trustee failed to disclose		
27		information which it ought to have disclosed.		

```
So, Ms. Edwards, did you review Exhibit 8 before
 1
 2
         attaching it to your affidavit?
 3
         Yeah.
     Α
 4
         And so you understood Mr. Van de Mosselaer's
     0
 5
         confirmation that Osler had no information regarding
         any settlement discussions?
 6
 7
         MS. ROBERTS:
                                   Objection.
         (OBJECTION)
 8
                                   On what basis?
 9
         MS. PAPLAWSKI:
10
         MS. ROBERTS:
                                   She's not here to give
         evidence about Mr. Van de Mosselaer's -- what
11
12
         Mr. Van de Mosselaer did or didn't understand.
                                   Well, she reviewed the
13
         MS. PAPLAWSKI:
14
         communication, and my question is simple.
         MS. PAPLAWSKI:
                                 You understood what
15
     0
         Mr. Van de Mosselaer advised in these paragraphs?
16
17
         MS. ROBERTS:
                                   The email says what it says,
18
         Ms. Paplawski.
19
         (OBJECTION)
20
         MS. PAPLAWSKI:
                                 So let's go to back to
     0
21
         paragraph 6(f) again.
                                 The start of paragraph 6, the
2.2
         lead-in paragraph, you say: (as read)
              I am informed by Sharon Roberts, counsel for
23
24
              Symmetry, and believe that ...
25
         And in (f) -- subparagraph (f) you say -- so you
         believe that Mr. Payne informed the receiver-manager,
26
         MNP, through its counsel of the fact that settlement
27
```

1		discussions had occurred when he delivered his file to				
2		counsel for MNP Ltd.				
3		And so, Ms. Edwards, you reviewed Exhibit 8. You				
4		swore that you believe to be true your statement in				
5		paragraph (f). What steps did you take to confirm that				
6		belief in paragraph 6(f) of your affidavit was				
7		accurate?				
8	A	I'm sorry. I'm misunderstanding the question.				
9	Q	Sure. What steps you reviewed Exhibit 8?				
10	A	M-hm.				
11	Q	Which we just reviewed. You understood what Mr				
12		when you reviewed Exhibit 8 before you swore your				
13		affidavit, yet you swore you swore in paragraph 6(f)				
14		that you believe that and I'm starting in 6(f) here:				
15		(as read)				
16		settlement discussions had occurred when				
17		he delivered his file to counsel for MNP Ltd.				
18		And I just want to know what steps did you take to				
19		confirm your belief that paragraph 6(f) was accurate?				
20		MS. ROBERTS: Ms. Paplawski, the witness has				
21		already said to you that the source of information for				
22		paragraph 6 was myself, and she also informed you that				
23		she knew there was a conversation between Mr. Payne and				
24		myself.				
25	Q	MS. PAPLAWSKI: So is it accurate to say,				
26		Ms				
27		MS. ROBERTS: Ms. Paplawski. Ms. Paplawski,				

1 you are asking the witness what steps she took 2 independent of the things she already said and limited 3 her involvement so (INDISCERNIBLE - OVERLAPPING 4 SPEAKERS) 5 MS. PAPLAWSKI: Is it accurate, Ms. Edwards, 0 6 that --7 MS. ROBERTS: Ms. Paplawski, please. objecting to the question. The witness told you the 8 things she's done, and she also told you the source of 9 the belief, which was that I informed her about a 10 conversation between Mr. Payne and myself and what 11 12 Mr. Payne informed me. 13 (OBJECTION) 14 MS. PAPLAWSKI: So is it accurate, Ms. Edwards, that you have no information whether or 15 not the information in 6(f) is accurate other than what 16 17 Ms. Edwards told you? Other than what Ms. Roberts told 18 you? Yeah, that's the source for my information. 19 Α 20 Right. So you have no other information about 6(f)0 other than what Ms. Roberts told you? 21 22 That's -- yeah, that's what I put in my affidavit. Α 23 Okay. Perfect. Q 24 Let's look at sub (q). You say in sub (q): 25 (as read) Ms. Roberts requested copies of invoices on 26 27 the ADT litigation matters from MNP Ltd.,

- 1 through its counsel, which request was 2 refused. 3 Do you see that? 4 Α Yeah. 5 Let's turn back to Exhibit 8, page 32. 6 know when you are there. 7 Yeah, I'm here. Α So when Ms. Roberts emailed to Mr. Van de Mosselaer on 8 November 24, 2022, in the third paragraph down, it 9 10 starts, "Are you prepared". Do you see that? 11 12 Yeah. Α 13 Ms. Roberts requests Mr. Van -- makes the following 14 request to Mr. Van de Mosselaer: (as read) Are you prepared to provide copies of 15 invoices for services rendered given our 16 17 evidence of historic records having been 18 removed and destroyed or withheld by one of 19 Romspen's witnesses, Ms. Duemler, or by 20 Mr. Zarafshani? Do you see that? 21 22 Yeah. А 23 And is this the request that you're referring to in
- Let's turn to a page forward, then, to page 31, Q Okay. 27 Mr. Van de Mosselaer's response to Ms. Roberts, dated

paragraph 8(g) of your affidavit?

