LINWOOD, NEW JERSEY

1-800-471-0299

(609) 927-0299

08221

FAX (609) 927-6420

THE COMBY GROUP 1-600-200-00-40

25

2-15-96

THE CURBY GROUP 1-000-200-00**

89-11051

2-15-96

89-11051

25

しゅうにゅ しゅじつう

Scott Lutes. Those are the service lists, I represent Mr. Chorney in the federal court case.

THE COURT: Okay. And anybody else who's here as an interested party can put your name on the record if and when you decide to speak up. Mr. Monzack.

MR. MONZACK: If Your Honor please, we're here on the Chapter 7 Trustee's Amended Notice of attempted sale of certain coins and stamps that are currently in the possession of Christie's. I guess just a brief overview of how we got here this morning.

THE COURT: Incidentally, as a mechanical matter, have you spoken to any of the objectors or dealt with any of them in connection with this morning's hearing?

MR. MONZACK: I've spoken to several folks on the telephone.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MONZACK: I don't think I've spoken to anybody who is present in the Court this morning specifically with regard to this hearing.

THE COURT: Okay. This is a suggestion or a thought. I'm willing to take a short recess -- we have apparently a few of the objectors who have appeared -- I'm just guessing. If you think you can have any meaningful discussion, informative or otherwise with these people not in a hearing context, I'll take a short break. If you think we

2-15-96

89-11051

107-100

いってい

should just keep going, I'll do that.

MR. MONZACK: We certainly are willing to give it a try, Your Honor, to have a discussion with the people who are here.

of my other ideas, call me back right away, and we won't waste any time. If you don't think you're accomplishing anything or informing people as to things that they might otherwise, you know, not get at a hearing, let me --

MR. MONZACK: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Off the record at Tape #1, Index #2801)

* * * * * * * * * * *

(On the record at Tape #1, Index #2802)

CLERK: Please remain seated.

MR. MONZACK: If Your Honor please, we have not been able to reach any agreement in the discussions that we had, so before the Court is the Trustee's Amended Notice of Intended Sale free and clear of liens and encumbrances dated January 11, 1996 seeking the authorization of this Court to sell certain coins and stamps in the possession of Christie's.

The whole issue as I understand it really resolves around paragraph 6 of the amended notice, which states as follows -- I'll just briefly read it into the record, Your Honor.

"The class action suit previously instituted by the redemption of coin holders was resolved by this Court's order of March 28, 1995 whereby the redemption coins were turned over to the attorney for the redemption coin holders. Notwithstanding the preceding, a concern has been voiced by several redemption coin holders that perhaps they can identify their coins from those now in the possession of Christie's.

To address this concern, any redemption coin holder may arrange with Christie's to view the coins which will be auctioned, and if a redemption coin holder has a realistic and legitimate concern that his or her coins may be auctioned, those coins identified by the redemption coin holder as possibly belonging to a redemption coin holder will not be auctioned until this Court determines how to dispose of any such coins."

As you will recall, the litigation with redemption coin holders was resolved pursuant to the Court order referenced in paragraph 6 of the Order. In an effort to -- let me step back a little bit. The problem that exists today and that existed at the time the settlement was made and what was known by all parties at that time was that the coins that were stored in these canisters that were identified as

2-15-96

89-11051

redemption coins had four digit identifying numbers on them. In round numbers, approximately two-thirds of the coins that were in these canisters had identifying numbers on them that matched up with known redemption coin holders based upon proofs of claim that were filed in the Bankruptcy Court or that were otherwise communicated to Mr. Smith.

For instance, I don't believe Mr. Taft filed a claim in the Bankruptcy Court, but he did communicate and indicate what his bearer number was, so the list in the Bankruptcy Court I don't believe is exhaustive of all people that communicated with Mr. Smith to identify their bearer numbers. Be that as it may, it still left about one-third of these coins in canisters with four digit identifying numbers that didn't match up with any known redemption coin holder though in total coins, the total number of coins that made up this lot of redemption coins was actually slightly in excess of those numbers previously represented by Mr. Chorney to have represented the total number of redemption coins.

With knowledge of that problem, and with the FDIC willing to give up its claim and to at least secure those claims, that settlement was reached, those coins returned to Mr. Smith -- the Court order in fact envisioned that there would be a problem and stated that those coins that could be identified to redemption coin holders would be returned to them. Those coins that could not be identified to a

1

6

7 8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25 particular redemption coin holder would be liquidated. Mr. Smith's professional fees would be paid out of that and the balance of the funds then would be disbursed to the remaining redemption coin holders pro rata to those folks who didn't get their coins back. That matter was resolved by this Court's order.

In an effort to accommodate Mr. Taft's concern --Mr. Taft had been before the Court a number of times and had voiced concerns about what happened in the administration of his case way back when, when it was a Chapter 11 case. have been -- pursuant to prior reports given to the Court, Mr. Taft and myself had met with Mrs. D'Orio who is the attorney for the bank, met with the U.S. Attorney, viewed tapes at both locations, took a look at additional documentation in an effort to answer some questions that Mr. In an effort to try to accommodate Mr. Taft and Taft had. other similarly situated redemption coin holders, it was -the offer was made that as part of this sale, if we could identify particular coins that possibly could be redemption coin holders, certain coins would be pulled out of the sale and the sale would go forward based upon some realistic and legitimate concerns with regard to those coins.

THE COURT: Has anybody come forward or taken you up on that offer?

MR. MONZACK: Well, here's where we are right now,

89-11051

הסעם: מעסה

Judge. Mr. Brodsky was successor in possession of the redemption coins, and Mr. Brodsky currently has in his possession the -- essentially the canisters that were identified as redemption coins for the purposes of that settlement that had bearer numbers on them that didn't match up with any known individual.

THE COURT: That did not.

MR. MONZACK: Whose bearer number is either on file with the Court or was previously communicated, I guess, to Mr. Smith before or to Mr. Brodsky after he took possession of the coins. In our discussion before the suggestion was made that if a redemption coin holder could not identify a coin by year and mint mark that was currently in Mr. Brodsky's possession, then we would seek to isolate those coins from the coins currently in Christie's possession, not conceding that they were redemption coin holders' coins, but pulling them out of the sale for the time being, and perhaps resolving a dispute later on, though it would be the position of the Trustee and the FDIC that there can be no dispute because this issue has been resolved.

This is really sort of just an effort to allow the sale to go forward in an expeditious manner. Apparently, though, the coins that are in Mr. Brodsky's possession have not been identified by year and mint mark, and so it's unknown for instance whether Mr. Taft's coins by year and

mint mark are in Mr. Brodsky's possession or not. Let me take that back. Coins that have the same year and mint mark as Mr. Taft's are in the possession of Mr. Brodsky.

To go back, even the coins that have been returned matched up with identifying numbers; some of the redemption coin holders take the position that because in the earlier administration of the case these canisters were opened, maybe they're not their coins, so even people who put coins back that appear to match up by year and mint mark that definitely matched up by identifying number, even those people -- some of those people say, "Well, how do I know these are my coins?"

So that's the kind of attitude, you know, that exists in this case. But it was the position of the FDIC that if the coins are not in the possession of Mr. Brodsky by year and mint mark, but there are coins in the possession of Christie's by year and mint mark that match up to the redemption coin holders, then those coins could possibly be pulled from the auction.

THE COURT: If you have a year and a mint mark, is that a positive ID of a coin, or does that just put it in a category that you can still fight over?

MR. MONZACK: Well, for instance I've got statistics -- I mean certain coins there were ten million of them minted. You know you bought a, you know, 1909 Morgan

silver dollar.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MONZACK: There are ten million of them -- just using arbitrary numbers --

THE COURT: Okay, so it's not like as if it was DNA here that we're --

MR. MONZACK: That's right. There is no way to identify that a particular coin in Christie's possession is that individual's coin, just as the redemption coin holder's coin matches the coin that were returned to them in canisters bearing their bearer numbers. They're saying, "How do I know those are my coins?"

THE COURT: Mmhmm.

MR. MONZACK: These were coins that were originally sold in sealed containers and to keep the so-called fifteen per cent a year guarantee you never could open it and look at it. I mean the people who bought these coins never visualized, as far as I know, didn't visually identify the coins in the canisters in the first place to be identical to what they were purchasing.

THE COURT: Are there any coins either in the possession of Mr. Brodsky or Christie's or anybody involved in this case that are still sealed and kept the way they were promised to be kept, or has everything been contaminated?

MR. MONZACK: Certainly -- I guess we have a slight

dispute as to whether there were any canisters that were not unsealed, but certainly a majority of the canisters appeared to have been unsealed early on in the administration of the case.

THE COURT: When you say a canister, what does that look like? What am I --

MR. MONZACK: It sort of looks like a -- a vitamin bottle. type of thing. But --

THE COURT: A what?

MR. MONZACK: -- it's a particular canister designed to hold silver dollars, and so it's got a radius in it that matches up with the radius of the silver dollar to be in a single stack, has a cap on it that looks sort of like a vitamin jar cap --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MONZACK: -- that type of cap that seals. Most of them are in like a translucent plastic. It's not clear. You really can't see into it, but you can sort of make out shadows on the inside. The canisters probably hold 20 coins maximum, but not all of them held 20 coins. A lot of them had like tissue paper in the top, and some of the canisters were never -- were not supposed to have held twenty. Some people bought ten coins and they were put in the canisters, some bought twenty, or numbers in between.

THE COURT: Yeah.

2-15-96

89-11051

.0000 -0000 000

MR. MONZACK: But every coin that was in that type of canister with a four digit number on it was returned to Mr. Smith. That was the terms of the settlement. The coins that Christie's has were not in canisters bearing four digit ID numbers. Now there's a lot of, as I said, finger-pointing that, you know, someone did whatever with these coins early on.

THE COURT: Mmhmm. Are the -- the finger-pointing, is it at Court-appointed officials like Mr. Weingarten and Mr. Cohen and you and the FDIC and the banks, or is it Mr. Chorney that --

MR. MONZACK: I guess different people point different fingers, but just about everybody you've mentioned has had fingers pointed at them.

THE COURT: Yeah, mmhmm.

MR. MONZACK: But principally I believe Mr. Taft and most of the people I think that are currently active as redemption coin holders are -- have more closely the perspective on it than Mr. Taft does, and I think it goes from the bank itself and when they moved coins around to when the Chapter 11 Trustee took possession of them, when the Special Master who was appointed -- I mean the examiner, he's the one who initially took possession of them and then they were turned over to Mr. Cohen. I think it's in that early stages of it when the bank was moving them around, when the

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

30T-000-1 10015

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

89-11051

Special -- when the examiner took possession, when various inventories and coins were counted.

I mean the problem that existed in the case from day one is that as soon as you tried to count the coins, allegations are made that you lessened their value. So the claim has been made both that there have been insufficient inventories done, and that there's been excessive counting of the coins done; but whatever, all of those issues, and some of them were intractable and really were not subject to resolution, especially at the stage that I got in the case, and so the determination was made that these coins that were in these canisters that had four digit identifying numbers, all of them would be returned to the redemption coin holders via their counsel, and that as I said, the order anticipated the fact that not all coins would be returned to all redemption coin holders, and in fact the order speaks to how those coins would be disposed of -- sort of a recognition of the fact that a -- that someone -- it would be nice if these people could get their coins back and try to accommodate people over -- even though it was not the legal obligation of the Trustee or the FDIC to do that in view of the settlement that was reached and the Court order that was entered.

But the problem we're having now is that this is really where I think the crux of the problem is. Mr. Brodsky's got these coins, they clearly are in canisters with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

four digit numbers that don't match up, for instance, with the people who are in the Court today who have bearer certificates with four digit numbers. No doubt about that. They don't match up with them. However, the coins that are in those canisters may match up by year and mint mark with those people's coins. They may or may not. Mr. Brodsky wants to continue to refer to them just by their identifying number and has not done a -- I don't want to speak for Mr. Brodsky but apparently he doesn't think it's relevant that you've got a year and mint mark. Perhaps there's a concern because as soon as you open these things up again, it's like counting them again; you're subject to people saying you further reduce their value. But the accommodation that we're trying to reach with redemption coin holders was if they can't get their coins back from those remaining coins that are now in Mr. Brodsky's possession, then we try to accommodate them by isolating and taking out a certain number of the coins that are proposed for sale.

THE COURT: I take it there are not enough coins to go around.

MR. MONZACK: No, in terms of absolute numbers, the number of coins that were returned to Mr. Smith was actually in excess of the number of redemption coin holder claims known.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MONZACK: So in terms of absolute numbers, there are enough coins. Whether they match up by year and mint mark, I don't know, and I think the redemption coin holders will take the position how do we know they're their coins, and they don't know that they're their coins, the same way though there's no way to know that a coin in Christie's possession is their coin. It would seem likely, however, that if a coin exists, it existed in that group of coins that were identified as redemption coins that were in these canisters with four digit numbers on them. If we can't reach any accommodation with the redemption coin holders in terms of trying to isolate the ones that Mr. Brodsky has and limit the amount that might be withheld from an auction —

THE COURT: Yeah. So there's no scientific or nonsubjective way to hook up redemption coin holders with their coins apparently, based on how these things were sold, is that right?

MR. MONZACK: The only way --

THE COURT: Like why -- are you able to do it? Is this Court able to solve this problem or is it something that'll be, you know, continuing when the next bankruptcy judge is here, you know?

MR. MONZACK: There is no -- as far as I can -- I'm not a numismatist, but the only way that I understand that a redemption coin holder could be identified with his coins or

THE CORE / GROUP | 1,800,255,5147

STOLLOOK MUDIC

her coins was that the coins were put in a canister and with a four digit identifying number on them. If you had the bearer's certificate that matched up with that four digit number, then you -- that would presumably be your coins. As I -- as I said, even the redemption coin holders, or a certain number of them who got their coins back, they were in canisters that had previously been opened, and so they say how do -- I guess the only way to be sure of the fact would be if they received a canister that was sealed, but nobody knows if the coins that were originally in there were matched up with the description.

THE COURT: Right. And I take it there's no such thing as a sealed canister in this case anymore?

MR. MONZACK: I thought that there were a few, but certainly the majority of them at least were unsealed.

THE JUDGE: Okay. All right. So we're talking about a lot of water over the dam. Maybe Mr. *Weingarten should be here to explain what he did, or Mr. Cohen, or --

MR. MONZACK: Well, that's -- if you remember, I was working with Mr. Taft in an effort to -- and I certainly would be willing to continue to work that way, but that's not going to resolve the issue that's before the Court today. In other words, I certainly don't have any reticence about continuing to work with Mr. Taft to try to get additional documentation from earlier -- from the examiner and the

יטטעם: פעטטי

Ë

Chapter 11 Trustee to try to find out more specifically how the case was administered.

