Alisa C. Lacey (#010571) Christopher Graver (#013235) 2 STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP 1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100 3 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4584 Tel: (602) 279-1600 4 Fax: (602) 240-6925 cgraver@stinson.com 5 Attorneys for ML Liquidating Trust 6 as Plaintiff in certain Superior Court Litigation 7 IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 8 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 9 In re Chapter 11 10 MORTGAGES, LTD., Case No. 2:08-bk-07465-RJH 11 ML LIQUIDATING TRUSTEE'S REPLY IN 12 SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER 13 **DIRECTING DISCOVERY PROCEDURES** 14 Date: June 5, 2012 Time: 10:30 a.m. 15 **Location:** Courtroom No. 603 230 N First Ave. 16 Phoenix, AZ Debtor. 17 18 Matt Hartley, as successor Liquidating Trustee of the ML Liquidating Trust 19 ("Liquidating Trustee"), through undersigned counsel, replies in support of his motion to 20 establish certain discovery procedures with respect to Robert Furst's Motion for Rule 2004 21 Examination and Production of Documents to Kevin O'Halloran, the former Liquidating 22 Trustee of the ML Liquidating Trust ("Furst 2004 Request," DE #3504). 23 Mr. Furst contends that the attorney-client privilege simply does not apply because he is 24 a beneficiary of the Liquidating Trust, asserting the "fiduciary exception" to attorney-client privilege as described in *United States v. Mett.*, 178 F.3d 1058 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998). *Mett.*, however, 25 26 <sup>1</sup> The Liquidating Trustee acknowledges that Mr. Furst is a beneficiary of the Liquidating Trust. 27

ase,&:08-10k-07-465-1RJH Doc 3509 Filed 06/04/12 Entered 06/04/12 16:18:55 Desc Main Document Page 1 of 4

28

not only involves the special circumstance of an ERISA plan, and determined that the fiduciary exception did *not* apply in that case, but expressly points out the limits of the fiduciary exception. *Mett*, 178 F.3d at 1064 (advice purely limited to plan administration is on one end of the spectrum, while advice with respect to defending the trustee against claims by beneficiaries is at the other). The *Mett* court reasoned that a communication could cover both ends of the spectrum, and that "where attorney-client privilege is concerned, hard cases should be resolved in favor of the privilege, not in favor of disclosure." *Id.* at 1065.<sup>2</sup>

The Liquidating Trustee has three primary concerns with disclosure of the requested documents. First, not only is the scope of the fiduciary exception generally limited, but there is an actual concern over simply allowing production of privileged documents to Mr. Furst in particular. Mr. Furst's interests are not entirely aligned with the interests of the Liquidating Trust. He is both a beneficiary of the Liquidating Trust and, as an investor, a litigant in ongoing litigation in which investors and the Liquidating Trust have competing claims against third parties. He was also a defendant in now-settled preference litigation brought by the Liquidating Trustee.

Second, even apart from questions of attorney-client privilege, the documents requested may be subject to one or more confidentiality or joint defense agreements – indeed, the settlement of Mr. Furst's own preference case is subject to a confidentiality agreement.

Third, once documents leave the control of the Liquidating Trust, they could be disclosed to third parties and prejudice the Liquidating Trustee's ongoing litigation and collection efforts.

The Liquidating Trustee has already objected to the Furst 2004 Request in its entirety, but if the Court is inclined to allow some discovery, the Liquidating Trustee believes that the dispute over document disclosure is not entirely ripe for decision. The importance of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Mett quotes Upjohn Co. v. United States, 449 U.S. 383 at 393 (1981): "an uncertain privilege, or one which purports to be certain but results in widely varying applications by the courts, is little better than no privilege at all."

23

24

25

26

27

28

Liquidating Trustee's concerns depends in large part on the nature of the documents and information in Mr. O'Halloran's possession. The Liquidating Trustee has proposed that this Court require that all documents responsive to the Furst 2004 Request be first delivered for review to the Liquidating Trustee.<sup>3</sup> The Liquidating Trustee will then be in a position to determine whether, and to what extent, to assert privileges or confidentiality agreements, and to provide non-objectionable documents and a privilege log to Mr. Furst. If Mr. Furst believes that he should have access to additional documents described on the privilege log, and the parties are unable to reach agreement, he can apply to the Court for relief. The Court can then determine the merits of his contentions, and order whatever further disclosure may be appropriate, based on actual rather than hypothetical facts.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2012.

## STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP

By: /s/ Christopher Graver # 013235

Alisa C. Lacey Christopher Graver 1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4584 Attorneys for ML Liquidating Trust as Plaintiff in the Superior Court Case

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Liquidating Trustee met with Mr. Furst on June 4, 2012, for purposes of attempting to resolve these issues and/or narrow the scope of Mr. Furst's discovery requests. The parties were unable to reach agreement. The Liquidating Trustee thereafter contacted Mr. O'Halloran, and Mr. O'Halloran agreed to provide the Liquidating Trustee with all documents responsive to the Furst 2004 Request. It is anticipated that they will be received within a week or so.

1					
2	COPY of the foregoing se of June, 2012, to:	ent this 4th day			
3					
4	Robert G. Furst				
5	Robert G. Furst 4701 North 57 <sup>th</sup> Way Phoenix, AZ 85018 rgfurst@aol.com				
6	rgfurst@aol.com				
7					
8	/s/ Anne Finch				
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
<ul><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>			4		
	     	Doc 3509 F		Entered 06/04/12 16:18:55	Desc