#### IN THE CHANCERY COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI

CYNTHIA N. ALMOND,

#### Plaintiff,

v.

SINGING RIVER HEALTH SYSTEM, a/k/a SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM, *et al.*  Civil Action: 2014-2653JB

Defendants.

#### THE SRHS DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

)

Defendants Singing River Health System ("SRHS"), Singing River Hospital System, Singing River Hospital System Foundation, Inc.; Singing River Health Services Foundation; Singing River Hospital System Employee Benefit Fund, Inc.; Michael Heidelberg; Allen Cronier; Tommy Leonard; Lawrence Cosper; Ira Polk; and Kevin Holland (collectively, "the SRHS Defendants") hereby move for sanctions against Almond's counsel, Earl Denham and Harvey Barton, pursuant to Mississippi Rule of Civil Procedure 11, and this Court's inherent authority. In support of this Motion, the SRHS Defendants contemporaneously submit and incorporate their Brief in Support, as the following Exhibits:

Exhibit A, May 12, 2015 Hearing Transcript;

Exhibit B, Collection of Public Statements from Almond's Counsel;

Exhibit C, Proposed Scheduling Order.

WHEREFORE, for reasons explained in the accompanying Brief in Support, the SRHS Defendants respectfully request the Court enter an Order granting its Motion for Sanctions, awarding the SRHS Defendants their attorneys' fees and costs incurred in preparing this Motion

1

and responding to Almond's Motion for Leave to Amend the Complaint, and any other or further sanction this Court may deem appropriate.

Respectfully submitted, this the 26th day of May, 2015.

SINGING RIVER DEFENDANTS

BY:

Andrea M. Kimball (pro hac vice) Carly D. Duvall (pro hac vice) DENTONS US LLP 4520 Main Street, Suite 1100 Kansas City, MO 64111-7700 Phone: 816-460-2400 Fax: 816-531-7545 Email: andrea.kimball@dentons.com carly.duvall@dentons.com

Feed Feenes

Fredrick B. Feeney, II (MSB 5168) Nathan L. Burrow (MSB 102865) Franke & Salloum, PLLC 10071 Lorraine Road P.O. Drawer 460 Gulfport, Mississippi 39502 Phone: 228-868-7070 Fax: 228-868-7090 Email: <u>fbf@frslaw.com</u> nlb@frslaw.com

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Fredrick B. Feeney, II, Counsel for Singing River Health System, do hereby certify that I have this day served via email and regular mail, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy

of the above Motion for Sanctions to the following:

Earl L. Denham, Esq. DENHAM LAW FIRM, PLLC P.O. Box 580 Ocean Springs, MS 38566 earl@denhamlaw.com

W. Harvey Barton, Esq. BARTON LAW FIRM, PLLC 3007 Magnolia Street Pascagoula, MS 39567 <u>harvey@wbartonlaw.com</u> *Counsel for Almond, Drury, Eiland, Bosarge, Thompson and Aguilar* 

James R. Reeves, Esq. Matthew G. Mestayer, Esq. REEVES & MESTAYER, PLLC P.O. Drawer 1388 Biloxi, MS 39533 jrr@rmlawcall.com mgm@rmlawcall.com Counsel for Lay

J. Cal Mayo, Jr., Esq. Pope S. Mallette, Esq. MAYO MALLETTE, PLLC P.O. Box 1456 Oxford, MS 38655 <u>cmayo@mayomallette.com</u> <u>pmallette@mayomallette.com</u>

O. Stephen Montagnet, III, Esq. W. Thomas McCraney, III, Esq. MCCRANEY, MONTAGNET, QUIN & NOBLE, PLLC 602 Ridgeland, MS 39157 <u>smontagnet@mmqnlaw.com</u> <u>tmccraney@mmqnlaw.com</u> *Counsel for Broun* 

Pieter Teeuwissen, Esq. SIMON & TEEUWISSEN, PLLC P.O. Box 16787 Jackson, MS 39236 <u>pteeuwissen@bellsouth.net</u> Counsel for Taylor John L. Hunter, Esq. CUMBEST, CUMBEST, HUNTER & MCCORMICK P.A. P.O. Drawer 1287 Pascagoula, MS 39568 jlh@cchmlawyers.com Counsel for Tolleson

John A. Banahan, Esq. Jessica B. McNeel, Esq. Calen Wills, Esq. BRYAN, NELSON, SCHROEDER, CASTIGLIOLA & BANAHAN, PLLC P.O. Drawer 1529 Pascagoula, MS 39568 john@bnscb.com jessica@bnscb.com calen@bnscb.com Counsel for Dr. Nunenmacher, Bydalek and Vice

Roy D. Campbell, III, Esq. BRADLEY ARANT BOULT CUMMINGS One Jackson Place 188 East Capitol St., Ste 400 Jackson, MS 39201 rcampbell@babc.com Counsel for Anderson

Stephen Peresich, Esq. Mary Van Slyke, Esq. PAGE, MANNINO, PERESICH & MCDERMOTT. PLLC P.O. Drawer 289 Biloxi, MS 38533 stephen.peresich@pmp.org mary.vanslyke@pmp.org **Counsel for Quintana** Brett K. Williams, Esq. Hanson D. Horn, Esq. A. Kelly Sessoms, III DOGAN AND WILKINSON, PLLC P.O. Box 1618 Pascagoula, MS 39568 bwilliams@dwwattorneys.com hhorn@dwwattorneys.com ksessoms@dwwattorneys.com

Andrea M. Kimball, Esq. Carly D. Duvall, Esq. DENTONS US LLP 4520 Main Street, Ste 1100 Kansas City, MO 64111 andrea.kimball@dentons.com carly.duvall@dentons.com Counsel for SRHS

This the 26th day of May, 2015.

Donald C. Dornan, Jr., Esq. Lauren R. Hillery, Esq. DORNAN LAW OFFICE, PLLC P.O. box 117 Gulfport, MS 39502 <u>ddornan@dornan-law.com</u> <u>lhillery@dornan-law.com</u> *Counsel for Crews* 

Fredrick B. Feeney, II (MSB 5168) Franke & Salloum, PLLC 10071 Lorraine Road P.O. Drawer 460 Gulfport, Mississippi 39502 Phone: 228-868-7070 Fax: 228-868-7090 Email: <u>fbf@frslaw.com</u>

