

Page 1

1 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 22ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
2 McHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS  
3  
4 PAUL DULBERG, )  
5 Plaintiff, )  
6 vs. ) 17 LA 377  
7 THE LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. )  
8 POPOVICH, P.C., and HANS MAST, )  
9 Defendants. )  
10  
11 The deposition of PAUL DULBERG, called for  
12 examination, taken pursuant to the provisions of the  
13 Code of Civil Procedure and the rules of the Supreme  
14 Court of the State of Illinois pertaining to the  
15 taking of depositions for the purpose of discovery,  
16 taken before KAREN PILEGGI, a Notary Public within  
17 and for the County of DuPage, State of Illinois, and  
18 a Certified Realtime Reporter of said state, at 150  
19 South Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois,  
20 February 19, 2020, at the approximate hour of 1:00  
21 p.m.  
22  
23  
24

Page 2

1 PRESENT:  
2 THE CLINTON LAW FIRM,  
3 111 West Washington Street, Suite 1437,  
4 Chicago, Illinois 60602,  
5 312-357-1515, by:  
6 MS. JULIA C. WILLIAMS,  
7 juliawilliams@clintonlaw.net,  
8 appeared on behalf of the Plaintiff;  
9  
10 KARBAL, COHEN, ECONOMOU, SILK & DUNNE, LLC,  
11 150 South Wacker Drive, Suite 1700,  
12 Chicago, Illinois 60606,  
13 312-431-3700, by:  
14 MR. GEORGE K. FLYNN,  
15 gflynn@karballaw.com,  
16 appeared on behalf of the Defendants.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 REPORTED BY: Karen Pileggi, CSR, RPR, RMR, CRR,  
24 CSR License No. 84-3404

Page 3

1 (WHEREUPON, the witness was  
2 duly sworn.)  
3 PAUL DULBERG,  
4 called as the plaintiff herein, having been first  
5 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:  
6 EXAMINATION  
7 BY MR. FLYNN:  
8 Q. Let the record reflect that this is the  
9 discovery deposition of Paul Dulberg taken by  
10 agreement of the parties and pursuant to notice.  
11 This deposition is being taken pursuant  
12 to the Rules of the Illinois Supreme Court, the  
13 Illinois Code of Civil Procedure and any applicable  
14 local rules in McHenry County.  
15 Sir, could you state your name and spell  
16 your last name for the record.  
17 A. Palm Dulberg, D-u-l-b-e-r-g.  
18 Q. What is your address?  
19 A. 4606 Hayden Court, McHenry,  
20 Illinois 60051.  
21 Q. How long have you lived there?  
22 A. Forty-nine years.  
23 Q. Who do you live there with now?  
24 A. Mike McArtor.

Page 4

1 Q. Did your mother live there at some point  
2 throughout the history of this case?  
3 A. Yes.  
4 Q. I'm just going to go over a few rules for  
5 the deposition. I know you've testified at least  
6 one time in a deposition before because you  
7 testified in the underlying personal injury case,  
8 correct?  
9 A. Correct.  
10 Q. Have you testified in any other  
11 depositions before?  
12 A. No.  
13 Q. I'll just remind you of a few rules that  
14 I'm sure you were aware of back then when you gave  
15 your deposition.  
16 The court reporter is here to take down  
17 everything that you and I say. She can only take  
18 down one at a time so I'd ask that before you answer  
19 a question, let me finish the entire question.  
20 Okay?  
21 A. Yes.  
22 Q. I'll try to do the same. I'll try to let  
23 you respond before I ask a follow-up question.  
24 You just nodded your head. That's

Page 5

1 another good point to make. She can't take down  
2 nods of the head, shrugs of the shoulders or other  
3 hand gestures. Your answers need to be verbal.  
4 From time to time we forget those rules  
5 and I may just point to the court reporter as a  
6 reminder, if that's okay.  
7 A. Yes.  
8 Q. If you need to take a break at any time,  
9 feel free to stop me. I just ask that it's not  
10 while a question is pending that has not been  
11 answered. Fair enough?  
12 A. I'll try to do that.  
13 Q. If you've answered a question, I will  
14 assume you understood it. Okay?  
15 A. Yes.  
16 Q. I was asking you about your mother. She  
17 lived at the house during the pendency of the  
18 underlying case?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. Is she still alive?  
21 A. Yes.  
22 MS. WILLIAMS: Can we define "underlying case"?  
23 BY MR. FLYNN:  
24 Q. The underlying case is a personal injury

Page 6

1 case that you filed against Bill and Caroline  
2 McGuire and David Gagnon.  
3 A. That sounds correct.  
4 Q. We'll get into the dates of the filing a  
5 little bit later. We'll call that, generally, the  
6 underlying case.  
7 Your mother lived at the house at that  
8 time?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. Did she own the house?  
11 A. No.  
12 Q. Do you own the house currently?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. Does anyone else own the house?  
15 A. No.  
16 Q. How long have you owned it?  
17 A. I think I first purchased it off my  
18 parents in '97, '98, something like that.  
19 Q. Did you hire a lawyer in connection with  
20 that transaction?  
21 A. No.  
22 Q. Were your parents represented by a  
23 lawyer?  
24 A. No.

