

Subj: Fw: Goldman Sacks depos in Lillian Glasser Guardianship matte r
 Date: 11/8/2005 8:13:49 AM Central Standard Time
 From: jreser@davidsontrilo.com
 To: Miamimark@aol.com

--- Forwarded by R. Jo Reser/DandT on 11/08/2005 08:12 AM -----

"Gerhart, John
 T."

<JGerhart@jenkens.com> To
 "jreser@davidsontrilo.com"

<jreser@davidsontrilo.com>

11/07/2005 02:19 PM cc

Subject

RE: FW: Goldman Sacks depos in
 Lillian Glasser Guardianship matte

r

s email will confirm my voicemail to you on Friday that neither David
 Lawrence nor Stacy Eastland will agree to appear for a deposition. Our
 action is based on lack of relevance -- neither can speak to the mental
 competence of Mrs. Glasser. Further, your contention that Mr. Lawrence
 is
 power of attorney simply is not true. Further, neither Mr. Lawrence nor
 Eastland had any involvement in the management of Mrs. Glasser's
 assets.

said on Friday, we would be happy to allow you to speak with Mr.
 Lawrence and Mr. Eastland by phone to confirm their lack of knowledge of
 relevant facts or we could inquire as to whether they might be willing

to provide affidavits to that effect. However, in either case, we would
 require your written agreement that you will not pursue depositions.

John Gerhart

Original Message-----

From: jreser@davidsontrilo.com [mailto:jreser@davidsontrilo.com]

Sent: Sunday, November 06, 2005 7:01 PM

To: Gerhart, John T.

Subject: Re: FW: Goldman Sacks depos in Lillian Glasser Guardianship matte

Why not a deposition as I requested? Judge Spencer has already ordered GS to produce their records-how bad does it look when David Laurance, who took power of attorney, to manage Lillian Glasser's \$25 million dollar plus estate, refuses to even be questioned by her son's attorney in a guardianship matter involving Lillian, who David has not bothered to come see while she has been committed involuntarily to a mental institution in San Antonio, put on large doses of antipsychotics drugs, and kept in Texas against her will by Suzanne, her daughter for nine months. Not to mention that Suzanne's attorney husband drafted David's POA.. You should know Suzanne has already testified in Court that Stacy Eastland (OF BAKER BOTTS RECENT FAME IN KERRVILLE) came up with the FLP that she used to transfer Mark's fortune to her own unrestricted control and effectively disinherit Mark's older Brother progeny, he is a jock,50ish.and entitled to the inheritance his father planned for him and his heirs., Mark. will probably live a very productive and fertile life now and will have children to carry the Glasser name. I will get the depositions I need and believe GS will deny telling you they would not produce them.

Assume you have been told that David is Lillian's aunt by marriage and that his mother with Suzanne convinced Lillian to trust David to intervene and stop another nephew from securing independent legal advice for Lillian

regarding and funding the first FLP. Do you plan to oppose a court order for David and SE. to be deposed after you complied with her order to produce your records? . I believe GS does business in Texas and even SA so the harder

it is for me on this the more I know your clients have to hide. Jurisdiction should not be a problem I assure you- I am licensed in Federal Court too. Federal Court has many advantages in Tort litigation which you know is my specialty-with Jury trials available too-not like the arbitrations you are used to. We all need to grow. I also want to know all connections GS has to Mark Gump, Mark's attorneys for a time until he wrote that letter to GS,

if your client deletes any email b/n those parties I will uncover it. Small claims. Spoilation is also a tort specialty.

I would prefer to work together if your clients are legit as their inhouse counsel have maintained. If so produce them for deposition so this matter can be resolved now in a global settlement. Other wise who knows what will happen. I make no promises either way,just sooner is better in most cases I realize that denial is not just a river in egypt. Howra. /

"Gerhart. John
T."

<JGerhart@jenkens

To

.com> "jreser@davidsontroulo.com"
<jreser@davidsontroulo.com>
11/04/2005 04:47 PM cc

Subject
Re: FW: Goldman Sacks depos in
Lillian Glasser Guardianship matte
r

es.

er my voicemail, suggest phone interview and, if needed, affidavit.

John T. Gerhart
Jenkins & Gilchrist
Attorneys at Law
Professional Corporation
45 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202-2799
(4) 855-4768 (tel)
(4) 855-4300 (fax)

-----Original Message-----

From: jreser@davidsontroulo.com <jreser@davidsontroulo.com>
To: Gerhart, John T. <JGerhart@jenkens.com>
Sent: Fri Nov 04 14:19:25 2005
Subject: Re: FW: Goldman Sacks depos in Lillian Glasser Guardianship matter

What are they refusing to give a deposition?

Gerhart, John T." <JGerhart@jenkens.com>

11/04/2005 09:46 AM To
jreser@davidsontroulo.com" <jreser@davidsontroulo.com>

Gall, Chuck A." <CGall@jenkens.com>

Subject
Re: Goldman Sacks depos in Lillian Glasser Guardianship matter

li. Jo.

Chuck is out and he asked me to coordinate with you. What is your telephone number? I should know something this morning.