# EXHIBIT A

#### 1 IN THE CHANCERY COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY, 1 MISSISSIPPI 2 1 IN THE CHANCERY COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY. 3 HOWARD BOSARGE COMPLAINANT MISSISSIPPI VERSUS CIVIL ACTION NO. 2014-2729-NH SINGING RIVER HEALTH SYSTEM, DEFENDAN A/K/A SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM; 2 5 DEFENDANTS з CYNTHIA N. ALMOND COMPLAINANT 6 SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM FOUNDATION, INC.; 4 VERSUS CIVIL ACTION NO. 2014-2653-NH SINGING RIVER HEALTH SYSTEM FOUNDATION, INC.; SINGING RIVER HEALTH SERVICES FOUNDATION; SINGING RIVER HEALTH SYSTEM, DEFENDANTS A/K/A SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM; SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM FOUNDATION, INC.; SINGING RIVER HEALTH SYSTEM FOUNDATION, INC.; SINGING RIVER HEALTH SERVICES FOUNDATION; 5 7 SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM EMPLOYEE BENEFIT б FUND, INC.; TRANSAMERICA RETIREMENT SOLUTIONS CORPORATION; 8 7 SINGING RIVER HEALTH SERVICES FOUNDATION; SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM EMPLOYEE BENSFIT FUND, INC.; TRANSAMERICA RETIREMENT SOLUTIONS CORPORATION; JOEN DOE ACTURATES A, B, OR C; AND JOEN DOE ACCOUNTING FIRM A, B, OR C; and MICHAEL HEIDELBERG, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, ALLEN CRONIER, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, ALLEN CRONIER, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, ALLEN CRONIER, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, MORMY LEONARD, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, IAWRENCE COSPER, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, NORRIS STRICKLAND, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, NARENCE COSPER, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, NORRIS STRICKLAND, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, NORNIS STRICKLAND, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, NUGO QUINTANA, M.D., Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, KEVIN NOLLAND, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, KEVIN NOLLAND, Individually and in his Official Capacity JOHN DOE ACTUARIES A, B, OR C; AND JOHN DOE ACCOUNTING FIRM A, B, OR C; and SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM EMPLOYEE BENSFIT 9 8 MICHAEL HEIDELBERG, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, 10 9 11 10 MICHAEL TOLLESON, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees 11 12 ALLEN CRONIER, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, TOMMY LEONARD, Individually and as a Member of 12 13 LAW RENCE COSPER, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, 13 14 14 15 MORRIS STRICKLAND, Individually and as a Member 15 of the Board of Trustees, IRA POLK, Individually and as a Member of the 16 16 **Board of Trustees** 17 17 STEPHEN NUNENMACHER, M.D., Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustee: 18 HUGO QUINTANA, M.D., Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, KEVIN HOLLAND, Individually and in his Official 18 19 Capacity 19 20 Capacity 20 21 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS Keld before the Honorable L. Breland Hilburn on May 12, 2015 at Chancery Court Of Jackson County, Mississippi. 22 21 23 22 24 REPORTED BY: 23 25 CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR #1704 24 CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR 25 CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR IN THE CHANCERY COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY, 1 IN THE CHANCERY COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI MISSISSIPPI 2 2 3 MAURY THOMPSON COMPLAINANT 3 KITTY PATRICIA AGUILAR COMPLAINANT 4 VERSUS CIVIL ACTION NO. 2014-2695-NH 4 VERSUS CIVIL ACTION NO. 2014-2752-NH SINGING RIVER HEALTH SYSTEM, DEFENDANTS A/K/A SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM; SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM FOUNDATION, INC.; SINGING RIVER HEALTH SYSTEM, DEFENDANTS A/K/A SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM; SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM FOUNDATION, INC.; SINGING RIVER HEALTH SYSTEM FOUNDATION, INC.; SINGING RIVER HEALTH SERVICES FOUNDATION; SINGING RIVER HEALTH SERVICES FOUNDATION; 5 5 6 6 SINGING RIVER HEALTH SYSTEM FOUNDATION, INC.; SINGING RIVER HEALTH SERVICES FOUNDATION; 7 7 SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM EMPLOYEE BENEFIT SINGING RIVER HOSPITAL SYSTEM EMPLOYEE BENEFIT 8 TRANSAMERICA RETIREMENT SOLUTIONS CORPORATION; FUND, INC.; TRANSAMERICA RETIREMENT SOLUTIONS CORPORATION; 8 JOHN DOE ACTUARIES A, B, OR C; AND JOHN DOE ACCOUNTING FIRM A, B, OR C; and MICHAEL HEIDELBERG, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, JOHN DOE ACTUARIES A, B, OR C; AND JOHN DOE ACCOUNTING FIRM A, B, OR C; and MICHAEL HEIDELBERG, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, MICHAEL TOLLESON, Individually and as a Member 9 9 10 10 11 MICHAEL TOLLESON, Individually and as a Member 11 of the Board of Trustees of the Board of Trustees, ALLEN CRONIER, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, 12 ALLEN CRONIER, Individually and as a Member of 12 the Board of Trustees 13 TOMMY LEONARD, Individually and as a Member of 13 TOMMY LEONARD, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, LAWRENCE COSPER, Individually and as a Member the Board of Trustees. 14 LAWRENCE COSPER, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, 14 MORRIS STRICKLAND, Individually and as a Member 15 MORRIS STRUCKLAND, Individually and as a memory of the Board of Trustees, IRA POLK, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, STEPHEN NUNENMACHER, M.D., Individually and as 15 MORRIS STRICKLAND, Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees 16 IRA POLK, Individually and as a Member of the 16 Board of Trustees 17 17 STEPHEN NUNENMACHER, M.D., Individually and as Member of the Board of Trustees a Member of the Board of Trustees, HUGO QUINTANA, M.D., Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, KEVIN HOLLAND, Individually and in his Official 18 HUGO QUINTANA, M.D., Individually and as a Member of the Board of Trustees, 18 19 KEVIN HOLLAND, Individually and in his Official 19 Capacity Capacity 20 20 21 22 23 23 24 24 25 25 CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR 1 of 8 sheets Page 1 to 4 of 29 05/18/2015 09:23:14 AM

<b></b>	13	1	15
	I want to kind of make this an		15
1		1	what has happened in the retirement plan.
2	informal meeting at this time so that I	2	When I say "Special Master" I am speaking
3	service of Direction and the here and the service of the service o	3	of someone who would have some expertise
ľ	I have about what is now before me.	4	in interpreting documents that have been
	To be honest, there is a	5	generated in the accounting process.
6	tremendous amount of paperwork that has	6	This would have to be something agreed to
7	gone on in this case before I got to it.	7	by the parties.
8	And I am not sure that I am completely up	8	The rule requires under most
9	to speed at this time to feel comfortable	9	circumstances that the Special Master be
10	about making some of the decisions that	10	an attorney; however, I believe that this
11	are required to be made in this case.	11	particular request for an accounting
12	My perception is that at this	12	represents a unique circumstance where
13	point in time is an equitable action for	13	someone other than an attorney might be
14	an accounting. So the way that issue is	14	more able to accurately interpret the
15	resolved is that we have an accounting.	15	documentation that surrounds the
16	So I think the defendant, who would have	16	retirement plan and those documents that
17	possession of all of the documents	17	were produced during discovery. If the
18	necessary to make a proper accounting	18	parties can agree to there being a
19	under this complaint would be required to	19	Special Master then, of course, I would
20	produce those documents to the	20	be required to conduct and order
21	plaintiffs' attorneys in order that the	21	discovery from the defendant. It would
22	accounting issue could be satisfactorily	22	be my revelation to you that after
23	resolved.	23	discovery is complete and sufficient
24	I notice that there has been	24	information is there for an
25	suggesting some protective orders filed	25	interpretation that I would seek expert
$\square$	CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR		CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR
1			16
1	to all of the efforts of the plaintiff	1	consultation before the Court would
2	has made in attempting to initiate	2	render a decision concerning the
3	discovery in this case.	3	interpretation and what actually went on
4	I am going to require the	4	in the administration of the retirement
5	defendant disclose sufficient discovery	5	plan.
6	to adequately explain the current posture	6	The way the process would go and
7	of the employee retirement system and the	7	the way the process would go in the
8	transactions that occurred in that system	8	selection of a Special Master is that the
9	which have brought it to the circumstance.	9	plaintiffs' attorneys would select one
10	it is in at this time. That is the only	10	representative and the defense attorneys
11	fair way to resolve the question about	11	would select one representative and those
12	what has gone on with this retirement	12	two individuals would meet and hopefully
13	system is for the defendant to make a full and adoquate disclosure of the	13	decide on an individual who would be
14	full and adequate disclosure of the transactions that have accurred and the	14	appointed as Special Master.
15	transactions that have occurred and the	15	If I am required to get someone
16	transactions particularly that brought	16	as a Commissioner or consultant to assist
17	the retirement system into the point	17	the Court in making a decision then I
18	where the defendant feels that it is	18	would select that individual. That
40	nococcany that the plan he aband	19	individual's name would be submitted to
19	necessary that the plan be abandoned.		
20	I also feel that there is some	20	the plaintiff and defendant to make sure
	I also feel that there is some utility in there being a Special Master	20 21	the plaintiff and defendant to make sure there is no objection or no conflict of
20 21	I also feel that there is some utility in there being a Special Master appointed for the purpose of obtaining	20 21 22	the plaintiff and defendant to make sure there is no objection or no conflict of interest that might be something the
20 21 23	I also feel that there is some utility in there being a Special Master appointed for the purpose of obtaining discovery and purpose of interviews	20 21 22 23	the plaintiff and defendant to make sure there is no objection or no conflict of interest that might be something the Court might not know about that one of
20 21 23 24	I also feel that there is some utility in there being a Special Master appointed for the purpose of obtaining discovery and purpose of interviews witnesses and for obtaining expert	20 21 22 23 24	the plaintiff and defendant to make sure there is no objection or no conflict of interest that might be something the Court might not know about that one of the parties might know. And assuming
20 21 23	I also feel that there is some utility in there being a Special Master appointed for the purpose of obtaining discovery and purpose of interviews	20 21 22 23 24	the plaintiff and defendant to make sure there is no objection or no conflict of interest that might be something the Court might not know about that one of