I believe it is, yes.

24

25

26

Α

- 1 November 25th, 2022.
- 2 A M-hm.
- 3 Q And at paragraph 2, Mr. Van de Mosselaer advises:
- 4 (as read)
- 5 We are unclear what you are asking for when
- 6 you request "invoices for services rendered".
- Obviously, on its face such a request raises
- 8 concerns about privilege, but we are unable
- 9 to respond to your request because we don't
- 10 know what you are asking for.
- 11 Do you see that?
- 12 A Yeah.
- 13 Q And do you know, Ms. Edwards, whether Ms. Roberts ever
- responded to this email clarifying the request?
- 15 A I have no knowledge of that.
- 16 O You will agree with me that if -- it's not attached to
- 17 your affidavit as Exhibit 8 or otherwise; correct?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Okay. And you will also agree with me, Ms. Edwards,
- 20 that nowhere in this paragraph 2, or anywhere in this
- 21 email -- and feel free to review it, if necessary.
- Nowhere in this paragraph 2, or in this email, did
- counsel, as you swear in your affidavit, refuse the
- 24 request?
- 25 MS. ROBERTS: It says what it says,
- Ms. Paplawski.
- 27 MS. PAPLAWSKI: Well, I want to know. Is

- 1 it --2 (INDISCERNIBLE - OVERLAPPING SPEAKERS) 3 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. You are both 4 talking overtop of each other. 5 MS. ROBERTS: The witness didn't author 6 this. I'm objecting. 7 (OBJECTION) MS. ROBERTS: You are not going to have her 8 9 read when you can read it, Ms. Paplawski, and so can 10 the Court. MS. PAPLAWSKI: Well, I just read it. 11 So let's go back to 6(f) then, 12 MS. PAPLAWSKI: Q 13 Ms. Roberts. 14 MS. ROBERTS: I'm not the witness. Ms. Edwards. 15 MS. PAPLAWSKI: Can you point me in Mr. Van de Mosselaer's 16 17 response where the request was refused? 18 Sorry. Just a moment. So for everything in Α 19 paragraph 6 I was informed by Ms. Roberts, and it 20 doesn't include any information that I did not receive in my affidavit. 21 22 So beyond this, I'm not sure. 23 So the email says what it says, and this is the extent of your information. Your affidavit is the extent of 24

Okay. Let's look at paragraph 8. Paragraph 8 you say:

your information?

Yes.

25

26

27

Α

1		(as read)			
2		Ms. Roberts further informed me, and I			
3		believe that:			
4		(a) in a telephone conversation she had with			
5		Mr. Payne in November 2022, Mr. Payne stated			
6		that he had asked counsel at Dentons Canada			
7		LLP, who had been acting for Eco and the			
8		other Alberta businesses subjected to the			
9		receivership order, why Dentons had not			
10		negotiated a "carve-out" of the ADT			
11		litigation so as to exclude it from the			
12		receivership, as was done with the other			
13		litigation claims in favour of Mr. White or			
14		the Dan White Family Trust.			
15		And paragraph (b): (as read)			
16		The lawyer at Dentons claimed to be unaware			
17		of the ADT litigation.			
18		So am I accurate, Ms. Edwards, that your information			
19		regarding the subparagraphs (a) and (b) was conveyed to			
20		you by Ms. Roberts?			
21	A	Yes.			
22	Q	And Ms. Roberts' information about subparagraph (a) and			
23		(b) was conveyed to her by Mr. Payne?			
24	A	I can assume so, but I cannot a hundred percent say			
25		yes.			
26	Q	And so Mr. Payne advised well, you say in a			
27		telephone conversation she had with Mr. Payne in			

- 1 November 2022 --
- 2 A M-hm.
- 3 Q -- to be fair.
- 4 So is it your information that Mr. Payne advised
- 5 Ms. Roberts of the information in paragraph 8, and
- 6 Ms. Roberts then advised you of the information in
- 7 paragraph 8?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q So other than what Ms. Roberts told you, you have no
- independent knowledge about the discussions between
- 11 Mr. Payne -- or between Ms. Roberts and Mr. Payne?
- 12 A Correct.
- 13 Q You also have no independent information about the
- 14 alleged conversations in paragraphs 8 between Mr. Payne
- 15 and counsel at Dentons?
- 16 A Correct.
- 17 Q And so in subparagraph (b), it states: (as read)
- 18 The lawyer at Dentons claimed to be unaware
- of the ADT litigation.
- 20 You see that?
- 21 A Yeah.
- 22 Q Now, I want to go to -- I advised Ms. Roberts today
- that I may refer you to the affidavit of
- Victor P. Kroeger sworn August 4, 2022.
- Do you have a copy of that in front of you?
- 26 MS. ROBERTS: I have a copy. Tell her where
- you're going, please. She hasn't read it.

