

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO.: CACE 15-000072

EDWARDS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs / Counterclaim Defendants,

v.

DERSHOWITZ,

Defendant / Counterclaim Plaintiff.

**DEFENDANT / COUNTERCLAIM PLAINTIFF ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ'S
OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS'
REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION TO DEFENDANT (PUNITIVE DAMAGES)**

Defendant / Counterclaim Plaintiff Alan M. Dershowitz ("Defendant") submits the following objections and responses to the Request for Production to Defendant (Punitive Damages) ("Document Request") propounded by Plaintiffs / Counterclaim Defendants Bradley J. Edwards and Paul G. Cassell ("Plaintiffs").

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

These responses and objections reflect the current state of Defendant's knowledge regarding the matters discussed herein. Defendant has not completed his discovery or trial preparation in this matter. Accordingly, Defendant reserves the right to revise, correct, clarify, supplement, or amend his objections and responses to reflect information hereafter discovered or acquired. These responses and objections are provided without prejudice to the rights of Defendant to use or rely upon subsequently discovered information or documents at any time, including at trial. The fact that a Document Request has been complied with in part shall not be construed as a waiver of all or any part of any objection that Defendant might or could make to

any Document Request propounded by Plaintiffs. Defendant further reserves the right to object to the admission in evidence of any and all information made available in response to the Document Request on any ground, including, but not limited to, the ground that it is irrelevant and immaterial to the issues in this action.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST

1. Please produce all Financial Statements prepared for or submitted to any Lender or Investor for the past three (3) years by you personally or on your behalf or on behalf of any entity in which you hold a controlling interest.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the

subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

2. Please product the W-2’s and any other documents reflecting any income (including salary, bonuses, dividends, profit distributions, royalties, advances, and any other

form of income), including all gross and net revenue received by you directly or indirectly for the past three (3) years.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata" and "inventories and rosters of your information

technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the term “indirectly” as vague and ambiguous as used in the context of this Document Request. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

3. All tax returns filed with any taxing entity during the past three (3) years by you or on your behalf, or on behalf of any entity in which you hold or held a controlling interest at the time of filing.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages.

Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata" and "inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols" as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of "Defendant" and

“You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

4. All bank statements or other financial statements which were prepared by you, on your behalf or by or on behalf of any entity in which you had an ownership interest of 10% or more at any time during the past three (3) years.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that

any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege

log unless and until Plaintiffs' produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the "instruction" purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' "Continuing Request" as inconsistent with Plaintiffs' position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

5. All financial statements which were prepared by you or on your behalf, or by or on behalf of any entity in which you held an ownership interest of 10% or more at any time during the past three (3) years.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the

subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

6. The deeds and titles to all real property owned by you or held on your behalf either directly or indirectly at any time during the past three (3) years.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata" and "inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network

drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the phrase “held on your behalf” as vague and ambiguous as used in the context of this Document Request. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

7. All passbooks with respect to all savings accounts, checking accounts and savings and loan association share accounts owned by you or on which you hold a right or have a held a right to withdraw funds at any time during the past three (3) years.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive

damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata" and "inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols" as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of "Defendant" and "You." Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant's

attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

8. All passbooks with respect to all savings accounts, checking accounts and savings loan association share accounts, owned by you in whole or in part jointly as co-owner, partner, or joint venturer, in any business enterprise, or owned by an entity in which you have or have had a controlling interest at any time during the past three (3) years.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the

extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the

“instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

9. The bank ledger sheets in your possession, or accessible by you on the internet or otherwise, with respect to all bank accounts in which you have a right to withdraw funds, reflecting the highest balance in said accounts for each month during the 365 days preceding your receipt of this Request.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the

subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

10. The bank ledger sheets in your possession, or accessible by you on the internet or otherwise, with respect to all bank accounts owned by you solely, or jointly as co-owner, partner,

or joint venturer, in any business enterprise, or any entity in which you have or have had a controlling interest at any time during the past three (3) years, reflecting the highest balance in said accounts for each month during the 365 days preceding your receipt of this Request.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as

application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

11. All checkbooks for all accounts on which you were authorized to withdraw funds for the past three (3) years.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a

relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata" and "inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols" as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of "Defendant" and "You." Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant's attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal

documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

12. All corporate securities (stocks or bonds) owned by you, directly or indirectly.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to

lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks intangible items and as an improper Interrogatory misstated as a Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant

objects to Plaintiffs' "Continuing Request" as inconsistent with Plaintiffs' position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

13. The latest available balance sheets and other financial statements with respect to any and all business enterprises of whatever nature in which you possess any ownership interest of 10% or more, whether as partner, joint venturer, stockholder, or otherwise.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of

things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

14. Your accounts receivable ledger or other records which set forth the names and addresses of all persons or business enterprises that are indebted to you and the amounts and terms of such indebtedness.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages.

Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata" and "inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols" as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of "Defendant" and

“You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

15. Copies of the partnership or corporate Income Tax Returns for any partnership or corporation in which you do possess or have possessed any ownership interest of 10% or more whether as partner, joint venturer, stockholder or otherwise, for the last three (3) years.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the

extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the

“instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

16. The title certificates, registration certificates, bills of sale, and other evidences of ownership possessed by you or held for your beneficial interest with respect to any of the following described property owned by you or held directly or indirectly for your beneficial interest:

- a. Motor vehicles of any type;
- b. Commercial, business or construction equipment of any type; and
- c. Boats, launches, cruisers, planes, or other vessels of any type.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal

financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the phrase “held for your beneficial interest” as vague and ambiguous in the context of this Document Request. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant

objects to Plaintiffs' "Continuing Request" as inconsistent with Plaintiffs' position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

17. All records pertaining to the transfer of any money or property interests or financial interests made by you in the past three (3) years.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant

objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

18. Any and all memoranda and/or bills evidencing the amount and terms of all of your current debts and obligations.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive

damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata" and "inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols" as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of "Defendant" and "You." Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant's

attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

19. All records indicating any and all income and benefits received by you from any and all sources for the past three (3) years.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to

lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the term “benefits” as used in this Document Request as vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in

which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' "Continuing Request" as inconsistent with Plaintiffs' position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

20. Copies of any and all brokerage account statements or securities owned by you individually, jointly with any person or entity or as trustee, guardian or custodian, for the past three (3) years, including in such records date of purchase and amounts paid for such securities, and certificates of any such securities.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome.

Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

21. All records pertaining to the acquisition, transfer and sale of all securities by you or on your behalf for the past three (3) years, such records to include any and all information relative to gains or losses realized from transactions involving such securities.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata" and "inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data

storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the time frame stated within this Document Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

22. All policies of insurance having any such cash value, which policies you or any entity controlled by you is the owner or beneficiary.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery

of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to this Document Request as duplicative of other requests for documents served by Plaintiffs earlier in this action, to which Defendant has already produced responsive documents. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata" and "inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols" as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of "Defendant" and "You." Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant's attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the "instructions" to the extent that they purport to

impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' "instruction" purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs' produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the "instruction" purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' "Continuing Request" as inconsistent with Plaintiffs' position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

23. Copies of any and all trust agreements in which you are the settlor or beneficiary together with such documents necessary and sufficient to identify the nature and current value of the trust res.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal

financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

24. Copies of all royalty agreements that you have for any publications or books you have authored, in whole or in part, including (but not limited to) Letters to a Young Lawyer; Why Terrorism Works: Understanding the Threat, Responding to the Challenge; Shouting Fire: Civil Liberties in a Turbulent Age; America Declares Independence; America on Trial: Inside the Legal Battles That Transformed Our Nation; Rights From Wrongs: A Secular Theory of the Origins of Rights; Preemption: A Knife that Cuts Both Ways; Blasphemy: How the Religious Right is Hijacking the Declaration of Independence; Is There A Right to Remain Silent?: Coercive Interrogation and the Fifth Amendment After 9/11; The Case Against Israel's Enemies: Exposing Jimmy Carter and Others Who Stand in the Way of Peace; The Case For Moral Clarity: Israel, Hamas and Gaza; The Trials of Zion; Taking the Stand: My Life in the Law; Terror Tunnels: The Case for Israel's Just War Against Hamas; and Chutzpah.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the

extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

25. Copies of all attorney representation agreements providing for compensation to you of any type, including but not limited to any cases in which you have a contingency free agreement, and the value of the compensation that is provided in the agreement (or the projected possible value of the contingency to be earned).