r			
	29		31
		1	
2		2	······································
3		3	
1	Again, the pot is being emptied	4	
	and nothing is going back in it. And all	• 5	was entered but all it says it invites
6	,,,	6	everyone to participate if they want to.
7		7	Nobody has to.
8	provide a second de la contracta de la contrac	8	THE COURT: Well, in 10 days we are
9	going to be a proposal in an agreed stay	9	going to produce those documents to the
10		10	Plaintiffs.
11	whatsoever, Harvey and I, in our lawsuit.	11	MS. DUVALL: Correct, Your Honor. We
12	It says "Nothing shall prohibit any party	12	will produce within 10 days and we
13	J	13	anticipate there may be further
14		14	discovery.
15		15	THE COURT: And I think it would be a
16	settlement reached through mediation or	16	good idea for us to set a date for us to
17	negotiation including said federal	17	reconvene and for the Court to take up
18	litigation regarding the pension plan	18	what additional issues would be generated
19	providing party and these suits are given	19	by after you got a chance to review those
20	notice in such mediation to participate".	20	documents and/or if for no other reason
21	We are not in federal court on	21	just have a meeting for a status report
22	purpose. We came to this court to a	22	for the Court.
23	state judge to get justice for state	23	So I would like for us to have
24	people in a state matter and we were	24	an agreed date for us to reconvene here
25	moved six times by these people to	25	before we leave today. I would say
1	CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR		CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR
N	30		32
1	federal court wrongfully.	1	within 30 days would be good.
2	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by	2	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the
2 3	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that.	2 3	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it
2 3 4	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we	2 3 4	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a
2 3 4 5	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt	2 3	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the
2 3 4 5 6	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to	2 3 4	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates.
2 3 4 5 6 7	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where	2 3 4 5	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that	2 3 4 5 6	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues. MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. They are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to set them 30 days apart and they don't lay
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues. MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. They are talking about a mediation in federal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to set them 30 days apart and they don't lay out for 30, 60, 90 days or more.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues. MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. They are talking about a mediation in federal court, which we were neither privy nor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to set them 30 days apart and they don't lay out for 30, 60, 90 days or more. MR. DENHAM: Your Honor, I want to go
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues. MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. They are talking about a mediation in federal court, which we were neither privy nor had any input nor are we interested in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to set them 30 days apart and they don't lay out for 30, 60, 90 days or more. MR. DENHAM: Your Honor, I want to go on the record so you will know, I am
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues. MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. They are talking about a mediation in federal court, which we were neither privy nor had any input nor are we interested in. We are here in state court.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to set them 30 days apart and they don't lay out for 30, 60, 90 days or more. MR. DENHAM: Your Honor, I want to go on the record so you will know, I am going to file today a motion to allow us
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues. MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. They are talking about a mediation in federal court, which we were neither privy nor had any input nor are we interested in. We are here in state court. THE COURT: That would be something	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to set them 30 days apart and they don't lay out for 30, 60, 90 days or more. MR. DENHAM: Your Honor, I want to go on the record so you will know, I am going to file today a motion to allow us to amend our pleadings to add other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues. MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. They are talking about a mediation in federal court, which we were neither privy nor had any input nor are we interested in. We are here in state court. THE COURT: That would be something you would need to take up with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to set them 30 days apart and they don't lay out for 30, 60, 90 days or more. MR. DENHAM: Your Honor, I want to go on the record so you will know, I am going to file today a motion to allow us to amend our pleadings to add other parties. There won't be any question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 23	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues. MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. They are talking about a mediation in federal court, which we were neither privy nor had any input nor are we interested in. We are here in state court. THE COURT: That would be something you would need to take up with the federal judge.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to set them 30 days apart and they don't lay out for 30, 60, 90 days or more. MR. DENHAM: Your Honor, I want to go on the record so you will know, I am going to file today a motion to allow us to amend our pleadings to add other parties. There won't be any question then of whether agreements between
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 23 24	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues. MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. They are talking about a mediation in federal court, which we were neither privy nor had any input nor are we interested in. We are here in state court. THE COURT: That would be something you would need to take up with the federal judge. MR. DENHAM: If I do I would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to set them 30 days apart and they don't lay out for 30, 60, 90 days or more. MR. DENHAM: Your Honor, I want to go on the record so you will know, I am going to file today a motion to allow us to amend our pleadings to add other parties. There won't be any question then of whether agreements between parties that have any sort of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 23	federal court wrongfully. So I just want to predicate by telling the Court we don't agree to that. We ought to be bound by mediation and we agree that you ought to and any attempt to settle this matter ought to have to come through you for settlement where this state matter is proceeding. So that is just to let you know the way things stand. THE COURT: Yes, sir. I certainly would expect all the Plaintiffs' lawyers to agree to anything that is presented to the Court representing the Plaintiffs posturing in any of these issues. MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. They are talking about a mediation in federal court, which we were neither privy nor had any input nor are we interested in. We are here in state court. THE COURT: That would be something you would need to take up with the federal judge.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	within 30 days would be good. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, we in the draft scheduling order we have found it helpful in other cases where you have a lot of lawyers and parties to keep the case moving we laid out specific dates. I don't know if they are clear on my calendar or anybody else's, but it is productive to by every 30 days to have a status conference where the Court is here if anybody wants to bring a motion they can. If they don't have a motion or don't want to attend they don't have to. THE COURT: Tell me that. MR. REEVES: I encourage the Court to set them 30 days apart and they don't lay out for 30, 60, 90 days or more. MR. DENHAM: Your Honor, I want to go on the record so you will know, I am going to file today a motion to allow us to amend our pleadings to add other parties. There won't be any question then of whether agreements between

