

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE  
FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND  
FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 502009CA040800XXXXMBAG

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SCOTT ROTHSTEIN, individually,  
BRADLEY J. EDWARDS, individually, and  
L.M., individually,

Defendant,

---

**RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO EPSTEIN'S MOTION TO  
REOPEN DISCOVERY TO TAKE DEPOSITIONS**

Counter-Plaintiff, Bradley J. Edwards, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby files this Response in Oppositions to Jeffrey Epstein's Motion to Reopen Discovery to Take Depositions, and as grounds therefor states as follows:

**The Motion Fails to Meet the Court's Requirements to Reopen Discovery**

1. On November 27, 2017, the Court entered its Order on Motion to Reconfirm Existing Pre-Trial Deadlines<sup>1</sup>, in which the Court ruled that additional discovery will only be permitted if "the discovery requests are impacted by the Court's rulings on motions currently pending to be heard on November 29<sup>th</sup>, December 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>." At the hearing preceding the Order, the Court outlined the standard by which any such additional discovery requests would be considered:

So what I am going to do is this. Because there are issues that need to be addressed -- and I'm hoping I will have orders out as soon as possible after those hearings are done -- is that I am going to require motions to be filed

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the Court's Order is attached hereto as Exhibit 'A'.

on a discovery issue-by-discovery issue, deposition by deposition, so as to find out several things. One, is the need to take that deposition and whether that need has been either clarified or required by virtue of a court order that will be entered subsequently to the commencement of Wednesday's hearings and thereafter on those days that I provided. **If it cannot be demonstrated to the Court that these witnesses need to be taken solely as a result the Court's ruling, then those requests will be denied.** because, again, we were set to try the case next week.

\*\*\*

So 20 some-odd deposition, unless they can be proven and shown to the Court as being required as a result of the rulings of the Court, will not be entertained. **They should have been done before. And if not done before, I will need a reason for that as well.**

11/27/2017 Hearing Tr. at 12:11-25 and 13:1-6, 17-23.<sup>2</sup>

2. Thus, Epstein has the burden to establish that (a) the new depositions are required solely as a result of a recent Court ruling, and, if so, (2) that the depositions could not have been taken before. Epstein's motion clearly fails to meet either requirement, and therefore the motion should be denied.<sup>3</sup>

**A. Epstein Has Been Aware of the Relevance of the Testimony of These Witnesses for Years and Could Have Deposed Them Long Before the Discovery Cutoff.**

3. As an initial matter, L.M. was a named defendant in this lawsuit filed by Epstein. Allegations regarding L.M.'s role in the Ponzi scheme and her fabricated claim are replete

---

<sup>2</sup> Excerpts of the November 27, 2017 hearing transcript are attached as Exhibit 'B'.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps understanding the Motion's futility, Epstein spends the first four pages arguing about Edwards' damages and, incredibly, accusing Edwards of using L.M., E.W. and Jane Doe for his own personal gain. As Epstein is all too aware, the only person who has forced these victims to do anything against their will is Epstein, and the suggestion that these victims have by now "put behind them" the atrocious sexual misconduct committed against them by Epstein is yet another example of Epstein's indifference to the permanent damage he inflicted on his child victims.

throughout Epstein's Initial Complaint. Any suggestion that L.M.'s deposition is needed "solely" as a result of the Court's December 5, 2017 ruling is therefore absurd.

4. Jane Doe is also named repeatedly throughout Epstein's malicious and baseless Initial Complaint, and she was also alleged to be pursuing claims against Epstein that had "minimal" value. Edwards' first witness list, filed June 30, 2010, listed all named victims of Jeffrey Epstein as fact witnesses for trial, which of course included Jane Doe. As such, any argument that Jane Doe's deposition is needed "solely" as a result of a recent Court ruling is also absurd.

5. Rather, Epstein was obviously well-aware of the relevance of the testimony of L.M. and Jane Doe long before the Court's recent rulings. There is no need, however, to accept Edwards' argument to that effect. Rather, the Court need only consider the fact that in August 2017, **Epstein requested and received dates to take L.M. and Jane Doe's depositions in early October 2017 (before the discovery deadline)**. Epstein, however, voluntarily chose not to set either witness for deposition.