- 1 MS. PAPLAWSKI: Can you please go to
- 2 Exhibit "U".
- 3 MS. ROBERTS: We're there.
- 4 Q MS. PAPLAWSKI: Do you know what this document
- 5 is --
- 6 A No. I haven't seen it.
- 7 O -- Ms. Edwards?
- 8 You haven't seen it?
- 9 A No.
- 10 Q If you go to paragraph 6(d) of your affidavit. 'D' as
- in David.
- 12 A M-hm.
- 13 Q You refer to a standstill agreement that Eco and
- 14 Dentons had entered into?
- 15 Do you see that?
- 16 A Yeah.
- 17 O And are you aware whether this is the standstill
- 18 agreement or not?
- 19 A The one that I'm looking at right here?
- 20 Q Correct. Exhibit "U" to Mr. Kroeger's affidavit?
- 21 A I haven't looked at this, so not sure.
- 22 Q Okay. So you have no information, then, if you look at
- 23 paragraph 3 of that standstill agreement?
- 24 A I know nothing about this.
- 25 Q When you look at paragraph 3, you see Court of Queen's
- 26 Bench of Alberta Action Number 1303-16983?
- 27 A I'm confused about where you're directing me to.

- 1 Q In paragraph 3 of the standstill agreement.
- 2 MS. ROBERTS: Sorry. I'm not sure if we're
- in a different document, but the witness is just
- 4 confused.
- 5 Can I just clarify with you, Ms. Paplawski, are
- 6 you on page 2 of the Davis letter?
- 7 MS. PAPLAWSKI: I'm on page 1 of the Davis
- 8 letter.
- 9 MS. ROBERTS: We don't see a Number 3, just
- 10 page 1.
- 11 MS. PAPLAWSKI: The paragraph starts "Eco
- hereby offers". It's the third paragraph of the
- 13 letter. It's not numbered.
- 14 MS. ROBERTS: Yeah. Sorry. We're looking
- at the numbered paragraphs. Okay, that's why we're
- 16 lost. Okay.
- 17 O MS. PAPLAWSKI: Okay.
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 0 1303-16983?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 O And can you confirm, Ms. Edwards, that that was the
- action number of the ADT litigation that we discussed
- earlier and that I requested you take a note of?
- 24 A Can I just wait one second before I answer that?
- 25 Q Of course. Feel free to refer back to the extent you
- need.
- 27 MS. ROBERTS: The witness -- it's in her

- 1 affidavit. The statement of claim I believe was what
- 2 you referenced --
- 3 MS. PAPLAWSKI: Yeah.
- 4 MS. ROBERTS: -- for her; right?
- 5 MS. PAPLAWSKI: That's right. Exhibit 6.
- 6 A Yeah. Yes.
- 7 Q MS. PAPLAWSKI: That's the ADT action?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q And if you go to page 3 of 4 of the standstill
- 10 agreement.
- 11 A Uh-huh.
- 12 Q You'll see Mark Heck and Dentons Canada LLP are party
- to this letter agreement?
- 14 A Yeah.
- 15 Q Which references the ADT action; correct?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q Okay. Let's go back to paragraph 8(a) of your
- 18 affidavit. So you refer in paragraph 8(a) to a
- 19 carve-out from the receivership order.
- 20 Do you see that?
- 21 A Yeah.
- 22 Q And did you review the receivership order before
- 23 swearing your affidavit?
- 24 A No.
- 25 Q So you don't know whether there are or are not
- 26 carve-outs for litigations within the receivership
- 27 order?

1 Α No. 2 Now, in the last sentence of paragraph 8(a) you 0 Okav. 3 state: (as read) 4 ... as was done with other litigation claims in favour of Mr. White or the Dan White 5 Family Trust. 6 7 Do you see that? 8 Α Yeah. And you'll agree with me, Ms. Edwards, that the ADT 9 action is not in favour of Mr. White or the Dan White 10 Family Trust; correct? Eco-Industrial Business Park is 11 12 the only plaintiff in the action? I don't understand. 13 Α 14 We need to refer back to Exhibit 6, to the extent 15 necessary. 16 The witness has said she MS. ROBERTS: 17 doesn't understand. You can walk her through to have 18 her acknowledge what's on the page, but I don't see 19 what that is, Ms. Paplawski: 20 (as read) "MS. PAPLAWSKI: Well, this is the witness's 21 information and that she swore and she 22 believes to be accurate. 23 She swore that I informed her 24 MS. ROBERTS: 25 and she believed that in a telephone conversation those 26 were Mr. Payne's words. 27 MS. PAPLAWSKI: Well, she swore that you

