## IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA CIVIL DIVISION

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS, STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO.: 51-2010-CA-2912-WS/G

vs.

BOTFLY L.L.C., DAVID R. LEWALSKI, and JON J. HAMMILL,

Defendants.

PROCEEDINGS: EMERGENCY MOTION FOR ENTRY OF

BREAK ORDER WITHOUT NOTICE

BEFORE: Honorable Stanley R. Mills

Circuit Judge

DATE: April 7, 2010

TIME: 9:45 a.m. to 10:27 a.m.

PLACE: 7530 Little Road

Room 314

New Port Richey, Florida

REPORTED BY: Cheri L. Unice,

Registered Merit Reporter

Page 1 - 33

ORIGINAL

- 1	
1	APPEARANCES:
2	JEFFREY W. WARREN, ESQUIRE Bush, Ross, P.A.
3	1801 North Highland Avenue
4	Tampa, Florida 33602 Attorney for Receiver
5	GREGORY S. SLEMP, ESQUIRE 400 South Monroe Street
6	PL-01: The Capitol Tallahassee, Florida 32399
7	Attorney for Office of the Attorney General
8	CLEMENTINE CONDE, ESQUIRE
9	Lucas, Green & Magazine, P.A. 8606 Government Drive
10	New Port Richey, Florida 34654  Attorney for Defendant
11	Jon J. Hammill
12	ALSO PRESENT:
13	MR. MICHAEL LUETGERT  Representative for Receiver
14	MR. JON J. HAMMILL
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## PROCEEDINGS,

THE COURT: All right. Fire away.

MR. WARREN: Good morning, your Honor. I'm

Jeffrey Warren with the Bush, Ross law firm in Tampa,

Florida. I represent Michael Moecker who the Court

appointed as the receiver in this civil action brought

by the office of the Attorney General against Botfly

L.L.C., David Lewalski and Jon Hammill. We're here

today on a motion that we filed seeking to have a break

order entered by this Court.

Based upon the order appointing receiver there were efforts to obtain possession of the business records and assets of Botfly, Mr. Lewalski and Mr. Hammill. In the process of attempting to comply with the Court's order the representatives of the receiver tried to serve the order appointing receiver. It was served on Mr. Hammill; however, access was refused to the premises where he was served. We've also encountered problems at another business address for this business. And it appears as though that's a residence where we believe a mother of one of the defendants may live at 2709 Clocktower Parkway, Bayonet Point.

Being denied the ability to enforce your
Honor's order we've asked the Court to authorize the

receiver, with the assistance of the Pasco County Sheriff's Office and the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office to, if necessary, effectuate a break into the two premises that we've identified; one at 2684 70th Avenue South, St. Petersburg, and the other one being at 2709 Clocktower Parkway, Bayonet Point, Florida.

At the Court's direction we provided notice of this hearing and of the motion as best we could. I am not familiar with counsel who's present, but apparently that notice has been effectual in a certain extent. So perhaps counsel may identify herself for me and then we can determine whether we need to have the Court's intervention or not.

THE COURT: All right. Well, Ms. Conde is certainly well-known to the Court, but -- do I get to call you CC or do I say this is Clementine Conde?

MS. CONDE: Clementine Conde. Yes, your
Honor. I just want to make it clear that Mr. Hammill
did consult with me -- he's present before the Court
for this proceeding as well -- yesterday. As you know,
my practice is criminal primarily. My firm does
personal injury and medical malpractice. We don't
handle what it is that is taking place here. He did
meet with me briefly yesterday, showed me the summons
and the complaint and also the order of protection. He

is trying to secure other counsel; he believes that he has, so I just told him I would come here. He called me last night. This was received on his door at 3:56 p.m. He didn't get home till 6:00 p.m.; that is the St. Petersburg address that's been referenced. His position is he hasn't had adequate time to secure his counsel in order to respond to this request to physically go into his house and remove him because that is the St. Petersburg address where he physically resides.

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They have been -- the receiver I understand, and security, have been outside his house since I believe Friday when they first came to the residence. I can't speak for I quess the elderly lady at the Clocktower address. Mr. Hammill's provided me with some documentation from Mike Wells Pasco County Appraiser -- Property Appraiser's office that the address on Clocktower is Kathleen Lewalski who's not a party to this action. She's an 82-year-old mother of Mr. Lewalski who is a party to this action. And the physical address apparently of the business was changed some time ago to the Gainesville address, and there is no business from Botfly occurring at that address on This is what Mr. Hammill's informing me. Clocktower. I don't represent Mrs. Lewalski at this hearing

however.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what we're asking, your Honor, is for the Court to continue this hearing so that Mr. Hammill can secure the proper counsel, adequate counsel to represent him on these issues as I don't feel that I can at this juncture, even though I'm physically here representing him in this capacity.