6. Thus, Epstein clearly fails to meet the first requirement enunciated by the Court, that the depositions be needed "solely" as a result of a recent ruling, and the Motion should be denied on those grounds alone.

**B. Epstein's Prior Counsel Failed to Set L.M. and Jane Doe's Depositions, Despite Requesting and Receiving Dates for Their Depositions in August 2017.**

7. The Motion should further be denied because, although Epstein could have taken these depositions months ago, he voluntarily chose not to so.

8. Specifically, on August 2, 2017, Epstein's prior counsel requested deposition dates for L.M. and Jane Doe (the email also sought the depositions of E.W. and [REDACTED]). That same day, undersigned counsel's office responded via email and stated that dates were available in early October, and to call to clear specific dates for these depositions.

9. On August 3, 2017, Edwards, as counsel for L.M., E.W. and Jane Doe, stated that he would accept service of subpoenas for his clients' depositions.

10. On August 14, 2017, after some back and forth email exchanges, Epstein's prior counsel instructed undersigned counsel's office to hold 10/5, 10/11 and 10/12 for depositions.

11. On August 16, 2017, Edwards confirmed that he would make L.M., E.W., and Jane Doe available on any date.

12. Epstein then set [REDACTED]'s deposition for 10/5 and E.W.'s deposition for 10/12. No depositions were set for 10/11.

13. On September 26, 2017, Epstein unilaterally cancelled the 10/5 deposition of [REDACTED] after Ms. Roberts had travelled to New York from Australia solely for purposes of sitting for the deposition.

14. Epstein failed to set L.M. and Jane Doe for deposition on 10/5, despite Edwards' notice that he could make them available on that date.

15. As such, no depositions were taken on 10/5

16. Epstein also failed to take any depositions on 10/11.

17. Instead, Epstein used only 10/12 to take the deposition of E.W.

18. Thus, when the Court asks Epstein's counsel for the reason why L.M. and Jane Doe's depositions have not been taken, the answer is quite simple: because Epstein chose not to take them.

**C. Epstein's Current Counsel Chose Not to Set Any Depositions Prior to the Close of Discovery.**

19. After Epstein's prior counsel failed to use either the 10/5 or 10/11 dates to take the depositions of L.M. and Jane Doe, his current counsel made efforts to set witness depositions prior to the November 24, 2017 discovery deadline.

20. Specifically, on November 13, 2017, Epstein's counsel requested deposition dates for a number of attorneys who had represented other Epstein victims.

21. Notably, however, Epstein's current counsel failed to request new deposition dates for either L.M. or Jane Doe.

22. On November 13, 2017, undersigned counsel's office advised Epstein's counsel that it was available for depositions each day, apart from Thanksgiving, until the discovery cutoff on November 24<sup>th</sup>. Thus, Epstein could have set depositions on 11/14, 11/15, 11/16, 11/17, 11/18, 11/19, 11/20, 11/21, 11/22, or 11/24.

23. Epstein failed to set any depositions, whether of the attorney witnesses or of L.M. and Jane Doe, on the dates given.

24. In total, Epstein therefore declined to use twelve (12) days provided by undersigned counsel to schedule the depositions of L.M. and Jane Doe prior to the discovery cut-off. As such, the only reason these witnesses have not been deposed, witnesses whose importance

Epstein has been aware of for years, is because Epstein affirmatively chose not to depose them. Epstein's current remorse over that litigation tactic certainly fails to meet the Court's requirements to reopen discovery, particularly on the eve of trial in this eight (8) year old case.

**Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, Epstein's Motion to Reopen Discovery should be denied.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was sent via E-Serve to all Counsel on the attached list, this 12<sup>th</sup> day of JANUARY, 2018.