- 1 advised her that Mr. Payne advised you of certain of
- 2 facts, let's --
- 3 MS. ROBERTS: Correct. Correct.
- 4 Q MS. PAPLAWSKI: And so when you say,
- 5 Ms. Edwards, "as was done with other litigation claims
- in favour of Mr. White or the Dan White Family Trust",
- 7 you have no -- or do you have any information whether
- 8 or not the ADT action was in fact in favour of
- 9 Mr. White or the Dan White Family Trust?
- 10 A Sorry. Can you repeat the question?
- 11 Q Sure. Do you have any information that the ADT action
- was in favour of Mr. White or the Dan White Family
- 13 Trust?
- 14 A No. I don't have any information regarding that.
- 15 Q And can you confirm -- and feel free to look at
- 16 Exhibit 6 to your affidavit -- that the only plaintiff
- 17 to the ADT action is Eco-Industrial Business Park Inc.?
- 18 A That's what I see in Exhibit 6.
- 19 O So Mr. White is not listed as a party; correct?
- 20 A Correct.
- 21 Q And the Dan White Family Trust is not listed as a
- 22 party?
- 23 A Correct.
- 24 Q Okay. Now, is it your understanding, Ms. Edwards, that
- 25 the assignment agreements relating to the ADT action in
- the Dentons claim were executed before the receivership
- 27 order?

- 1 A I don't have any knowledge of that.
- 2 Q And so do you have any information why counsel for Eco
- 3 would seek to negotiate what you call a "carve-out"
- 4 from the receivership order if the ADT action in the
- 5 Dentons claim were already owned by Symmetry? Do you
- 6 have any information?
- 7 A No information.
- 8 Q Okay. I'm going to put an email on the screen. I'll
- 9 just share my screen. Bear with me for one moment.
- 10 A Of course. And let me just know -- let me know when
- 11 you can see an email from Mr. Van de Mosselaer to
- 12 Ms. Roberts dated October 6, 2022.
- 13 MS. ROBERTS: Are you able to make it
- 14 bigger? It's, like, super tiny on our end.
- 15 MS. PAPLAWSKI: I don't believe so.
- 16 A It's okay. We have it here.
- 17 MS. ROBERTS: Is this the one that you sent?
- 18 A Correct.
- 19 MS. ROBERTS: Okay. We have a paper copy.
- 20 Why don't we use that?
- 21 MS. PAPLAWSKI: Sure.
- 22 MS. ROBERTS: The screen copy is really
- 23 difficult to read.
- 24 Q MS. PAPLAWSKI: And so do you have a copy in
- front of you, then, Ms. Edwards, of the email from
- Mr. Van de Mosselaer to Ms. Roberts dated October 6,
- 27 2022?

1	А	Correct.		
2	Q	And if you look at the ccs, you'll see Haven Eboni		
3		Edwards?		
4	А	Yeah.		
5	Q	Do you see that?		
6		And is that your email, Ms. Edwards,		
7		haveneboni@robertsokelly.com?		
8	A	Yeah, that's my email.		
9	Q	And so you received this email on or about December 6,		
10		2022?		
11	A	I probably received it, but I probably did not read it.		
12		MS. PAPLAWSKI: Okay. I'd like to mark this		
13		email as Exhibit 1		
14		MS. ROBERTS: Sure.		
15		MS. PAPLAWSKI: to the transcript, please.		
16		EXHIBIT 1 - Email from Mr. Van de Mosselaer		
17		to Ms. Roberts dated October 6, 2022		
18		MS. PAPLAWSKI: Okay. So let me just unshare		
19		my screen.		
20		Okay. Those are all my questions.		
21		MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.		
22		MS. PAPLAWSKI: Thank you very much.		
23		(WHICH WAS ALL THE EVIDENCE TAKEN AT 10:33 AM)		
24				
25				
26				
27				

1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT:
_	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT.
2	
3	I, Claire Forster, certify that the foregoing
4	pages are a complete and accurate transcript of the
5	Proceedings conducted in accordance with the Alberta
6	Protocol for Remote Questioning, taken down by me in
7	shorthand and transcribed from my shorthand notes to
8	the best of my skill and ability.
9	Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta,
10	this 19th day of December 2022.
11	
12	
13	
14	Cm Forster
15	Claire Forster, CSR(A)
16	Official Court Reporter
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

1	EXHIBITS ENTERED IN THE QUESTIONING OF
2	HAVEN EBONI EDWARDS
3	DECEMBER 19, 2022
4	DECEMBER 19, 2022
5	PAGE NUMBER:
6	FAGE NOMBER.
7	EXHIBIT 1 - Email from Mr. Van de Mosselaer to 29
8	Ms. Roberts dated October 6, 2022
9	Ms. Roberts dated october 0, 2022
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
24	
25	
26	
27	

	32
1	OBJECTIONS ENTERED IN THE QUESTIONING OF
2	HAVEN EBONI EDWARDS
3	DECEMBER 19, 2022
4	
5	
6	PAGE NUMBER:
7	
8	(OBJECTION) 5
9	(OBJECTION) 15
10	(OBJECTION) 15
11	(OBJECTION) 17
12	(OBJECTION) 20
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