Page 7

1 Q. The building, as I understand it, is a  
2 duplex; is that right?  
3 A. No.  
4 Q. Were there two apartments in the building  
5 at one time?  
6 A. No.  
7 Q. Was there a point in time where you and  
8 your mother lived in one half of the house and  
9 Mike McArtor lived in the other half?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. How was that arrangement with respect to  
12 the location of the living spaces, if you can  
13 describe it?  
14 A. It has a walkout basement. He had the  
15 downstairs with an exit out the back. We had the  
16 upstairs with an exit out the front.  
17 Q. Have you ever been convicted of a crime  
18 of fraud, dishonesty or deceit?  
19 A. No.  
20 Q. Besides the hiring of the Popovich firm  
21 in connection with the underlying personal injury  
22 case, up to that point in time had you ever had an  
23 occasion to hire a lawyer?  
24 A. I did during a traffic accident, and I

Page 8

1 don't remember the year.  
2 Q. Were you injured in about 2002? Does  
3 that sound right?  
4 A. Roughly.  
5 Q. Who did you hire?  
6 A. I might get the name wrong because it's  
7 been a long time. I think it was Weiss and Michling  
8 and something else. It was a lawyer right outside  
9 the courthouse in Woodstock.  
10 Q. A McHenry County lawyer?  
11 A. Yeah.  
12 Q. It was a personal injury case?  
13 A. Yeah. It was a car accident.  
14 Q. Did you file a lawsuit in that case?  
15 A. I don't think we needed to.  
16 Q. You just filed an insurance claim?  
17 A. They did, yes.  
18 Q. You settled it?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. Any other occasions to hire a lawyer  
21 between that time and the time you hired the  
22 Popovich firm?  
23 A. May I consult for a minute because I'm  
24 not sure how to answer that.

Page 9

1 Q. Why don't you just tell me why you can't  
2 answer it.  
3 A. Because I've hired lawyers, but they were  
4 for the company that I had. That's different.  
5 Q. I'm asking general questions about any  
6 interaction you've had with hiring lawyers. Any  
7 experience you've had with hiring lawyers.  
8 A. I had a corporate lawyer. My mom and dad  
9 hired a lawyer for me when I was a kid. It was  
10 something. And myself, just the corporate lawyer,  
11 the car accident lawyer and the Popovich firm.  
12 Q. Have you ever been married?  
13 A. No.  
14 Q. So you never hired a divorce lawyer.  
15 Good. How old are you now?  
16 A. Forty-nine.  
17 Q. The underlying case arose out of an  
18 injury that occurred on June 28, 2011, correct?  
19 A. That sounds correct.  
20 Q. How old were you at that time?  
21 A. Forty-one.  
22 Q. Besides the underlying lawsuit against  
23 the McGuires and Mr. Gagnon, had you ever filed any  
24 other lawsuit up until that point in time?

Page 10

1 A. No.  
2 Q. Have you filed any lawsuits since that  
3 time besides the lawsuit against Popovich and Mast?  
4 A. No.  
5 Q. Do you have any military experience?  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. Please tell me about that.  
8 A. Army National Guard. Illinois Army  
9 National Guard.  
10 Q. How long have you been in the National  
11 Guard?  
12 A. I'm not currently in it.  
13 Q. When were you, from when to when?  
14 A. I may not get the year correct. '88 or  
15 '89 to '92 or '93, somewhere in there.  
16 Q. What was your highest rank when you were  
17 discharged from the National Guard?  
18 A. When I was discharged?  
19 Q. Correct.  
20 A. I don't know. I've gotten moved up and  
21 moved down. I don't know where I ended up.  
22 Q. How was it that you were discharged?  
23 A. Less than honorable.  
24 Q. What was the cause?