---

JACK SCAROLA  
Florida Bar No.: 169440  
DAVID P. VITALE JR.  
Florida Bar No.: 115179  
Attorney E-Mail(s): jsx@searcylaw.com and  
mmccann@searcylaw.com  
Primary E-Mail: ScarolaTeam@searcylaw.com  
Searcy Denney Scarola Barnhart & Shipley, P.A.  
2139 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard  
West Palm Beach, Florida 33409  
Phone: (561) 686-6300  
Fax: (561) 383-9451  
Attorneys for Bradley J. Edwards

**COUNSEL LIST**

Bradley J. Edwards, Esquire  
staff.efile@pathtojustice.com  
425 N Andrews Avenue, Suite 2  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
Phone: (954)-524-2820  
Fax: (954)-524-2822

Jack A. Goldberger, Esquire  
jgoldberger@agwpa.com; smahoney@agwpa.com  
Atterbury Goldberger & Weiss, P.A.  
250 Australian Avenue S, Suite 1400  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Phone: (561)-659-8300  
Fax: (561)-835-8691  
Attorneys for Jeffrey Epstein

Nichole J. Segal, Esquire  
njs@FLAppellateLaw.com; kbt@FLAppellateLaw.com  
Burlington & Rockenbach, P.A.  
444 W Railroad Avenue, Suite 350  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Phone: (561)-721-0400  
Attorneys for Bradley J. Edwards

Scott J. Link, Esquire  
Eservice@linkrocklaw.com; Scott@linkrocklaw.com; Kara@linkrocklaw.com;  
Angela@linkrocklaw.com; Tanya@linkrocklaw.com; tina@linkrocklaw.com  
Link & Rockenbach, P.A.  
1555 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard  
Suite 301  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Phone: (561)-727-3600  
Fax: (561)-727-3601  
Attorneys for Jeffrey Epstein

Marc S. Nurik, Esquire  
marc@nuriklaw.com

Edwards adv. Epstein  
Case No.: 502009CA040800XXXXMBAG  
Response in Opposition to Epstein's Motion to Reopen Discovery  
Page 8 of 8

One E Broward Blvd., Suite 700  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
Phone: (954)-745-5849  
Fax: (954)-745-3556  
Attorneys for Scott Rothstein

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE  
FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND  
FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 502009CA040800XXXXMBAG

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

SCOTT ROTHSTEIN, individually,  
BRADLEY J. EDWARDS, individually, and  
L.M., individually,

Defendant(s).

ORDER ON MOTION TO RECONFIRM EXISTING PRETRIAL DEADLINES

AND RE PRETRIAL STIPULATION

THIS CAUSE having come to be considered upon Bradley J. Edwards' MOTION TO RECONFIRM EXISTING PRETRIAL DEADLINES, and the Court having reviewed the file and being fully advised in the premises, it is hereby,

ORDERED and ADJUDGED: *that the motion is granted to the*

*extent that wholesale additional discovery will not be permitted but individual discovery requests may be allowed on a*

DONE AND ORDERED at West Palm Beach, Palm Beach County, Florida, this 27

day of Nov., 2017.



DONALD HAFELE  
CIRCUIT JUDGE

*\* matter by matter basis and only if the discovery requests are impacted by the court's rulings on motions currently*

Copies have been furnished to all counsel on the attached counsel list.

*pending & to be heard on Nov. 29, Dec. 6 & 7, 17. Joint pre-trial stipulation shall be prepared and filed no later than Friday December 15, 17.*

Ex. A

Edwards adv. Epstein  
Case No.: 502009CA040800XXXXMBAG  
Order on Motion to Reconfirm Existing Pretrial Deadlines

COUNSEL LIST

Jack Scarola, Esquire  
\_scarolateam@searcylaw.com  
Searcy Denney Scarola Barnhart & Shipley PA  
2139 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard  
West Palm Beach, FL 33409  
Phone: (561) 686-6300  
Fax: 561-383-9451  
Attorneys for Bradley J. Edwards

Bradley J. Edwards, Esquire  
staff.efile@pathtojustice.com  
425 N Andrews Avenue, Suite 2  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
Phone: (954)-524-2820  
Fax: (954)-524-2822

Nichole J. Segal, Esquire  
njs@FLAppellateLaw.com; kbt@FLAppellateLaw.com  
Burlington & Rockenbach, P.A.  
444 W Railroad Avenue, Suite 350  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Phone: (561)-721-0400  
Attorneys for Bradley J. Edwards