8 of 17 sheets

·			·
	33		35
		1	THE COURT: What day is that?
	the first beauty and first be bare to being	2	
1 3	you a copy of it. And I would suggest	3	
)	that as early a hearing as we could have	4	· · · ·
	) on that after we get it disseminated the	5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
6		6	
7		7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
8		8	
9	· · · · · · ·	-	
10		9	sa system is getting manned that days
11		10	
	won't have continuing it will go a lot in	11	
12		12	
13		13	
14		14	THE COURT: We can come to the
15	the secret meeting and signed off on the	15	wedding.
16	minutes. We did not flush out the	16	MR. BARTON: In the Bahamas and love
17	complainants. We did not have time at	17	to have you.
18	that point.	18	MR. REEVES: I vote for the Bahamas.
19	THE COURT: Always as the rule of	19	THE COURT: All right. Well, then,
20	thumb the amendment will be allowed. I	20	Mr. Denham represents he will be here.
21	will have to see the pleading before we	21	Then July 13th will be our second
22	give it to allow people to object if	22	
23	there is a reason for objection.	23	scheduled meeting and then we will go after that.
24	MR. DENHAM: Yes, sir. We have one		
25	last little draft we are looking through	24	Now, let me say this: If there
20	CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR	25	is some extended urgent circumstances
ľ			CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR
	34		36
	and we will file it today.	1	36 that comes up in this case and you need
2	and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree	1 2	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing
2 3	and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June?		36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or
2 3 4	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested	2	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing
2 3 4 5	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry.	2 3	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down
2 3 4	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right.	2 3 4	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up.
2 3 4 5	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry.	2 3 4 5	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let
2 3 4 5 6	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right.	2 3 4 5	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we
2 3 4 5 6 7	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before it went out of their purview. In the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, it may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before it went out of their purview. In the meantime, all of the requests for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, it may be productive, may I suggest we go ahead and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before it went out of their purview. In the meantime, all of the requests for production that we have filed they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, it may be productive, may I suggest we go ahead and set one for July before everybody's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before it went out of their purview. In the meantime, all of the requests for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, it may be productive, may I suggest we go ahead and set one for July before everybody's calendar gets filled up on them and set	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before it went out of their purview. In the meantime, all of the requests for production that we have filed they objected to every one of them. Now, what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, it may be productive, may I suggest we go ahead and set one for July before everybody's calendar gets filled up on them and set them 60 and 90s days out so most people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before it went out of their purview. In the meantime, all of the requests for production that we have filed they objected to every one of them. Now, what they want to do is start that process
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, it may be productive, may I suggest we go ahead and set one for July before everybody's calendar gets filled up on them and set them 60 and 90s days out so most people have flexibility. The next day we had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before it went out of their purview. In the meantime, all of the requests for production that we have filed they objected to every one of them. Now, what they want to do is start that process again so that they can clean up those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, it may be productive, may I suggest we go ahead and set one for July before everybody's calendar gets filled up on them and set them 60 and 90s days out so most people have flexibility. The next day we had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before it went out of their purview. In the meantime, all of the requests for production that we have filed they objected to every one of them. Now, what they want to do is start that process again so that they can clean up those objections. Everyone had a boilerplate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 23	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, it may be productive, may I suggest we go ahead and set one for July before everybody's calendar gets filled up on them and set them 60 and 90s days out so most people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before it went out of their purview. In the meantime, all of the requests for production that we have filed they objected to every one of them. Now, what they want to do is start that process again so that they can clean up those objections. Everyone had a boilerplate objection, so they are going to object
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 23 24	34 and we will file it today. THE COURT: Can we go ahead and agree on a specific date to reconvene in June? MR. REEVES: Judge, we had suggested I'm sorry. THE COURT: It's all right. MR. REEVES: reconvening June 12th. We set dates for the next several months and primarily to schedule around Your Honor's convenience. THE COURT: I actually had a hearing in Tupelo on a case going on up there. I know that has been continued. So I know June 12th is available for me to be here at 9:00 if that is agreeable for everyone else. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. MR. REEVES: Your Honor, it may be productive, may I suggest we go ahead and set one for July before everybody's calendar gets filled up on them and set them 60 and 90s days out so most people have flexibility. The next day we had suggested was perhaps July 13th, so we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	36 that comes up in this case and you need me to come down here and have a hearing all you need to do is just let me know or we will set a date and we will be down here and we'll hook them up. MR. BARTON: Judge, procedurally let me discuss something with the Court so we understand what is happening. They and I say they, the defendants have not discussed with Mr. Denham and myself at all what we consider to be the core documents. They are going to produce documents that have already been produced. I'm sure that is a clean sanitized set of documents they have thoroughly gone through and vetted before it went out of their purview. In the meantime, all of the requests for production that we have filed they objected to every one of them. Now, what they want to do is start that process again so that they can clean up those objections. Everyone had a boilerplate

05/18/2015 09:25:15 AM

<b></b>	<u>^</u>		
	61		63
1	deposition and do the best you can	1	affirmative duty to check on the client
2	without it.	2	every day and make sure he is alright and
3	MR. MAYO: Absolutely.	3	if there is any turn to notify everybody.
M	THE COURT: If the documentation is	4	I don't want to find out 2 weeks after it
K	there and he can't answer the question	5	is all over with.
6	then he would have to tell you he can't	6	THE COURT: Well, it would be my
7	answer.	7	inclination to set the deposition the
8	MR. MAYO: Yes, sir.	8	week after June 12th so that would be
9	THE COURT: That is a perfectly good	9	somewhere on the 14th. So you can be
10	answer, I don't know.	10	prepared to depose him at that time. The
11	MR. DENHAM: It is a difficult	11	week after our meeting of June 12th.
12	situation. I've been informed by counsel	12	MS. HILLERY: Okay.
13	that he is capable of giving his	13	THE COURT: What else have we?
14	deposition today. I don't know what he	14	MR. REEVES: Nothing further from the
15	will be like a month from now.	15	Plaintiffs, I think, Your Honor.
16	Her problem is that he does not	16	MR. WILLIAMS: Nothing.
17	have documents. When I've asked what	17	THE COURT: Well, I will see you'at
18	documents all I get is documents. This	18	9:00 on June the 12th unless there is
19	is the CFO who served during a critical	19	some revelation that changes that.
20	period. He certainly knows who he	20	Like I said, I am available for
21	would know maybe who ordered the when	21	the phone conference any time there is
22	the payment who was present when the	22	something that comes up that you need my
23	payments when the decision was made	23	voice in. And let's get those orders to
24	that the payments would quit going into	24	me.
25	the plan. Who was it that authorized the	25	So we will stand adjourned until
	CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR		CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR
( )	62		64
1	sending out of communications to the	1	June 12th.
2	retirees that the plan was just fine when	2	(Court session concluded at 10:41 a.m.)
3	it wasn't. He would know questions like	3	
4	that without documents.	4	
5	THE COURT: So you are asking me to	5	
6	make a decision because I don't know the	6	
7	condition of the deponent. I don't know	7	
8	if he is critically ill and there is an	-	
9	emergency situation where we need to go	8	
10	and depose him now or whether he is, you	. 9	
11	know, just on a clear day 30 days from	10	·
12	now he is still going to be able to be	11	
13	deposed.	12	
14	MS. HILLERY: That is the most	13	
15	likely. Obviously I can't promise that	14	
16	some catastrophic accident won't happen	15	
17	between now and then, but it is not an	16	
18	emergency situation as of right now.	17	
19	MR. DENHAM: We had his deposition	18	
20	set. Judge Harris had set the deposition	19	
21	and then the Judge replaced him and they	20	·
	took it away and the rest is history. So	21	
23	it has been set one time. And I just	22	
24	point that out.	23	
25	Counsel ought to have an	24	
	CRYSTAL LYNN MORRIS, CSR	25	

# EXHIBIT B



## Another TRO issued in SRHS legal battle

Posted: Jan 05, 2015 4:32 PM CST Updated: Jan 06, 2015 5:52 AM CST-

By Doug Walker CONNECT

JACKSON COUNTY, MS (WLOX) - For the fifth time, a 10 day temporary restraining order was issued Monday preventing officials with Singing River Health System from terminating the financially troubled pension plan.