Yeah, I'm not going to continue THE COURT: it, counsel. We're going to either work something out I've qot some here or bad things are going to happen. I'm sure the allegations that are extremely serious. other side thinks that I was terrible in not letting some Gestapo tactic take place where I just tell people without any chance for them to be heard that some people with uniforms are going to come busting into their house, and I'm not going to do that and I doubt that I'll ever do that. Maybe if there's some great allegation about impending national disaster, but with money involved I'm never going to do anything of that nature.

But on the other hand, I do understand that recordkeeping being of an electronic nature, that giving people too much notice on this kind of thing means that I risk that stuff goes down the drain. So my compromise is I told them that -- or I had my

secretary tell them that we could do this on short notice, but I wanted some notice so they'd have an opportunity to at least get somebody to come in here and try to help them. And they've certainly got a fine lawyer, albeit one who probably isn't involved in this sort of case very often. I dare say there's probably not a lawyer in the state of Florida that's involved in this sort of case very often.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But we've got allegations here that some 23 million dollars in a -- at least according to the affidavits I've seen, a fairly obvious -- actually, ridiculously obvious Ponzi scheme has been spirited away and spent on a lot of things, not the usual stuff with the Ponzi scheme, and that is paying off the other people with the new people's money, but also on a number of luxury items and everything else. All of which may be completely untrue and there may be some wonderful explanation for it, but they've got an affidavit from somebody who is -- whose name I don't recall right now, but probably fills the bill as a forensic accountant or something of that nature who says, whoopsie, I don't see any indication that anything's been invested very well. I see indications that things have been spirited away and spent on things they shouldn't have been spent on and, you know, that

requires some action.

1.3

So we're either going to resolve this peacefully or I'm going to have to find some way to make sure that that evidence doesn't go south, because it would look as though there is a great deal of reason to be concerned about investors' money. And while I certainly want to make sure that both sides get a fair day, I'm not required to be blind to the idea that evidence may go missing on us here, not the least of which would be just flat out money, so --

MR. HAMMILL: If I may interject.

THE COURT: Well, I'd be careful about that without talking to your lawyer first. These fellows are very nice, but they are the enemy.

MS. CONDE: Your Honor, he indicated to me, and he's just reiterating, that the monies in the accounts have all been frozen. He doesn't have access to any of the monies, I believe. What they -- I think it's an online business, I think. I don't know what they want in the house other than to secure whatever furniture or property that he has in the house, so I'm not sure what it is they want, or just to take possession of his house, which is a mortgaged house.

THE COURT: I'm guessing they don't care a whit about his furniture, the big screen television,

the coffeemaker or anything else. I'm guessing what they're concerned about is records, electronic records, written records, things written on the back of the door, anything that might give them evidence as to what's been going on here. And if it turns out that everything is legitimate and it was all just a big misunderstanding -- and you and I both have been in situations where things looked awfully bad, didn't turn out to be so bad once in a while. But right now we're at the stage where it looks bad, smells bad, I'm worried that it is bad. If it isn't, then fine, we'll all go away peacefully.

I'd rather not have a bunch of broken doors and a terrified 82-year-old woman out of the whole thing. I'm confident the Attorney General doesn't want to have a terrified 82-year-old woman on the front page of the newspaper either, so -- but, you know, the political considerations are not mine here. I have little regard for politics since I'm in my last term and would ever be running for anything again, including dog catcher, so I'm pretty much immune to the political concerns here. The due process concerns I'm never immune from, so, you know --

MR. WARREN: May I be heard, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, of course. I'm open to

suggestions --

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WARREN: Thank you, your Honor. And I appreciate --

THE COURT: -- since we have about three minutes to resolve this.

MR. WARREN: I understand what the Court is We are very concerned about electronic saying. records. We're concerned about valuable assets that may be in these locations. Our compromise with the Attorney General's office was to qualify a removal of any of the parties only to the extent necessary and appropriate. So once we have been able to inspect what's in these two locations, to the extent that there are computers, to the extent there are laptops, to the extent there are records, you know, files, things of that nature that relate to the business, or valuable assets or things of that nature that should be preserved, not necessarily left on the premises so that we don't have to post a guard outside the door 24 hours a day to make sure things aren't removed, you know, that solves those issues.