John Gerhart
14 855 4768

---Original Message---

From: Gall, Chuck A.
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2005 5:30 PM
To: Gerhart, John T.
Subject: Fw: Goldman Sacks depos in Lillian Glasser Guardianship matter

/l

Charles A. Gall
Jenkins & Gilchrist
14-855-4338

--Original Message--

From: jreser@davidsontrouilo.com <jreser@davidsontrouilo.com>
To: Gall, Chuck A. <CGall@jenkens.com>
Sent: Thu Nov 03 17:01:56 2005
Subject: RE: Goldman Sacks depos in Lillian Glasser Guardianship matter

is good-depo notices need to go out tomorrow

Gall, Chuck A." <CGall@jenkens.com>

11/02/2005 08:02 AM To
jreser@davidsontrouilo.com" <jreser@davidsontrouilo.com>

Gerhart, John T." <JGerhart@jenkens.com>
Subject
: Goldman Sacks depos in Lillian Glasser Guardianship matter

I am not sure what our position will be but I am checking and will get back to you. Hope all is well with you. ---Original Message---

From: jreser@davidsontrouilo.com [mailto:jreser@davidsontrouilo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2005 2:17 PM
To: Gall, Chuck A.
Subject: RE: Goldman Sacks depos in Lillian Glasser Guardianship matter

Could we depose David Lawrence and/or Stacy Eastland in NY on Nov. 18th?
Let me know soon as schedules are firming up around those dates -

Gall, Chuck A." <CGall@jenkens.com>

10/31/2005 02:50 PM

From: jreser@davidsontroilo.com" <jreser@davidsontrilo.com>

Subject: E: Goldman Sacks depos in Lillian Glasser Guardianship matter

Thanks. I will look into everyone's availability and get back to you.
--Original Message-----
From: jreser@davidsontrilo.com [mailto:jreser@davidsontrilo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2005 2:00 PM
To: Cgall@Jenkins.com
Subject: Goldman Sacks depos in Lillian Glasser Guardianship matter

Dear Chuck,

I represent Mark Glasser in this matter which is set for trial Dec. 5, 2005. I will be noticing David Lawrence, Stacey Eastland and Lois Lawrence in the near future and would like to work with you to schedule depositions. We are happy to do them in Dallas if that helps you. Otherwise all depositions will be in the NJ/NY area Nov. 15, 16 and need to notice them for those dates. I will send you the depo notices. I know that you are not representing Lois -but she is David's mother and I am sure David will want to know when her depo is being taken. Lois is related to Lillian by marriage. David is Lillian's nephew I believe. Please let me know where and when we can take these depositions asap. Susan Mathews attorney stated she had no luck with getting this scheduled with you. I am sure we will not have the same problems.

I do not hear from you I will notice these depositions for Nov. 15, 16th and 15.

Sincerely, R. Jo

JENKENS & GILCHRIST E-MAIL NOTICE - This transmission may be: (1) subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) an attorney work product, or (3) otherwise confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you may not disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information.

If you have received this in error, please reply and notify the sender (only) and delete the message. Unauthorized interception of this e-mail is

violation of federal criminal law.

This communication does not reflect an intention by the sender or the sender's client or principal to conduct a transaction or make any agreement by electronic means. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature under the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, any version of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act or any other statute governing electronic transactions.

JENKENS & GILCHRIST E-MAIL NOTICE - This transmission may be: (1) subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) an attorney work product, or (3) otherwise confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you may not disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information. If you have received this in error, please reply and notify the sender (only) and delete the message. Unauthorized interception of this e-mail is

violation of federal criminal law.

This communication does not reflect an intention by the sender or the sender's client or principal to conduct a transaction or make any agreement by electronic means. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature under the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, any version of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act or any other statute governing electronic transactions.

JENKENS & GILCHRIST E-MAIL NOTICE - This transmission may be: (1) subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) an attorney work product, or (3) otherwise confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you may not disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information. If you have received this in error, please reply and notify the sender (only) and delete the message. Unauthorized interception of this e-mail is

violation of federal criminal law. This communication does not reflect an intention by the sender or the sender's client or principal to conduct a transaction or make any agreement by electronic means. Nothing contained

in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature under the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, any version of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act or any other statute governing electronic transactions.

JENKENS & GILCHRIST E-MAIL NOTICE - This transmission may be: (1) subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) an attorney work product, or (3) otherwise confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you may not disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information. If you have received this in error, please reply and notify the sender (only) and delete the message. Unauthorized interception of this e-mail is

iolation of federal criminal law. This communication does not reflect an
intention by the sender or the sender's client or principal to conduct a
transaction or make any agreement by electronic means. Nothing contained

1
his message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a
writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or
electronic signature under the Electronic Signatures in Global and National
Commerce Act, any version of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act or any
other statute governing electronic transactions.

JENKENS & GILCHRIST E-MAIL NOTICE - This transmission may be: (1) subject
to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) an attorney work product, or (3)
strictly confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this
message, you may not disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information.
If you have received this in error, please reply and notify the sender
(privately) and delete the message. Unauthorized interception of this e-mail is

iolation of federal criminal law

This communication does not reflect an intention by the sender or the
sender's client or principal to conduct a transaction or make any agreement
by electronic means. Nothing contained in this message or in any
attachment

shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein
shall constitute a contract or electronic signature under the Electronic
Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, any version of the Uniform
Electronic Transactions Act or any other statute governing electronic
transactions.