Though there are certain problems -- for instance, there was an inventory -- a hand-written inventory of certain coins made by Mr. Chorney on a so-called yellow pad that admittedly was in the hands of the U.S. Attorney at one point, and the U.S. Attorney can't find it anymore. That's part of -- of -- we went over there and met with the U.S. Attorney, and probably Mr. Lutes is more familiar with that than I am, but there are certain documents that existed that were in the possession of, for instance, the U.S. Attorney. We met with these attorneys to find out what they had, and for instance that --

THE COURT: The U.S. Attorney lost an inventory?

MR. MONZACK: I'm told -- it's all hearsay, but I'm told that this yellow pad that Mr. Chorney had was at one time in the possession of the U.S. Attorney and at the present time they have been unable to locate it.

THE COURT: Yeah, but do they acknowledge that they ever had it?

MR. MONZACK: I think they do. Mr. Lutes? I don't know.

MR. LUTES: Last I was told, because we didn't file the motions for a new trial, last I was told they had them, that I'd looked at them, and I didn't want them, so I have no

89-11051

2 they
3 and 3
4 they
5 and 6 so 7 I'm
8

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

idea whether they have them and I just haven't seen them, or they never had them. I mean there's conflicting tales back and forth. Last I was told about a month ago they had them, they were in Box -- I want to say 32, something like that, and supposedly I had signed for it and I had already seen it, so -- but I don't recall seeing them either. That's what I'm told.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MONZACK: You know, to get to the point -we've made an effort, Judge, to find out some of this
information as I said, and I would be -- I was ordered
actually by you to continue to aid Mr. Taft in sort of an
informal investigation that he has, but that -- none of this
is going to resolve the issue -- none of this is going to
identify a coin that's going to be Mr. Taft's, because there
may be a coin that has the same year and mint mark, but as I
said, there may be 5 million of them that were minted.

THE COURT: Okay, based on your -- all of your contact with the redemption coin holders and the recent -- during the recess that we just took a few minutes ago, what do you understand the position of the coin holders to be? What do they want you to do?

MR. MONZACK: I think, you know --

THE COURT: And I'll hear from them, I'm sure.

MR. MONZACK: To summarize, the different opinions

as I heard them, and you know, every -- it may not -- my hearing may not be one hundred per cent accurate on this, and not all the redemption coin holders probably have the exact same position. I think at the most extreme, I think what some of the redemption coin holders would like to do is inventory Mr. Brodsky's coins, take a look at all the coins that are in Christie's possession, find out every coin that exists between Mr. Brodsky and Christie's that match up with the year and mint mark. If they have ten of those coins, you get someone in there to find out what the ten most valuable in that group are, and get those ten most valuable back. I think that's probably one extreme position.

THE COURT: Okay, that's pretty extreme. Go ahead.

MR. MONZACK: I think the next position is -- I'm

not really sure. To stop the sale, don't let it go through

until it's determined if those coins that Christie's has is

my coins. I can see it right now. One is never going to

determine if the coins that Christie's has is a particular

person's coin.

THE COURT: Okay. And probably it's not fair to ask you what their position is. I guess I'll get that from the coin holders.

MR. MONZACK: But if I may make clear what my position would be --

THE COURT: Yeah.

89-11051

MR. MONZACK: -- it would be that these folks should first look to the redemption coins that were returned to Mr. Brodsky. It may be that in number Mr. Brodsky has enough coins of the right year and mint mark to return these coins to the redemption coin holders, though they may not be happy to get them, because they don't believe they were kept in these inviolate canisters.

THE COURT: Are we dealing with a problem now that most of what Mr. Brodsky has is kind of worthless, or practically, compared to what was paid for it maybe?

MR. MONZACK: Based upon the appraisals that I've seen in the case, the coins would all appear to be substantially -- worth substantially less than what was paid for the coins. Again, I'm not a coin expert, but the appraisals that I saw that were done while the examiner was in place indicated that the coins were worth perhaps ten to fifteen per cent of the face amount paid for them. I don't know if the coins that Mr. Brodsky -- I have no reason to believe that the coins that Mr. Brodsky currently holds are less valuable than the approximately two-thirds of the coins already returned to the redemption coin holders. They're probably -- again, it would be an assumption on my part, but I'm assuming that they're of a similar value as to the ones that were returned.

THE COURT: Thank you.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

JENN CHOCK - 1000-1010-0

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

MR. TAFT: What Mr. Monzack is saying basically is a good summary. From my understanding the coins that Mr. Brodsky has in his possession are in these canisters with bearer numbers. None of those bearer numbers match up to certain redemption people, including myself.

THE COURT: None of them?

What's inside those MR. TAFT: None of them. tubes, if the outside bearer number doesn't match up to my bearer number, then the coins inside apparently cannot be what I had, or what any of the redemption people had. quess what Mr. Monzack is stating that these tubes can just be opened up and take a look at year and mint mark and say, "Well, even though it's not your bearer number, we'll put it in -- these will be yours, different bearer number." There was prior testimony in this case -- and I thank the Court for being so patient with me and amongst other redemption clients -- but there has been prior testimony about all of these coins being opened, all of these tubes and these things called flats, which are singular coins sealed, have all been opened up to be examined by the FDIC or whoever else was doing the inventory.

I filed this motion, why we're here today, because there were some lot numbers that are at Christie's that have a year and mint mark of similar coins that I had. It doesn't have a bearer number, but does have a year, a mint mark. And

.2000-000-

-0000 10000

that's why I filed that. And then what I did is I also did a comparison to the two inventories that were told to me would be the exact coin under prior testimony; the coins that were sent out to Christie's would be the same exact coins that were here, which I did an inventory which I would like to present to the Court if they want it, which do not match up. The two inventories do not match.

Now I was told by Mr. Monzack that I guess there is a difference in the way they inventory, the two different companies, Rampapo (phonetic) and Christie's, which I didn't know; I just went by two inventories comparing the coins, and I have a discrepancy here. I guess we -- at this point there is no way to know unless they open up the tubes that Mr. Brodsky has. I'm not under the understanding that any of these are just loose coins. The -- during this whole -- I'd like to say fiasco I guess --

THE COURT: Don't be too polite.

MR. TAFT: These coins have all been, tubes and everything have been opened, and by prior testimony, there have been problems putting the correct coins back into the correct tubes, so there has been a lot of mixing up, I guess I want to say the word, so could my coins or someone else's coins here be at Christie's in New York with the same year and mint mark, no. That's possible, but can I say those are definitely mine, no, of course not, I can't, because they've

2-15-96

89-11051

all been opened. But when I say that that lot contains my 70 coins with the same year and mint mark and they're in loose condition right now, that is a possibility, and that's why I did this, finding the lot numbers that I stated in my motion to see if we could take a look at that.

Now I didn't know about these other people coming forward, so I'm a little lost on that, because I only had one day to read their response to the original motion, which I was hoping I'd have a couple -- at least a week to do, but I just received it the day before, so that's -- and the only other thing is that they used these coins as a grading issue, not only year and mint mark, but there's a grading issue as you well know, so I guess -- I brought this up with Mr.

Monzack. He was saying that if Mr. Brodsky has a coin that's similar to my year and mint mark, that that most likely could be mine, and yet if Christie's had one with the same year and mint mark, there could be two totally different gradings of that coin, so who's to say? And I thank you for your patience again.

THE COURT: Mr. Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: May it please Your Honor, would the Court be indulgent with me for a moment so that I could give a background concerning the physical appearance of these coins? When coins were delivered to me pursuant to my appointment; they came in four large metal caskets. There

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was no identification of ownership of any of these coins.

THE COURT: These came from Mr. Smith?

MR. BRODSKY: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

They were delivered to me personally MR. BRODSKY: And when I assembled those coins, each of the by Mr. Smith. coins, all of the coins were in containers about the size of a cup, Your Honor, plastic. You know the size of a silver dollar. It could hold a maximum of twenty, and each of the containers, Your Honor, had a number -- one, two, three, four -- and another notation, 1880, and another notation 10, 12, I learned that the one, two, three, four was a bearer number, a number that Cumberland assigned to a coin holder when the coin holder made a purchase, and when the coin holder made that purchase and got possession of those coins, there came a time when the coin holder decided that the coin holder wanted those coins redeemed, and so those coins were sent back to Cumberland, and Cumberland in turn sent a piece of paper, called it "Invoice" -- you've seen it -- and that invoice contained a number comparable to the original bearer number, and that invoice indicated the The name -- sometimes it just said "bearer," by following: the way -- and then it said, "1880," which is the year of the coin: Ten, I think it said, container of ten; and on the right-hand side, the miserable number of a purchase price.

When I came into possession of those coins and had them all inventoried so that if you called me up or wrote to me and said your number was one, two, three, four, I could then open my document of records and say, "Gee, Judge Votolato, I don't have one, two, three, four," or "I do have one, two, three, four. Send me that invoice." And when that invoice came into my possession and it said, "1880, 10, one, two, three, four," I went to the container, opened it up, 1880, 10, R, then I devised a scheme of how they would get it by sending postage and so forth. The difficulty, Your Honor, in my trying to find the coin holders was that I only had bearer numbers. Nothing came into my possession that indicated a list of names with corresponding numbers — corresponding names and numbers.

THE COURT: I take it that's been a problem since the beginning of this case, right?

MR. TAFT: Yes. And let me continue.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. TAFT: And so when I was on the mailing list for notices to Your Honor before this case before this Court, I then came forward last time and indicated to the Court that many inquiries made of me by coin holders did not find their numbers in my possession, and I suggested to this Court that perhaps the coin holders ought to be notified. Hence this hearing today.

Now then, Your Honor, they keep saying that Brodsky has coins. Fine. They have coins. He has coins. He doesn't know the names of the coin holders, and I had on two occasions had to prod FDIC for a list of names with corresponding bearer numbers, never got the response from Mr. Monzack when I wrote to him during this interval between January 4 and today. However, some of the information forwarded me by Mr. Cadigan of FDIC did have corresponding names and numbers. That will take care of my obligation.

Now the -- the claim here, Your Honor, is if a John Jones wrote to me and says, "My number is one, two, three, four," and I don't have it, the likelihood, Your Honor, now finger-pointing, is that that one, two, three, four might be in the possession of FDIC, and I don't know and I don't know whether the Court knows what manner of physical possession did FDIC take when it received those coins that they seek to sell. I don't believe they came in barrels. They had to be in containers, or if they were in these little containers, they may have been dumped out, in which case there may be still some evidence of those containers that have numbers on it, you see, so that perhaps when John Jones says to me, "I need one, two, three, four," maybe, just perhaps, FDIC has that. And the petition before the Court, Your Honor, to sell has merit to it.

They want to sell it and liquidate their security

2-15-96

89-11051

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

interest, but with these claims that are now coming in to me, and incidentally, Your Honor, to give you an idea, they come from all over the country, and I have in my possession a large number of coins. But, Your Honor, when you call me up and say your number is so-and-so, I hardly can tell you whether or not those are the very coins that you purchased, other than your identification 1880, 10, bearer number. I've taken the responsibility on my shoulders to send it back to those people who claim it. And so I respectfully suggest to Your Honor this -- and I do this most respectfully -until this Court is satisfied that the coins can be identified in the possession of FDIC that would be attendant upon their petition, rather than having hundreds from all over the country descending upon Christie's in New York, it's a very severe burden upon them. Now with reference to the time of sale, Your Honor, these are not strawberries that are going to go sour tomorrow. Their value today is going to be no different than at any time when Your Honor is reasonably satisfied as are these coin holders that perhaps they've done everything reasonably within their power to identify those coins.

Your Honor, I leave you with one other observation, and I repeat myself. Those coins that came into the possession of FDIC had to be in containers, in these plastic containers. They weren't loose. They weren't around to just

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

viewed, some were in the containers we were describing earlier, some of the coins were in the single plastic flats that had one coin in them with the little plastic container.

THE COURT: Mmhmm. Yeah.

MR. MONZACK: But every coin that was in a container with a four digit identifying number on it was deemed to be a redemption coin and returned to Mr. Smith. The other coins, and they were segregated into separate -- I think it was seven specific safety deposit boxes -- they may be the canisters Mr. Brodsky speaks of, these gray safe deposit boxes that they were kept in, and they were given back to Mr. Smith -- that the other coins that were kept in a different area were also in containers, but these containers did not have the four digit number that Mr. Brodsky speaks of, didn't have the kind of labeling on it. They were just in plastic containers, otherwise unlabeled, I believe. didn't have 10, 1880 on it. Didn't have any of the markings That's how the redemption coins that Mr. Brodsky speaks of. were identified, and when you took all of those canisters that had four digit identifying numbers on it and the other markings that Mr. Brodsky speaks of, and you took the numbers that were listed on the outside of the canisters and the numbers that were in it, and you added those numbers up, that's the number that came up to be a number slightly larger than the number given by Mr. Chorney as the total number of

ABAD GABAT THE UNITED TO SERVICE THE TRANSPORTER TO THE TRANSPORTER TO

shovel up, and the cost of getting an expert in here to say whether this 1880 coin is the same as this other 1880 coin would be so -- would be prohibitive; it would be beyond the reasonable scope of the jurisdiction of this Court, and so I ask this Court, not that I'm a spokesman for these coin holders, because I don't represent them, but if I were to administer my trust to the appointment of the Supreme Court, these people ought to be given a reasonable opportunity in this Court. Rather than having to come from all over the country to go over to Christie's now, there ought to be and should be records of how they came into possession, how FDIC came into possession of these coins, whether they came from containers, where are the containers, and I dare say that if I could find those containers, we could match up those coins that are being requested to return to the coin holders.

MR. MONZACK: Mr. Brodsky misses one key point here, and that is clearly the silver dollars were stored in containers.

THE COURT: They were what?

MR. MONZACK: They were stored in containers.

THE COURT: Which silver dollars?

MR. MONZACK: I think just about every silver dollar was in some sort of container.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MONZACK: Some were in the single, as Mr. Taft

redemption coins that Cumberland Coin had. These other canisters reveal nothing other than the fact they are silver dollars that were stored in a separate area and they had no identifying marks on them. Now Barbara Quinn is here from the FDIC and she really oversaw the custody and control of the coins from early on, and if the Court would like, she can take the stand and speak to the issues raised by Mr. Brodsky.

THE COURT: Well, if this is an issue, I guess we ought to have some kind of a record about it, and --

MR. MONZACK: I mean, I would take the position that this was all pursuant to the settlement of the litigation.

THE COURT: Probably it was, but hasn't it been sort of reopened with the way the Notice of Sale in paragraph 6 is worded? Aren't we kind of revisiting the question again, because you're a nice guy? So you can't be a nice guy and not go through the steps.

MR. MONZACK: But I'm just saying that the issue that Mr. Brodsky raises is an issue that was known at the time of the settlement that I outlined earlier. They didn't match up by bearer number -- by known redemption coin holder claim.