We also have a second issue, your Honor, that existed because there was a clerical error in the order appointing the receiver. It wasn't clear about the financial statements that should be provided, which

your Honor should clear this up, because the receivership order directs the defendants to provide certain financial information on a very short time period and there was supposed to be forms attached to the receivership order that weren't there. So we prepared a motion to amend that order so that the defendants can have the opportunity to respond on the standardized form used for enforcement of judgment so that the Court and the plaintiff can determine with some certainty what assets are out there for Botfly as the corporate entity and the two individuals.

1.3

And so we -- you know, between the combination of only accessing for the purposes necessary to protect the assets and having the defendants to complete the standard form that is approved as part of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, I think we solve everybody's concerns. And then Mr. Hammill should have an opportunity to get counsel; we'll be happy to work with him.

THE COURT: What I take it they're suggesting is some type of peaceful coordinated entry into the premises, a look to see if there's any kind of business records there. Obviously they have no intention, I'm sure, of walking off with an 82-year-old woman's Social Security records or her personal bank records or

anything of that nature. It would appear that if her son has a computer there then they're probably going to want access to that computer to be able to go through it in a nondestructive fashion to find out if there are business records related to this Botfly limited liability corporation on it or if there are any other business records in there. My guess is they wouldn't have any problem with her sitting on the front porch or sitting in the living room watching Let's Make a Deal reruns or anything else that she might want to watch while they go through and do not tear up her house or anything else.

My desire is to make sure that we do this as peacefully as possible rather than having some poor deputy who doesn't want to terrify an 82-year-old woman either come in there and force the front door open or get a locksmith at someone's expense to get into the place and really upset her.

MS. CONDE: Yes, your Honor, and I understand what the Court is -- the Court's position. I was just concerned about the wording of their order is that they wanted to be in possession and control of all property, change the locks and that the defendants would no longer have access, that was the way that it read.

THE COURT: They probably didn't realize this

was an 82-year-old woman's home at the time. It was listed as a business address.

MR. HAMMILL: And mine as well.

1.3

MS. CONDE: Mr. Hammill's residence, that's the St. Petersburg address that I was referencing as well.

THE COURT: Well, I don't think -- you guys don't have any intention of walking away with his household belongings and things of that nature, I take it? Now, if they find 23 million dollars in cash stuffed in a closet somewhere, I would guess they would want to take custody of that, and they'll give him a nice receipt for it.

MR. WARREN: Yes, your Honor. We will be -we are responsible. We will be filing a bond with the
Court. We'll file the oath of receiver today. Your
Honor, we are accountable to this Court and to the
people of the state of Florida for our conduct. What
we have to do is make sure that, you know, the assets
of the two individuals and the assets of the business
entity are protected.

THE COURT: And there's going to have to be some search. I mean, no offense to your client, but part of their job description is not to trust him as far as this sort of thing. They've got some stuff from

the Attorney General's office that would indicate that trust is not necessarily a good idea at this point, so let's have everybody not worry about trusting anybody. They'll give receipts for anything. But I'm thinking that the only thing that they're going to depart with is potentially computer equipment, which they may have to remove in a nondestructive fashion, it's easily unplugged, and move it to some other location to make sure they go over it. They're to obviously stay away from anything other than business records, and if there are written business records they'll want to go through all those.

MS. CONDE: Yes, your Honor, but he indicated to me they mentioned taking his vehicle, which is his means of transportation.

MR. WARREN: No, your Honor. We're not talking about a normal vehicle. We're talking about a Porsch, is that --

MR. LUETGERT: One of the defendants drives a Porsch convertible. I noticed a nice truck and a Lexus sitting outside the house in St. Petersburg, which is the location I went to. I know there's a Ferrari, I guess, in one of the other locations.

THE COURT: Well, I'm green with envy, but let's come to the conclusion right now that those

things aren't going to be easily removed. And if we have to I'm sure something can be done through the Department of Motor Vehicles to put some sort of a hold to make sure they're not sold or traded or anything of that nature. But right now there are lots of people who make me green with envy who have Porsches and Lexuses -- my God, yes, our court reporter last time I saw was driving a Lexus. And I shudder at thinking what her husband drives; my God, it's probably gold-plated. But in any event, I drive an older Buick right now. So there are lots of people, some of them probably work for the Attorney General's office, that have a Lexus, maybe a Porsch or two sprinkled in there someplace.