	2018 6:15,21,24	20 20:12	ADT/	assigned 9:16,19
Exhibits	2021 8:3 9:15		DENTONS 14:12	14:14
Exhibit 1 -	2022 4:7 11:5,22 12:17 13:13,27	7	advise 10:14	assignment 27:25
Email to Sharo	18:9 19:1 21:5	7 11:3	12:22	assistant 4:23
n Roberts -	22:1,24 28:12,27		advised 5:10 7:5,	assume 21:24
October 6 2022	29:10,17 30:10	8	18,19 8:27 9:1	attach 11:2
29:16 31:7	31:3,8 32:3		10:11 15:16	attached 19:16
	23rd 11:22	8 11:2,13 15:1 16:3,9,12 18:5	21:26 22:4,6,22 27:1	attaching 15:2
	24 12:17 13:13 18:9	19:17 20:27 22:5,	advises 12:3 14:2	attention 12:6
(a) 5:6,13,14 21:4,	24-2806171 4:7	7,14	19:3	August 22:24
19,22	25th 13:27 19:1	8(a) 25:17,18	affidavit 4:5,9,	author 20:5
(b) 5:7 6:11,18	29 31:7	26:2	14,18 5:1,18 11:2	aware 7:10 8:21,
7:7 21:15,19,23	2nd 4:7	8(g) 18:24	15:2 16:6,13	23,24 23:17
22:17			17:22 18:24 19:17,23 20:21,	awareness 12:9
(c) 5:7	3	9	24 22:23 23:10,	
(d) 5:7 7:24,27 8:14		9:57 3:8	20 25:1,18,23	B
(e) 5:7	3 4:13 23:23,25	7.31 3.0	27:16	back 6:9,10 15:20
(f) 5:7 9:24 10:12,	24:1,9 25:9	A	affirmation 4:2	18:5 20:12 24:25
15,17,20,25	31 13:24 18:26		affirmed 3:9,26	25:17 26:14
15:25 16:5	32 13:10,11 18:5	ability 30:8	4:19	ballpark 8:7
(g) 5:7 17:24	33 11:16,20 12:14	Absolute 14:7	agree 9:15 19:16, 19 26:9	basis 15:9
	34 11:14,25	accordance 30:5	agreement 8:5	Bear 28:9
1	4	accurate 4:19	23:13,18,23 24:1	behalf 14:6
1 24:7,10 29:13,		8:13 16:7,19,25	25:10,13	belief 7:21 16:6, 19 17:10
16 31:7	4 22:24 25:9	17:5,14,16 21:18 26:23 30:4	agreements	believed 26:25
100 5:16		acknowledge	27:25	believes 26:23
10:33 29:23	5	26:18	Alberta 4:5,6	Bench 4:6 23:26
1303-16983 6:5	5 22.9	acting 21:7	21:8 23:26 30:5,9	bigger 28:14
23:26 24:19	5 32:8	action 4:6 14:10	alleged 8:8 22:14 amended 5:17	binding 4:2
15 32:9,10	6	23:26 24:22 25:7,	amended 5:17 amendment 6:12	body 11:26
17 32:11		15 26:10,12 27:8,	7:19	bottom 11:16,20
18 14:5,13	6 5:1,2,18 6:10	11,17,25 28:4 addressing 12:20	amendments	boxes 14:5,13
19 31:3 32:3	15:21 16:22	ADT 5:17,21,26	7:2,6	brought 6:13
19th 30:10	20:19 25:5 26:14	6:1,16 12:8,25	application 6:13,	Business 26:11
	27:16,18 28:12, 26 29:9,17 31:8	17:27 21:10,17	27	27:17
2	6(d) 8:18,27	22:19 24:22 25:7,	appointment	businesses 21:8
2 19:3,20,22 24:6	23:10	15 26:9 27:8,11,	14:16	
20 32:12	6(f) 15:21 16:6,	17,25 28:4	approximately 14:4	
	13,14,19 17:16,		14.4	