Chancery Judge Neil Harris granted the motion by a system retiree following a two hour hearing. And just like in the past four cases, attorneys for the health system will ask to have the case moved to federal court.

Before a standing room only crowd, Ralph Drury, 84, testified he worked for Singing River . for 32 years, and draws a monthly retirement check of about \$2,000. That check is now in jeopardy.

"It's sad to start with, all these people are being hurt," Drury said. "This thing has affected thousands of people and we've got to do something about it, some way, some how."

In addition to the TRO, plaintiff attorneys also filed motions concerning the make-up of the system board of trustees, since questions have been raised about where some of the trustees live, according to Earl Denham.

"We've added in to this particular complaint some additional state issues, and that is whether or not the board is validly constituted, and whether or not it was validly constituted when it voted on this thing," Denham explained.

Sabrina Smith was a surprise witness. She attended the Jackson County Board of Supervisors meeting, and testified about an agreement between the supervisors and trustees preventing the liquidation of the pension plan for up to 90 days.

"I was wanting to let the judge know that the agreement between the board of trustees and the board of supervisors is not legally binding," Smith said.

Meanwhile, frustration is mounting for the crowd of retirees who show up at every hearing. One of them is Jerry Holtz.

"Well, quite personally, it is frustrating because I don't think that the people at large in Jackson County are being given the right kind of information to make a decision."

Another is Susan Creel, who is set to retire later this year.

"It's made me have to rearrange everything I do, how I'm going to do my retirement, and it's very frustrating. It seems like we're always behind the eight ball," Creel said.

Officials with the health system had no comment Monday evening, referring us to a written statement issued last month, stating that while litigation is underway, they would have nothing more to say.

Copyright 2015 WLOX, All rights reserved.

#### RECOMMENDED

Promoted Links by Taboola

87 Yr Old Trainer Shares 3 Fit Foods For Getting Slender Athletic Gresus Supplement Subscription

Daughter defends mom after Facebook post on killing white cops

14 Benefits Most Seniors Didn't Know They Had Sewsmax

2 Mississippi women sentenced in James Craig Anderson killing

#### WE RECOMMEND

Pics of teen girls in panties leads to firefighter arrests

Sheriff: 14-year-old filmed toddler performing sex act, posted video to Facebook

Woman confesses church trip led to sex with teen, 'it just happened'

Contractor saves 8-year-old boy from dog attack

Police: Arrests made in large, planned fight in Gulfport

#### **PROMOTED STORIES**

The shocking fees that come with annuities (TheStreet)

What Does Your Last Name Say About You? (Ancestry)

Not a Routine Traffic Stop: The True Tale Behind a Broken Taillight (DGI Wire)

<u>13 Chilling Childhood Photos Of</u> <u>History's Most Infamously Evil</u> <u>Humans (BrainJet)</u>

Forget Googling them, this site reveals all. Simply enter a name and state of anyone you know, what will you learn today? (Instant Checkmate)

Recommended by Contaction



### The Sun Herald

**Previous Story** Next Story

## SRHS retiree's attorney: 'The hunt is on' for whoever halted pension funding

## Retiree's attorney: 'The hunt is on' for whoever halted pension funding

By ANITA LEE

calee@sunherald.comJanuary 15, 2015 Updated 16 hours ago

- Facebook 0
- Twitter .
  - 0

o

- Google Plus
- More
  - Linkedin
  - Reddit ٥
  - YouTube σ

  - E-mail
  - Print
  - ٥ 0

http://www.sunherald.com/2015/01/15/6019528/federal-judge-sends-srhs-back.html

1/5



#### Harris





http://www.sunherald.com/2015/01/15/6019528/federal-judge-sends-srhs-back.html

- Related Stories:
- Federal judge orders 90-day reprieve on pension plan termination
- Wiggins introduces bill to rein in SRHS trustees
- Other Related Content:
- · File: Order remanding Cynthia Almond case back to Chancery Court

GULFPORT -- Singing River Health System retiree Cynthia Almond is back in Chancery Court, where she wanted to be all along.

Almond is suing the health system, its trustees and CEO Kevin Holland over the failed pension plan. She secured a temporary restraining order in Chancery Court to prevent plan termination and wants an accounting from SRHS that would show why it stopped funding the plan.

SRHS removed her case to federal court, along with those of five retirees who sued after her.

U.S. District Judge Louis Guirola Jr. has now ruled Almond's case belongs in Chancery Court. The health system, he said, failed to meet its burden of proof that the case should be tried in federal court. Guirola

. 1/16/2015

SRHS retiree's attorney: 'The hunt is on' for whoever halted pension funding | Singing River Health System | The Sun Herald

found invalid SRHS' argument that Almond's lawsuit involved any dispute over federal tax and other regulations that apply to the pension plan.

One of Almond's attorneys, Earl Denham, said he

is eager to return to Chancery Court. He plans to subpoena witnesses and records that could reveal who in the health system decided to stop funding the pension plan, when and why.

"It's on," Denham said. "The hunt is on. I am so grateful that things have worked out this way and now we can go about the business of doing something for our clients. I am tired of holding the gate and I am ready for the hunt."

Chancery Judge Neil Harris made it clear before he lost the Almond case he plans to set a brisk pace for the proceedings.

- Facebook
- Twitter
  - 0
  - o
- Google Plus
- More
  - Linkedin
  - Reddit
  - YouTube
  - °\_\_\_\_
  - o E-mail
    o Print

  - 0

#### Join The Conversation

The Sun Herald is pleased to provide this opportunity to share information, experiences and observations about what's in the news. Some of the comments may be reprinted elsewhere in the site or in the newspaper. We encourage lively, open debate on the issues of the day, and ask that you refrain from profanity, hate speech, personal comments and remarks that are off point. Thank you for taking the time to offer your thoughts.

Commenting FAQs | Terms of Service



© 2015 www.sunherald.com and wire service sources. All Rights Reserved. http://www.sunherald.com



## Attorneys for SRHS retirees prepare to file lawsuit

Posted: May 08, 2015 8:51 AM CDT Updated: May 08, 2015 8:51 AM CDT

Attorneys for some of Singing River Health System's retirees say they're ready to name names. WLOX News has confirmed they're drafting a lawsuit that will allege breach of fiduciary relationship and breach of contract. And they expect to file that suit in circuit court by Monday.

Earl Denham is that attorney. He tells WLOX News he's drafting the suit to get pension money back for the retirees and to bring the wrong-doers to light.

Denham says, "It's time for those names to come out." Denham represents a handful of the retirees who've been battling with Singing River Health System since reports surfaced about their pension funds not being fully funded.

Denham posted this comment on the SRHS Hopes Facebook page today. "To all our Singing River retiree clients and their families, and to their tireless organizer, Singing River Hopes, and to Cindy Almond who blazed the trail, we dedicate this glorious day. I hope to file today - Monday at the latest."

This is a developing story. As we gather more details, and get reaction from Singing River Health System, we're share that on <u>WLOX.com</u> and on WLOX News.

Copyright 2015 WLOX. All rights reserved.