Page 11

1 A. I missed morning call, roll call. If  
2 you're not there, you're AWOL.  
3 Q. Absent without leave?  
4 A. Yes.  
5 Q. What is the highest level of education  
6 that you've attained?  
7 A. I do not have a degree. Two years of  
8 college.  
9 Q. You graduated from high school?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. Was that in Johnsbury in 1988?  
12 A. Yes.  
13 Q. Did you know Mr. Gagnon from Johnsbury  
14 High School?  
15 A. Not from high school but just after high  
16 school.  
17 Q. Just coincidentally you attended the same  
18 high school?  
19 A. He was three years older than I was. I  
20 didn't know who he was until after high school.  
21 Q. You had some education after high school  
22 but did not receive a degree, correct?  
23 A. Correct.  
24 Q. Where did you study?

Page 12

1 A. I had a couple classes at McHenry County  
2 College and McMurray College.  
3 Q. What did you study?  
4 A. The first two years. The basics.  
5 Q. General studies?  
6 A. Yeah. I did a criminal justice course.  
7 I did a macro/microeconomics. I did psychology,  
8 sociology. The normal stuff.  
9 Q. How did you meet David Gagnon?  
10 A. Through a mutual friend.  
11 Q. When was that?  
12 A. I want to say, roughly, 1990.  
13 Q. Was your home located somewhere fairly  
14 close to his parents' home or his mom and stepdad's  
15 home?  
16 A. Two streets away.  
17 Q. That's where you were injured on June 28,  
18 2011, was at David Gagnon's mom's house and his  
19 stepdad's house?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. And their name is McGuire?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. Generally speaking, you were injured  
24 assisting David with a chainsaw trying to cut down a

Page 13

1 tree?  
2 A. He was cutting a branch.  
3 Q. Cutting branches off a tree, correct?  
4 A. Cutting up the branches after they were  
5 off the tree.  
6 Q. Could you tell me a little bit about your  
7 work history. Do you have any licenses or  
8 certifications?  
9 A. I'm certified to run printing presses.  
10 Or at least I was.  
11 Q. You worked for Sharp Printing, Inc. from  
12 '91 to 2011; is that right?  
13 A. Ninety-one? No. I would say 1999.  
14 Q. Did you own that corporation?  
15 A. Yes. Well, partner. I was a partner. I  
16 didn't own like...  
17 Q. It was an Illinois corporation?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. Were you --  
20 A. A stockholder.  
21 Q. Let me just finish my question so she can  
22 take us down.  
23 You were a stockholder in Sharp Printing,  
24 Inc.?

Page 14

1 A. Yes.  
2 Q. Who else were the stockholders?  
3 A. Mike McArtor and Scott Dulberg and at  
4 that time it was Herbert Dulberg.  
5 Q. What does that mean? Do you mean Scott's  
6 name was Herbert?  
7 A. No. Scott Dulberg was an owner and  
8 Herbert Dulberg was an owner. Three different  
9 Dulbergs: me, my brother, my dad.  
10 Q. And Mike McArtor?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. There were four owners at what time?  
13 A. Until my dad died and then it went to  
14 three.  
15 Q. Was that business incorporated?  
16 A. Yes.  
17 Q. Did a lawyer assist the corporation with  
18 setting up the corporation?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. When did that happen?  
21 A. 1999.  
22 Q. Did you hire the lawyer yourself?  
23 A. All three of us did. All four of us.  
24 Sorry.

Page 15

1 Q. What was the name of that attorney?  
2 A. McAndrews, and I don't remember the rest  
3 of it. It was McAndrews in McHenry. I can get you  
4 the rest of that information.  
5 Q. They are based in Crystal Lake, Illinois?  
6 A. It used to be in McHenry when we did  
7 that.  
8 Q. Patrick McAndrews, he was also identified  
9 as the registered agent of that corporation?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. It was voluntarily dissolved on April 8,  
12 2011; is that right?  
13 A. That's what the Secretary of State's  
14 Office has, yes.  
15 Q. Is that your understanding as well?  
16 A. I was corrected. My partners -- I was  
17 corrected. It was actually after the accident. How  
18 it got to end up with that date, I'm not sure.  
19 Q. What was corrected, exactly?  
20 A. Well, do you want me to -- Mike read my  
21 deposition and he said, "You got that wrong." I  
22 said, "What do you mean?" because I answered it  
23 twice in that deposition.  
24 I was thinking that Juskie happened