	concerns 19:8	22:15 28:2	27:26 28:5	28:25 29:3,6 31:2
	conducted 14:8	Court 3:11,15	destroyed 18:18	32:2
	30:5	4:6 6:5 12:11	details 7:10	email 11:17,20,26
Calgary 30:9	conducting 3:19	20:3,10 23:25	difficult 28:23	12:5,18,21,26
call 7:8 10:16,19	confirm 3:26	30:16		13:24 15:17
11:3 28:3	16:5,19 24:21	cross-	directing 23:27	19:14,21,22
Canada 21:6	27:15	examination	directly 12:2	20:23 28:8,11,25
25:12	confirmation	3:20 12:5	disagree 12:21	29:6,8,9,13,16
capacity 6:15	15:5	Cross-examined	disclose 13:1,22	31:7
carve-out 21:10	confused 23:27	3:9	14:26	emailed 18:8
25:19 28:3	24:4	CSR(A) 30:15	disclosed 12:10,	emails 11:5 13:9
carve-outs 25:26	conscience 4:2	Curiously 12:10	27 14:27	end 28:14
ccs 29:2		cursory 14:7	discussed 8:12	ensure 14:8
	contemplated 8:7	cursory 14.7	24:22	entered 8:6 23:14
CERTIFICATE 30:1			discussions 9:2	31:1 32:1
	contested 6:13, 26	D	10:1 15:6 16:1,16	entire 13:17
certify 30:3		damages 5:15	22:10	evidence 15:11
chain 11:17	conversation 7:10,22 16:23	8:8	document 5:22	18:17 29:23
13:24	17:11 21:4,27	Dan 21:14 26:5,	23:4 24:3	exception 14:24
City 30:9	26:25	10 27:6,9,12,21	dog 7:25	exchanged 11:5
claim 5:15,20 6:5	conversations	date 12:17	Duemler 18:19	_
7:3,6 8:9 9:2,5,	22:14	dated 11:22		exclude 21:11
15,18 14:12 25:1 27:26 28:5	conveyed 21:19,	18:27 28:12,26	E	executed 27:26
	23	29:17 30:9 31:8		exhibit 5:18 11:2,
claimed 21:16 22:18	copied 11:21	David 7:26 23:11	E-B-O-N-I 3:13	13 13:25 15:1
	copies 11:3 13:21	Davis 24:6,7	E-D-W-A-R-D-S	16:3,9,12 18:5 19:17 23:2,20
claims 14:14,17, 19 21:13 26:4	17:26 18:15	day 13:13,26	3:14	25:5 26:14 27:16,
27:5	copy 4:9 5:20	30:10	earlier 24:23	18 29:13,16 31:7
Claire 30:3,15	22:25,26 28:19,	de 11:8,21 12:1,3,	Eboni 3:9,13	EXHIBITS 31:1
clarify 24:5	22,24	15,16 13:13,25	4:15 29:2 31:2	expect 14:18
· ·	correct 3:27 4:1,	14:2 15:4,11,12,	32:2	extent 20:23,24
clarifying 19:14	3,7,24,25 5:11	16 18:8,14,27	Eco 5:16,21,25	24:25 26:14
clear 14:17	6:17,20,22,23,25	19:3 20:16 28:11,	6:1,16,24 7:11	21.23 20.17
client 12:9	7:1,3,4,12,23	26 29:16 31:7	8:5 9:11,19 14:7	
COMMENCED	8:18,19 9:11,16	December 4:7	21:7 23:13 24:11	F
3:8	10:4 19:17 22:12,	29:9 30:10 31:3	28:2	face 19:7
communicated	16 23:20 25:15	32:3	Eco-industrial	fact 9:27 14:14
10:18,21	26:11 27:3,19,20,	defined 5:25	26:11 27:17	15:27 27:8
communication	23 28:18 29:1	delivered 10:2	Edwards 3:9,13,	facts 27:2
15:14	counsel 5:3 6:15,	16:1,17	16,26 4:15,22 6:17 9:4 15:1	failed 14:26
communications	21,24 7:11 8:4	Dentons 8:4,5	16:3 17:5,15,17	
13:19 14:22	9:11,19,27 10:2, 3,8 11:7,9 14:16	9:2,5,8,16 21:6,9,	19:13,19 20:15	fair 22:3
complete 30:4	15:23,27 16:2,17	16 22:15,18	21:18 23:7 24:21	Family 21:14
	18:1 19:23 21:6	23:14 25:12	26:9 27:5,24	26:6,11 27:6,9,
	I	I	1	I