Jack A. Goldberger, Esquire  
jgoldberger@agwpa.com; smahoney@agwpa.com  
Atterbury Goldberger & Weiss, P.A.  
250 Australian Avenue S, Suite 1400  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Phone: (561)-659-8300  
Fax: (561)-835-8691  
Attorneys for Jeffrey Epstein

Scott J. Link, Esquire  
Eservice@linkrocklaw.com; Scott@linkrocklaw.com; Kara@linkrocklaw.com;  
Angela@linkrocklaw.com; Tanya@linkrocklaw.com; tina@linkrocklaw.com

Edwards adv. Epstein  
Case No.: 502009CA040800XXXXMBAG  
Order on Motion to Reconfirm Existing Pretrial Deadlines

Link & Rockenbach, P.A.  
1555 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard  
Suite 301  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Phone: (561)-727-3600  
Fax: (561)-727-3601  
Attorneys for Jeffrey Epstein

Marc S. Nurik, Esquire  
marc@nuriklaw.com  
One E Broward Blvd., Suite 700  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
Phone: (954)-745-5849  
Fax: (954)-745-3556  
Attorneys for Scott Rothstein

<p style="text-align: right;">1</p> <p>IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA Case No. 502009CA0408000000MB</p> <p>JEFFREY EPSTEIN, Plaintiff, vs. SCOTT ROTHSTEIN, individually, BRADLEY EDWARDS, individually,  Defendants/Counter-Plaintiffs.</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>DATE TAKEN: Monday, November 27th, 2017 TIME: 9:01 a.m. - 9:27 a.m. PLACE: 205 N. Dixie Highway, Room 10C West Palm Beach, Florida BEFORE: Donald Hafele, Presiding Judge</p> <p>This cause came on to be heard at the time and place aforesaid, when and where the following proceedings were reported by:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sonja D. Hall Palm Beach Reporting Service, Inc. 1665 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard, Suite 1001 West Palm Beach, FL 33401 (561) 471-2995</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">3</p> <p>1 MS. ROCKENBACH: Good morning, Your 2 Honor. 3 MR. SCAROLA: Good morning. 4 THE COURT: Good morning. 5 Thank you for sending me the legal 6 issues that need to be addressed and the 7 anticipated amount of time that you are 8 going to need. I appreciate that. 9 This motion I have before me is to 10 reconfirm and Edwards' opposition to the 11 existing pretrial deadlines, which were set 12 in contemplation of the case going to trial 13 in December. 14 MR. SCAROLA: Almost, sir. 15 THE COURT: Pardon? 16 MR. SCAROLA: Almost. Your Honor has 17 it backwards. It is Mr. Edwards who is 18 seeking to reconfirm the deadline. 19 Mr. Epstein is objecting to that 20 reconfirmation. 21 THE COURT: My error. Sorry about 22 that. 23 MR. SCAROLA: That's all right. A 24 mistake that we all make repeatedly. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Edwards is seeking to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">2</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES: 2 For Plaintiff: 3 LINK &amp; ROCKENBACH, P.A. 4 1555 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard, Suite 301 5 West Palm Beach, FL 33401 6 By KARA BERARD ROCKENBACH, ESQUIRE 7 8 For Bradley Edwards: 9 SEARCY, DENNEY, SCAROLA, BARNHART &amp; 10 SHIPLEY, P.A. 11 2139 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard 12 West Palm Beach, FL 33409 13 By JACK SCAROLA, ESQUIRE 14 By DAVID P. VITALE, JR. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">4</p> <p>1 confirm or reconfirm the existing deadlines, 2 Mr. Epstein is objecting. Okay. 3 All right. So I guess the place to 4 start is from Mr. Edwards' standpoint as the 5 punitive plaintiff here. Is there any 6 discovery that's necessary from your 7 standpoint at this juncture? 8 MR. SCAROLA: No, sir. 9 THE COURT: Ms. Rockenbach? 10 MS. ROCKENBACH: Yes, Your Honor. If 11 you recall, your order that granted the 12 motion to continue sets forth in it -- which 13 is November 14th -- that both parties don't 14 know how the Court will ultimately rule on 15 critical issues, which will require counsel 16 to try to strategize and plan their 17 respective cases under extreme uncertainty 18 and duress. And that was a quote from your 19 order, which you correctly identified. 20 And as a result, Your Honor opened up 21 additional days on your calendar so that we 22 could hear those incredibly significant 23 dispositive legal motions that are pending. 24 We are going to be before the Court on 25 Wednesday, and then next week, on</p>

9

1 Keeping these deadlines in place,  
2 freezing this case in the position that it  
3 was in on the eve of trial and ready to be  
4 tried is the only way to prevent those kinds  
5 of last-minute delays.