1.3

MR. WARREN: But, your Honor, those were properly acquired through proper resources and funds. Here the allegations are that these assets have not been acquired --

THE COURT: We don't have any judgment yet. I don't want people grabbing things that we can preserve in other fashion. Right now there's not a presumption of guilt the last time I checked. I grant you things don't look so good from what I see from the affidavit.

MR. WARREN: The more practical problem, your Honor, is that the Court has placed the receiver in the

position of responsibility for these assets, so consequently to the extent that these assets are used by the defendant, he has an accident or something of that nature, the claim would be made against the receiver associated with that asset. So we cannot --

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

1.1.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: These assets are in the name of the business?

The only assets that we can take MR. WARREN: would be assets that are owned by Botfly L.L.C., by Mr. Lewalski or by Mr. Hammill. We can't take somebody else's assets without coming to this Court and getting an order to do so. So, you know, consequently those are the only assets that we have court authority to And so if the title to this vehicle is not in Mr. Hammill's name then we don't have the authority to If it's in Mr. Hammill's name then not only do we have the authority to take it, we have the responsibility to take it and we have the liability for not taking it. So, you know, it doesn't matter whether it's a \$10, you know, 1929 Volkswagen. You know, it's not the make or model, it's the asset itself. And, you know, so -- you know, we need to be judicious. obviously we have no intention, your Honor, of taking normal regular personal household furnishings and things of that nature because there would be no

practical way or reason for us to do things like that, but valuable items, and to the extent that there are things such as vehicles or boats, you know, that's what we're responsible for.

THE COURT: Would you tell the next people I'm running late and I'll do the best I can.

MR. WARREN: We thank your Honor for accommodating us on short notice.

THE COURT: Well, there's a lot of property at stake for citizens here. And I don't want to give everybody the bum's rush, but this isn't the only case I've got so ---

MR. WARREN: Well, two things, your Honor.

Number one, we're not going to dispose of anything; we will simply hold it and protect it. Number two, if the Court agrees with our effort to amend the order appointing receiver then the defendants will have the opportunity to quickly, you know, come forward with information regarding the financial status and assets and that will enable everybody to not deal with things in a vacuum, but deal with things that are under oath, filed with the Court, and we can very quickly sort something out if there's been a -- if there's an issue regarding title or ownership or possession.

THE COURT: All right. Well, moreover of

1.5

course, the defense has always got the opportunity to move to dissolve the orders that have already been set in motion, and I've got to give that some priority even if I have to cancel other things and replace them with this.

All right. Got anything to say that answers that problem? They say their receiver that they represent has got things that have, according to the affidavit, been acquired with money which is, at least based on the affidavits, based on a rather -- well, actually poorly put together Ponzi scheme. You know, one of the things according to the affidavits that the best hope is that it doesn't get noticed; if it gets noticed it becomes unraveled almost immediately. That may not be the case here at all, but that's certainly what the affidavit sets forth in some detail.

so they're worried that if the receiver is acting on behalf of the defendants as well as the -- as Botfly L.L.C. that all the assets that are in their names, that might potentially cause some liability to the receiver or be destroyed in an accident or something else, but in worst case scenario a car of course could create some liability, not personally for the receiver, but for the receivership, and they want to get all those things nailed down so that they don't

reduce in value, become destroyed, get stolen or anything else. They want to take them, lock them up until we can have a fuller hearing on the matter. I think they probably got a point there.

MS. CONDE: Well, your Honor, I know that
Mr. Hammill doesn't have title to all of those vehicles
that they've just referenced, so I'm not quite sure
what vehicles we're talking about other than what's
been mentioned.

THE COURT: Well, it's only going to the ones that are titled in his name, Mr. Lewalski's name or in Botfly L.L.C.

MR. WARREN: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, I mean, if he's got vehicles there that are in somebody else's name then -- you know, even if it's Mrs. Hammill, if there is a Mrs. Hammill, then I would assume they're going to need to come back. We can't take someone's property who isn't even a party to the suit. And we're not taking anything, by the way. I'm using a bad term there. We are simply nailing it down to the floor so that it doesn't drive away from us before everything gets taken care of.