12,21	Hoskin 10:4		9:3 28:13	27 18:9 19:1 21:5
favour 21:13	Hoskins 11:9	K	makes 18:13	22:1
26:5,10 27:6,8,12	hundred 21:24		manager 9:26	number 4:7 6:5,8
feel 19:21 24:25	Hustwick 6:14	King's 4:6	mark 25:12	11:22 23:26 24:9,
27:15	13:18 14:5	knew 16:23	29:12	22 31:5 32:6
file 6:5,8 10:2		knowledge 9:7,9	materials 12:11	numbered 24:13,
13:17 16:1,17	I	10:6,18,20 13:4,6	13:17	15
filed 5:20 9:5,8		19:15 22:10 28:1	matters 14:6,8	numerous 14:6
files 14:11,18	idea 12:22	Kroeger 22:24	17:27	
flip 12:14 13:8	immediately	Kroeger's 23:20	million 5:16	0
foregoing 13:23	12:17		misunderstandi	O'KELLY 4:23
30:3	include 20:20	L	ng 16:8	11:6
Forgive 12:1	included 13:19	loto 11.5	MNP 9:26 10:2,3,	objecting 17:8
Forster 30:3,15	14:13	late 11:5	8 11:10 15:27	20:6
forward 12:14	increased 5:15	Law 4:23 11:7	16:2,17 17:27	Objection 5:24
13:8 18:26	independent	lawsuit 12:8,25	moment 13:6	15:7,8,19 17:13
free 19:21 24:25	17:2 22:10,13	lawyer 4:26 21:16 22:18	20:18 28:9	20:7 32:8,9,10,
27:15	INDISCERNIB		morning 3:16,17,	11,12
front 4:9 11:15	LE 17:3 20:2	lead-in 5:2 15:22	27	OBJECTIONS
22:25 28:25	information	legal 4:23	Mosselaer 11:8,	32:1
full 3:12	6:17 8:13 9:22	letter 24:6,8,13	21 12:1,3,16 13:13 14:2 15:12,	occurred 6:12
	10:11,14,17,20, 23,24,27 11:1	25:13	16 18:8,14 19:3	10:1,22 16:1,16
G	13:1 14:11,21,27	limited 17:2	28:11,26 29:16	October 28:12,
15 10	15:5 16:21 17:15,	listed 27:19,21	31:7	26 29:17 31:8
give 15:10	16,19,20 20:20,	litigation 5:17,21	Mosselaer's	offer 11:1
glitches 3:21	24,25 21:18,22	6:2,15,16 9:6 14:6 17:27 21:11,	12:15 13:25 15:4,	offers 24:12
Good 3:16,17	22:4,5,6,13 23:22	13,17 22:19	11 18:27 20:16	office 10:3 13:16
	26:22 27:7,11,14	24:22 26:4 27:5		Official 30:16
Н	28:2,6,7	litigations 25:26	N	ongoing 14:6,10
H-A-V-E-N 3:13	informed 5:3 8:2,17 9:26	LLP 6:14 11:9		order 21:9 25:19,
Harcourt 10:4	15:23,26 16:22	21:7 25:12	nature 12:24	22,27 27:27 28:4
11:9	17:10,12 20:19	looked 23:21	needed 14:9	original 8:8
Haven 3:9,13	21:2 26:24	lost 24:16	negotiate 28:3	Osler 10:4,8 11:9
4:15 29:2 31:2	intended 14:17		negotiated 21:10	15:5
32:2	invoices 17:26	M	negotiating 9:19	OVERLAPPIN
haveneboni@	18:16 19:6		negotiations 8:3	G 17:3 20:2
robertsokelly.	involved 6:26	M-HM 5:19	12:7,24 13:4	overtop 20:4
com 29:7	7:1,2 9:6	16:10 19:2 22:2	note 6:8 24:23	owned 28:5
hear 3:22	involvement	23:12	noted 7:6 10:24	
Heck 25:12	17:3	made 5:11 7:3	notes 30:7	P
historic 18:17		14:16	November 11:5,	20.4
		make 5:26 6:8	22 12:17 13:13,	pages 30:4
	I	I	I	I

paper 14:5 28:19 Paplawski 3:10, 16 5:23,25 6:1 7:26,27 15:9,13, 15,18,20 16:20, 25,27 17:5,7,14 19:26,27 20:9,11, 12,15 23:1,4 24:5,7,11,17 25:3,5,7 26:19,27 27:4 28:15.21.24 29:12,15,18,22 **PAPLAWSKI: WELL** 26:21 paragraph 5:1.2 6:10 8:12 10:24 11:3 12:2,18 13:14 15:21.22 16:5,6,13,19,22 18:9,24 19:3,20, 22 20:19,27 21:15 22:5,7 23:10,23,25 24:1, 11,12 25:17,18 26:2 paragraphs 15:16 22:14 24:15 Pardon 8:22 Park 26:11 27:17 **part** 9:6 **party** 25:12 27:19,22

Payne 6:14 7:8, 11,18 8:2,17 9:1, 10,26 10:6,14,18 13:18 14:5 15:26 16:23 17:11,12 21:5,23,26,27 22:4,11,14 27:1

Payne's 26:26 people 11:22 percent 21:24 Perfect 4:12 8:26

17:23

personal 10:5 plaintiff 26:12 27:16 pleadings 5:16 13:21 **point** 20:16 **points** 12:20 prepared 13:22 18:10,15 presume 4:15 **prior** 4:18 privilege 19:8 **privy** 7:22 10:16, 22,24 proceeding 5:4 11:8.10 proceedings 3:8 30:5 **Protocol** 30:6 provide 18:15 provided 14:19 **Province** 30:9 pursuant 8:4 **pursue** 14:17 **pursuing** 8:3 9:1 **put** 3:18 17:22

O

28:8

qualifications
12:7,25 13:5
quantification
13:20 14:23
quantum 8:6
Queen's 23:25
question 12:8,26
15:14 16:8 17:8
27:10
Questioning
30:6 31:1 32:1
questions 4:5
29:20