THE COURT: Well, what's your pleasure? Do you want to put on some testimony?

MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, could I just have a

minute before the testimony? I'm co-counsel for the class, and I don't really know what that means anymore -- David Campbell. My office negotiated on behalf of the class with Mr. Smith the order that's in issue here today. I'm betwixt and between -- I take no position on the motion before the Court other than to say my name again is on that order. I negotiated on behalf of the class with Mr. Smith, or really my office negotiated on behalf of the class with Mr. Smith, and I think the order speaks for itself.

TO HER GROUP I BOOK BY A HEOD

MS. KEARNS: May I speak before the young lady gives her testimony?

THE COURT: Sure. Say your name again.

MS. KEARNS: Okay, Frieda Kearns, and we are one of the redemption holders. These are the two canisters that I received from Mr. Brodsky and I'd like to thank him for it.

Now I don't know whether Cumberland is remiss in giving us an invoice. Three of my purchases have redemption numbers, two did not, but they did have the dates, and the price, unfortunately. I had these checked over by a coin expert, and he was willing to give me \$400.00 for something I paid eight thousand for. So what I'd like to say is that it took us five hours to get here, we drove, and we stayed overnight, a lot of effort and a lot of time and cost to us. I hate to think that this thing would go out of proportion to, you know, our able to get to it, but we'd like to resolve this.

DEDC-007-000-1 LOCATO LOUGO

I'd hate to think that I got part justice and not complete justice for this, so I would hope that I could see what Christie's has so that they don't sell my coins. I may not be able to prove that they're my coins, but they can't prove that they're not my coins, so that's what I'd like to say, and I thank you, Judge, for listening.

THE COURT: But before you leave now, the problem that you just now posed, you can't prove that they're your coins, but Christie's can't prove that they're not your coins, where does that leave us? How do we resolve a problem like that?

MS. KEARNS: Well, I think since I paid so much money for them that I ought to have the -- let's say the edge. Why not? It's not Christie's or the FDIC, it's mine, because I bought five of these.

THE COURT: But you were probably defrauded when you bought these things. Do you understand that?

MS. KEARNS: Well, that's beside the point.

THE COURT: No, it's not beside the point. That's what bankruptcy is about in a case like this.

MS. KEARNS: But I don't have the other three.

THE COURT: But what I'm saying to you is that you were probably financially irreparably damaged the moment you paid for these things, okay, way back whenever it was. We can't cure that.

89-11051

I'm not asking for that, Judge.

1

24

25

MS. KEARNS:

2 just -- I just want my -- the coins. I'd like the 3 satisfaction --4 THE COURT: But which coins? 5 MS. KEARNS: What coins? 6 THE COURT: You know, believe me, I'm listening to 7 you, we're trying to -- I think everybody right now is being 8 exceptionally considerate of their opponents' positions, but 9 when you say you want your coins -- suppose you were given 10 your choice to walk into the FDIC to get -- right now, to get 11 your coins. Which ones would you pick up? 12 MS. KEARNS: Well, I have the dates. 13 THE COURT: Yeah. 14 MS. KEARNS: And I would choose 20 of those dates. 15 THE COURT: You'd pick out the best ones probably, right? 16 17 MS. KEARNS: I'm not an expert either. I might 18 take the lesser valued coins, but I don't have anything now. And so it was occurring to me that maybe I ought to bring a 19 coin dealer with me to look them over. 20 21 THE COURT: I don't think you -- you saved yourself some money if you didn't by not bring him, because I don't 22 think --23

89-11051 2-15-96

Throwing good money after bad.

Yeah. Exactly. That's what this case

MS. KEARNS:

THE COURT:

1 is all about. 2 MS. KEARNS: Well, this is what, you know, this is my feeling. I would hope that the Court would see to it that 3 4 I receive my just due, and that's --5 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. 6 MS. KEARNS: Thank you. 7 THE COURT: We'll do our best. MR. TAFT: May I be heard, Your Honor? 8 THE COURT: Okay, we're going to get to this 9 testimony some time, but go ahead. 10 MR. TAFT: Just real quick, Your Honor. 11 have misunderstood Mr. Campbell when he said he had -- if I 12 heard him right, he said he negotiated the settlement with 13 14 Mr. Smith on the --MR. CAMPBELL: What I said was my office --15 THE COURT: His office, yeah. 16 17 MR. CAMPBELL: --negotiated the settlement, on behalf of --18 THE COURT: You didn't take part in that? 19 MR. CAMPBELL: No, not the negotiations. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21

MR. CAMPBELL: The order speaks for itself. It was the redemption coin holders, to the extent possible, if they

2-15-96

It was for what? Did he -- just for the

89-11051

return of the coins?

22

23

24

25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

were identifiable, the coins were to be returned. extent that it was not possible, they were to take an interest in the liquidated proceeds, as I understand it.

MR. TAFT: And that was just from Mr. Smith allowing -- helping him out?

> MR. CAMPBELL: I'm not sure what you're asking.

MR. TAFT: Well, Mr. Smith never mentioned anything to me that that was being done at the time. I didn't know -that's why I was asking how that all came about.

MR. CAMPBELL: In terms of my input or my office's input as far as you're concerned, prior to the signature of the order, I can't speak, of course.

The last thing, Your Honor, is just the MR. TAFT: response that came from an affidavit from -- regarding a motion from (End Tape #1. Tape #2 ends without interruption as follows:) Tosca's. They were talking about the differences in the two inventories that were done, and they admit that there was a 14 coin discrepancy between the two, but the thing that I underline here that they came up with the best coins to comprise the for auction. And in other words, the coins were mixed up, and it says a write-in from them, and I think what Mrs. Kearns is trying to ask is just to return basically the coins with her mint mark and year, not so much as saying her exact coins in a tube, because those tubes for some reason don't seem to be around anymore,

1	so that's what I think we're all looking for. Thank you,
2	Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Yes, sir. You want to step up, please?
4	MR. HERSEY: I just wanted to hear this. I like
5	Ms. Quinn here early before the Court.
6	THE COURT: Okay, what's your name?
7	MR. HERSEY: My name is David Hersey.
8	CLERK: Spell that, please.
9	MR. HERSEY: H-E-R-S-E-Y.
10	THE COURT: How long will this examination last, do
11	you think?
12	MR. MONZACK: Ten or fifteen minutes, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: And is there going to be any cross-
14	examination, or Mr. Brodsky, do you intend to examine?
15	MR. BRODSKY: I hardly know until I hear the
16	direct.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
18	BARBARA QUINN, SWORN
19	CLERK: Please state your name for the record.
20	THE WITNESS: Barbara Quinn.
21	CLERK: Please spell that.
22	THE WITNESS: Q-U-I-N-N.
23	CLERK: Please be seated.
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION
25	BY MR. CADIGAN:

Ω.	Mrs.	Quinn,	would	you	please	give	me	the	name	of	you
emp1	oyer,	please	•								

- A. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
- Q. What capacity are you employed?
 - A. As a credit specialist.

THE COURT: Let's all keep our voices up so these people who traveled here can hear what's happening.

BY MR. CADIGAN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

- Q. Ms. Quinn, were you the credit specialist in charge of the Cumberland Investment portfolio?
- 11 A. Yes, I was.
 - Q. When did you take charge of that portfolio?
- 13 A. When the bank closed in December of --

MR. BRODSKY: Your Honor, please, her voice does not project back here.

THE COURT: Can you turn up the volume at all?

Okay, try it now, but pretend you didn't have a mike and make believe you're talking to Bill back there.

THE WITNESS: From the time the bank closed.

20 BY MR. CADIGAN:

- Q. Which was in December of 1993?
- 22 A. December of '93.

THE COURT: December '93?

THE WITNESS: December of '92, wasn't it?

THE COURT: '92?

25

24

That's correct, Your Honor. Eastland MR. CADIGAN: Bank failed in December of 1992.

THE WITNESS: December 11.

BY MR. CADIGAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

- Do you recall, Ms. Quinn, and if you do I'd like you to explain to the Court the first time you were involved in taking possession of the coins, silver dollars, that were the -- that comprised the Cumberland Investment inventory.
- The first time we saw the coin was -- it was in the vault in Cranston, Rhode Island.
- 11 And what was in the vault?
 - There was -- there were coins in safe deposit boxes, there was coin in -- there was loose coin in -- in -- wrapped in bags. There was --
- 15 Were there coins in canisters?
 - Those -- the coins that were in canisters were in safe deposit boxes.
 - Were the coins in canisters in safe deposit boxes, did they have names on the outside, did they have bearer numbers, what did they look like?
- They were in canisters, they had bearer numbers on them, and I mean we didn't open anything, you know, that was in 22 this --23
- And those coins were segregated? 24 Q.
- A. Right. 25

- 1 Q. And those coins were identified as redemption --
- 2 A. Redemption coins, right.
- 3 Q. How were they segregated, Ms. Quinn?
- A. They were in -- in these large boxes. We kept them separate from everything else that was in the vault.
- 6 Q. What kind of boxes were they?
- 7 A. Large safe deposit boxes. Metal boxes.
- 8 Q. Metal boxes?
- 9 A. Right.
- 10 Q. And approximately how many did they number in terms of the metal boxes that they were contained in?
- 12 A. Must have been about four or five.
- Q. At some point those coins are removed from Cranston,
 Rhode Island, is that correct?
- 15 A. Right.
- 16 Q. How were they -- where were they moved to?
- 17 A. They were moved to the vault at Eastland Bank in
- 18 Woonsocket.
- 19 Q. And how were they transported from Cranston?
- 20 A. They were transported by armored car. We had -- we had
- 21 -- armed guards at the vault where they were being removed,
- 22 and at the truck where they were being -- placed.
- Q. And they were removed from the truck and placed in the vault in Woonsocket, Rhode Island?
- 25 A. Right. On the second floor in the vault in Rhode

- 1 | Island.
- 2 0. And that was at the old Eastland Bank?
- 3 A. Right.
- 4 Q. Were the redemption coins segregated in that vault?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And how were they segregated?
- 7 A. They were put off in one corner away from everything
- 8 | else.
- 9 Q. Were you -- who had -- and the vault was closed at all 10 times, correct?
- 11 A. Right, mmhmm.
- 12 Q. Who had access to the vault, Ms. Quinn?
- A. Ross Watson and myself were the only two who had the combination to the vault.
- 15 Q. And you indicate that the vault was on the second floor.
- 16 A. Right.
- 17 Q. And how was access gained from the lobby area to the 18 second floor?
- A. By elevator, which was locked. There was a key for the elevator, so anyone on the first floor could not go up to the second floor without that key.
- 22 Q. And who had the key?
- 23 A. Either Ross or I would have it.
- Q. There were times when access to that vault was given to various appraisers, correct?

- 1 A. Right.
- 2 Q. Access was given to Ramapo?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. When Ramapo did the appraisal, would you please
 describe how that was done -- not the appraisal, but how they
 got access to the vault and whether there were security
- 7 | quards there.
- 8 A. Right. We had security guards on the vault, we had a
 9 security guard on the vault. The appraisal was done in a
 10 room adjacent to the vault. We had a security guard in that
- 11 room at all times.
- Q. How many -- how long did it take for Ramapo Coin
 Exchange to do the --
- 14 A. I believe it took them three days.
- Q. And then when the appraisal was concluded, they -- the redemption coins only -- I'm -- I'm -- the redemption coins were not appraised.
- 18 A. They were not appraised, no.
- 19 Q. They were segregated.
- 20 A. They were never touched.
- Q. So when the appraisal was done by Ramapo of the coins that we're now trying to sell --
- 23 A. Right.
- Q. --what kind of containers were those coins in, if you
- 25 | know?

- A. Those were in safe deposit boxes also, but they were in long narrow containers and each coin was -- was in a -- they
- 3 were all individually wrapped.
- 4 Q. Individually wrapped?
- 5 A. In a -- a small case, or a --
- 6 Q. I'm going to show you my ID badge. Something like
- 7 | this, Ms. Quinn, where it's -- whether it's a flat with a
- 8 plastic --
- 9 A. Some were like that. Some were with a cardboard around
- 10 them so that you could see the coin.
- 11 Q. Were there any coins that were in canisters that were
- 12 appraised that are now for sale that were in canisters
- 13 | similar to redemption coins?
- 14 A. No. No.
- 15 Q. So the redemption coins were in totally different
- 16 | canisters?
- 17 | A. Right.
- 18 Q. No similarity?
- 19 | A. No.
- 20 Q. The coins were also -- when Mr. Monzack was appointed
- 21 Trustee, he was let into the vault also, wasn't he?
- 22 A. Right.
- 23 Q. And there was always somebody, either you or Mr. Watson
- 24 who was there at all times when the vault was open?
- 25 | A. Yes.

- Q. Isn't it true that signature cards had to be signed by anybody who made entrance to the vault?
 - A. Right. Right.
- Q. I believe it was in April of 1995 when the so-called redemption coins were returned to Mr. Smith, is that correct?
- 6 A. Yes.

7

11

20

- Q. Were you present that day?
- 8 A. Yes, I was.
- 9 Q. Would you describe to the Court if you can generally what happened that day, that morning, when Mr. Smith arrived?
- 12 A. He had two associates.
- 13 Q. I was present.
- 14 A. Right.
- 15 Q. Mr. Monzack was there, correct?
- 16 A. Right.
- 17 THE COURT: Do we know that date?
- MR. CADIGAN: It was April 4th, 1995.

Mr. Smith arrived with two of his associates.

19 THE WITNESS: Okay.

BY MR. CADIGAN:

- 21 Q. You opened the vault, as I recall, is that correct?
- 22 A. I opened the vault, and Mr. Smith made -- made a list of all the coins he was taking.
- Q. Okay, and he was just concentrating on --
- 25 A. He and his associates, right.

1 Q. -- just on the redemption --2 Just on the redemption coins. 3 And they took the -- they took a list of what they were 4 taking, as I recall. 5 Right. Α. 6 THE COURT: You say he listed each coin? 7 THE WITNESS: I don't know if he listed each coin, 8 or just the canisters. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Did he open canisters that day, 10 that you saw? 11 THE WITNESS: I don't remember. 12 THE COURT: Come on, try. Now this is really --13 THE WITNESS: I know. I think he did. THE COURT: You think he did? 14 15 THE WITNESS: Mmhmm. 16 MR. MONZACK: Your Honor, I was there. 17 THE WITNESS: I think he had to. 18 MR. MONZACK: There's no doubt some of the 19 canisters were opened. He opened canisters, though, that had 20 previously been opened. My recollection is he opened some 21 canisters that had previously been opened. That is, he 22 didn't have to break a seal to open them.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that your testimony, too?

BY MR. CADIGAN:

THE WITNESS: Yes.

