Poc 77 - Number Mess copy for "Daily Copy Note Gook!"

amount. IN THE COURT OF CHANCERY OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE IN AND FOR NEW CASTLE COUNTY 3 4 WILLIAM B. WEINBERGER, 5 Plaintiff, 6 Civil Action No. 5642 VB. 7 UOP, INC., THE SIGNAL COMPANIES, INC., SIGCO 8 INCORPORATED, LEHMAN BROTHERS HENRY D. SKOGMO - LORRAINE B. MARINO KUHN LOEB, INC., CHARLES S. 135 Public Bldg., Wilmington, Del. 19801 ARLEDGE, BREWSTER L. ARMS, Official Reporters, Chancery Court ANDREW J. CHITIEA, JAMES 10 V. CRAWFORD, JAMES W. GLANVILLE, RICHARD A. LENON, face of JOHN O. LOGAN, FRANK J. PIZZITOLA, WILLIAM J. QUINN, 12 FORREST N. SHUMWAY, ROBERT S. STEVENSON, MAYNARD P. 13 VENEMA, WILLIAM E. WALKUP and HARRY H. WETZEL, 14 Defendants. 15 16 Courtroom No. 2 County Courthouse 17 Wilmington, Delaware Monday, May 19, 1980 18 10:00 a.m. 19 Before: 20 HONORABLE GROVER C. BROWN, Vice Chancellor. 21 Appearances: 22 WILLIAM PRICKETT, ESQUIRE, and GEORGE SEITZ, ESQUIRE 23 Prickett, Jones, Elliott & Kristol

For the Plaintiff

Appearances (Continued): grames A. GILCHRIST SPARKS, III, ESQUERE 2 Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell For Defendant UOP, Inc. 3 4 ROBERT K. PAYSON, ESQUIRE Potter, Anderson & Corroon 5 -and ALAN N. HALKETT, ESQUIRE, of the Calif. Bar 6 Latham & Watkins For Defendant Signal Companies, Inc. 7 R. FRANKLIN BALOTTI, ESQUIRE 8 Richards, Layton & Finger For Defendant Lehman Brothers Kuhn 9 Loeb, Inc. 10 Also Present: 11 BREWSTER L. ARMS, ESQUIRE 12 13 PROCEEDINGS 14 THE COURT: Good morning all. 15 MR. PRICKETT: Good morning, your Honor. 16 The thing that brings us to Court this 17 morning is the opening of the trial in Weinberger vs. 18 WOP, et al. I think that it is agreed that the 19 procedure that we will follow this morning is to present 20 to the Court certain depositions that the plaintiff 21 wishes to introduce in evidence, the witnesses not being 22 available. 23 We had considered the possibility of 24

having the depositions orally read into the record by

following the usual procedure of putting someone on the stand, and then doing it in question and answer form, but it was agreed by the parties and by the Court that time would be saved if the Court simply retired to Chambers and read the depositions themselves, and therefore it has been agreed, I believe, that the Court would devote the first two days of the trial in making a review of these depositions, and that the live testimony would begin on Wednesday, and that's what brings us here.

Now, at the outset I have served on the attorneys for the defendants, and I hereby file, plaintiff's pretrial memorandum on liability. I hand the Clerk the copy that acknowledges service on it, and I hand the Court a working copy for the Court.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Prickett.

MR. PRICKETT: I tender to the Court now extra transcripts of the following depositions.

That is, the transcript of these depositions have been filed with the Register. As a convenience to the Court we have made copies of these depositions with the exhibits that are referred to in the depositions so that the Court does not need to pull the official Register copies, but can use these copies of the depositions.

And the depositions that I refer to are the following:

Forrest Shumway, Mr. Chitiea, Mr. Clements,

Mr. Lenon, Mr. LOGAN, Mr. Pizzitola, Mr. Glanville,

Mr. Pearson, Mr. Schwarzman, Mr. Seegal.

I have one additional deposition, that of Mr. Crawford, that is not among the group that I have here, but I will send that up later. I think your Honor has enough for the present with these transcripts.

Mr. Crawford is among the persons who is tentatively listed by the defendants as a live witness, but we think that your Honor may want to review the deposition of Mr. Crawford in any case.

Let me try to make that a little bit clearer:

than their expert witness tentatively the following people whom they have indicated they would or might call: Mr. Crawford, Mr. Logan, Mr. Arledge and Mr. Glanville. However, at the pretrial conference they said that I as the attorney for the plaintiff should not rely on that; that they might or might not call these persons. I have therefore indicated that I would offer the depositions of all of those four people since I could not tell at the conclusion of my case whether or not they

Trees.