MS. CONDE: Well, he's indicating to me that there's one vehicle that's titled in a business that he

was associated with; it's not Botfly, but --

THE COURT: If it's not Botfly and it's -- I repeat, if it's not Botfly and it's not one of these guys then I don't think that the receiver has any business dabbling in it, at least at this point.

Possibly at some point, but certainly not without further hearings. So we're only talking about stuff that's titled in the name of the corporation or in the name of Mr. Lewalski or Mr. Hammill.

MS. CONDE: Yes, your Honor. I understand about the computer equipment and that they have the right to go in and search for any monies or anything, but -- would be of substantial value, but, I mean, the term assets in there -- I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. CONDE: The term assets that they listed here shall include files, records, documents, which we've already talked about, monies, leases, mortgages, securities, investments, contracts, effects, lands, agreements, judgments, bank accounts, book of accounts, rents, choses in action, goods, automobiles, motorcycles. It's pretty much, you know, I think anything that anybody could own.

THE COURT: Well, and that's what most of us would do if we were representing the receiver too,

because we don't know what we've got there. And if you narrow it down too much then you miss stuff that you should have taken and that sort of thing. The house up here I would assume is in the name of this lady?

MS. CONDE: It is. It's in the name of Margaret -- excuse me, Kathleen Lewalski.

THE COURT: Well, they're not going to take possession of Kathleen Lewalski's house right now. Six months from now they can demonstrate the ill-gotten gains were given to her in order to buy the house for her, well, they may have a different attitude about it. But where we are right now is I want to establish that there's going to be some peaceful way to get this accomplished. And I got to be frank with you, if there isn't a peaceful way we'll do it a nastier way.

MS. CONDE: No, I understand, your Honor.

Obviously he doesn't want that. Mr. Hammill's house is a rented house, by the way. He doesn't own it, so --

THE COURT: Well, then they're not going to be taking a house anywhere, the house is there. I don't imagine even the Attorney General's Office has the ability to pick it up and cart it away, so the house is going to remain where it is. As far as I can see Mr. Hammill is going to continue to live in it. I simply want somebody to go in there without breaking

the door down or doing something else that is relatively Draconian to gain access. You know, if they simply allowed access in the first place we wouldn't even be here arguing about this. Might be arguing about something else, but we wouldn't be arguing about this.

All right. Here's what I'm going to do. This is something that needs to be done with dispatch, so I'm going to give like two hours to work out some peaceful way to get this done, otherwise I'm going to give them what they want and tell them that the Sheriff's Office gets to accompany them. And if they're not allowed access, then the Sheriff's Office is to obtain access in the least destructive way they possibly can, but obtain it they will, I can guarantee you.

Anything they remove of course they will receipt for just as if it was a search warrant, which is kind of where we are here, I'm afraid.

MS. CONDE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: As a matter of fact, it's good that they've picked somebody who's quite familiar with the criminal side of things because I think we both know there's probably not a judge in the county that wouldn't have signed a search warrant for this sort of

thing on the criminal side and they'd be in there by now, there wouldn't be any talk about it. We're just on the civil side so I feel compelled to behave more civilly.

MS. CONDE: Your Honor, the company was investigated by the FBI and they were cleared by the FBI, not that long ago, for the same sort of allegations. So he did cooperate with the FBI. It was an ongoing investigation for a while. So he will cooperate, obviously, peacefully in this respect. He doesn't want the sheriffs to go in and break the door and change the locks and so forth, so there will be cooperation at this point in allowing them to come in and search and take whatever, that they'll inventory, that they need to take for their end of the investigation.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor has been very gracious. The proposed order that we have is -- enables, you know, Mr. Hammill, and to the extent it's Ms. Lewalski at the other location, to consensually allow the entry and only if that is denied would the break order become effective. And, you know, we would not be doing anything that's not necessary or appropriate. So I think we have this resolved because it sounds to me like with the advice of good counsel,

you know, this will be done amicably. If it turns out that there's a problem then, you know, we'd like to have the order already entered so that we don't have to come back and have further delay.

THE COURT: I agree with you. I agree with you. Have you seen the proposed order, CC?

MS. CONDE: I'm looking at it right now.

THE COURT: I do want to add something that says that everything that's removed is to be receipted for.

MR. WARREN: May I, your Honor? I think you have the order we sent before we made the change to add as necessary and appropriate in both instances, because that was something that the Attorney General wanted to make sure that there was no disruption of -- I guess it's Mrs. Lewalski.