23

24

- 1 Q. How long did that take, that inventory, Ms. Quinn?
- 2 A. Took the better part of the day.
- 3 Q. And when he had concluded the inventory, Mr. Smith
- 4 removed those coins under your supervision --
- 5 A. Right.
- 6 Q. -- to his truck, as I recall.
- 7 A. To his truck.
- 8 Q. And he signed a receipt?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And then you proceeded -- you were -- you never left the
- 11 | vault area, as I recall --
- 12 | A. Right.
- 13 Q. -- Ms. Quinn. I think I helped Mr. Smith. I --
- 14 A. I think -- right. I know you went down to the --
- 15 | Q. I supervised the coins going down the elevator and into
- 16 the truck.
- 17 A. Into the truck.
- 18 | Q. And you remained in the vault.
- 19 | A. Right.
- 20 Q. And after Mr. Smith left, we collected our things and
- 21 | you closed the vault.
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And locked it.
- 24 A. Mmhmm.
- 25 Q. And we left the premises.

- 1 A. Right.
- 2 Q. At some point thereafter, we had permission from this
- 3 | Court to remove those coins from the vault to Christie's
- 4 | Auction House in New York, is that correct?
- 5 A. Yes, mmhmm.
- 6 Q. And you were present that day, weren't you?
- 7 A. Yes, I was.
- 8 Q. Do you recall if that was in May of '95?
- 9 A. Yes. Yes, it was.
- 10 | Q. May of '95, the end of May?
- 11 | A. Right.
- 12 Q. And as I got to the bank that morning, there was a gray
- 13 | semi --
- 14 A. There was a semi-truck, right.
- 15 | Q. With three armed guards present?
- 16 A. Yes, mmhmm.
- 17 Q. Mr. Monzack showed up?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And you let us into the second floor area, and opened
- 20 | the vault --
- 21 A. We opened the vault, right.
- 22 Q. And what happened thereafter, Ms. Quinn?
- 23 A. The guards loaded the coin on dollies, took them
- 24 downstairs. At all times there was someone -- I stayed
- 25 | upstairs, Ross would go down with -- with the guard. They

- 1 | loaded them on the truck.
- 2 Q. Was there always an armed guard from Brinks in the vault
- 3 with you, Ms. Quinn?
- 4 A. Yes. Mmhmm. There were three.
- 5 | Q. That process took about how long to physically remove
- 6 the items from the vault to the truck?
- 7 A. I think they were there from eight o'clock in the
- 8 morning until three o'clock in the afternoon.
- 9 | Q. And they were -- a receipt was signed by --
- 10 A. Yes, mmhmm.
- 11 Q. -- Brinks? Mr. Monzack was there at all times?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. As well as yourself?
- 14 A. Mmhmm.
- 15 | Q. Mr. Watson?
- 16 A. Right.
- 17 | Q. And myself?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And the truck left around three?
- 20 A. Mmhmm.
- 21 Q. And as I recall -- did you lock the vault at that time,
- 22 or did you turn the keys over to the manager of the bank, as
- 23 | I recall? Do you remember?
- 24 A. I think we left the door open, and there were no keys for
- 25

the vault.

But there was nothing in the vault. 1

- 2 No, it was empty.
- I have no further questions. 3

BY MR. MONZACK:

- I do want to clarify one thing, Ms. Quinn. Do you 5
- recall -- I mean, some of the redemption coins, in fact, you 6
- may recall, were used I believe in a criminal proceeding and 7
- were used as evidence? 8
- That's right. 9 Α.
- So some of the canisters were opened, and some coins 10 Q.
- were semi-loose in --11
- 12 Mmhmm. Α.
- 13 -- like a plastic baggie?
- 14 Α. Yes.
- And some of those coins within their redemption coin 15
- class were sub-classified as coins that were in fact marked 16
- for evidence --17
- 18 Α. That's right.
- -- by the U.S. Attorney's Office and/or the FBI? 19
- 20 A. Yes.

21

- THE COURT: Well, what happened with those? Did you get them back? 22
- THE WITNESS: Yes, they returned them. 23
- MR. MONZACK: Those were also returned, Your Honor, 24 and they were identified as redemption coins, and I just want 25

89-11051

2-15-96

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to make it clear what these coins looked like. Some were in these canisters as shown to you. Some were sort of attached to a canister --

THE WITNESS: Some were in a baggie.

MR. MONZACK: -- with a plastic baggie attached to it and had coins in it marked as exhibits in a criminal trial, so some of these coins were used as exhibits in a criminal trial, and therefore some -- I'm presuming that's why some of the canisters were opened. I don't know how or when they were opened, and some were loose out of the canisters but attached to the canister in the baggie having been used for evidence in the criminal proceeding.

THE COURT: But they all came back before Mr. Smith came and got them?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. MONZACK: They were in the vault.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MONZACK: That's right.

THE COURT: Yeah. Okay.

MR. CADIGAN: Just one more question, Your Honor.

BY MR. CADIGAN:

- Q. Ms. Quinn, so none of the non-redemption coins were in canisters that were similar to the redemption coins?
- 24 A. Not that I remember.
- 25 Q. Thank you.

BARBARA QUINN - Direct/Cadigan--Cross/Brodsky Page 51

MR. BRODSKY: What was your answer?

THE WITNESS: Pardon me?

MR. BRODSKY: I didn't get the answer to that.

THE WITNESS: No.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BRODSKY:

- Q. When Eastland closed, was that when your office took jurisdiction over the property of the bank?
- A. Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

- Q. So that prior to December '92, it's a fair statement to say that you personally had no knowledge of anything about
- 12 Cumberland Coins, is that right?
- 13 | A. That's right.
- Q. And how did you come about to go down to the vault in Cranston? What prompted you to do that?
 - A. We found out that we had a vault that was part of our -- part of our inventory.
- 18 Q. When you say "our inventory," you mean --
- 19 | A. FDIC.
- 20 Q. -- Eastland's inventory.
- A. Well, it was Eastland's, but it became property of the FDIC.
- Q. Yes, it became yours, so that you learned that Eastland had a vault in Cranston. Was that with Fleet?
- 25 A. That's where Fleet is now.

89-11051

- 1 | Q. Yes. Had a vault in Cranston containing property --
- 2 A. We didn't know what it was.
- 3 Q. You didn't know what it was, and so when you personally
- 4 went down to the vault, what did you observe generally?
- 5 A. It was a vault. The vault was full.
- 6 Q. Yes, but what did you observe in the vault? What did
- 7 | you see there?
- 8 A. Stacks of safe deposit boxes -- coin.
- 9 Q. Now when you say "coin," did you expect to see coins
- 10 when you went there?
- 11 A. We didn't know what was in it.
- 12 Q. And what did the coins appear -- did they appear loose,
- 13 were they in containers?
- 14 A. Everything was in containers, except for the wrapped
- 15 coin that was in bags.
- 16 | Q. We'll get to the bags in a moment. Now you mentioned
- 17 | that you saw some in containers.
- 18 A. Right. Some were --
- 19 | Q. Little plastic containers.
- 20 A. No, no, not the -- not the plastic.
- 21 Q. What did you see them in?
- 22 A. They were in -- some were in ammunition boxes.
- 23 | O. Yes.
- 24 A. And the silver dollars were in long safe deposit boxes.
- 25 Q. Loose or in containers?

In -- in narrow -- long narrow boxes with two rows of

- 1
- 2 coin in each box and they were individually wrapped.
- 3 they weren't the wrapped -- the plastic canisters.
- 4

17

18

- Q. Did they have any identification?
- 5
- They were just marked --6 Other than the year. I don't mean that.
- 7 No, just with the year.
- 8 Just with the year, so that you saw coins that had 1880
- or 1890 or whatever. 9
- 10 Α. Right. That's right.
- 11 You mentioned something about redemption coin holders Q.
- 12 with bearer numbers. Where did you see those?
- 13 Those were -- those were also in safe deposit boxes.
- 14 So that you saw some with numbers on it.
- 15 Well, we had to open them, the safe deposit boxes, to 16 see.
 - I assume that you had to open them. When you opened up these containers that held coins, did you see some in plastic containers?
- 20 I'm not sure if we opened those, but some of them --
- 21 How did you identify them to be redemption coin holders 22 with bearer numbers? How did you know that?
- I don't think we knew that at first. 23 They were marked as evidence and we didn't touch them. 24 Those that had been 25 marked by the FBI as evidence.

- 1 So that when you came down after December '92, there was 2
- 3 Α. Yes.
- 4 Well, how were you able -- you testified that you set 5 aside those with bearer numbers, how did you know to set 6 aside something with so-called bearer numbers?
- 7 We set aside the boxes that were marked as evidence and found out later that those were -- had -- were bearer 9 numbers.
- 10 o. Now did you understand what bearer number meant?
- 11 Α. No.
- 12 0. Do you know what it means now?
- 13 I know what it means now.
- 14 o. What does it mean now?

a criminal case pending?

- 15 Α. It belongs to whoever purchased that.
- 16 Exactly. So that when you saw coins there in the vault, 0.
- 17 some of them already were in the possession of the United
- 18 States District Attorney in a prosecution case, is that
- 19 right?
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 Q. Did you take possession of those?
- 22 A. They were there. We didn't touch them.
- 23 Well, which ones did you take possession of and ship up Q.
- to Woonsocket? 24
- 25 We moved everything that was in there.

- 1 Q. Including the F -- the United States District --
- 2 A. We had permission to move those.
- 3 Q. I beg pardon?
- 4 A. We had permission to move --
- 5 Q. So you moved everything, is that right? Well, how did
- 6 you know what was belonging to so-called redemption coin
- 7 holders --
- 8 A. They were segregated. We kept them segregated.
- 9 Q. Who segregated them? Do you know?
- 10 A. Well, as we moved them, we knew which -- we could tell
- 11 which ones were the redemption coins.
- 12 Q. How could you tell they were coin -- redemption coin
- 13 holders? Did somebody explain that to you? How did you
- 14 | learn that?
- 15 A. The FBI and the Postal Inspector had been in there, and
- 16 | they -- they showed us which --
- 17 Q. So that after a concert of opinions, you believed that
- 18 some were so-called redemption coin holders' coins, is that
- 19 | right? Did you compile a list?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 0. Is there any reason why you didn't?
- 22 A. We knew they didn't belong to us.
- 23 Q. I didn't ask you that. Is there any reason why you
- 24 | didn't compile a list that these were so-called bearer
- 25 | numbers belonging to redemption coin holders? Is there any

- reason why you didn't -- so you say when you put them aside,
 you don't know how many you put aside, is that right?
- 3 A. We put aside everything that was in the --
- 4 Q. Well, how many did you put aside?
- 5 A. I don't know. I don't know the number.
- 6 Q. Now I dare say that you took every care -- I say you,
- 7 | FDIC -- took every care to have armored cars bring them to
- 8 Woonsocket. When they got to Woonsocket, did you compile a
- 9 | list?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. So what did you do when Smith came around? Just gave
- 12 him what you believed to be bearer numbers belonging to
- 13 redemption coin holders?
- 14 A. We made a list at that time.
- 15 Q. Where is that list? Do you have it?
- 16 A. I believe so.
- 17 Q. I beg pardon?
- 18 A. I think I do.
- 19 Q. Do you have it with you now?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. So you do have a list of what you gave to Mr. Smith, is
- 22 | that right?
- 23 A. No, Mr. Smith made a list.
- 24 Q. Did you make the list?
- 25 A. No.

89-11051

2-15-96

1	Q. So that when Mr. Smith made the list, did he give you a
2	copy?
3	A. I think I have the list that he made.
4	Q. I didn't hear you, ma'am.
5	A. I have the list that he made.
6	Q. Now evidently that cannot be presented today, but would
7	that list show anything other than a bearer number and the
8	amount the number of coins, or would it show bearer
9	number, number of coins, perhaps coin holder's name?
10	A. No, it didn't have any of that information.
11	O What did it have?

THE COURT: Is that list by chance in court, Mr. Cadigan, or somebody from FDIC have a copy of it? Mr. Monzack?

> MR. BRODSKY: I have been seeking that.

MR. MONZACK: There is no list with people's names, because that's --

THE COURT: No, the list that the witness says Mr. Smith gave her.

MR. MONZACK: The list that Mr. Smith prepared -- I believe I have a copy of -- I probably have a copy -- may even have a copy of it with me. I brought most of my files, not all of them, with me.

THE COURT: Okay.

25

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'm not sure.

1	MR. MONZACK: That list, though I forget now how
2	it was marked up, but that list was made up of bearer numbers
3	from perhaps claims that were filed in the Bankruptcy Court,
4	but it doesn't coincide with the bearer numbers that were
5	turned over because as it's been
6	THE COURT: What it says is one thing. I'm just
7	trying to locate if you can the list that this witness just
8	referred to that was made up by Mr. Hershel Smith when he
9	took these coins with him, and we're going to find that out
10	at two o'clock because it's lunch time.
11	MR. SMITH: (?) Your Honor, tomorrow morning I have
12	a preliminary injunction hearing before Judge Lageur
13	(phonetic), and we're meeting with counsel to mark and agree
14	to exhibits this afternoon. I don't think I can afford
15	anything
16	THE COURT: You're excused. If you're before Judge
17	Lageur, by all means

e before Judge Lageur, by all means.

MR. SMITH: (?) Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. BRODSKY: Did you say two o'clock this afternoon?

THE COURT: Right. Step down.

(Off the record at Tape #2, Index #1511)

(On the record at Tape #2, Index #1512)

THE CLERK: Be seated.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Yes.