4 5

end tk. 1

and a second

would be called. I have not suggested other than

Mr. Crawford that those depositions be read. I would

suggest that if they are not called, we would ask the

Court to be sure to read those, but if they are called,

it's perhaps unnecessary.

So that in sum, we have furnished the Court with transcripts of the depositions of witnesses whose depositions have been taken and as to whom neither party is either able to call them or will call them.

Second Second

THE COURT: You are offering the entire deposition of Mr. Crawford, aren't you? Did I see that somewhere?

MR. PRICKETT: No. The entire deposition of Mr. Shumway is offered.

THE COURT: I beg your pardon.

MR. PRICKETT: Mr. Crawford, we have designated pages. There have been counter-designations and objections as to certain portions.

Your Monor, in addition, we have designated and hereby offer four notebooks, numbered 1 through 4, containing the exhibits that, pursuant to the pretrial order, we have designated. They are marked and tabbed, and this is a copy for the Court. There is an additional copy for the Register, so that the Court has its own copy.

Pursuant to the pretrial order, the defendants served on Friday their objections to some of the documents designated, and they served counter-designations of documents.

There are some items that I think we are agreed on are mechanical; that is, in just the physical job of pulling these documents together, I inadvertently put wrong dates and things like that on them, and that

2 - 2

is my responsibility and not my hardworking staff's. At to those, I would suggest that we attempt to pare that list down by getting together and comparing notes, now that we have a definitive set of the documents, and see if we can eliminate those mechanical objections.

furnished to the three defendants one complete copy of what I am furnishing to the Court and to the Register in the form of volumes of exhibits, so that we all start with the same pieces of paper. And to some extent I would suggest that we work together on making certain that the objections go to the substance rather than to mechanical problems of my inadvertently misdescribing or misdating a document or some other problem that we can resolve. I don't think it is a matter that the Court should take the time to hear at this point.

THE COURT: Let me ask you something.

You say you have a copy of those exhibits that you would offer for the Register. I assume, then, you mean that those would be the ones that you would be offering into evidence and have them designated as such.

MR. PRICKETT: Yes. Let me now physically carry these documents over and for the record describe them.

before you do that, Mr. Prickett, is, I was wondering, for the purpose of using them during trial, are we going to leave them in the notebooks, or is it the contemplation of the parties to have them numbered as separate exhibits. That is not something we have to be terribly concerned about now, but I was just wondering, when someone gets to cross-examine on a particular document, if he is going to want the document or if he is going to be content to carry the book around. It matters not to me. I will be doing neither.

MR. PRICKETT: Your Honor, what I would suggest, just as a thought for the defendants, would be that we leave in the Register's possession at all times the four volumes intact; that, having furnished the defendants each with a copy, a complete copy of that, that if and when they want to examine a witness on a document, they pull their copy of the document out of their group of four books and show it to the witness, and the witness be furnished, for example, with one of mine, but that we not touch those documents, so that we have them intact there.

THE COURT: Fair enough. That is your proposal, and I will see if they agree with it. I was

just curious as to how we were going to handle that.

MR. PRICKETT: One of the reasons why I made the copies for the other side was so that everybody would have a copy of the documents, and we would not be in the problem of taking them out of the Register's copy, except to the extent that there is a ruling that they are inadmissible. At that point they would come out of his copy, but otherwise, we would leave them there. And for purposes of the examination or argument, we would each refer to our own copy, it having been agreed that legible copies are admissible. And therefore, I would suppose they would be fungible and interchangeable, and we would not have to get into the problem of the Register's copies.

THE COURT: All right. Fair enough.

Thank you.

MR. PRICKETT: Your Honor, that completes the items that I have at this point.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Prickett.

MR. PAYSON: Good morning, Chancellor.

THE COURT: Mr. Payson.

