FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 10/15/2013

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 308

INDEX NO. 652140/2013
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 10/15/2013

EXHIBIT C

```
1
 2
     SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
     COUNTY OF NEW YORK: CIVIL TERM : PART
     ____X
 3
     WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., AS TRUSTEE,
 4
                          Plaintiff,
                                              Index No.
 5
                                              652140/13
                   -against-
 6
     CHUKCHANSI ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
 7
     THE BOARD OF THE CHUKCHANSI ECONOMIC
     DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, THE TRIBE OF
 8
     PICAYUNE RANCHERIA OF THE CHUKCHANSI
     INDIANS, THE TRIBAL COUNCIL OF THE TRIBE
     OF PICAYUNE RANCHERIA OF THE CHUKCHANSI
     INDIANS, THE PICAYUNE RANCHERIA TRIBAL
10
     GAMING COMMISSION, RABOBANK, N.A., GLOBAL
     CASH ACCESS, INC., NANCY AYALA, TRACEY
11
     BRECHBUEHL, KAREN WYNN, CHARLES SARGOSA,
     REGGIE LEWIS, CHANCE ALBERTA, CARL
12
     BUSHMAN, and BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,
13
                          Defendants.
14
     Telephone conference
                            New York Supreme Court
15
                            26 Broadway
                            New York, New York 10007
16
                            July 29, 2013
17
    BEFORE:
                 HON. MELVIN L. SCHWEITZER, JSC
18
    APPEARANCES:
19
20
     Latham & Watkins LLP
     Attorneys for the Plaintiff
21
     885 Third Avenue
     New York, New York 10022-4802
    BY: ROBERT J. MALIONEK, ESQ.
22
         CRAIG A. BATCHELOR, ESQ.
    and DAVID S. HELLER, ESQ.
23
24
25
    (Appearances continued on next page.)
```

Proceedings

THE COURT: Well, my understanding or my recollection was that, that was one of the reasons to have weekly reports of where the money was going, so that in the event one of the parties disagreed with what was happening, that there would be some mechanism where they could express their objections and reach some kind of an understanding as to what was proper and what was not proper.

MR. HOCHMAN: This is John Hochman. Sorry.

Thank you, your Honor. That's exactly what we are here asking for today, is we need to know what money they are proposing to take out. We need to know where it's going. And we need a special master, so there is somebody besides your Honor, because I don't think you are going to want to be doing this on a weekly or monthly basis, to refer to if something goes awry; if, in fact, money is being used to purchase food cards for one faction's supporters.

THE COURT: Yes. Well, first we've got to have a hearing with a brief on the order to show cause.

Today is actually a preliminary hearing to accommodate you folks to see whether we can't reach an interim understanding until this is decided on a return date for the order to show cause. It seems to me that the best way to do that is the way we had intended it to work, which is that both sides should be sitting down on a weekly

Proceedings

basis to review the expenditures and rule in those that
both sides agree have to be paid, whether they are to
vendors, whether it's to the CEDA board, whether it's to
the tribal gaming commission, or whether it's to the tribal
government, for certain expenditures that would go to all
tribal members, not just one faction of the tribal members;
and that since we are talking about a month, I'm on
vacation for a month, we have to reschedule this at the
earliest possible time for September, when you will have
the opportunity to brief it and we will have the actual
data.

I don't see why we can't have that kind of an internal agreement on this conference call, which is being transcribed, that there be a weekly meeting to make that determination.

Can I hear both sides on that?

MR. HOCHMAN: That would be completely acceptable to us. I would simply ask that those meetings be forward-looking. In other words, you know, say on Monday of each week we have a meeting about what expenses they intend to pay that week. And then do the same thing, you know, going forward for the next week or whatever the dates would be, on a Thursday for the following week something like that.

MR. MARSTON: Just so I'm clear, what you are

Proceedings

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

in the first instance, has jurisdiction to decide the issue.

I need an interim process because I'm THE COURT: on vacation right now until the month of September. think what we should do is, if there is a disagreement about a payment, it should not be paid and it should be put in escrow as a pending payment and I will decide that in September, A, whether I have the power to do it; and B, if I do, where it should go.

> Thank you, your Honor. MR. HOCHMAN:

Your Honor, this is Les Marston. MR. MARSTON: Are you saying that the casino then shouldn't make a payment to the gaming commission or to the CEDA board even if that means that then the gaming commission or the CEDA board cannot provide the service to the casino necessary for the casino to continue to operate?

THE COURT: No, I don't think -- I don't think that that's what he is saying.

MR. MARSTON: That's exactly what he is saying.

THE COURT: He is saying that there may be CEDA board payments that don't fall into the category of necessary payments in order for the casino to operate. Ιf that's what it is, that's a different story. But obviously, if there are CEDA board payments that are required, they need to be made.