R

Randal 11:8,21

read 5:2.14 6:11

12:3.19 13:15

8:1 9:25 11:4.27

14:3 15:22 16:15

17:25 18:14 19:4

20:9,11 21:1,15

22:17,27 26:3,20

raises 19:7

28:23 29:11 **reasons** 7:5,18,20 receive 14:4 20:20 received 13:16 29:9.11 receiver 9:26 14:4 receiver's 14:15 receivermanager 15:26 receiver/trustee 14:10,20,26 receivership 21:9,12 25:19,22, 26 27:26 28:4 recently 12:5 **record** 3:12,19 **records** 18:17 **refer** 5:21 10:8 22:23 23:13 24:25 25:18 26:14 referenced 12:26 25:2 references 25:15 referring 12:23 13:3 18:23 **refuse** 19:23 refused 18:2 20:17

relating 27:25 Remote 30:6 removed 18:18 rendered 18:16 19:6 repeat 3:22 27:10 replies 13:14 **Reporter** 3:11,15 20:3 30:16 request 18:1,14, 23 19:6,7,9,14,24 20:17 requested 17:26 24:23 requesting 12:4 requests 18:13 respond 19:9 responded 19:14 respondent 11:7 response 12:15 13:12,26 18:27 20:17 result 6:12 **review** 13:9 14:7 15:1 19:21 25:22 reviewed 4:18 15:13 16:3,9,11, 12 **Roberts** 4:23 5:3, 10,22 6:19,21,24, 26 7:5,8,18,19,25 8:2,14,17,27 10:11,14,19,21, 23 11:6,21 12:3, 16,18 13:14,26 14:2 15:7,10,17, 23 16:20,27 17:7, 17,21,26 18:8,13, 27 19:13,25 20:5, 8,13,14,19 21:2, 20 22:5,6,9,11, 22,26 23:3 24:2,

related 14:11.18.

21

9,14,27 25:4
26:16,24 27:3
28:12,13,17,19,
22,26 29:14,17,
21 31:8

Roberts' 13:12
21:22

Roderick 6:14

Romspen's
18:19

S

screen 28:8.9.22 29:19 seek 28:3 sentence 26:2 services 18:16 19:6 **set** 13:17 settlement 8:3.6 9:1,20 10:1 13:19,20 14:22, 23 15:6,27 16:16 **share** 28:9 **Sharon** 5:3 11:6. 21 12:16 15:23 shorthand 30:7 signature 4:14. 16 significant 14:24 similar 8:12 **simple** 15:14 **simply** 12:27 **skill** 30:8 **sort** 13:7 **source** 16:21 17:9,19 **SPEAKERS** 17:4 20:2 **spell** 3:11 standstill 8:5 23:13,17,23 24:1

25:9	Symmetry's	understanding	
start 5:1,13	14:16	7:17 9:13 10:5,7,	
11:14,16,17	1.110	9 27:24	
15:21		understood	
starting 16:14		13:16 15:4,15	
starts 11:27	talking 5:26 9:3	16:11	
18:10 24:11	20:4	unshare 29:18	
state 3:11 6:11	technological	urgent 14:9	
7:27 26:3	3:21		
stated 8:17,27	telephone 10:19	\mathbf{V}	
10:12,15 21:5	21:4,27 26:25		
statement 5:20	thing 5:27 9:3	Van 11:8,21 12:1,	
6:4,18 7:3,6 8:9,	things 17:2,9	3,15,16 13:13,25 14:2 15:4,11,12,	
14 9:5 16:4 25:1	thinly 14:25	16 18:8,13,14,27	
statements 5:10	time 7:12 9:10	19:3 20:16 28:11,	
states 9:24 12:19	tiny 28:14	26 29:16 31:7	
22:17	today 6:9 22:22	veiled 14:25	
steps 14:9 16:5,9, 18 17:1	told 6:19 8:15	Victor 22:24	
subjected 21:8	17:8,9,17,21 22:9		
subparagraph	top 6:4	\mathbf{W}	
5:13,14 6:11,18	transcribed 30:7		
7:7 8:14 10:12,	transcript 29:15	wait 24:24	
15,17,20,25	30:1,4	walk 26:17	
15:25 21:22	true 16:4	White 21:13,14	
22:17	Trust 21:14 26:6,	26:5,10 27:6,9,	
subparagraphs	11 27:6,9,13,21	12,19,21	
5:6,11 21:19	trustee 12:22,27	withheld 18:18	
substance 11:26	truth 3:27	witness's 26:21	
suggest 14:11	turn 4:13 11:25	witnesses 18:19	
suggested 14:24	13:24 18:5,26	words 26:26	
suggestion 14:25	typing 4:15		
super 28:14	ypings	Y	
swear 19:23	U	year 14:15	
swearing 4:18		Jui 17.13	
25:23	Uh-huh 25:11	Z	
swore 4:5 16:4,	unable 19:8		
12,13 26:22,24, 27	unaware 12:23	Zarafshani	
sworn 22:24	21:16 22:18	18:20	
Symmetry 5:4	unclear 19:5	Zoom 3:20	
6:21 9:16,19	understand 4:4,		
14:15 15:24 28:5	22 7:11 9:4,10		
	15:12 26:13,17		