MR. PAYSON: I know Mr. Halkett needs no further introduction, but I would like to reintroduce

- Comment

to the Court Mr. Brewster Arms, who is the senior vice-- Control president and general counsel of The Signal Companies. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Arms, good to see you 3 again. 4 MR. PAYSON: Chancellor, if I may ask 5 through you to Mr. Prickett --6 7 MR. PRICKETT: May I ask Mr. Payson something. 8 9 (Discussion off the record.) 10 MR. PAYSON: I am wondering if the 11 depositions which Mr. Prickett has copied include only 12 the designated pages or the entire deposition. 13 MR. PRICKETT: The entire deposition, but 14 we have included the counter-designations, I believe, 15 to the extent we had them. We just goe one this 16 morning. 17 MR. PAYSON: But complete copies of all 18 the depositions have been provided to the Court. 19 MR. PRICKETT: Yes. That's right, and 20 the page designations thereof. 21 MR. PAYSON: Yes. I believe Mr. Prickett 22 misspoke when he indicated that Mr. Logan's deposition 23 had been offered in lieu of his testimony. We have 24 never designated Mr. Logan as a witness. We designated

1 2 G
3 M
4 t
5 u
6 C
7 x

as possible witnesses Messrs. Walkup, Arledge,
Glanville and Crawford. And as I understand it,
Mr. Prickett has designated their entire deposition
transcripts. And we would ask the Court not to wait
until the defendants' case but rather, subject to the
Court's time schedule and convenience, that the Court
read all of those depositions in their entirety so that
the Court has a feel for exactly what is in
Mr. Prickett's case.

THE COURT: Well, let's go back to

Mr. Logan, then. Does that constitute an objection to
that deposition?

MR. PAYSON: No, sir. Mr. Logan's deposition transcript was in part designated by Mr. Prickett, and I believe there were counterdesignations. But the Court asked Mr. Prickett this morning if Mr. Crawford's deposition was being offered in its entirety. I believe he said no; rather, that designated portions had been done. In fact, there have been no designations of any portions of the Crawford deposition. I believe it has been offered in its entirety.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. PRICKETT: Your Honor, let me see if

I can clear that up. I may have misspoken on Logan.

If I did, I apologize. But Logan's deposition is in

one of the three volumes that were referred to as

reading copies for the Court. So we have that.

THE COURT: You have him on your list here.

MR. PRICKETT: That's correct. And if I misspoke, I apologize.

Now, as I understand the defendants' motion, that is -- I don't know exactly what it is.

They want the Court to read in our case not only the depositions that I have here provided the Court with reading copies of, but if it is part of my case, the depositions of the additional witnesses who may or may not be called. And as I understand that list, it consists of Crawford, Walkup, Arledge and Glanville.

MR. PAYSON: As I understand it, you have offered those depositions in evidence as part of your case.

MR. PRICKETT: Yes, I have. And I have no objection to that, Your Honor. I have not provided the Court with "reading copies" of those depositions.

THE COURT: Well, that may not be necessary if we are into the whole deposition perhaps.

We certainly don't have to worry about it now. We do have a copy of the complete deposition in the file.

Since there will be no designations or anything of that sort as to those depositions, let's not worry about getting the extra copy right at the time.

MR. PRICKETT: Yes. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Halkett.

MR. HALKETT: Good morning, Your Honor.

Mr. Prickett has said that he is offering the deposition or portions of the depositions, to which the exhibits are attached for the convenience of the Court. I think it should be made clear that the documents identified during the course of the deposition are not exhibits in this case and they are not being offered for that purpose as part of the depositions. If they are, then we would want to consider objections thereto.

In other words, the way the past week went was, Mr. Prickett designated those depositions or portions of depositions which he wished to introduce as a part of his case in chief. He did not include in those depositions any of the documents marked during the course of any one or more of those depositions.

Therefore, our review of Mr. Prickett's deposition designations did not go to the subject of the pieces of

LM/pb

paper that were used during the course of the deposition. So we have not agreed that any of the depositions exhibits as such may be introduced in evidence in this case.

THE COURT: As a part of the deposition.

MR. HALKETT: As a part of the deposition.

As it turns out, probably the great majority of those pieces of paper have been marked by Mr. Prickett and are included within the documents he has in these bound volumes.

Just so the record is clear, I thought that I should make that point on the record.

Constant

fair enough.

as far as you're concerned, the only exhibits being offered by the plaintiff are those set forth on the list of designated exhibits. To the extent that they may be duplicated by being attached to a copy of a deposition, or something, there is no problem, but anything that is attached as an exhibit to a deposition which is not designated on the plaintiff's list of exhibits, you do not consider it to be offered into evidence or as being part of the case.

MR. HALKETT: That's correct at this point.

THE COURT: You reserve the right to object to them if any such offer is made.

MR. HALKETT: Correct.