THE COURT: You're still under oath. THE WITNESS:

BY MR. BRODSKY:

- To pick up a thread, Ms. Quinn, from the recess -- you testified that you, "you" meaning FDIC, did not make a list or an inventory of coins that you believed to be redemption coin holders' property, is that right?
- 8 Α. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

- 9 Q. And when they finally got to Woonsocket, was it in
- Woonsocket that Mr. Smith appeared to -- for acceptance? 10
- 11 Α. I'd like to clarify something I said earlier.
- 12 Q. Please do. With the Court's permission, of course.
- 13 The reason we didn't make a list, we were instructed by Α. 14 the FBI not to touch the redemption coins, and we didn't.
- 15 Have you finished with your explanation? Q.
- 16 Well, I just wanted you to know --Α.
- Well, I may get to that in a moment. 17 Q.
- 18 A. All right.
- 19 0. Mr. Smith came to Woonsocket, did he not?
- 20 A. Right.
- 21 Q. To accept the coins.
- 22 A. Right.
- 23 Q. Were you there personally?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Were you the responsible person who handed them over to

- Smith, or was it someone else? Responsible person on behalf of FDIC.
- $3 \mid A$. Well, I guess I was, yes.
- 4 Q. All right. Don't be ashamed of it. It's very
- 5 important, and I think you did a credible job in that. Now
- 6 when you gave the coins to Mr. Smith, you had no accounting
- 7 of your own, did you not?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. Is that right?
- 10 A. That's right.
- 11 Q. When you gave the coins to Mr. Smith, did you perhaps
- 12 ask him for a receipt of what he received?
- 13 A. Yes. Yes.
- 14 Q. What kind of a receipt did he give you?
- 15 A. We had a receipt made out.
- 16 \mathbb{Q} . And what did the receipt generally say?
- 17 A. That we were receiving all of the redemption coins over.
- 18 Q. Were they listed?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. Do you happen to have a copy of that, or the original of
- 21 | that receipt? You shake your head --
- 22 A. I don't have it with me.
- 23 Q. Would that receipt perhaps have read, "Received of FDIC or
- 24 Ms. Quinn, redemption coins"? Just --
- 25 A. I'm trying to think how it read. It -- it -- I'm sure

- it said, "Redemption -- redemption coins."
- Q. Probably no more than saying, "Received of FDIC,

 redemption coins." Is that right? You shake your shoulders.
- 4 A. Yes. I -- there was no list of them at that time, so --
- Q. Did you ever see a list that related to redemption coin
 holders? Any printed list?
 - A. Well, Mr. Smith made a list the day that the coins were picked up.
- 9 0. I think at the recess --
- 10 A. Right, and he did come -- I don't know just when -- the 11 first time he came to look at the coin -- at the redemption 12 coins, we had a list of the-- of the claimants.
- Q. "Claimants" meaning those who were filing claims with this Bankruptcy Court?
- 15 A. Who had filed a claim, right.
- Q. I'm not talking about that, Ms. Quinn. I'm talking
 about a list of coins that would be -- that you set aside as
 being redemption coin holders.
- 19 | A. No. No.
- Q. And when Mr. Smith finally gave you that receipt -incidentally, how many times was he there with reference to
 these coins before he took full possession?
- 23 A. Two or three.
- Q. In any event, did you ever see a list containing
 identification either by bearer number or numbers of coins or

1	coin holders that related to redemption coin holders?	You're
2	shaking you head. Is that "No"?	

- A. Just the list that was made up by Hershel and the FDIC together from the list of claimants.
- Q. When did the FDIC join with Smith in making up a list of redemption coin holders, to your knowledge?
 - A. When Smith came into the vault to look at the coin, he wanted to make a list of the coin.
- 9 Q. Go ahead.

4

7

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

- 10 A. And we had a list of claimants that would --
- 11 Q. Where is that list of claimants?
- 12 A. I think -- do you have a copy of it?
 - MR. MONZACK: We gave Mr. Brodsky a list.
 - MR. BRODSKY: Yeah, two minutes ago you gave me a sheaf of papers. You tell me which one is the names of the claimants.
 - THE COURT: Gentlemen, let's have a question to the witness.

19 BY MR. BRODSKY:

- Q. Was there a list of claimants made up by FDIC?
- 21 MR. CADIGAN: Your Honor, if it please the Court,
- 22 I'm probably the one that should be responding to these --
- MR. BRODSKY: Well, if she doesn't know -- she says
- 24 | "I don't know."
- 25 MR. CADIGAN: It was --

89-11051

1 THE COURT: Hold it, please. 2 MR. CADIGAN: I'm sorry, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Do you object to the question? 4 MR. CADIGAN: I do, Your Honor, I object to the 5 question. 6 THE COURT: What's the grounds? 7 MR. CADIGAN: Well -- I withdraw the objection.

BY MR. BRODSKY:

- Q. Let me get to the point. Have you ever seen this sheaf of papers stapled together, five in number? I believe Your Honor may have --
- 12 A. Right.

8

10

- 13 Q. Yes. Have you seen that?
- 14 A. I hadn't seen this one, no.
- 15 Q. Is this the first time you've seen it?
- 16 A. In this form. I believe this is the list that -- that
- 17 | Hershel made, but he had it --
- 18 Q. Ms. Quinn, I don't care who made it up. Is this the
 19 first time you've seen this --
- 20 A. This particular one.
- 21 Q. These here?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. How do you interpret on top "Coins signed for" which is in typing, then "that do not have identifiable owners"? Who
- 25 | put that in? Do you know?

A.	No.	I	don't	know	whose	writing	that	is.
----	-----	---	-------	------	-------	---------	------	-----

- Q. And you're seeing this now for the first time? Were there therefore perhaps two lists: identifiable owners and non-identifiable owners?
- A. No, I -- I believe he made the handwritten list and he had it transferred to this.
- Q. Did he give you that handwritten list?
- 8 A. No.

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. So that you believe he made -- he made up these five sheets of paper? I say -- I should refer to them as an exhibit for identification, I suppose, Your Honor, unless Your Honor can identify them.

THE COURT: No, we'll call this spiving (phonetic) --

MR. BRODSKY: On behalf of the redemption coin holders, and I don't represent them as a counsel, but I'm here in that capacity at least as far as the amicus curiae that this is an exhibit for identification, perhaps #1 on behalf of the redemption coin holders.

THE COURT: So marked.

WHEREUPON EXHIBIT #1 WAS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION BY MR. BRODSKY:

Q. Is there another list that contains redemption coin holders identification either by bearer number or name or identification of coins?

89-11051

2-15-96

- A. I believe Attorney Cadigan gave you one.
- 2 | Q. I beg your pardon?

12

- 3 A. I believe Attorney Cadigan gave you a list.
- Q. You pick out which ones you believe contain the names of identification of owners or by bearer numbers of redemption
- 6 coin holders. And I would have done the task myself, Ms.
- Quinn, if I had been given that when I first requested it after January 4.
- 9 A. This is a list of claim numbers.
- 10 Q. Which of those three packages contains identification of redemption coin holders either by name or bearer number?
 - A. I don't know. I didn't make the list.
- Q. How would you know, Ms. Quinn, therefore, that coins
 that your agency is seeking to sell may not be also including
 redemption coin holders' coins?
- 16 A. Because the redemption coins were always segregated from the rest of the coins.
- 18 Q. But you don't have a list of your own that you made up,
 19 is that right?
 - A. No, I don't have a list.
- 21 Q. Now the coins that were finally sent down to Christie's--
- 22 A. Minhmm.
- 23 Q. -- were they taken out of containers? Any form of container?
- 25 A. No, the containers was --

- 1 Q. I don't hear you, ma'am.
- 2 A. No, they weren't.
- 3 | Q. Well, how were they delivered to Christie's? I don't
- 4 mean physically. In what form? Were they in bags, in
- 5 | cellophane? In containers?
- 6 A. They were just the way we found them in the vault.
- 7 Q. Well, how did you find them in the vault?
- 8 A. I told you, in the -- they were in steel safe deposit
- 9 boxes.
- 10 Q. When you say sealed safe deposit --
- 11 A. Steel. Steel.
- 12 0. Sealed.
- 13 THE COURT: Steel.
- 14 THE WITNESS: Steel.
- 15 BY MR. BRODSKY:
- 16 Q. And do they contain any identification other than the
- 17 | year?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Nothing at all?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. Who told you that certain coins, however marked, by
- 22 bearer number or name, were redemption coin holders' coins?
- 23 Who told you that?
- 24 A. The FBI.
- 25 Q. The FBI?

Α. Yes.

1

10

11

- 2 So that you are testifying today that you set aside 3 something that FBI said to you belonged to the redemption 4 coin holders, is that right?
- 5 Α. Right. Yes.
- 6 Would you know now or even then that perhaps some of the 7 coins that were not set aside by FBI might have been 8 redemption coin holders?
- 9 None of them were marked.
- I'm not asking about marking. Would you know of your own knowledge, other than what the FBI said to you, "These 12 belong to the redemption coin holders," that some of them 13 that were not pointed out to you by FBI might have also been
- 14 redemption coin holders' property?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 0. You don't know. When you sent the material -- strike 17 that -- when you sent the coins to Christie's, did you make 18 out an inventory? I say "you"; I meant FDIC.
- 19 A. I know. We checked off each box as it left.
- 20 Q. Did you make up an inventory? There has been -- while 21 you're thinking of the answer, there's been a suggestion here 22 made that Christie's has perhaps 8700 coins.
- 23 A. Right.
- 24 Q. Do you have a list of those --
- 25 Α. We have an appraisal.

89-11051

- 1 Q. Where is that list?
- 2 A. We have an appraisal.
- 3 Q. Well, who made up the appraisal?
- 4 A. The appraiser, an appraiser.
- 5 Q. Somebody that you engaged?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And he gave you a report, did he not?
- 8 A. Right.
- 9 Q. Did he list it by each coin --
- 10 A. Each coin.
- 11 | Q. -- or merely 8700 coins --
- 12 A. No, each coin.
- 13 Q. -- worth four million dollars.
- 14 A. Each coin.
- 15 Q. Each coin. Do you have that list?
- 16 A. Do you have a -- I believe Mr. Cadigan has a copy of it.
- MR. MONZACK: If I may? We have a lot of lists.
- 18 We have the list that Ramapo did. We have the list that
- 19 | Christie's did. We have the list that was done jointly by
- 20 | myself and the FDIC before we let Christie's take the coins.
- 21 | There are -- we have the list we just turned over to Mr.
- 22 | Brodsky. We have innumerable different types of lists, and I
- 23 don't know where this is all headed. We have a bunch of
- 24 different lists that talked about these coins that were non-
- 25 | redemption coins.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	1
13	

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

	THE	COURT:	Well,	are	any	of	the li	ists	that you	
have, wo	uld t	hey be	responsi	ive	to ar	ıy x	equest	ts th	nat Mr.	
Brodsky	made 1	before	today?	Не	said	he	asked	for	something	j
back in	Janua	rv.								

MR. MONZACK: It's my understand, I know Mr. Cadigan did send a list, I presented more lists to Mr. Brodsky today. Uh, but these are lists of -- for instance, the list, Mr. Brodsky would like an explanation of the list that was --

MR. BRODSKY: If I may interject, my question is the inventory list that was sent forth by FDIC to Christie's. The list. I don't care who made the appraisal and who compiled it. But there is a list to show that Christie's has 8700 coins and the identification of them.

MR. MONZACK: This, Your Honor, is a list provided by Christie's of all the coins broken down by the number of coins, the date of the coin, and the approximate value that Christie's expects to get for the coin at auction. I believe this was provided to Mr. Taft.

THE COURT: What is that number, by the way?

MR. MONZACK: Total number of coins?

THE COURT: Total number -- the total expected sale price.

MR. MONZACK: It's a range, and the total aggregate range is between \$99,290.00 and \$148,280.00, and Christie's

goes on to say I think it was sort of a self-promotion,
but we think we can do better than that at auction, so I
think their proposal is probably conservative. But that's
their aggregate pre-sale estimate.

Thank you. Okay, why don't we have THE COURT: another question.

BY MR. BRODSKY:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is that list that was sent to Christie's available for inspection by the redemption coin holders? We either have the list or we don't.

I'm not sure she said that FDIC sent a THE COURT: If you established that already, I'll back off, but I don't -- I'm not sure I heard the witness say that.

MR. MONZACK: If I can just briefly respond. Brodsky --

MR. BRODSKY: Before the witness answered, Counsel stood up and said we have a bunch of lists.

> THE COURT: Right. Mmhmm.

MR. BRODSKY: I'm only concerned about the list that went to Christie's.

THE COURT: Okay, is there such a list, Ms. Quinn? THE WITNESS: I don't think so. I can't remember. Let's see -- I don't remember.

MR. BRODSKY: Your Honor, I think you've -- the Court must have gotten the gist of this, and I would prefer

89-11051

2-15-96

)

to address myself other than the questioning examining of
this witness. It's frustrating that these records are not
here and it's frustrating that I feel that I haven't been
able to learn the identity of coins that have been sent out
to Christie's, and perhaps from that list the coin holders
could be somewhat satisfied that their coins are not included
there.

MR. MONZACK: Your Honor, Mr. Brodsky says he doesn't represent redemption coin holders. Mr. Taft has been very active on behalf of himself, perhaps we could say on behalf of other redemption coin holders. We gave Mr. Taft the complete list of coins in the possession of Christie's. That's what he uses the basis for his objection he filed with the Court. Nobody's trying to hide anything from anyone. I'm not sure who represents who here. We provided Mr. Taft a total list of coins in Christie's possession.

THE COURT: Are we finished with this witness?

MR. BRODSKY: I have no other questions, Your

Honor.

MR. CADIGAN: I'd like to redirect, so.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CADIGAN:

Q. Ms. Quinn, I just want to make perfectly clear, when you arrived as an FDIC representative upon the failure of Eastland Bank to the vault in Cranston, was the FBI present

89-11051

- 1 | that day?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Yes.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And who was the FBI agent present?
- 6 A. John Treslow.
- 7 | Q. And was a postal inspector present?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And what was his name?
- 10 A. Steve Rothmitch.
- 11 Q. And you were present?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. And who else was present? Mr. Watson?
- 14 A. Ross Watson.
- 15 | Q. And were there other people from either the FDIC or the
- 16 government there as you recall?
- 17 A. We may have had one other FDIC person.
- 18 Q. And when you went into the vault, did Mr. Treslow, the
- 19 | FBI agent, have any instructions for you?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. What did he --
- 22 A. He pointed out the canisters that held the redemption
- 23 | coins. He sealed them.
- 24 | Q. How do you mean sealed them?
- 25 A. He put evidence tape around the boxes.

BARBARA QUINN - Redirect/Cadigan

Page 73

- 1 Q. And Mr. Treslow, an FBI agent, told you those were 2 redemption coins.
- 3 A. Redemption coins.
- 4 Q. And that you were not to -- not to look at them or
- 5 | inventory them?
- 6 A. Right.
- 7 Q. Or do anything with them?
- 8 A. Right.
- 9 Q. And he put a tape around them.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. To segregate them.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. When they were removed from the Cranston location to the
- 14 Eastland Bank in Woonsocket, were the redemption coins moved
- 15 with the rest of the coins?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Was an FBI agent present?
- 18 A. Yes, there was.
- 19 Q. And who was the FBI agent?
- 20 A. John Treslow.
- 21 Q. Was a postal inspector present?
- 22 A. No, he wasn't there that day.
- 23 Q. Besides the FBI agent and --
- 24 A. He had two other agents with him, but I don't know their
- 25

names.

- 1 Q. All right, so there were three FBI agents present?
- ² A. Right.
- 3 Q. And you were present?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Anyone else from the FDIC present?
- 6 A. Uh, I don't think Ross was there that day. Uh...
- 7 Q. And those were moved by what? By armored car?
- 8 A. Armored car.
- Q. Okay. And did the FBI agents accompany you to
- 10 | Woonsocket?
- 11 A. Yes, they did.
- 12 Q. Were they there when the redemption coins were put into
- 13 | the vault?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. And when they were put into the vault, did the FBI
- agents do anything with the coins?
- 17 A. No, they just -- they didn't touch them. They just --
- 18 Q. Did they put any tape --
- 19 A. They were taped.
- 20 Q. They segregated them?
- 21 A. They were segregated, they were taped, and the lids were 22 sealed.
- Q. And did they give you any instructions about those redemption coins?
- 25 A. They said not to inventory them.