#### RECOMMENDED

Promoted Links by Taboola

Learn How One Man Used 5 Stocks To Retire At 42 Newsmax

Missing Gulfport woman's body found in Ocean Springs marsh

87 Yr Old Trainer Shares 3 Fit Foods For Getting Slender Albeur Strens Suppliment Subscription

SRHS retirees request 100 percent restoration of retirement benefits

#### WE RECOMMEND

Fatal crash victim identified as Ocean Springs man

Worker accused of stealing more than \$17,000 from casino

Missing Gulfport woman's body found in Ocean Springs marsh

#### PROMOTED STORIES

Postal Worker Who Stole Coupons Sues JC Penney (About.com)

Not a Routine Traffic Stop: The True Tale Behind a Broken Taillight (DGI Wire) Karmagenes, the DNA-Based Personality Test, to Attend the Collision Conference in Las Vegas

MDEQ: Don't swim in these waters

Why Cleveland Kidnapping Survivors Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus Don't Speak with Fellow Victim Michelle Knight (People)

Forget Googling them, this site reveals all. Simply enter a name and state of anyone you know, what will you learn today? (Instant Checkmate)

Woman Dies After Nurse Refuses to Do CPR (AARP)

Recommended by Outbrain

SEARCH FCC Public File wlox@wlox.com EEO Report Closed Captioning



NEWSWEATHERSPORTSVIDEOHEALTHEDUCATIONTVCONTESTS/DEALS

MISSISSIPPI NEWS NOW		éb <u>è</u> NEWS
<b>X</b> .	Privacy Policy	Terms of Service



Earl Denha	am	a ti takar dari ta ta sa	Q Home 200			
	9 monders 2. mondeste Constant Privous :	\$ <b>\$</b> }	Extremely soft work laws give you the right to work for a lot less money than states with non-right to work laws. I think the average is \$1500 less money. Like Reply $(D^{-1} + 1)$ ::			
	KE Friend's AKOLE ★★★	123	Franklin Davis I must say that I have worked for Northrop Grumman, before they had the so called spin off to Huntington Ingalis, for the most part the union is a joke, the electrical union anyway what people do not know is that the union is supposed to represent the See More. Like $\cdot$ Reply $\underline{ID2} \cdot 50$ mms		•	
	***		Carolyn Lee Bhahahhahhaa, LQVE IT!! Like · Reply · 14 adas · :			
inter and a second s	G PRITER LECTRE. LIPPITER BIRD Cériles carregedent cecilits i sintes PS Bosque Mexican Restaurant	35	Wile 6 connont			
	🗙 🗙 🗙 Bord Mordan Hursteinzus na Euro Ledar Garras (De para Larastru, et as		Earl Denham Black Educar 🖗			
	Oak Choclaw People meeling Jeave,MS	Jacks	Supervisor and every hospital trustee and every retirement trustee in on County needs to immediately declare for the Retirees and those who	,		
OTES 23		for the ones v is sim	o see all documents and take responsible action against wrong doers or Administration and its allies, fighting to keep its secrets and protect the who diverted pension money and deceived the retirees and the public. It ple, you cannot serve both. One or the other right now, because			
Support the J	obs Plan over k year lega	-	en today and the See More			
so, sin havir goo	d i norse all over America Iosing Ib-li		Jonument - Share - ▲27 口 8 4° 23			
isply, adds P	, then care line, insurance, their besident concerns of outh a plan to my lebastricture to be	r> 23 €				
	me and Luckett is The Man		Phyllis Denmark I want to see who will tell the truth? We have waited long enough. I hope that there are still some honest people among us. We will see. This debacle was not a "perfect storm" as Mr. Holland would have us all believe. This was a man made event. Those responsible should be held accountable.			
antinus His-c	a fea bho a fonciy kille best angung is a Germanalez velar is Misservijed,	58	Like - Reply - ∲2 - 6 bis Margaret Horton Rucinski Ameni			
risa disas seri	alo, 'y levy telen boer oktor tonji n o staty, i elastetivi	a	Like · Reply · 6 hr., Myra Felsher White Very true, Like Reply 6 hrs			
<u>ር</u> ች 1	· ·····		Diann Wheeler Sims I certain hope y'all get Some truth and explanationand Your money III So Like · Reply · 5 http			
		<b>C</b> .3	Cher Foley I can never understand why people have such a hard time standing up for what they say they believe in. SHARED.			
		\$1 <b>0</b>	Like-Reply-∢8co Morris Burns It's time. Like Reply L∯1 5cos			
			Laura Zamzow Mckenzie It has been long enough. We will not give up! Like - Reply - 🏠 1 - S box			
		<i>51</i> 5,	Ed Myers Well said Earl!! Like Reply 1 th			
		S.	Wike a common '			
			Earl Denham May & of 0:47569 - 19	Sponsere		
		beautif imagin	iis is the hour. Ya los pajarillos cantan. La luna ya se metio`, just as the ul old Spanish song observes. La hora de todas cosas posibles en el acion`, my magic hour, returning from where I have been, shifting to accomodate where I am going now, this day.The little birds are			
		indeed surrou	singing as they awaken, and the darkness in the post moon garden nding my small house, La Casa de la Luna, after the moon set was so	Men's She		
		Like - C	nd that when I awakened See More enneet Staee ሲዮ 59 ር፲ 35	amazon o Free shipp eligible iter		
			Earl Denham			
			May 2 3 602 min Example is ottages ready to rent at Saint's Retreat. Both new, 2 BR, Woodland with read to deen water on haven. Gas kitchen, control boot and air			
			with road to deep water on bayou. Gas kitchen, central heat and air. s. Big screen porch. \$800 per month, \$500 deposit. 6 month lease,	Meet Men MeetMenn		
			ncluded. Call 217-7401.	Typical ad-		