THE COURT: I think that's probably

Mr. Prickett --

MR. PRICKETT: Yes. Let me say, your Honor, I understand the defendant's position. I'm not sure that I agree, but I think mechanically every exhibit that was referred to in the deposition is included in the designation, though I say that with a little bit of a tentative approach because I'm not dead

sure that every one was. But certainly all the important ones were. And I'll recheck Mr. Halkett's reservation on the deposition exhibits, and if I have slipped up, I'll perhaps come back and offer it, but I really don't think it's a problem.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. HALKETT: The four volumes of proposed exhibits, I believe that Mr. Prickett said that they had been designated and hereby offered in evidence. I suggest that perhaps may be a little premature for such an offer until such time as we have gone through the procedure Mr. Prickett suggested, which I think is a good one.

Let us have the chance here when we are through with this Court session this morning to see if there are my of the objections which we made to his exhibits which can be eliminated. Then there will undoubtedly be a certain number of objections to certain of these documents which are included in the volumes, and those will have to be ruled upon by the Court before they are offered.

In effect then I gather that these are being tendered to the Clerk for purposes of identification only in a sense at this point. As long as that's

No.

9.

clear, that's fine.

MR. PRICKETT: Now, that's not right.

They are offered. The objections can be made any time,
but I want the record clear that it's not as restated
by Mr. Halkett that they are not offered. They are
offered.

Now, I agree that we ought to go through the objections and try and pare them down, but let's be clear about the record. I have offered them.

THE COURT: You consider they are identified by the fact that they are put together in that volume as far as you're concerned, and you're offering them now subject to ruling by the Court, I understand.

MR. PRICKETT: Yes. I just don't want a problem that Mr. Halkett at some time says well, he agreed that they were moved for identification. They are offered.

Now, there are objections that

Mr. Halkett will try to refine with my help, and then
they will be presented, but I want the record clear
that these are offered in evidence, and not offered
for identification.

MR. HALKETT: Again, I think the record

g

Secured

should reflect our objections to their introduction at this point until we have an opportunity to be heard on that score.

THE COURT: All right. I don't think we're really talking about any major problem. I'm certainly not going to rule on them at this point.

MR. HALKETT: The final thing that I have is my suggestion would be that at some point in time we work out a system whereby mechanically the document identifications can be physically placed on the documents themselves, and as appropriate, maybe stapled so that whether or not they remain physically in these volumes or not, at some point in time if a document is removed from the volume, one is going to be able to identify it as an exhibit and by the number of the exhibit.

Thave no problem at all using extra copies in examinations with witnesses, and so on, but I noticed in going through our set of these that where, for example, there are multiple pages that make up one exhibit, they are not stapled together, nor do they necessarily all bear a designation as they do on the tab. Some place along the line I think they ought to be identified before they are part of the record of the

case.

Second Second

THE COURT: Well, as I understand what you're saying then, you feel that perhaps as to each document, or combination of documents offered as an exhibit, they should be as in the normal procedure given an evidence identification sticker by the Clerk, and in some manner stapled or put together so that they don't get separated or lost with the understanding, I suppose, they could then be put back in the notebook volumes. Is that right?

MR. HALKETT: Correct, That's what I do suggest.

THE COURT: Your suggestion I believe I interpret as being one simply to make sure we preserve no matter what happens a complete set of exhibits, and don't get any confused.

MR. HALKETT: And a complete record so that there is no later confusion about what pieces of paper were part of what.

THE COURT: That would be merely a mechanical problem, and I suspect that that's something that can be handled by Mr. Donovan while I'm reading for two days. I suppose he will have plenty of time to get those various documents marked at his leisure. So I

think it's probably not a bad idea.

MR. PRICKETT: I would think that we could probably take a Xerox of our own numbers and make the stickers, and then with counsel we could simply get the stickers on and staple them.

THE COURT: I would presume that perhaps somebody from either side could assist him to make sure he gets them all designated properly. I have no problem with your suggestion. That will probably make sure we preserve all the documents that are in fact in evidence.

MR. HALKETT: Finally, I would like to make a suggestion, if I may, and that is that perhaps we reconvene tomorrow morning at ten o'clock for a brief period of time to resolve the question or questions about the objections to any of these documentary exhibits. That will give us the balance of the day to work out our own problems, and to perhaps then have an opportunity tomorrow so that before we start the live testimony on Wednesday morning, we'll know which documents are in evidence as well. Gratuitously, you will probably need a break anyway from the reading.

THE COURT: I was thinking of that.