6 There has been an avalanche of motions  
7 that have already been filed, but we have  
8 plenty of time now to dispose of those  
9 motions. And if there is a reasonable basis  
10 upon disposition of those motions for Your  
11 Honor to consider on a case-by-case basis --  
12 and that's the only way it should be done,  
13 an extension of a deadline or an exception  
14 to a deadline -- then Mr. Epstein, through  
15 his very able counsel, has every means by  
16 which to present those issues on a  
17 case-by-case basis to the Court. But the  
18 deadlines previously set should be enforced.

19 Thank you, Your Honor.

20 MS. ROCKENBACH: Your Honor, I want to  
21 try this case on March 13th.

22 THE COURT: We are going to try the  
23 case on March 13th.

24 MS. ROCKENBACH: There's no question  
25 that both parties are respecting this

10

1 Court's order on November 17th setting that  
2 specifically. But as Your Honor has  
3 identified, these critical issues have yet  
4 to be ruled on by this Court.

5 And Mr. Scarola makes my point in  
6 raising the three claimants that Mr. Edwards  
7 previously represented and settled their  
8 cases. That's a very significant issue that  
9 this court will rule on on Wednesday to  
10 determine whether their testimony is even  
11 relevant.

12 I see that we're getting a preview  
13 about the fabrication issues. But I look  
14 forward to Wednesday and discussing it with  
15 the court.

16 The attorneys that Mr. Scarola  
17 identifies as designated for years, they  
18 were not. They were fact witnesses and only  
19 recently identified as expert witnesses, so  
20 appropriate discovery was propounded and  
21 their depositions were requested.

22 The new expert that Mr. Edwards has  
23 listed -- brand-new expert -- is being  
24 deposed this Friday, which incidentally is  
25 past the discovery cut-off date. I think he

11

1 was in Europe and that was the date that was  
2 provided. He contradicts Mr. Edwards'  
3 answers to interrogatories about damages.

4 So this case -- there are no additional  
5 motions to be filed. Your Honor has them  
6 all, in addition to the responses. What we  
7 do need is to proceed in an orderly fashion  
8 and allow these deadlines to be reset in  
9 conformance with a standard pretrial order  
10 for a March 13th trial setting.

11 THE COURT: Thank you.

12 My intention was not to open the  
13 floodgates to allow wholesale discovery, as  
14 pointed out, and not -- it really wasn't so  
15 much the Court's schedule, but respective  
16 counsel's vacation schedules, which took up  
17 essentially a month of time where I wasn't  
18 able to set anything substantively during  
19 that period and had to thereafter wait.

20 Because there is time that opens up and  
21 I know -- or at least counsel that  
22 represented Mr. Epstein in the past -- they  
23 typically were amenable to setting things  
24 and getting hearings set if the Court had  
25 time open. Mr. Scarola and his office have

12

1 always been very accommodating in that  
2 regard.

3 So it was not with the anticipation  
4 that we are going to open the floodgates for  
5 discovery to essentially recommence.

6 Again, it's a 2009 case. I know the  
7 counterclaim was filed a little bit later  
8 than that, but it is an old case -- has an  
9 appellate history -- that needs to get tried  
10 in March.

11 So what I am going to do is this.  
12 Because there are issues that need to be  
13 addressed -- and I'm hoping I will have  
14 orders out as soon as possible after those  
15 hearings are done -- is that I am going to  
16 require motions to be filed on a discovery  
17 issue-by-discovery issue, deposition by  
18 deposition, so as to find out several  
19 things. One, is the need to take that  
20 deposition and whether that need has been  
21 either clarified or required by virtue of a  
22 court order that will be entered  
23 subsequently to the commencement of  
24 Wednesday's hearings and thereafter on those  
25 days that I provided.