•

Earl Deni	nam		Q Home 20+		
	49 inerthers	Di dagi seli se di secili s	See More		
<b>7756</b> 1	nd, mentation ber und Ad Isla. T	Like -	Comment Shale - 65 💭 3		
REVIEWS		<b>H</b> all I	<b>_</b>		
SN	AKE Friend's AKOLE	S.	Earl Denham Moy Fat 5:02am - :?		
*:	***	Satu	rday afternoon I have been asked to meet with the Srhs Hopes folks to		
	ceivo's		iss what may come next. I will meet with persons supporting the Retirees 00 pm on Saturday, tomorrow with Harvey Barton and 4 others.		
*:	1999 S 新文文文 1983 - S 1997 LECES 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1		Comment - Share 615 [2 A 1		
	en e camera marca a comerca en Oli si equerca en comerca	<b>I</b> C 15	people like this.		-
0 C A 200 - 6 CM	be's Bosque Mexican Restaurant 体女☆☆	\$1:			
	, bin 120 si shi Rokavava ba bi s onsido i Colori (organo nangi ji may	210	Jean Manning Thank you		
	e Oak Choctaw People meeting Icleave.MS		Like Reply May 1 of 0:49 to		
<b>*</b>	1010 (193) (1910) 1010 (1930) (1910)		Carolyn Verbeck where will you meet? Like : Reply : Say 1 of \$210m		
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	(	Wide a company		
NOTES 20			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Support the		œ۶,	Earl Denham		
	el lovo a popinije od propio zleover America (ostaj loviji	18	April 20 at 7.52pm - 63		
ata, celebrano	on proper cancer when canonical tests of their constitution the life President source on when plan to		a day of informed counsel, I can tell you that except for the various rs at play, it is absolutely wrong that the Jackson County Board of		
rebuil our de cr	Mediregesterense je ho Nediregesterense je ho	Supe	rvisors has not announced its long awaited plan concerning the pension		
n 14 💭 8			There is no reason to wait. And any law firm that has members who or whose relatives have done business directly with the hospital or		
	ime and Luckett is The Man		gh ownership in other companies should resign or be fired at once. The goes for any trustee or supervi See More		
	n - sinon a yaan aga Ka tak tina a tahooy kuto bula cilaging tu		Comment - Share - 1247 [] 27 5 11		
te degol, boro	e on economic vite in Mississippi. 5 0 Canadiate vite in Mississippi. 1990 y BAS been busicance long		people like this.		
bolara invias inv	the state. Existing		shares		
<u>67</u> 1		A-8-	Renee Barton Way to tell the truth		
		S. 201	April 19 at 6:03pts - Like - 😰 3		
			Laura Zamzow Mckenzie The TRUTH will prevail. Be steadfast and strongwe are many voices together		
		<b>1</b> 2291	April 20 of 9.24pm - Like Mike Brauston Brausil van guickly na Ma have akandy and the delevit effer		
		Pint	Mike Brewster Prevail yes, quickly no. We have already seen the delay tactics SRHS has used and will continue to use in some form.		
			April 20 st 4t64pm - Like to 1 Gpa Grimm For the love of God and /or whichever higher power you believe in,		
		(B)	all citizens of Jackson County, heck along the entire Guif Coast If anyone of you know something that will help us or help get those who caused this jail time		
			SPEAK UP NOW IIII THIS SO HER US OF HER US WITH CAUSE WITH CAUSE UNITS AN UNE SPEAK UP NOW IIII THIS SOE MORE April 20 cl (cl / p is - Cl /		
		20	Lauren Braden Thank you, Gramps. You and Mrs. Grimm are so sweet and		•
			have been doing so much to help out. Any information may be helpful. Appl (3) at 9:22pai - Like - #0.4		
		<u>m</u>	Jean Manning I have already started		
		N.	April 29 at 9557pm - Like of 2 Jean Manning and i will keep on doing the things which will help us hopefully		
		$\heartsuit$	and never give up	Sponsore	
		1.30	Apat 23 of 9066park Like II 23 Nick Mason For a debacle of the magnitude of the pension fund to occur, there	2794	
			would have had to been a conspiracy of several, and if not by direct intentional acts, at least by incompetence, complacency or silence.		
		2 Table Street	Apal 30 at 7:54aa - Like - 🕼 3		
		1343	Eric Denmark Thanks Earl but my wife said this from the very beginning. When the board of Supervisor president lied to her face from the beginning. Those who	Men's She amazon ce Free shier	
			conducted this travesty know who they are. Remaining silent is wrong. Those that know the who and why of th See More	Free shipp eligible ile:	
			April 30 of 9:33an - Like - £34		
		<u>es</u>	Randy Heddings Earl, you should call me, if you get time. I told Chris Anderson, via a letter in June/July 2010 time frame they were not properly managing money and them to the Delated any Beat to be a second. The black should be a con-		
			and trying to rob Peter to pay Paul so to speak. That letter should be on file in my Dad's Health records. If you need my help to get it, let me know. I will do all I can.		
			Their arrogant response should be there as well. April 33 at 1511 ar Like - 1622	Meet Men	
	· · · ·		Carolyn Lee 🥳 Give em Hell Earl 🤃	Maettéenii Typicul ad	
			May i of 4:20pm - Like n 🖒 1	may be ris	
		648			

^

٠

Earl Denham		Q Home 20+		
9.949 members Port Lintegals der Cans and Pelling		must be sure that whatever plan is See More May 1 at 0:55pm - Like		
EVIEWS : \$3	. 19	Spa Grimm If the BOS oversaw the damn hospital like they should had and if those stupid BOTH had throughly read everything nine of this happened May 1 at 7(15) at Like 1271		
SNAKE Friend's AKOLE *****	ê.	Sabrina Manning Smith John McKay how can you sit there and say it's not the BOS fault when 2 of the Supervisors (Ross and Mangum) where in the trustees meeting when they agreed to terminate the plan and still remained silent?? Please explain that? Why did the BOS keep ap See More May 16 / 52(an Like - 2)		
*****      IFFACECATE LOCATE LOCATE LOCATE     IFFACE ADDRESS AND THAT ADDRESS      Pape's Bosque Mexican Restaurant     ******	÷.	Sabrina Manning Smith Oh an BTW the reason the retirees are still getting their checks it's because of Earl Denham Harvey Barton and Lauren Braden who worked their butts off and got TRO's after TRO's until yall and the hospital realized that they (the retirees) weren't playing and are NOT playing!!!! May 1 (a7.35pm - Like - $f_{2}$ .2		
The Cold 91-0 on Problems der 3 Micro Cold Cond Rectance and A. Cold A. Cold A. Cold A. Cold A. Cold A. Coold A. Cool		Debra Steybe That's right Sabrina Manning Smith. If the BOS were doing their job and not just taking someone's word there may have not been a problem. May 1 at $653$ pp - Like $\sqrt{2}2$	•	
	M	John McKay Sabrina, 1. About Ross and Mangum: I can only give you my explanation of Mr. Ross and Mr. Mangum as I have heard. The way I understand it is that Mr. Ross and Mr. Mangum were at the meeting. Both have stated that they did not fully realize what		
DTES 20		wa See More May 1 at 3:00pm - Like		
upport the Jobs Plan Eard Berkhan - over a year ago 5 white-a good ( early a shown America tooring to a 45 whiteamers, their cars, thour instruction, their 10%, and the President comos up with a plan te		Harvey Barton Supervisor McKay. Before you call Sabrina a flar which you just did you need to check your facts. Compare the date of the TROs we obtained vs your MOU. You and your cohorts were two days from terminating the plan and wiping out approximately 148 millio See More May 1 at 9:24pm - Like - $\frac{4}{5}$ 2		
build our of caylog indicatostore to Lo 514 (C)8 pow Is The Time and Luckett Is The Man	Ģ,	Sabrina Manning Smith McKay, with all due respect sig but do you not consider the retirees tax paying citizens that you so say your trying to protect??!! They are loosing their pension and your sitting on your thumbs!! And then you the BOS denies their voices to be head See More Mary 1 at $9\times4$ part. Like $\sqrt{-1}$		
Earl Disilion – original year ago matianas I kove lest file a lansity lette bad anguag pr		Etta Bennington Anglin What does MOU, & TRO stand for? Nay 1 of 0:39pm - Like		
t duseri, bang ir O- modulfa wilar ar Alsel-siy (f. an Ibbagh rity findly 433 baan hara sina stong fare it virs e van ir stars, i dan't feol	<u>g</u>	John McKay Etta, An MOU is a memorandum of understanding. A TRO is a temporary restraining order. May 1 sh v63pm - Like		
<u>.</u>		Eric Denmark Thank you Mr. McKay you said it ALL in the first statement. If Ross and Magnum did not fully understand "what they were really voting On" then why in the world did they vote at all. They should not have cast a vote either way if they had any question a See More $Mort = 1.04$ Apr - Like $\frac{1}{2}$ /3		
		John McKay Eric, Mr. Ross and Mr. Mangum did not vote. They were attending the BOT meeting as observers. They did not have a vote. As far as I know, they did not even have copies of any documents being discussed. My statement above was that they "were at the me See More May 1 at 104 drsn - Like		
		Gpa Grimm I live in Dist 5 and promise you this. My household WLL NOT vote for any incumbents		
		There is obviously a huge coverup and if justice doesn't prevail now , yall just know that God will come judgement day Bog 1 of 11:05 pm - Like g*2		
		Eric Denmark Agreed Gpa Grimm		
		May 3 at 2592am Like Eric Denmark Well respectively Mr. McKay if this was going own by the BOT and they were not in agreement with it, or it "stunk to high heaven" as the voice of the people of Jackson County they should have been screaming from the rooftops to get the pension fund is See More May 3 ht 9:052an Like "\$1	Sponsore 	
		Eric Denmark In district 5 please consider voting for Mr. Randy Bosarge. I know Eric Denmark In district 5 please consider voting for Mr. Randy Bosarge. I know that if you call him with a question he will answer it. May 2 of 0.05mm - Like : 10:1		
		Véla a Genument . 🔅 👘	Men's She amazon co Free shipp eligible iter	
	Z	Earl Denham April 30-227/885-a-+15		
	Today Srhs H	I am going to post on Singing River after a few more meetings with		
	Like - Ce	onescut - Share - ∰ 32 [] 3	Mest Men	
			MeetMenir	