Do you have any problem with withat,

Mr. Prickett? I gather what he's saying is it might be a good idea to meet tomorrow morning at ten o'clock to see what, if anything, else can be straightened out, or if any other problems have arisen over the course of today.

MR. PRICKETT: Well, I think it would be a good idea to meet tomorrow morning.

THE COURT: If we don't have to do anything, it won't take long.

MR. PRICKETT: We may want to see -Your Honor has taken on a monsterous reading assignment.

THE COURT: I see that now.

MR. PRICKETT: That has been added to now by the four principal depositions, and there will be a real question in my mind as to whether the Court will have been able to complete the reading of the depositions by Wednesday morning. And as your Honor knows, we had originally contemplated reading the depositions in, but it was as an aid — it was agreed that instead of that, the Court would read them. But it is fundamental to the plaintiff's case that these depositions on liability be read, and there has already been one suggestion that one day be allowed for this. Well, we have now doubled, in effect, what the Court has

- Constant

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: I was going to ask about that. It seemed to me that if that's the case, that if

undertaken to read. So tomorrow morning we may need a reading as to where the Court is in this because if the Court is not finished, we would want to enlarge the time for the Court to do this just as you would do if we hadn't gotten through the testimony.

THE COURT: Well, we're in agreement we can meet at ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. HALKETT: All right. I gather from what Mr. Prickett has previously said, that going back to our procedure for the designation of the depositions and portions of depositions, the defendant's counter designations in which we added certain pages and line references -- and I believe the Court has a copy of that counter designation -- that Mr. Prickett has no objection to any of those counter designations, and therefore, what we now understand is before the Court in the deposition testimony are Mr. Prickett's designations plus our counter designations subject to any objections that we may have that have not been yet ruled upon, and I think there is only one, and that is as to a portion of Mr. Crawford's deposition, and on that subject I turn that over to Mr. Sparks.

-

Mr. Prickett had no objections to what your counter designations were, then I only had actually one objection made to any portion of the deposition being offered.

MR. HALKETT: That's correct.

MR. PRICKETT: That's right, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. That helps.

Thank you. I'm pleasantly surprised.

MR. SPARKS: I'm prepared to go forward with respect to that matter at this time, if that is the Court's pleasure.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure it would be helpful to do so at this time, Mr. Sparks, since I haven't the faintest idea what is in the deposition or what's been objected to.

MR. SPARKS: Well, there is an alternative approach, and that would be that if your Honor in reading the various depositions -- I know you don't even have Mr. Prickett's designated copy of the Crawford deposition yet. If your Honor preferred, and could adjust your voluminous reading such that the Crawford deposition would be one that would be read, I guess, after the arguments tomorrow, perhaps that would be the way to handle it.

THE COURT: I think probably that's what I'll have to do, Mr. Sparks. Either if we can't come to it by the time we meet tomorrow, then if there is only one, maybe we have to take that up the first thing Wednesday morning, and I'll give you what my views on it are, or make a ruling on it before we start.

MR. SPARKS: Would you like me to go ahead and make the argument, and point out the problem to the Court in the event you get to that point?

THE COURT: Well, your objection had to do with relevance, I think.

MR. SPARKS: It does have to do with relevance, and I think if it's fairly simply stated, maybe it would be helpful to the Court if I just go ahead and make the argument.

THE COURT: Yes. Just state it simply. Well, let me ask you to do this:

Give me the general outline of the problem and your objection without going into detail.

I'll try and pick that up when I read it.

MR. SPARKS: Both of the line and page designations in the Crawford deposition to which we have objected relate to questions directed by Mr. Prickett to Mr. Crawford at his first session of his deposition

Ί

Eng

relating to the subject of UOP's stock option plans and the provision made in the merger between UOP and Sigco to satisfy UOP's contractual obligation with respect to the option holders. And just to orient the Court, what happened is that the difference between the \$21 merger price and the exercised price of the options was paid to all those people who had options.

Now, we have objected to these particular designations by Mr. Prickett on relevance grounds since neither the option plans nor UOP's satisfaction of its obligation under those plans as we understand this case are at issue, and really beyond that we just don't see what that has to do with the case.

Perhaps if Mr. Prickett has something to say we can respond further, but as we read the complaint, it's just not part of the case. That's the basis for our objection.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Prickett, what is your pleasure?
You certainly are not compelled to respond now.