13

1           If it cannot be demonstrated to the  
2 Court that these witnesses need to be taken  
3 solely as a result of the Court's ruling, then  
4 those requests will be denied, because  
5 again, we were set to try the case next  
6 week.

7           And but for the legal issues that  
8 remained and the fact that the Court did not  
9 want to put anyone's back against the wall,  
10 including itself, in the short period of  
11 time that we had between trial and the  
12 hearings that had been set, and those were  
13 just for a one-day period and not enough  
14 time -- it was not contemplated that  
15 discovery was going to be open again, at  
16 least on the wholesale basis.

17           So 20 some-odd deposition, unless they  
18 can be proven and shown to the Court as  
19 being required as a result of the rulings of  
20 the Court, will not be entertained. They  
21 should have been done before. And if not  
22 done before, I will need a reason for that  
23 as well.

24           MS. ROCKENBACH: Thank you, Your Honor.  
25           And so for clarification, that motion

14

1           that Your Honor is referencing would be  
2 filed after Your Honor's rulings on  
3 November 29th or December 5th or  
4 December 7th?

5           THE COURT: Meaning any motions that  
6 will be filed after the Court rulings  
7 relative to whether or not those deponents  
8 or the discovery was occasioned by the  
9 Court's ruling?

10           MS. ROCKENBACH: Correct.

11           THE COURT: Correct. We don't know  
12 what that is going to be as of yet.

13           MS. ROCKENBACH: Thank you.

14           And as far as the pretrial -- the joint  
15 pretrial stipulation, Your Honor, my point  
16 in that was not knowing how the Court will  
17 rule on critical issues requires -- it  
18 causes extreme uncertainty with regard to  
19 the issues to be tried.

20           Mr. Scarola -- Mr. Edwards filed a  
21 unilateral pretrial stipulation. I am going  
22 to ask the Court to allow us to reconvene  
23 following the hearings that are pending  
24 before and scheduled before Your Honor so  
25 that we can arrive at a joint pretrial

15

1           stipulation. Those issues are going to be  
2 significantly impacted by the Court's legal  
3 rulings.

4           THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't follow  
5 that.

6           MS. ROCKENBACH: I'm sorry.

7           Joint pretrial stipulation is due --  
8 was due. In our response to Mr. Edwards'  
9 unilateral pretrial stipulation, we noted  
10 that based on the fact that Your Honor is  
11 going to be making significant legal rulings  
12 on November 29th, December 5th and  
13 December 7th, it was impossible for us to  
14 frame the issues to be tried in this case.  
15 There are pending legal motions that Your  
16 Honor is going to be ruling on probably on  
17 Wednesday. So my request is that we be  
18 allowed additional time following those  
19 hearings to reconvene and arrive at a joint  
20 pretrial stipulation.

21           THE COURT: All I can say is the  
22 elements of malicious prosecution are well  
23 set out in Florida law.

24           MS. ROCKENBACH: Agreed.

25           THE COURT: And so anticipating

16

1           witnesses to testify as to those issues  
2 shouldn't be an extraordinary tasks at this  
3 point in time.

4           What I was going to say is I recognize  
5 that those lists might be tailored in  
6 accordance with the Court's rulings, but it  
7 shouldn't hold back -- just like pending  
8 motions in limine that are in every case,  
9 subsequent to -- either filed or filed  
10 before or after the pretrial is filed and  
11 heard. And it may reduce, increase or  
12 whatever the number of witnesses, but it  
13 wouldn't change the issues that have to be  
14 tried as it relates to a malicious  
15 prosecution action.

16           MS. ROCKENBACH: I would tend to agree  
17 with Your Honor. However, the recent  
18 filings by Mr. Edwards show that perhaps  
19 there are a mixing or misunderstanding of  
20 those legal elements as compared to a  
21 defamation case.

22           So I think this will be cleared up on  
23 Wednesday when Your Honor sees our motions,  
24 hears our arguments, and substantively rules  
25 on the pending real issues to be tried. And