Like - Commont Share - 10 17 (7) 5

App 20 of 640 ap + Bullot + e

Typical admay be ris

Meet Men MoetMeni

Earl Denham	Q	
6.040 pointhere Needla steads of a Ceen and Results	my straight face and set it aside. By Friday night, the pain and swelling spreading, I suffered a huge cramp in my leg and foot which was grotesque in appearance, torm ligaments and displaced bones. I gave it my best through	
REVIEWS 106	the weekend, but went to bed Sunday night and there I lay until this morning, and I have had enough sleep for a week and am going to work, late, but I am	
SNAKE Friend's AKOLE	going. I get so frustrated with this body at times and yet am truthfully grateful to still have it with so much yet to do!	
	Like Comment Saaro 🔥 66 🖓 72	
Jocelyn's ***** Holicaso Ir a Evocesib Lote mats up PU/Vel //d caracterior to service or service	Earl Denham Apal 20 61 10:3461a - Orden Episeps, MB - W	
Pepe's Bosque Mexican Restaurant ***** The tool Minduest Protegnationalise Minimum Compl. California and and and Minimum California California	It would be so much better for all of us if the government just got out of the marriage business altogether. Neither the Feds nor the States ought to be defining, promoting, forbidding, licensing, or even discussing marriage. Marriage is a private matter, not a public one. Marriage was here before	
Live Oak Choctaw People meeting Vancleave,MS	government existed.	
*	Like - Conuncut - Share - 🏠 64 🖓 18	
and the second secon	Opp kige; Rec. al Stopee. ▼	
NOTES 23	The state of the second st	
Support the Jobs Plan		
So we find a good promote all over America locary (n- ): Joss, their formes, there exists their interaction, fight distribution and the Paradiant adapts of pricinia plan to which are retraking adoptionated to the		
<b>ř</b> 14 ()8		
2 		
Now Is The Time and Luckett Is The Man		
donslinss i Havo let (v en levuly 1809 biel acqueris Berdhand, barry o Consecute with a Kostraggi, com Rospil na Goldense becathere pace tog builde store under statu, i dent Kost		

### 251

Sponsore



Men's Sha amazon.co Free shipp eligible iter



Meet Men MoolMenir Typical ad-may be ris

Seerch Chai

#### https://www.facebook.com/earl.denham?fref=nf

# EXHIBIT C

#### IN THE CHANCERY COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI

KITTY PATRICIA AGUILAR, PLAINTIFF CYNTHIA N. ALMOND, PLAINTIFF HOWARD BOSARGE, PLAINTIFF DONNA B. BROUN, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS VIRGINIA LAY, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS MAURY G. THOMPSON, PLAINTIFF BRENDA JEAN EILAND, PLAINTIFF RALPH DRURY, PLAINTIFF

CAUSE NO. 2014-2753-NH CAUSE NO. 2014-2653-NH CAUSE NO. 2014-2729-NH CAUSE NO. 2015-0027-NH CAUSE NO. 2015-0060-NH CAUSE NO. 2015-0060-NH CAUSE NO. 2015-0030-NH CAUSE NO. 2015-0030-NH

#### VERSUS

#### SINGING RIVER HEALTH SYSTEM, ET AL.

DEFENDANTS

#### **PROTECTIVE ORDER**

THIS COURT, having been presented with this Protective Order by the parties, hereby finds and orders as follows:

1. All confidential information disclosed in this action through discovery, both formal and informal and whether provided by agreement or pursuant to the Mississippi Rules of Civil Procedure, shall be subject to this Protective Order entered pursuant to the provisions of Mississippi Rule of Civil Procedure 26(d). Documents shall be considered "Confidential Information" if so marked by one of the parties (or a non-party which consents to the terms of this Protective Order) based on good cause that the documents or things require those protections provided by this Protective Order.

2. If any party objects to a "Confidential Information" designation, the objecting party shall provide the objection, in writing, to the producing party or non-party. The producing party or non-party shall have seven (7) days to meet and confer with the objecting party. If they do not reach an agreement regarding the designation within seven (7) days, the objecting party may seek relief from the Court as is appropriate. The producing party or non-party shall bear the burden of establishing that the documents or things designated as "Confidential Information" reasonably requires the protections afforded by this Protective Order. The documents and things designated as "Confidential Information" shall retain the protections afforded under this

84205706\V-3

Protective Order until a determination by the Court that the producing party or non-party has failed to establish that such protections are necessary and appropriate. If the Court, *sua sponte* or upon motion, determines that a producing party or non-party has marked documents or things as "Confidential Information" without good cause and refuses to correct that designation following a meet and confer, the Court shall award reasonable attorney fees and expenses to the party challenging such wrongful designation.

3. The parties and counsel shall not give copies of any "Confidential Information" to any person, other than: (1) counsel of record in this action and employees of counsel to whom it is necessary that the material be shown for purposes of this action; or (2) parties or the respective insurers to this action; or (3) experts consulted for purposes of this action by counsel for a party in this action; or (4) witnesses deposed in this action when they are shown said documents by any party; or (5) stenographers retained to record testimony in this action; or (6) third-party contractors involved in copying, organizing, coding, imaging, converting, storing or retrieving data, or (7) the Court, including the Special Master or Receiver appointed by the Court; or (8) any other person who is designated as a qualified person by Order of the Court, after notice to the parties and any interested non-parties.

4. If the parties or counsel tender any "Confidential Information" to any expert witness, said expert shall be given a copy of this Protective Order and shall sign his or her name, indicating his or her agreement to abide by the terms and conditions of this Order.

5. In the event that any "Confidential Information" must be used in any Court proceeding in connection with this litigation, it shall not lose its confidential status, and the submitting party shall take all steps required to protect its confidentiality.

6. Nothing in this Protective Order shall be construed to prevent any party from introducing any "Confidential Information" into evidence at a trial of this matter or to prevent

84205706\V-3

2

any jury selected at a trial of this matter from viewing any document.

7. "Confidential Information" shall not be used for any purpose other than the preparation and trial of this or related actions, without prior written Order.

8. All "Confidential Information" subject to this Order and all reproductions thereof shall be safeguarded from dissemination through the conclusion of this litigation. This includes all copies given to any expert or made by any expert witness. Following conclusion of this litigation, all such confidential documents shall be destroyed.

9. If a producing party or non-party discovers it has inadvertently produced information protected by the attorney-client privilege or attorney work product doctrine, such production shall not operate as a waiver of the privilege or protection, provided the producing party or non-party party gives written notice of the inadvertent production. Such notice shall include a statement and explanation of the basis for the contention that the inadvertently produced information is privileged or is otherwise not appropriate for disclosure. After receiving such notice, the receiving parties must promptly return, sequester, or destroy the inadvertently produced information and any copies that it has. The receiving party may promptly present the inadvertently produced information to the Court under seal for a determination of whether the information is discoverable and shall not use or disclose the information until there is an agreement or adjudication that the material is discoverable. The party or non-party claiming the privilege or immunity has the burden of proving it.

10. The Court retains continuing jurisdiction to enforce or modify this Protective Order.

3

SO ORDERED, this the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2015.

L. BRELAND HILBURN, SPECIAL CHANCELLOR