MR. PRICKETT: Your Honor invites me as to what my pleasure is, and it's certainly not here. But seriously, your Honor, we do not think that by any

stretch of the imagination a major portion of our case on liability concerns itself with the handling of the stock options by Mr. Crawford. The relevance of the stock option situation is as follows:

Mr. Crawford, the president of UOP, when he was first presented with Signal's proposal, and at the meeting of the board of directors, addresses himself not to the rights of stockholders, but how he's going to handle the options of the UOP employees. What he says is what we're going to do is to make sure that those people are satisfied, and that's actually what happened.

exercisable at a price on condition that they stay there because the idea was to get them to work for a long time for UOP because they were very beneficial. Signal is going to buy them out, so they accelerate all these options at a cost of \$2,000,000 to the stockholders.

Now, the relevance of this is who was Crawford really concerned with in this situation? Was it the people who are going to be employees of Signal, or his stockholders? What were his priorities here? And it's perfectly clear that in the option situation he created a very favorable thing for the employees, and

Succession

they said so. They were very, very grateful because they had gotten a plum that had fallen off the tree. At the same time he's busy arranging a merger that is grossly unfair to the stockholders, and that's the relevance of the matter.

Now, that's why it's included in there.

It's not a major element of the case, but it shows what

Crawford's priorities and loyalties were in this

situation.

THE COURT: I certainly understand why you think it's relevant then based on that.

MR. SPARKS: Your Honor, first I take issue with the characterization of what happened. These were not options that were accelerated. It was just a matter of having to do something to take care of the option situation since the stock of UOP was obviously not publicly available for use to the option holders. But I think that what Mr. Prickett has said points up the fact that this really just has nothing to do with this case.

The matter with respect to the options was fully disclosed in the proxy materials, and it just cannot be the basis for any nondisclosure claim that Mr. Prickett has. And under those circumstances, given

the nature of his amended complaint, which of course he had a chance -- did amend after the discoverly was completed which we're referring to right here -- If he had had some claim with respect to some form of fraud with respect to this option plan, he's had ample opportunity to make it. We are at this late stage in the case, and whether he characterizes it as a big part of his case or a little part of his case or a peripheral part of his case we think, based on the complaint as it now exists, it's no part of his case. Certainly under any standard where fraud would have to be pleaded with some sort of particularity, it's just not in there. It's not something that we ought to be required to meet at this late day.

16

ï

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

4-1

. 4

MR. PRICKETT: Your Honor, let me just say, I think Mr. Sparks didn't hear me. I didn't say I am making a claim on this. I don't need to amend my complaint, and his objection is not that I failed to state a claim or something like that. What we are talking about is evidence relevancy. And I have tried to indicate to Mr. Sparks its relevancy in terms of what Crawford, the head executive of UOP, felt his obligations were and his priorities.

I am not making a claim that we ought to get those payments back. And that is all the relevancy. And I do say that it is not by any means a major element in this case, but it is there, and it is relevant to that point, and that is what it is there for.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. PRICKETT: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Maybe that will be sufficient to make a ruling without having to ask you to reargue at some time when we again convene.

All right, gentlemen. Is there anything else we need to do this morning before I have to go to work?

gwone

come to light on that within the next day or two.

All right, gentlemen. Mr. Prickett, what is mine, now? These four volumes here belong to the Register. The other three of the depositions are mine?

MR. PRICKETT: Belong to you. And these four volumes of the offered exhibits which duplicate the Register's are the Court's.

THE COURT: Fair enough. I just didn't want to walk out with the wrong ones. As a matter of fact, I am not sure I am going to walk out with them.

I may have to designate a deposition and exhibit bearer for the purpose of the trial. But I am not sure it is quite as bad as it looks, although it is rather imposing.

MR. PRICKETT: Oh, it is very good, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I hope to find it so, if I have got to read it.

All right, gentlemen. I gather if you have no further pending applications, we will recess the matter until ten o'clock tomorrow morning, at which time we will reconvene for the purpose of trying to resolve any problems that may have come up overnight. And I understand that today you will be attempting to see how many of the thirty-five objections that are listed here

4 -- 4

-

to the exhibits can be resolved on the theory that they are just designations of dates or mechanical things, and at least tomorrow morning you can advise me of that. If we have anything else to take up, we will try to do it then.

Thank you very much for the preparation you have obviously gone into in getting the matter into this posture. It is certainly going to be of considerable assistance to the Court doing it this way rather than trying to go through offering these documents on a piece-by-piece basis.

All right. I guess we stand in recess, then, until ten o'clock tomorrow morning. Thank you.

(Court adjourned at 10:40 a.m.)

cado proca depó