Page 16

1 before the accident. Sharp Printing wasn't actually  
2 dissolved until after the accident when we decided  
3 to sell off the equipment and end it all. That's  
4 the honest truth.  
5 Q. I will represent to you that the Illinois  
6 Secretary of State's Website as of today shows that  
7 the company was involuntarily dissolved on April 8,  
8 2011. So it's your testimony that that is not true?  
9 A. I don't know how they come up with that.  
10 Q. Why don't we break it down and start with  
11 why the corporation was involuntarily dissolved. Do  
12 you know that?  
13 A. Involuntarily? I don't know. It may be  
14 that I was late on paying the corporate licensing  
15 thing, which we just pay a fine and did it. We  
16 didn't renew it because we decided to end it.  
17 We had a ten-year thing, I think, on it.  
18 I may be wrong. I've got to go back and look at the  
19 records.  
20 Q. Is it possible that the corporation was  
21 actually involuntarily dissolved by the Illinois  
22 Secretary of State on April 8, 2011?  
23 A. Sure.  
24 Q. Did Sharp Printing, Inc. file corporate

Page 17

1 tax returns while it was a going concern?  
2 A. We had a problem the couple of years  
3 before the accident because I was not up in Illinois  
4 and I usually did that with the lawyer and the  
5 accountant and things got screwed up while I was  
6 taking care of a loved one who was dying down in  
7 Florida.  
8 Q. Did the corporation ever file tax  
9 returns?  
10 A. Oh, yes.  
11 Q. When did they file?  
12 A. Quarterly and annually.  
13 Q. Until what year?  
14 A. Roughly somewhere in 2008. I was missing  
15 things because I was not here. I know we missed a  
16 few.  
17 Q. I believe you testified in your  
18 underlying deposition that Sharp Printing, Inc. was  
19 not dissolved as a result of your June 28, 2011  
20 chainsaw accident, correct?  
21 A. Yes, I did. I stood corrected by my  
22 partners.  
23 Q. So is it your testimony that the  
24 corporation was dissolved because of your personal

Page 18

1 injury?  
2 A. I don't know how to answer that without  
3 going back and looking at records.  
4 Q. Was the company winding down up until  
5 about the time you were hurt?  
6 A. The company books got screwed up when I  
7 was down in Florida and I was back up in Illinois in  
8 2010 getting back on my feet and I was going to pick  
9 things back up, get everything paid up, the fines  
10 and everything.  
11 Q. Who were you taking care of in Florida?  
12 A. My grandmother.  
13 Q. You were gone from when until when?  
14 A. I want to say from the mid to end of 2007  
15 until somewhere in the beginning of 2010.  
16 Q. Was anyone running Sharp Printing during  
17 that period of time?  
18 A. Mike McArtor.  
19 Q. Did Sharp Printing have any customers for  
20 that three-year period?  
21 A. Yes, they did.  
22 Q. How many?  
23 A. I'm not sure, without looking at the  
24 books.

Page 19

1 Q. Can you estimate what the yearly revenues  
2 were for Sharp Printing in the year 2007?  
3 A. In 2007? I'd have to look at the books,  
4 to be honest with you.  
5 Q. Was it more than \$5,000?  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. Was it more than \$100,000?  
8 A. No.  
9 Q. Was it more than \$20,000?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. Same line of questioning with respect to  
12 2008. Do you know what the revenues were for Sharp  
13 Printing in '08?  
14 A. Are you asking me what we reported or  
15 what we made and put into accounts for equipment?  
16 Q. I'm asking you about revenues.  
17 A. Total sales?  
18 Q. Total revenues.  
19 A. In two thousand...?  
20 Q. 2008.  
21 A. I'd have to go back and look.  
22 Q. Can you estimate what they were?  
23 A. No, because I wasn't there.  
24 Q. Do you know how many customers the

Page 20

1 company had in 2008?  
2 A. We had a few, I know that. I don't know  
3 how many. Mike was handling it and it got messed  
4 up.  
5 Q. What types of customers did Sharp  
6 Printing have in 2007 and 2008?  
7 A. What kind of customers?  
8 Q. Right. What did you do?  
9 A. We printed on t-shirts. We printed on  
10 CDs. We printed on anything that wasn't wet. We  
11 printed on glass, all different stuff.  
12 Q. Were there any full-time employees of  
13 Sharp Printing in '07 and '08?  
14 A. In '07 and '08, no.  
15 Q. Just the owners?  
16 A. Just the owners.  
17 Q. Did all the owners operate the business?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. Including your brother?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. What were the yearly revenues of Sharp  
22 Printing in 2009?  
23 A. I don't know.  
24 Q. What about 2010, do you know?

Page 21

1 A. No.  
2 Q. When did Sharp Printing start selling its  
3 equipment?  
4 A. I put up the ad in August. I think  
5 August. I might be off by a month or two. August  
6 of 2011.  
7 Q. Did you sell any equipment prior to  
8 August 2011?  
9 A. No.  
10 Q. What type of equipment did Sharp  
11 Printing, Inc. have or own?  
12 A. Mostly textile screen printing equipment,  
13 but we had other screen printing stuff too. Paper.  
14 Q. Where was the equipment located?  
15 A. My home.  
16 Q. Did you require a license to conduct this  
17 business out of your home?  
18 A. We had what was called a temporary --  
19 we're in a rural area so we didn't have to have  
20 that.  
21 Q. In any event, you didn't have a license,  
22 correct?  
23 A. We had a license to do business there,  
24 yes.