THE COURT: I was confident that would be the case. Anybody have a problem with me adding language that all items removed or taken into possession shall be receipted for? I'm sure I can find a less clumsy way to say that. All right.

MS. CONDE: Your Honor, just that the language
-- C it says, "Place receiver in possession and control
of all property of the defendants at the premises." I
mean, that's --

Okay. I'm open to suggestions. THE COURT: 1 Because that sort of is all MS. CONDE: 2 encompassing, as you know. I think we talked about as 3 part of Botfly, I think the language says part of 4 Botfly Enterprises, titled in -- I don't know. I'm 5 trying to think --MR. WARREN: It's just Botfly L.L.C. Just Botfly L.L.C. 8 MS. CONDE: MR. WARREN: And it's limited of all property 9 of the defendants at the premises, so it's limited to 10 the three defendants. 11 MS. CONDE: This was the motion you already 12 13 filed back in April? MR. WARREN: This was the motion I No. 14 referenced earlier about fixing the order because the 15 order references an attachment that's not there. 16 THE COURT: All right. Now, normally, for 17 instance, in a search warrant, I'm sort of likening 18 this to a search warrant, the receipt would be provided 19 to the defendant, of course, and the original would 20 normally be filed with the return on the warrant with 21 the court. Now, I don't know whether that's going to 22 interfere with any investigation, so I'm wondering if 23 that shouldn't be sealed in the court records. 24

25

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, on April 21st we were

ordered to provide a report to the Court and if there was a need to seal something we can request it be sealed, otherwise we would provide the report.

THE COURT: All right. I'll let it go at that. If it would appear there's going to be something that -- well, actually both sides, there may be things that the defense would like to have sealed, too. I'm just wondering if we shouldn't just have the original sealed in the court file right to begin with so that nothing of a personal nature for the defense is out there for the public and --

MS. CONDE: Yes.

THE COURT: -- nothing that might interfere with the investigation is out there for the public to see.

MR. WARREN: We're not uncomfortable with protecting the rights of the defendants, your Honor. We don't know of any reason why we would need something under seal, but we don't want to interfere with the rights of the defendants.

MS. CONDE: There's already been press on this case. It was already in the St. Pete Times, so -- but further sealing probably would be a good idea not to have any further press on it, access to that information, because I'm sure that they'll be looking

to access that information for further articles.

1.3

2.1

THE COURT: And they may be entitled to it. I just want to make sure that there isn't a good argument that it's going to unnecessarily invade your client's privacy and that it isn't going to unnecessarily hinder the investigation that's going to be ongoing here and which will hopefully come to a very peaceful solution. I'm sure if the press wants it they'll come storming in with their own sea of lawyers. At that point everyone will be given notice and an opportunity to be heard on it.

MS. CONDE: Exactly.

THE COURT: Okay. So what I've added is language that says, "All items removed or taken into possession of the receiver shall be shown on a receipt; a copy of which shall be provided to the defendants. The original receipt shall be sealed in the court file." Not pretty, but it's the best I can do on short notice.

MR. WARREN: We appreciate that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. CONDE: And your Honor, he's --

THE COURT: The reason I'm talking about allowing a couple hours here is so somebody can contact this lady and let her know that --

She's got another son that -- I 1 MR. HAMMILL: mean, he's about two and a half hours away that I can 2 call to see if he can come down and at least --THE COURT: She may want to go sit at Denny's or something and have a cup of coffee. On the other 5 hand, I suspect if people were going through my house 6 I'd rather be on premises to make sure there wasn't a 8 lot of loud crashing and banging. MR. HAMMILL: I think they would like to have 9 someone from the family there, of course, to sit with 10 her and make sure that --11 THE COURT: Well, and that's fine. 12 MR. WARREN: We don't object to that, your 1.3 14 Honor, at all. MS. CONDE: Right, because of her age. 15 If I leave now it will take me MR. HAMMILL: 16 an hour and a half to even get back home from here, 17 18 so --I don't think this is going to be THE COURT: 19 a situation where anything terrible is going to happen. 20 As we both know, sometimes with the standard search 21 warrant things are considerably less friendly and that 22 things get broken in the process, and we don't want 23 that to happen here. Okay. 24

25

MS. CONDE: So, your Honor, the time frame --

because he's got to get back to his house obviously.