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties' claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of "Documents" to the extent that it seeks "electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata" and "inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data

storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction” purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “Continuing Request” as inconsistent with Plaintiffs’ position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

26. Copies of the complaints in any lawsuits that you have filed in any court in which you seek damages or any other financial recovery.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Document Request as premature because Plaintiffs have not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of a claim for punitive damages. Defendant will move for summary judgment on the requesting parties’ claim for punitive damages. Defendant further objects to this Document Request because net worth is not a relevant subject matter and has no probative value until the trial court makes a determination that there is a reasonable evidentiary basis for recovery of punitive damages, which must be more than the mere assertion of an intentional act that, as a matter of law, potentially permits recovery of punitive damages. By responding to this Document Request, Defendant does not concede that

any document requested is relevant to this action or admissible at trial. Defendant objects to the extent that any documents that might be responsive to this Document Request are not relevant to any issues in dispute in this litigation and the Document Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to the production of personal financial information prematurely in this action and without appropriate additional confidentiality order. Defendant expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery on the subject matter of this Document Request. Defendant objects to this Document Request to the extent that it seeks documents generated since this action began as overly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks the production of things beyond the scope of Rule 1.280 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to the definition of “Documents” to the extent that it seeks “electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata” and “inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems – e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servicers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols” as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant objects to the definitions of “Defendant” and “You.” Defendant is an individual and has no officers or directors; moreover, Defendant’s attorneys, employees, and agents are not parties and therefore, seeking their own personal documents is improper. Defendant objects to the “instructions” to the extent that they purport to impose obligations on Defendant beyond those in the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ “instruction” purporting to require a privilege log unless and until Plaintiffs’ produce any privilege log, and further objects to the extent that the “instruction”

purports to require a privilege log with detail or in a format in which any privilege log that Plaintiffs ultimately may produce does not include. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' "Continuing Request" as inconsistent with Plaintiffs' position regarding the obligations of the parties in this action with respect to discovery responses.

Respectfully submitted,

Of Counsel:

Kenneth A. Sweder
SWEDER & ROSS, LLP
131 Oliver Street
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: 617-646-4460
Fax: 617-646-4470
[REDACTED]

/s/ Thomas E. Scott

Thomas E. Scott, Esq.

Florida Bar No. 149100
[REDACTED]

Steven R. Safra, Esq.

Florida Bar No. 057028
[REDACTED]

COLE, SCOTT & KISSANE, [REDACTED]

Dadeland Centre II, 14th Floor
9150 South Dadeland Boulevard
Miami, Florida 33156
Phone: (305) 350-5300
Fax: (305) 373-2294

Richard A. Simpson (pro hac vice)
[REDACTED]

Mary E. Borja (pro hac vice)
[REDACTED]

Ashley E. Eiler (pro hac vice)
[REDACTED]

Nicole A. Richardson (pro hac vice)
[REDACTED]

WILEY REIN LLP

1776 K Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006

Phone: (202) 719-7000

Fax: (202) 719-7049

Counsel for Alan M. Dershowitz

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been electronically filed through the Clerk of Broward County by using the Florida Courts eFiling Portal and thus served by electronic mail: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] to: **Jack Scarola, Esq.**, Searcy Denney Scarola Barnhart & Shipley, [REDACTED], Counsel for Plaintiff, 2139 Palm Beach Lakes Blvd., West Palm Beach, Florida 33409; jonijones@utah.gov to: **Joni J. Jones, Esq.**, Assistant Utah Attorney General, Counsel for Plaintiff Cassell, 160 East 300 South, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114; [REDACTED] to: **Bradley J. Edwards, Esq.**, Farmer, Jaffe et al, 425 North Andrews Avenue, Suite 2, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301; cassellp@law.utah.edu, to: **Paul G. Cassell, Esq.**; [REDACTED], [REDACTED] to: **Sigrid S. McCawley, Esq.**, Boies Schiller & Flexner, LLP, 401 E. Las Olas Blvd, Suite 1200, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301, this 29th day of December, 2015.

By: *s/Thomas E. Scott*
Thomas E. Scott
FBN: 149100
Steven R. Safra
FBN: 057028