BARBARA QUINN -- Redirect/Cadigan--Recross/Monzack Page 75

- 1 Q. Not to inventory them. At the time that Mr. Smith
- 2 removed the coins on April 4th, the question has come up
- 3 | about a receipt being signed, is that correct?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Do you know who prepared that receipt?
- 6 A. I don't remember.
- 7 Q. It was prepared by the legal division.
- 8 A. Right.
- 9 Q. And -- and -- and do you know who signed the receipt?
- 10 You didn't sign the receipt, did you?
- 11 A. I don't think so.
- 12 Q. Did Mr. Monzack sign it, as you recall?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Did Mr. Smith sign it?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Do you know if anybody else that signed it other than
- 17 | those two?

21

- 18 A. I don't remember anyone else signing it.
- 19 $\|$ Q. For the record, I may have signed it also.
- 20 MR. CADIGAN: I have no further questions.

RECROSS EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. MONZACK:

- 23 Q. During an affidavit that you had signed and presented as
- 24 a response to my motion, you had put down here from December
- 25 | 1993 until January 1996.

89-11051 2-15-96

- 1 A. Mmhmm.
- 2 Q. These were under your charge.
- 3 A. Right.
- $^4 \parallel \mathsf{Q}$. You just testified it was December 1992, not January.
- 5 Just for my --
- 6 A. What was the date in there?
- 7 Q. Just for my own record, I want to get this --
- 8 A. Okay, what was the date on that?
- 9 Q. I believe your signed affidavit, you put December of
- 10 | 1993. On testimony, you testified --
- 11 A. I'm sorry, it should be '92.
- 12 0. It should be '92?
- 13 A. It should be '92.
- 14 Q. So prior to December of 1992, you had no contact with
- 15 | these coins whatsoever?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. How did the FDIC obtain inventory of the Cumberland
- 18 assets originally?
- 19 A. The bank failed.
- 20 Q. And so they went in and took all the inventory?
- 21 A. Right.
- 22 | Q. Was there any, to your knowledge, was there any
- 23 | inventory taken when they, you know, a precise inventory when
- 24 | they took the inventory from the Cumberland?
- 25 A. Oh, I don't -- I wasn't involved with it then.

- Q. Okay. The bank was taken over in 1992?
- 2 A. Right.

9

- 3 Q. Were there any -- do you know, to your knowledge, was
- 4 there any cease or desist orders in effect prior to December
- 5 of 1992?
- 6 ∥ A. I don't know.
- 7 CLERK: Excuse me. Ms. Quinn, please speak
- 8 directly into the microphone.
 - THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 10 CLERK: Thank you.
- 11 BY MR. MONZACK:
- 12 Q. Have you ever seen an inventory done by the FDIC?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Like this here?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- MR. CADIGAN: Can I look at that?
- MR. MONZACK: Yeah, sure. This was given to me by
- 18 Mr. Lutes. This was prior to the auction in 1991 by the FDIC
- 19 and it didn't make any sense to me, the bank being taken over
- 20 | in '92 and this is in '91 prior to an auction.
- 21 BY MR. MONZACK:
- 22 Q. But your first recollection of the FDIC taking over the
- 23 | bank was 1992?
- 24 A. What was the date? I'm not sure now.
- 25 Q. To your recollection, the bank was taken over, or the

89-11051

1	assets of the bank were taken over to your knowledge in 1992?
2	A. It was when the bank closed. Was it December of was
3	it December of '91?
4	MR. CADIGAN: For the record, Eastland Bank
5	Eastland Bank failed in December of 1992.
6	THE WITNESS: I believe
7	MR. CADIGAN: December of '92 it failed and was
8	taken over by the FDIC.
9	MR. TAFT: And my question, at that point, and I
10	can place this into exhibit if you would like, Your Honor,
11	there was an inventory done by the FDIC, and maybe I don't
12	understand the legal parts of somebody going in, you know
13	this was an inventory taken.
14	MR. CADIGAN: I don't know who took it. It appears
15	to be it appears to be a
16	THE WITNESS: What is the date on that?
17	MR. CADIGAN: Maybe we should show it to the
18	witness to see if she
19	MR. TAFT: Oh, okay.
20	MR. CADIGAN:recollects what it is.
21	MR. TAFT: Sure. May I approach the
22	THE COURT: Sure.
23	THE WITNESS: Where is the date on it?
24	MR. TAFT: This was this was a list that was
25	given to me by Attorney Lutes showing an auction that took

_ '	place in 1991. I can get the dates that that was compiled.
2	THE COURT: But there are no dates on this?
3	MR. TAFT: On here, there are not.
4	THE WITNESS: This is an inventory that the FDIC
5	made of what was in the vault.
6	MR. TAFT: Do you know when that was done?
7	THE WITNESS: That was done after '92. After
8	December of '92.
9	MR. TAFT: Can that be placed in as an exhibit,
10	Your Honor?
11	THE COURT: Negative. It's not authenticated. The
12	dates that were attributed to it came from Mr. Lutes,
13	apparently originally from Mr. Chorney. It's totally
14	unreliable.
15	MR. TAFT: Do you know of any of the
16	THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry, it may be marked as an
17	exhibit for identification, but not as a full exhibit. And
18	Mr. Brodsky's exhibit, can we call it a full exhibit?
19	MR. BRODSKY: Yes, I was going to move later. It
20	may be made full now. I'd appreciate it.
21	MR. TAFT: Thank you, Your Honor.
22	WHEREUPON EXHIBIT B WAS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE
23	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. TAFT:

To your knowledge, well, strike that. May I ask if

25

```
1
    she's seen this, Your Honor?
2
              THE COURT:
                           Sure.
3
              MR. CADIGAN: May I take a look at that?
4
              MR. TAFT: Oh, I'm sorry.
5
        (Pause)
6
    BY MR. TAFT:
7
         Have you ever seen this before?
8
    Α.
         No.
              No.
9
         All right, I was going to ask if you knew of any
10
    collateral coins that were moved from Eastland-Woonsocket to
11
    Eastland in Cranston.
12
              MR. CADIGAN: Objection to the form of the
13
    question.
14
    BY MR. TAFT:
         Do you know of any collateral coins that were moved
15
16
    since your control or charge or whatever --
    A.
         Mmhmm.
17
         -- of collateral coins from Eastland-Woonsocket to
18
    Eastland-Cranston.
19
20
    Α.
         No.
21
    Q.
         On that sheet that I just gave you, could you read for
22
    the Court how many coins were moved?
23
               MR. CADIGAN: Objection, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Sustained.

THE WITNESS: I don't know where this came from.

24

25

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

MR. TAFT: Okay.

BY MR. TAFT:

Q. So would you know of any coins being sent by the FDIC, collateral coins, from Woonsocket to Cranston?

A. No.

MR. TAFT: Just for, Your Honor, just for identification, can that be marked?

THE COURT: It's been marked for identification.

MR. TAFT: Thank you.

THE COURT: It's going to be -- what is it, Taft Exhibit? Exhibit B for identification. It's already been marked in magic marker type stuff Exhibit K. So that will further identify it.

MR. TAFT: Just a last thing, Your Honor, and I don't know how to go about this, because I'm not an attorney. My original motion that I presented and I received a response from Mr. Monzack, I had compiled a complete cross-reference between the two inventories from the Ramapo and Christie's totals, which it supports my original motion, and I did want to submit it as either identification or exhibit for the Court.

THE COURT: Do you object to this being -- do you know what it is?

MR. MONZACK: I know what it purports to be. I don't know -- won't vouch for its accuracy.

2-15-96

THE CORBY GROUP 1-800-255-5040

BARBARA QUINN - Re-redirect/Cadigan

Page 82

1

2

3

4

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 BY MR. CADIGAN:

Yes.

Thank you.

19

20

21

22

23

24

A.

25

this; I believe Mr. Taft that he prepared this comparison.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm not asking you for any

THE COURT: No, I'm not asking you to do that.

MR. MONZACK: Except Mr. Taft says he prepared

warranties. We're talking about admissibility now. May it be an exhibit? Or do you need to cross-examine Mr. Taft on how he did it or from what, et cetera?

MR. MONZACK: I would imagine if Mr. Taft wants this as an exhibit, and yeah, I'd like to know exactly how he did it.

THE COURT: Okay, we'll mark it for identification right now, and then you may have to testify to --

MR. TAFT: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- to try to authenticate that.

MR. TAFT: Thank you. That's all, Your Honor.

RE-REDIRECT EXAMINATION

Ms. Quinn, I just want to make it as clear as possible

the kinds of canisters that the redemption coins were in versus the kinds of packaging and canisters that the -- all the other coins were in. Were the canisters containing the redemption coins different?

THE COURT: When you say canisters, are you

2-15-96

referring to the plastic tubes?

2	THE WITNESS: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Is that or the safe deposit type
4	boxes that they were in?
5	MR. CADIGAN: The canisters would be the canisters
6	that the lady Ms. Kearn presented and showed to the
7	Court about that high.
8	THE COURT: Yeah. Is this the thing that the pros
9	call them tubes? Is that it?
10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
11	MR. TAFT: Tubes.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	BY MR. CADIGAN:
14	Q. So the redemption coins, which we have established, the
15	FBI agent told you they were redemption coins.
16	A. Right.
17	Q. And the FBI agent told you to segregate the coins and
18	not to and not to disturb the coins, correct?
19	A. Right.
20	Q. But there were but there were canisters that these
21	redemption coins were in, correct?
22	A. Right.

And they looked different and were different than the

packaging and the containers that the non-redemption coins

were in?

23

24

25

Yes.

A.

2	MR. CADIGAN: Thank you. I have no further
3	questions.
4	THE COURT: Step down. Thank you.
5	THE COURT: Okay, I guess before we forget too many
6	loose ends, Mr. Taft want to take the witness stand and I
7	guess he can tell us what it is that he compiled and how he
8	did it and then you can examine on it, okay?
9	WARREN TAFT, COIN HOLDER, SWORN
10	CLERK: Please state your name for the record.
11	THE WITNESS: Warren Taft.
12	THE CLERK: Please spell your last name.
13	THE WITNESS: T-A-F-T.
14	THE CLERK: Please be seated.
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. MONZACK:
17	Q. Do you have, Mr. Taft, the document that you want to
18	submit to the Court as an exhibit?
19	A. Yes, I do.
20	Q. Mr. Taft, I guess did I previously supply you with
21	copies of the Ramapo appraisal and the Christie's Auction
22	compilation?
23	A. Yes, you did, sir.

And why don't you describe for me what you did with

regard to those two reports that I furnished you.

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

22

23

A.	То	the	best	of	my	ab	ility,	I	did a	COI	nparis	on c	of both	h
inve	ntor	cies	and	trie	ed t	co	compile	e a	list	рÀ	year	and	count	of
the a	anir													

THE COURT: Could you say the question again to that answer?

MR. MONZACK: What process Mr. Taft took, what he performed with regard to comparing the Ramapo appraisal and the Christie's compilation.

THE COURT: Okay, so you were comparing one document with another. You weren't near any coins?

THE WITNESS: That is correct, Your Honor.

BY MR. MONZACK:

- Q. And are you aware of the different approaches that the Ramapo appraiser may have taken with regard to the -- and the Christie's compilers may have taken?
- 16 A. I don't know what procedure they used, no.
- Q. And so you're not aware of the fact of whether or not one person on behalf of one organization may have specified markings when they did their compilation and the other person may have compiled the coins in a different fashion?
- 21 A. I would not be aware of that, no, sir.
 - Q. Did you make certain assumptions when you compared the two reports?
- 24 A. I did a direct comparison by year and any markings and 25 the count.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MONZACK: If Your Honor please, Mr. Lamb (phonetic) from Christie's should be available by telephone and it may be helpful -- I don't know if we can do this -- in some way to have him give an explanation as to how he compiled his list. Mr. *Herman is also available from Ramapo. The problem is, if I may just give by way of example, on Mr. Taft's comparison. For 1900-0, Mr. Taft has a comparison that shows that the Ramapo for 1900-0 has a hundred coins, and Christie's for 1900-0 has 119 coins. for 1900-0/CC, Ramapo has twenty and Christie's has zero, so Mr. Taft has a total discrepancy on those two entries of thirty-nine coins, wherein I'm advised that Christie's did not make that specific designation of O versus O/CC, and therefore the discrepancy is really one, but there's really no way of making that determination without hearing from the representatives of the two appraisers.

I might also point out that on Mr. Taft's compilation, he assigned -- the sum total of Ramapo is higher and some of Christie's is higher. Mr. Taft, I believe, does a compilation and comes up with 126 amount difference between the Christie's and the Ramapo. Now when you come up with that difference of 826, that makes no adjustment for one -- one listing having more coins on one instance and the next instance the other listing has more coins.

THE WITNESS: It's showing the total difference.

89-11051

1	MR. MONZACK: And in fact the total coins I believe
2	Christie's shows 14 more coins than Ramapo.
3	THE WITNESS: I believe that is correct.
4	BY MR. MONZACK:
5	Q. So Mr. Taft, you're not aware of what assumptions the
6	appraiser or compiler made for Christie's or for Ramapo
7	when they compiled their list, is that correct?
8	A. I would not be aware of their procedures.
9	Q. And what rationales they used when they grouped their
10	coins together?
11	A. No, I just did it as a layman's way of comparing two
12	lists.
13	MR. MONZACK: If Your Honor please, I would ask
14	that the document not be marked as a full exhibit in that we
15	don't really know how valid of a comparison it is because we
16	don't know what the underlying assumptions of Ramapo and
17	Christie's approaches were, but I do believe Mr. Lamb from
18	Christie's and Mr. Herman from Ramapo would be available by
19	telephone to give their explanations of the approaches they
20	used on these if the Court feels that would be helpful.

THE COURT: Well, neither of the two lists are in evidence either, is that right?

MR. MONZACK: That's right.

THE COURT: Is there objection to introducing as exhibits -- I know they're hearsay, but if the parties -- if

2-15-96

89-11051

)

21

22

23

24

25

everybody would like those -- the Christie's inventory and the Ramapo -- is that what -- I think it would make some sense to have those as exhibits; I would, for the reasons mentioned by Mr. Monzack and because there's a gap here between the witness's understanding of how the two different appraisals were done, I would exclude that. It may remain as an exhibit for identification, but what -- I'm not leaning on anybody, but we'll allow these things in if the parties want them in.

MR. MONZACK: I feel I have a problem, if the Court

-- these are my only -- I think I might have an extra Ramapo

-- it's my only Christie's compilation. If I could indulge

the Court to get a copy back to me on Christie's. I guess I'm

also trying to figure out exactly where we're going. I think

the initial objection, as I understood it, is Notice of

Intended Sale. So I don't lose sight of what's before the

Court, was that the redemption coin holders sort of objecting

on the grounds that maybe it's their coins in New York.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MONZACK: Notwithstanding the fact that this issue was resolved by prior litigation.

THE COURT: I think you can step down.

MR. TAFT: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Unless you were -- were you finished?

MR. TAFT: Yes, I am, sir.

MR. MONZACK: This compilation prepared by Mr. Taft I don't think goes to that issue at all. I guess what Mr. Taft is saying is that here we go again. We have different lists for different coins, and again we don't have an accurate accounting for what coins exist at what periods of time. The total discrepancy from an absolute number of coins is 14. In fact, Christie's has 14 more than Ramapo shows. He -- I haven't done a compilation for instance to compare what's on Christie's, what's on Ramapo -- these are all very time-intensive tasks in a case in which administrative claimants alone well exceed any funds that are ever going to come in to this bankruptcy estate.

I know from talking to Teresa Hoskiss (phonetic) who did a comparison in terms of dollar amount difference, it appears to be not substantial. If we took the dollar amounts on Ramapo and compared them to what was on Christie's, some questions are not answerable just from the documents such as what was pointed out by Mr. Taft and I referred to the Court as 1900/0 versus 1900/0/CC.

In absolute numbers, those two categories together appear to be one coin apart, though Mr. Taft, the way he's calculated it, has it really being 39 apart.

THE COURT: Well, it's all diminishing returns now. You know, we started out with forty million dollars in this case, and we're down to what, ninety-thousand now maybe?

23

24

25

1 MR. MONZACK: Well, a hundred to a hundred and 2 fifty --I don't -- from what I've heard 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 through -- incidentally, there was one other person in the 5 courtroom who wanted to say something maybe when the 6 examinations were through? 7 MR. HERSEY: Now or later? 8 THE COURT: What would you like to say? Are you a 9 redemption coin holder? 10 MR. HERSEY: I've got two coins that are questionable, so I'll let you decide, Your Honor. 11 12 indulge the Court, I apologize. 13 THE COURT: Have we got his name? My name -- I'll repeat it -- David C. 14 MR. HERSEY: 15 Hersey, H-E-R-S-E-Y. That's right. I'm sorry. 16 Okay. THE COURT: 17 MR. HERSEY: Do you want my address? THE COURT: No, it's okay. 18 MR. HERSEY: By way of the courts, or by your way, 19 my introduction to you, you and I became familiar with this 20 case approximately July of 1990. Mr. Furness I believe was 21

89-11051 2-15-96

the attorney or the representative for Eastland Bank. I

happened to stumble in here -- I was on my way from the rehab

lab because I had open heart surgery at that particular time.

As I came into the building to find my way to the Proof Claim

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Court, they told me to come in here because it was on, and everyone reached for me to be a witness. If you can remember back a few years, I think you'll remember that, Your Honor. It was a long day and I think a long time for you. getting to is I supplied the courts with various evidences. I showed my bearer numbers which I believe Hinckley & Allen have a copy and he lent me a copy here, I need to be -they're all documented, if they need to be reprocessed, because they were introduced at that time, we can do so The invoices and what I have taken to be my first introduction to Mr. Hal Chorney, and that was in 1995 to that particular time period. It was a small time period that I did not know Mr. Chorney had been in bankruptcy. I had taken part then in another purchase, so that was after the bankruptcy --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. HERSEY: If you follow the situation, okay.

Two -- two documents -- one document was for a -- and I allude to this because of the fact we seem to be having a paper trail problem today, a trail of accountability, in a way the process in the early stages of this fiasco was moved along to say the least. I introduced while I was sitting at the chair a document, and it's on the Court, I believe, if I'm not misleading myself or the Court; if I'm not, I indulge your -- years going back now -- there was a coin called a 19

89-11051 2-15-96

-- an 1885 MS 67. And I'm sure you are not aware of what these numbers mean. In the numismatic term, the higher the number, the greater the value. This coin had a value somewhere in ex -- around \$10,000.00. And I filed a Proof of Claim for that particular coin. Secondly --

THE COURT: Is that coin in existence? Does anybody have that coin? Either FDIC or --

MR. HERSEY: I couldn't find it in --

THE COURT: I'm not surprised. If it's a good coin I'm not surprised that you can't find it.

MR. HERSEY: I can infer what you mean. Secondly, to go back and forth a bit, I have -- I'm a little dry in the mouth.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HERSEY: I spoke to Mr. Monzack about appearing before you. Mr. Monzack thought it was a waste of time.

THE COURT: Shame on you.

MR. HERSEY: I didn't think it was a waste of time when I came here in 1990 and what I went through.

THE COURT: Mr. Monzack, I hope you misunderstood him. I'm sure he didn't mean any affront. He may have been trying to give you some practical advice in maybe colloquial terms. Don't take it to heart.

MR. HERSEY: I didn't. It's a closed matter. A
1991 double CC, Carson City. There's only two in existence.

89-11051 2-15-96

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS 65. On that particular date when I testified before the committee, and it was argued on the opposite side -- I guess that's -- I'm not sure -- defendant -- Mr. Chorney's side, to be more proper -- that the coin that I had was not the proper coin, and I showed an invoice -- first I showed the picture, front and back, then I showed what I called my invoice, and it was Eastland Exhibit #20, made out to the bearer. the word "invoice" but no number. It lists one -- quantity, Form A one 1891 CC MS 65 description, value \$6,150.00. I'm perplexed over the fact that someone can tell me while I was sitting in the back room that day and I'm in the room today, because obviously either Christie's or Ramapo or someone else has probably got that coin, too. got this coin. It's in a sealed -- what they call -- it's an They have a PC, a PG, a PS CG or whatever, and NGC certification division. I happened to have a case that I pulled out several coins, they were sealed inside, and they were what they call a certified coin acceptable. And it was supposedly the only one. The argument that took place on the floor that that is not the one. My question back to the Court was, "What do I have?" So my question today is still going to be the same thing: Does Christie's or Ramapo have my coin and what coin did I get in its place.

THE COURT: Well, does Christie's have such a coin?

MR. MONZACK: We've called Mr. Lamb -- I don't have

89-11051

this multiple page exhibit. I didn't think we had any coin that were that valuable, but Mr. Lamb I think would know -- he's familiar with the coins -- if we had a coin such as that. I'm not sure I understood Mr. Hersey. Is he -- he saying he has a coin that was -- someone took a look at it and said this was not the coin you thought you purchased and you had possession of that coin so you're looking for the coin you believe that should have been provided to you? I'm not sure I understand.

MR. HERSEY: I'm showing a -- you can look over my shoulder -- the physical well-being of this document, this item as you see printed, it was presented before the courts, front and back.

MR. MONZACK: You had those coins with you on that day?

MR. HERSEY: Yes.

MR. MONZACK: In your possession?

MR. HERSEY: I brought all my coins.

MR. MONZACK: You brought your coins with you.

MR. HERSEY: Right.

MR. MONZACK: And then you turned them over to someone at that day?

MR. HERSEY: I turned them over to the courts. And I received these coins back. My question is, does Christie's or does Ramapo since the argument on the floor that day,

2-15-96

2 the defendant denied by saying that coin does not exist. 3 THE COURT: Did you get back the coins that you 4 left here? 5 MR. HERSEY: There's a guestion on -- I can't 6 recall -- I got this coin back that I just referred to. 7 THE COURT: Mmhmm. 8 MR. HERSEY: -- Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: But when you left these coins in court, 10 how long were they here? Who had custody of them? 11 MR. HERSEY: I let Eastland Bank and my eyesight do 12 as best as I could to watch them so they didn't wander or 13 walk away. 14 THE COURT: Mmhmm. They never left the courtroom? 15 MR. HERSEY: They did not leave the courtroom. 16 MR. MONZACK: So you walked into the courtroom with 17 these coins that you just have photostatic copies of, and you 18 walked out of the courtroom with -- with three coins -- what 19 appeared to be the same coins in the same containers? 20 that right? At the end of the day? 21 I walked out with these --MR. HERSEY: 22 THE COURT: Are you suggesting that somebody 23 switched coins on you while you were in court here that day? 24 And if so, why are you raising that right now at this --

MR. HERSEY: No, I'm not -- in the testimony that

which was never settled as far as I know, who had -- since

89-11051

25

was given that day, Your Honor, the question was brought up, that's not the coin, the correct coin. We only have one, and the document --

THE COURT: Well, that's what somebody said. Who said that?

MR. HERSEY: I don't know. Now I -- let's go back to the other question. The 1885 MS 67, the \$10,000.00, \$15,000.00 coin or perhaps thirty thousand today, I have no idea. I submitted a proof of claim for it. These coins that I'm talking about at this present time was after the bankruptcy and I received no -- what I thought would be a person within the order of standing -- I guess when you file a proof of -- I don't know if it's credit or it's a debit -- when you file it --

THE COURT: You purchased some coins from Mr. Chorney after the petition?

MR. HERSEY: Yes. I was unaware that he was bankrupt.

THE COURT: Yeah, all right. Do you know who you're dealing with then? Mr. Chorney is the man you want to talk to.

MR. HERSEY: That wasn't the question and that's not what was said to me that particular day in July. When I asked for the courts to send me and Hinckley & Allen about the proof of claim on this particular coin, no one has any