Page 22

1 Q. In that location?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Did customers ever come to the shop?  
4 A. Yes.  
5 Q. Do you recall how many customers the  
6 business had in 2010?  
7 A. Not in 2010.  
8 Q. Was it more than five?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. Was it more than 100?  
11 A. It might be around that. I don't know,  
12 specifically.  
13 Q. In 2010 you may have had 100 customers  
14 that you did t-shirt screen prints for?  
15 A. Possibly. I'm not saying that is the  
16 number, but it's possible.  
17 Q. Did Sharp Printing have any customers in  
18 2011?  
19 A. Mike was finishing up one customer's  
20 thing in the spring of 2011, yes. We don't -- I'll  
21 give you -- we don't typically get much work between  
22 January 1st and the first warm days of Spring. We  
23 sell t-shirts and not a lot of people buy during  
24 that period. They just don't.

Page 23

1 Q. You did not earn a salary from Sharp  
2 Printing, correct?  
3 A. No.  
4 Q. You did not earn an hourly wage, correct?  
5 A. No.  
6 Q. I think your interrogatory answers  
7 indicate you didn't take a profit or a draw,  
8 correct?  
9 A. Correct.  
10 Q. How much, if any, money did you earn from  
11 Sharp Printing in 2011?  
12 A. Can I ask how to define that? In 2011 I  
13 didn't pull any.  
14 Q. Did you earn any income whatsoever from  
15 Sharp Printing in 2010?  
16 A. I don't think so.  
17 Q. You were down in Florida for '07 to 2010?  
18 A. Sometime in early 2010, yes.  
19 Q. Did you earn any income from Sharp  
20 Printing from 2007 to 2010?  
21 A. No.  
22 Q. Were you working in Florida?  
23 A. No.  
24 Q. Is it fair to say you were unemployed

Page 24

1 from 2007 to 2010?  
2 A. Yes. I was not officially collecting  
3 unemployment.  
4 Q. You weren't an employee of any business  
5 or working for any individual, correct?  
6 A. I did do some work for Mark. I did some  
7 traveling back and forth from Florida to Illinois  
8 back and forth during that time. When I was up  
9 here, I did do some work for Juskie Printing. Not  
10 much, though.  
11 Q. What is Juskie Printing?  
12 A. Juskie Printing is another one that I had  
13 listed as an employer in the underlying case.  
14 Q. What are they?  
15 A. Another print broker.  
16 Q. Where are they located?  
17 A. I don't know the exact address, but it's  
18 off of Chicago Avenue off of 355 going south.  
19 MS. WILLIAMS: I think he's asking what city.  
20 BY THE WITNESS:  
21 A. I don't know how the cities break up down  
22 there.  
23 BY MR. FLYNN:  
24 Q. Somewhere in the western suburbs of

Page 25

1 Chicago?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. How long did you have a relationship with  
4 Juskie Printing?  
5 A. Since the early 2000s.  
6 Q. What type of printing did Juskie do?  
7 A. Offset, mostly.  
8 Q. What does that mean?  
9 A. Prints on paper.  
10 Q. Did you have a set schedule at any time  
11 working for Juskie?  
12 A. I don't know what you mean by "a set  
13 schedule."  
14 Q. Did you have a particular number of hours  
15 per week?  
16 A. No. The jobs I got were project based.  
17 Q. How many projects did you have from 2007  
18 to 2011 for Juskie?  
19 A. Probably a few hundred quick little  
20 things, yeah. At least.  
21 Q. Do you know what you earned from working  
22 at Juskie in 2007?  
23 A. Not without looking at the returns, I  
24 don't know offhand.

Page 26

1 Q. How often were you in the Chicago area in  
2 2007?  
3 A. I didn't leave here until, I want to say,  
4 August or September of '07.  
5 Q. And then thereafter?  
6 A. I was not back that year.  
7 Q. You didn't work for Juskie in 2008,  
8 correct?  
9 A. I might have done some stuff.  
10 Q. You're not sure?  
11 A. I'd have to go back and look.  
12 Q. Were you in Florida?  
13 A. Part of the time, yeah.  
14 Q. How often did you come back and forth  
15 between --  
16 A. About every three months I tried to get  
17 back up here.  
18 Q. For how long?  
19 A. Sometimes a few weeks. Sometimes a  
20 month.  
21 Q. Did you come back and work or did you  
22 take care of other things?  
23 A. If I'd let Mark know I was back, "I've  
24 got something for you or I don't."