I'd use the telephone if I were THE COURT: him because these guys are going to get more nervous by the second. And frankly, I'm going to get more nervous by the second because I may have a whole bunch of citizens out there who have got a whole bunch of money who have an interest in this too, and guess who they're going to think has messed up big time here if some of that stuff goes south on them? They're going to think it's me. And that's not what I'm primarily concerned about, about what people think about me, but I do say that to emphasize that I've got some responsibility to both sides here and I'm trying my best to cover it. But further delays other than just giving her a couple hours to make some arrangements to either go sit with a neighbor or --

MS. CONDE: No. No. I understand. I'm just speaking of Mr. Hammill, because the house is all the way down in St. Petersburg, so he's got to get back there and --

THE COURT: They won't beat him there.

MS. CONDE: I think there were people still outside the house is my understanding. They've been sitting outside the house, obviously, you know --

THE COURT: Well, you need to give him a fair

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

opportunity to get down there. Where is it in St. 1 2 Petersburg? MR. HAMMILL: Pinellas Point, the last exit. 3 THE COURT: That's about as far south before 4 the Skyway. Well, I don't know that it's going to take 5 you two hours, but it's certainly going to take you over an hour to get down there. MR. HAMMILL: If I have to notify his 8 9 mother --THE COURT: Well, you can notify his mother by 10 telephone, and I'm sure that Mr. Lewalski can notify 11 his mother by telephone too, assuming he's somewhere to 12 do that sort of thing. And I'm not asking, it's not my 13 business. So I've signed it. Do you have copies? MR. WARREN: I do, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: If you would all like to troop up 16 17 to my --MR. WARREN: That's what I was thinking, we 18 should just work from your Honor's handwritten order --19 THE COURT: Yeah. 20 MR. WARREN: -- and make copies. 21 THE COURT: That would be a good idea. 22 MR. WARREN: Procedurally, your Honor, with 23 respect to the motion that I have to file to amend the 24 order appointing receiver, how does the Court wish us 25

to proceed with something ministerial like that? Would the Court consider that without a hearing or --

THE COURT: I don't think I better consider much without a hearing in here other than what I've already done. So we'll squeeze it in wherever we can, that's the best I can tell you. My office is located one floor up. You all can take the elevator and all of you can troop up there together and --

MS. CONDE: Yes, your Honor.

ahold of Helen. She will show you. Push the button and Helen, once she sees that you're not wearing assault rifles or something around your neck, she'll push the button and let you back in. Now, what I'm going to do here is what the Clerk's Office never ever wants me to do and that is to just give you the original file and the original order because I'm not in a position since I got to get on with the half hour hearing I'm now going to have to squeeze in about three minutes --

MS. CONDE: I'll walk it all together --

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  WARREN: We'll follow her since she knows where she's going.

THE COURT: That's a good idea. And Helen can take care of where we can squeeze something else, too.

We can leave the file with Helen? 1 MS. CONDE: Yes, leave the file and the 2 THE COURT: original order with her. Tell her that although the 3 4 legislature's apparently unhappy with every single penny we spend that we'll nevertheless make copies of 5 that order so she doesn't have to go through doing all 6 that stuff and to give -- make sure that both sides get 8 copies. MS. CONDE: Yes, your Honor, I'll certainly do 9 10 that. Thank you. We'll take a copy. 11 MR. WARREN: 12 THE COURT: I appreciate you and your client, Ms. Conde, coming in here on what was admittedly short 13 14 notice. MR. WARREN: Just for the record, I understand 15 that the Sheriff's Office will request that we have 16 17 certified copies. The Clerk's Office will have to THE COURT: 18 take care of that for you. And they'll probably send 19 somebody up to get the file from Helen. If she's got a 20 minute she'll probably walk it down for you, but one 21 way or the other we'll get it down there for you. 22 MR. WARREN: Thank you, your Honor. 23

HEARING CONCLUDED AT 10:27 A.M.

24

25

STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH I, Cheri L. Unice, Registered Merit Reporter, do hereby certify that proceedings were held in the above-entitled case at the time and place set forth in the caption hereof; that I was authorized to, and did, report in shorthand the testimony and proceedings had in said proceedings, and that the foregoing pages, numbered 1 to 33, inclusive, constitute a true and correct transcription of my said shorthand report. WITNESS MY HAND THIS 15th day of April, 2010, at Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida. CHERI L. UNICE, RMR, Registered Merit Reporter