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

information on it. So I can't show you the paperwork, and I filed it.

MR. MONZACK: For what it's worth, Your Honor, the compilation that we have by alphabetical listing having reviewed the -- actually, the FDIC did the compilation, Mr. Hersey filed a proof of claim, he listed the 1891 CC, he listed 1885 coins; it actually was unclear by looking at Mr. Hersey's proof of claim who had possession of the coins. There's a notation here. I mean, the claim is filed -- I'm not sure if Mr. Hersey is now questioning the process by which a claimant might receive a dividend. The purpose of this is notice of intended sale is an effort to bring some money into the estate. So there are administrative claims exceeding any money that's going to come into the estate, so this notice also was segregating a certain amount of funds or designated for unsecured creditors notwithstanding that. in that sense, Mr. Hersey's claim would ultimately be processed in the normal way that claims are processed, if these are funds available for unsecured creditors.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MONZACK: I'm not really sure what Mr. Hersey in questioning.

THE COURT: I'm not sure yet what you're getting at, Mr. Hersey, except that you are, you know, obviously one of the -- call them creditors/victims in this case. There

89-11051 2-15-96

are lots of you.

MR. HERSEY: After the fact and before the fact.

THE COURT: Right. Mmhmm.

MR. HERSEY: My final point to you I guess then is the paper trail of this -- of the document. I would like the Court to at least send me a copy of the document that I -- I never -- I never -- I asked and I never received -- I received the other information, but I never received any acknowledgment to the 1885, so I don't -- never knew that it was in any way being adjudicated one way or another, and that's why I was upset with Mr. Monzack when I called him, because I could not get that question to him. Maybe I just can't present myself properly.

THE COURT: Now what document is it you're looking for?

MR. MONZACK: Some of the -- actually, a little while ago -- I didn't really remember the conversation, but parts of it are coming back to me now. I think in sort of the same discussion we had at length on the telephone some time ago, I guess Mr. Hersey is looking for some acknowledgment that indeed he's filed a proof of claim and it's recognized that he's filed a proof of claim for an 1885 and an 1891 CC. I think I tried to explain to Mr. Hersey that unless you request sort of with a stamped self-addressed envelope a receipted copy of your proof of claim and receipt

89-11051

back, that's not the normal procedure, but it's clear that Claim #150 is a claim filed by Mr. Hersey in which he makes reference to the 1891 CC and 1885, an if, in fact, a number of other coins.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we're getting afield, but as long as we're here, let's try and line it up. What is it that you're looking for from Mr. Monzack? Maybe we can --

MR. HERSEY: I'm not looking for anything from Mr. Monzack, I'm looking just for the courts to kind of clear up the paper trail that -- because like I said, in five years or six years I don't have any information. I don't know anybody in the room other than you, Your Honor, and when I look to my left, Mr. Chorney.

THE COURT: Okay, that's two of us. The paper trail that you would like clarified or part of what I had started to say just before you stood up, Mr. Hersey, was that there are discrepancies and questions and missing items that I don't think can be cleared up by this Court or by experts or by court-appointed officials, examiners, trustees, accountants, lawyers. This is a tangle that was a mess before it ever got to this Court. It continued apparently through people -- you know, unfortunately people like you who are dealing with Mr. Chorney and not even knowing he, or his company, was in bankruptcy or in Chapter 11 at the time, I think. But there are just some things, many of the things,

in fact all the important things happened pre-petition, cannot be undone, and no amount of legal miracle can -- there is no such thing -- but if there was, it couldn't straighten this out. The damage was done.

There were misrepresentations about the value of stuff, property has been obviously disposed of but nobody will ever be able to locate. It's a terrible thing, it's -- I think most of it is totally unrepairable. We're down to numbers now that you've heard are so insignificant compared to what creditors and anybody involved in the case thought might be involved when the matter was early on. And I see no way, at least no logical or objective way to put anybody back in the position that they think they should be in. Many of the experts early on when there was some asset aspect to this case -- I think, well, Mr. Weingarten's firm and certain of the attorneys early on in the case were paid very substantial fees on the assumption that the case warranted those amounts of compensation.

As it turned out, the more inventories and appraisals we had the less everything was worth. I'm not unsympathetic to you and everybody in a similar place, and it's a pathetic case. People who were here earlier who came all the way from New Jersey just to get more bad news, that's what this kind of a case is about. My only inclination at this point is to, for whatever it's worth, is to go ahead and

have this sale. I think that the paragraph 6 that does give any alleged redemption coin holder or any other type of creditor with an identifiable interest, I think a reasonable time to present any proof that a given item is not property of the estate and shouldn't be in the possession of the bank.

I don't think the bank has to come and, or can or should have to prove that every coin in its possession does not belong to somebody else. Maybe that's wrong, maybe it's an unjust result, and in some cases if we were ever to know the truth, but I don't think we're ever going to know the truth in this case. It might upset you to hear a judge say that and to, you know, admit it in front of other people, but a case like this, the truth is very hard to come by.

(End of Tape #2. Tape #3 continues without interruption as follows:)

I think the sale should go forward. I think whatever redemption coins are in the possession of Mr. Brodsky, maybe they should be liquidated at the same time and go along in the Christie's sale, and I can't see any way right now other than to just have these proceeds distributed pro rata to anybody who's in the category of redemption coin holder, because there's no way that from what I've heard or from any promises or representations that have been made about what experts might be able to do; we cannot match redemption coin holders with specific coins, and unless we

89-11051 2-15-96

can do that, I don't -- I'm at a loss. If somebody's got a better suggestion, I'm entertaining things.

Obviously I'm making what I think is the best of a lot of lousy choices here. Mr. Monzack, Mr. Taft, anybody, if you have a better idea, you can either put it in writing or say it right now and I'll think about it, but I've given you what my impression is of what the only way out, or the only conclusion to this is.

MR. D'ORIO: Your Honor, if I might just interject one point -- Joseph D'Orio on behalf of Fleet Bank. We also had on record an objection which has been resolved, but we've had some discussions with FDIC. We've also arranged with the Court to allow the sale to take place, but there is a proposed distribution or a recommendation as to distributions, none of which we really quarrel with except that -- as follows: We have a competing claim with FDIC to all the proceeds. Our claim, Fleet's claim is really administrative priority, expenses that were funded by way of a loan, and there's an order that gives us a first priority security interest in all of that. We're trying to work that out with the FDIC -- as long as those funds are held back before they're distributed to the FDIC. And secondly --

THE COURT: Well, I think in the circumstances that we agree that the sale should go -- no, we don't agree that the sale, but the sale will go forward, but that the FDIC

89-11051 2-15-96

1 won't distribute any funds until there's an order of 2 distribution. 3 MR. CADIGAN: Absolutely, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. 5 MR. D'ORIO: Fair enough, Judge. Thank you. 6 MR. MONZACK: If I could just clarify. You were 7 talking -- when you're talking about the pro rata 8 distribution to redemption coin holders, I'm assuming you're talking about that from the coins that Mr. Brodsky has? 10 THE COURT: Mr. Brodsky's -- yeah. 11 MR. MONZACK: And the other proposed distributions 12 contained in the Notice of Intended Sale? Those funds. 13 THE COURT: Yeah. Now, this Notice of Intended 14 Sale doesn't touch on selling the coins Mr. Brodsky has, is 15 that right? 16 MR. MONZACK: No. In fact, it -- the Trustee would 17 have no power to well those coins. The order that resolved 18 that action --19 THE COURT: Well, the question is could it and 20 should it be done all at one time? 21 MR. MONZACK: I was going to say that. The court 22 order that resolved the adversary proceeding said that the 23 redemption counsel would come before the court with a

proposed manner of liquidation of those coins.

Mmhmm.

Yeah.

THE COURT:

89~11051

24

25

MR. MONZACK: I guess that could be the proposed manner would be to liquidate these coins at the same time as the other ones to segregate them out and to segregate these proceeds, and then have them laid out in accordance with the terms of that letter. The curious thing is that Mr. Campbell, who is the co-counsel of the redemption coin holders, and Mr. Brodsky really has been sort of speaking on behalf, so to speak.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MONZACK: Maybe not officially, but practically on behalf of the redemption coin holders.

MR. CADIGAN: Your Honor, I've been in communication with Mr. Lamb of Christie's and they're going to have a sale this June, and they need to get their lots photographed for the investor -- I mean for the purchasers, the auctioneers, and I understand that there was like a March 1st deadline to get this to the printer. Our coins are already there, or the estate's coins are already there, so if there's going to be some attempt to sell the redemption coins held by Mr. Brodsky in the upcoming sale, this would have to be done very fast.

THE COURT: Yeah. That was strictly gratuitous comments by the Court. Mr. Brodsky, if you want to get together with Mr. Campbell to decide --

MR. BRODSKY: I'd like to make a statement to the

89-11051 2-15-96

Court, Your Honor, please. Only after I was furnished the past few days with names of coin holders has there been a flurry of response on my behalf to those coin holders. I think it would be an injustice to them if those coins in my possession were turned over to FDIC for liquidation.

THE COURT: I'm not --

MR. BRODSKY: And because it was going to be my intention, now that Your Honor has mentioned it, to come before this Court with instructions after I can forward to the Court some guidance if, for example, the responses by potential coin holders is not forthcoming to me, I don't want the burden and the responsibility of maintaining possession of those coins, and I'm not even going to tell them in public where they are for fear that there might be some happening, so that if I may at some reasonable time from now come before the Court on an appropriate petition for the Court's guidance.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BRODSKY: But certainly not before March 1st, and certainly not before June, because in writing to these people and waiting for their responses we have to give them not only a reasonable opportunity of responding, but these lists that have been forwarded to me contain addresses of ten or more years ago, and many of those envelopes have come back to my office "Date for forwarding has expired."

THE COURT: Yeah, but this is a 1989 case. The problem as I see it, and I'm talking practicalities now, suppose we had until June three years from now with the numbers and the dates of these coins and the number of coins that were minted in each year, do you foresee anybody being able to establish title or ownership in any given coin no matter how long we try?

MR. BRODSKY: Other than the bearer number, Your Honor, it would be difficult for me to honor the request. In other words, in the -- I have received invoices without any number at all, and I've received invoices with an identification that don't match exactly what I have, so that if they don't match exactly what I have, I can't honor them, and for someone to come back and say the 1880 coins are mine --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. BRODSKY: -- we'd need something more than Solomon.

THE COURT: Right. Yeah. So you and maybe any of these active redemption -- I keep calling you redemption coin holders -- that's becoming quite a misnomer these days, but you may want to decide among yourselves if you want to try to tag along on this June sale, but as I say, I'm certainly not ordering that, I'm not putting any heat on anybody to do that, but if it were my money I might possibly be interested

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in that alternative, but the Notice of Sale as -- Intended
Sale as filed is approved. If it needs to be amended in that
way, I guess you'll have to let me know fairly shortly.

MR. D'ORIO: Excuse me, Your Honor, if I may, I
just -- turning to Mr. Brodsky, showed him today that bearer
number 4439 he does have in possession, and I'll be getting
together with him on that. He does have my coins.

THE COURT: Okay. And you're all set on that?

MR. D'ORIO: I just want to make mention here. And again, as far as the other people, the victims, like you said you know, limited justice in this particular case a lot of people have been taken and they're very despondent and they wish a different outcome, but unfortunately it doesn't seem to be that way. Thank you.

THE COURT: I agree with you.

MR. MONZACK: If I can just clarify one thing, Your Honor. So the Notice of Intended Sale will be granted and the subject at paragraph 6 we will not go forward with that. The coins that are in Christie's possession will be sold.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MONZACK: Paragraph 6 was the opener to have if someone could identify their coins, have them pulled from the sale.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MONZACK: But the order and finding of the

Court is that those coins in the possession of Christie's will all be sold.

THE COURT: Yeah. I think we ought to sell the

THE COURT: Yeah. I think we ought to sell the coins, but there's going to be some kind of an additional open door after the sale to -- if anybody has -- and I don't see -- I think their chances diminish after the coins are gone, but there won't be a distribution until an Order of Distribution.

MR. MONZACK: Yes.

THE COURT: And I assume that that is to -- as I say, I don't see any present ability of any redemption coin holders or alleged holders to establish ownership; that's why I'm approving the sale in the first place. If I thought there was still a problem, I wouldn't be doing it.

MR. MONZACK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate tran-

script from the electronic sound recorded record of the

above proceedings.

21 B. J. Willami

3-2-96March 22, 1996

GCI TRANSCRIPTION & RECORDING SERVICES

505 Hamilton Avenue Suite 107

Linwood, NJ 08221

(609) 927-0299 FAX (609) 927-6420 1-800-471-0299

25

24

23

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

COMPARISON OF RAMAPO & CHRISTIES TOTALS

ONLY 5 OF THE 38 TOTALS FOR THE SAME YEAR MATCH USING YEAR TOTALS, THERE ARE 382 COINS THAT ARE DIFFERENT

YEAR	RAMAPO TOTALS	CHRISTIES TOTALS	DIFFERENCES
1878	588	589	1
1879	85	83	2
1880	490	460	30
1881	567	529	38
1882	518	518	0
1883	104	101	3
1884	176	182	_
1885	3 26	833	
1886	177	179	7 2
1887	135	179	1.1
1888	210	217	7
1889	164	177	13
1250	474	430	44
1891	[49]	166	17
1855	75	72	3
1893	22	23	1
1894	26	22	.1
1352	10	fu)	0
1896	60	54	6
1897	71	71	3
1898	80	81	ī
180ò	116	117	1
1900	181	184	3
1901	136	133	3
1902	96	94	2
7903	86	77	2 9
1204	60	69	9
1921,	826	846	20
PEACE I	DOLLARS		
1921	92	88	4 .
1922	688	810* (689)	1
1923	555	584	29
1924	229	220	9
1925	70	59	11
1926	170	170	0

1927	48	48		
			0	
1928	95	56	3 9	
1934	86	96	10	
1935	· 83	83	0	
			382 TOT/	VI_
			D	IFFERENCE.
COUNTE	RFETTS		_	
	11	8		-
SET OF 50	0	50		
HOLED C	OINȘ 5	0		
TOTALS	8643	8768 (8647 T	ISING ONLY I LOT	#131)

COUNTERFEITS

ONLY 6 OF THE 11 COINS MATCH

YEAR	RAMAPO . BOX 119-6	CHRUSTIES LOT #123
1902-8	1	0
1879-CC	1	0
1889-CC	1	1
1883-5	2	2
1884-S	4	3
1893-S	1	0
1934-S	1	0
1888-S	0	1
1897-0	0	1

ONLY 35 OF 124 DIFFERENT YEARS AND MINT MARKS MATCH USING YEAR AND MINT MARK THERE ARE 826 DIFFERENT COINS

1878 7TF	0.6	aa	
	96	77	18
1878 8TF	39	57	18
1878 7/8ፒፑ	14	0	1.4
1878-S	325	325	O
1878-CC	82	32	0
1878 REV 79	9 1 8	0	18
1878	14	48	34
1879	29	29	0
1879-6	29	28	i

1879-S	. 7		
1879-CC	17	16	1
10/34(.)	10	10	0
1830	224	199	25
1880-0	228	225	
1880-8	36	35	3
1880-€€	2	1	1
		•	
1881 0-1881	96	79	18
	146	425	21
1881-5	23	23	0
1881-CC	2	2	0
1882	25	26	ī
1882-0	325	325	0
1882-8	134	133	
1882-CC	34	34	I
		34	0
1883	12	10	2
1883-0	45	44	1
1883-S	26	26	Ů.
1883-CC	21	21	Û
1884	9	10	,
1884-0	134	134	1
1884-8	27	32	0
1884-CC	6	6	5
	Ü	O	0
1885	222	242	20
1885-0	574	547	27
1885-S	10	24	14
1885-CC	20	20	0
1886	116	Lan	
1886-0	43	118	2
1386-5	18	43	0
100000	13	18	0
1887	47	43	6
1887-0	45	103	58
1887-8	43	35	8 8
	_	J.J.	0
1888	130	146	16
1888-C	64	70	6
1888-S	16	i	15
1889	94	107	
	. ,	197	13

•			
1889-0	64	68	4
1889-5	5 .	1	4
1889-CC	1	1	0
1890	16	54	3 7
1890-0	200	216	16
1890-8	162	141	21
1890-CC	21	19	2
1891	49	68	10
1891-0	63	62	19
1891-S	24	24	1
1891-CC	13	12	0
	15	12	1
1892	29	28	1
1892-0	33	32	i.
1892-S	8	7	1
1892-CC	5	5	Ô
			v
1893	6	6	0
1893-0	8	8	0
1893-3	1	1	0
1893-CC	7	8	1
1894	1	1	0
1894-0	17	17	° c
1894-S	8	4	4
		•	4
1895	6	0	0
1895-0	6	7	1
1895-S	4	3	1
1896	27	20	7
1896-0	25	26	
1896-S	8	8	1
	*	•	0
1897.	28	26	2
1897-()	78	27	1
1897-S	18	18	0
1898	46	47	1
1898-0	7	7	1
1398-8	27	27	0
	,L. ,	21	0
1800	47	47	0
1899-0	53	52	1
			•

1899-S	16	18	2
1900	48	50	2
1900-0	100	119	19
1900-0/CC		0	20
1900-S	13	15	็ว
		.,	ū
1901	20	18	2
1901 0	97	96	I
1901-5	19	19	0
1902	37	38	Ţ
1902-0	43	39	4
1902-S	16	17	1
1903	53	41	12
1903-0	12	13	1
1903-5	21	23	2
1904	37		
1904-0	12	46 12	9 0
1904-5	11		0
1.704-0	11	11	U
1921	529	502	27
1921-D	261	316	55
1921-S	36	28	8
PEACE D	OLLARS		
1921	92	88	4
1922	593	708 (587)	5
1922-D	65	72	7
1922-S	30	30	ó
1722 5	30	. v	•
1923	474	495	21
1923-D	28	33	5
1923-S	53	56	3
1924	21.1	211	3
1924-5	15	9	6
1925	50	.10	13
1925-S	52 18	40 19	12
1270-9	1.5	17).
1926	34	16	12

٧,

	23 113		60	
1926-D 1926-S		11 113	12 0	
1927	13	13	0	
1927-D	16	16	0	
1927-S	19	19	0	
1928	21	20	1	
1928-S	74	36	38	
1934	40	44	4	
1934-D	20	25	5	
1934-S	26	27	1	
1935 1935-8	63 20	73 10	10 10 826 DIFFERENCE	

AFFIDAVIT OF THERESA RYAN TOSCHES

· . · . . .

NOW COMES THERESA RYAN TOSCHES and declares as follows:

- 1. I am employed as a Legal Technician with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and my business address is 124 Grove Street, Franklin, Massachusetts, 02038.
- 2. I have reviewed the Motion and Memorandum filed by Warren Taft on October 6, 1995, and the Motion and Memorandum To Continue Hearing, filed by Mr. Taft on February 5, 1996. I have compared the appraisal and inventory of the coins prepared by RAMAPO COIN EXCHANGE, on February 10, 1994 and the inventory listing and pre-auction estimates prepared by Spink America in June of 1995. I have also consulted with representatives of Spink America on February 13, 1996, to discuss my findings and observations in connection with the two inventory listings.
- 3. In comparing the RAMAPO COIN EXCHANGE appraisal against the manuscripts of Spink America, the RAMAPO appraisal listed each coin by value and condition. Spink America's manuscripts grouped coins of the same date together, but not necessarily of the same condition, in order to come up with the best coins to comprise a lot for auction. In other words the coins were mixed up, in order to be more attractive for sale.
- 4. In totaling up the number of silver dollars listed in the RAMAPO appraisal against the total number of silver dollars listed in the Spink America manuscripts, there is a 14 coin discrepancy. It appears at this time that Spink America is showing 14 additional doins in its inventory.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the forgoing is true and correct and if called as a witness could competently testify thereto.

Dated: February 13, 1996