Page 27

1 Q. Who is Mark?  
2 A. Mark owns Juskie Printing.  
3 Q. I think your interrogatory answers  
4 indicated from 1999 through 2006 you were employed  
5 in a barter situation; is that right?  
6 A. With Mark, yes.  
7 Q. What does that mean, exactly?  
8 A. Well, he would owe me money and he would  
9 give me printing equipment instead of cash.  
10 Q. He owed you money for working for him?  
11 A. Well, he owed both Sharp Printing and me,  
12 personally, money. They are two different things.  
13 But he would just pay by saying, hey, I've got this  
14 or I've got this paper cutter or this or that. It  
15 was a barter.  
16 Q. So you worked for him from 1999 to 2006  
17 but did not earn any income in the traditional  
18 sense?  
19 A. No money changed hands.  
20 Q. He gave you things to pay you for  
21 projects?  
22 A. Correct.  
23 Q. You gave a deposition in the underlying  
24 case on January 24, 2013. Does that sound right?

Page 28

1 A. If it says it on there, yes.  
2 Q. You took an oath that day?  
3 A. Yes.  
4 Q. You told the truth?  
5 A. I tried to, to the best of my knowledge,  
6 on that day, yes.  
7 Q. You told the truth in response to all of  
8 the questions that day, correct?  
9 A. I tried to, yes.  
10 Q. You testified you were last employed  
11 prior to the accident in May of 2011?  
12 A. That would be with Juskie, yes.  
13 Q. It's accurate --  
14 A. Actually, I wasn't employed. I was a  
15 1099 so I was self-employment.  
16 Q. When in May did you stop working for  
17 Juskie, whether it be as an employee or an  
18 independent contractor?  
19 A. I believe it was the end of May.  
20 Q. Then from the beginning of June until  
21 your accident on June 28, 2011, you were not  
22 employed; is that an accurate statement?  
23 A. Correct.  
24 Q. You were not even acting as an

Page 29

1 independent contractor for any business from that  
2 period of time, correct?  
3 A. Not during that month, no.  
4 Q. Your deposition testimony from 2013 is  
5 typed up on 175 pages. I don't intend to go back  
6 over each of those details.  
7 A. Okay.  
8 Q. It's fair to say you were injured, your  
9 arm was injured on June 28, 2011, correct?  
10 A. Correct.  
11 Q. Which arm was that?  
12 A. My right arm.  
13 Q. As a result of the injury, you hired the  
14 Popovich law firm to explore a recovery in the case?  
15 A. I hired them to represent me, yes.  
16 Q. You hired them to represent you and file  
17 a lawsuit against David Gagnon who was operating the  
18 chainsaw that injured you, correct?  
19 A. He was one of them, yes.  
20 Q. I'm asking you if you hired him to --  
21 listen to the question, please.  
22 David Gagnon was operating the chainsaw,  
23 correct?  
24 A. Correct.

Page 30

1 Q. No one else was operating the chainsaw?  
2 A. Correct.  
3 Q. You also hired Popovich to sue Bill and  
4 Caroline McGuire, correct?  
5 A. Correct.  
6 Q. They were the land owners where your  
7 accident occurred?  
8 A. They did own the land, yes.  
9 Q. The accident occurred at their house,  
10 correct?  
11 A. Correct.  
12 Q. This was in the backyard, so to speak?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. Hans Mast was the primary handling  
15 attorney at the Popovich firm for your case?  
16 A. That's who I met with, yes.  
17 Q. Did any other lawyer communicate with you  
18 while Popovich was handling your case?  
19 A. The lady who sat in on my deposition.  
20 Ms. Freeman I think it is. I'm not sure about that.  
21 Q. Generally speaking, Hans Mast, though,  
22 was the primary handling attorney?  
23 A. Yes.  
24 Q. Before you hired the Popovich firm in May

Page 31

1 of 2012, is that the correct time period?  
2 A. I don't think so. I don't think they  
3 filed it until then, but I might be wrong. I'd have  
4 to go back and look.  
5 Q. Was there a retainer agreement executed  
6 in May 2012?  
7 A. I don't think I paid a retainer.  
8 Q. Did you execute an attorney engagement  
9 agreement in May 2012?  
10 A. I believe it was much earlier than that.  
11 Q. You only executed one engagement letter  
12 or engagement agreement with Popovich, correct?  
13 A. Yeah.  
14 Q. Before you executed or came to an  
15 arrangement with Popovich, had you talked to any  
16 other lawyers about investigating --  
17 A. One.  
18 Q. Let me finish the question.  
19 -- investigating or filing the lawsuit?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. Who was that?  
22 A. I went back to the same firm that handled  
23 the car accident for me years earlier.  
24 Q. What was the name of that firm?

Page 32

1 A. They changed names when I went back  
2 there. It was Weiss -- I have to go back through  
3 paperwork and get you the actual name.  
4 Q. They are known as a personal injury firm;  
5 is that right?  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. Why did you not hire them to take your  
8 case?  
9 A. The man who handled my case previously  
10 with the car accident was no longer with the firm  
11 and they said go find somebody else.  
12 Q. I'm not sure what one has to do with the  
13 other.  
14 A. I don't either. I just said okay and I  
15 went and found somebody else.  
16 Q. Did you meet with an attorney at that  
17 firm?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. Did you tell them what happened with your  
20 incident?  
21 A. Yes.  
22 Q. They told you that they did not want to  
23 take the case; is that right?  
24 A. Yes.



Page 33

1 Q. They declined the case?  
2 A. They declined the case.  
3 Q. Did they tell you why they declined the  
4 case?  
5 A. No.  
6 Q. You next went to the Popovich firm?  
7 A. Yes.  
8 Q. They took the case?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. They, ultimately, filed a lawsuit against  
11 Gagnon and the McGuires on May 15, 2012; is that  
12 right?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. You reviewed the lawsuit and approved it,  
15 correct?  
16 A. I didn't -- I never got anything to  
17 review.  
18 Q. Did you ever read the lawsuit?  
19 A. No. I was never given any paperwork.  
20 Q. Back to the incorporation of Sharp. What  
21 interaction did you have with corporate lawyers when  
22 they were first retained?  
23 A. McAndrews?  
24 Q. Correct.

Page 34

1 A. What relationship?  
2 Q. What experience did you have with  
3 McAndrews when you first retained them?  
4 A. He was good.  
5 Q. How often did you meet with him or speak  
6 to him?  
7 A. Once a year.  
8 Q. Did he file corporate returns or other  
9 documents for the company?  
10 A. No. I had to file them. He just made  
11 sure they were all done right, I believe.  
12 Q. Have you ever had occasion to hire a  
13 criminal lawyer?  
14 A. I did in 1990. My mom and dad had to  
15 hire one. Not me.  
16 Q. Did you hire a criminal lawyer for your  
17 mom and dad?  
18 A. No. They hired one for me.  
19 Q. Who was that?  
20 A. Give me a second. You're digging back  
21 far in my memory. Driscoll was the last name.  
22 Q. This was a McHenry County-based criminal  
23 lawyer?  
24 A. No. Des Plaines.

Page 35

1 Q. What was the general nature of the reason  
2 for the need for a lawyer?  
3 A. Drug possession.  
4 Q. Were you convicted of it?  
5 A. Yes. I pled guilty.  
6 Q. That was a Cook County case, then?  
7 A. No. It was a McHenry County case.  
8 Q. The lawyer was in Des Plaines, though?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. But he represented you in McHenry County  
11 in criminal court?  
12 A. Yes.  
13 Q. Throughout the case you met with the  
14 lawyer?  
15 A. A few times.  
16 Q. While Popovich represented you in the  
17 underlying personal injury case, did you ever  
18 communicate with any other lawyers about your case?  
19 A. At the end, yes.  
20 Q. Popovich withdrew sometime in March 2015?  
21 A. Correct.  
22 Q. And Brad Balke entered his appearance on  
23 March 19, 2015. Does that sound correct?  
24 A. That is correct.

Page 36

1 Q. Popovich also withdrew that day, right?  
2 A. I don't know if it was on the same day.  
3 I'd have to look at the paperwork.  
4 Q. Besides Mr. Balke, had you talked to any  
5 other lawyers towards the end of the relationship  
6 with Popovich?  
7 A. Yes.  
8 Q. How many?  
9 A. Hundreds.  
10 Q. Hundreds of lawyers?  
11 A. I'm not kidding. Yes.  
12 Q. Did you ask those lawyers to take your  
13 case?  
14 A. I asked them to review it.  
15 Q. Did any of them take the case?  
16 A. No.  
17 Q. They all reviewed it, though?  
18 A. Yes. Most took the time to review it.  
19 Q. Did any of them tell you why they didn't  
20 want to take the case?  
21 A. There were different reasons I got from  
22 various. Some people just didn't get back to me and  
23 some people wrote me letters. I think I gave you  
24 some of those. But I got various reasons back from

Page 37

1 attorneys.  
2 Q. I don't recall seeing any lawyers, but I  
3 would ask you to search for those.  
4 MS. WILLIAMS: We'll search for those. I'll  
5 make a note.  
6 BY MR. FLYNN:  
7 Q. As you sit here, do you recall the basis  
8 for any attorney declining to take your personal  
9 injury case over from Popovich?  
10 A. Say that again.  
11 Q. As you sit here today, do you recall any  
12 of the reasons why any attorney declined to take  
13 your personal injury case over from the Popovich  
14 firm?  
15 A. Yes.  
16 Q. What were those reasons?  
17 A. I remember a few. One I was looking at  
18 local lawyers in McHenry County and I was told  
19 like -- I can name them. My sister was married to  
20 him.  
21 Anyway, I was told if Tom Popovich says  
22 you don't have a case, you don't have a case and  
23 we're not even going to look at it. That I got a  
24 lot of it.

Page 38

1 Q. That's one reason. Any others?  
2 A. That I got locally a lot of. As I  
3 started to work away from local further out finding  
4 attorneys, the thing was your decision to settle  
5 with the McGuires was a mistake and we don't take it  
6 because of that.  
7 Q. Who said that?  
8 A. Sal Ferris.  
9 Q. When did you speak to Sal Ferris?  
10 A. I don't know the exact date.  
11 Q. When did he --  
12 A. He wasn't the only one.  
13 Q. When did he say that to you, that you  
14 just described?  
15 A. He said it in a letter and he said it on  
16 the phone and he sent me an e-mail, I think. I  
17 don't remember the ways that he contacted me. I'd  
18 have to go back and look.  
19 MS. WILLIAMS: We'll find it.  
20 BY MR. FLYNN:  
21 Q. Besides Sal Ferris, can you recall any  
22 other attorney, specifically, that told you they  
23 wouldn't take the case because of your settlement  
24 with the McGuires?

Page 39

1 A. Yes.  
2 Q. Who was that?  
3 A. There was at least three firms downtown  
4 here right near the Daley Center that I came down to  
5 see and I don't remember their names, but they -- I  
6 got the same thing out of all three of them.  
7 Q. Did any of the lawyers give you any other  
8 reason for declining your case?  
9 A. Mostly it was because they knew Popovich  
10 or it was the McGuire settlement.  
11 Q. Did any lawyer tell you that they didn't  
12 want to take your case because there was  
13 questionable liability against David Gagnon?  
14 A. No.  
15 Q. Did any lawyer tell you that there was  
16 questionable liability against the property owners,  
17 the McGuires?  
18 A. No.  
19 Q. We're jumping ahead, but did you have  
20 different lawyers that handled a binding arbitration  
21 or binding mediation for you in the underlying case?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. Their name was Baudin?  
24 A. Yes.

Page 40

1 Q. Why did Brad Balke not handle the binding  
2 arbitration?  
3 A. I fired him.  
4 Q. When did you fire Brad Balke?  
5 A. I'd have to look at the dates. I'm not  
6 sure, exactly.  
7 Q. Why did you fire him?  
8 A. Because he forced me to undergo the exact  
9 mediation at the McHenry County court in front of  
10 Judge Meyer that Hans Mast set up that I  
11 specifically said no to.  
12 Q. When was this mediation?  
13 A. I'd have to look at the dates again.  
14 Q. Was it a pretrial conference?  
15 A. Yes.  
16 Q. You actually attended this pretrial  
17 conference?  
18 A. Yes, I did.  
19 Q. What happened?  
20 A. I said no.  
21 Q. You said no about what?  
22 A. They offered an amount of money and I  
23 said no.  
24 Q. The defendants offered an amount of

Page 41

1 money?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Was this before or after the McGuires  
4 settled out of the case?  
5 A. They were settled.  
6 Q. So there was an offer of settlement from  
7 David Gagnon or his insurer?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 Q. Do you recall what that amount of money  
10 was?  
11 A. \$50,000.  
12 Q. You refused the offer?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. Why did that cause you to fire  
15 Brad Balke?  
16 A. He wouldn't take it any further than that  
17 and he agreed to when I hired him. He agreed that  
18 that was not going to be the end of it and then he  
19 changed his tune, and I said, you know what -- and  
20 the other thing was, I finally got through to the  
21 Baudins who I wanted to take the case because they  
22 had helped my family -- his dad helped my family  
23 many eons earlier.  
24 Q. Did you ever talk to Brad Balke about the

Page 42

1 liability or lack of liability by the McGuires, the  
2 property owners in the case?  
3 A. I don't think so. We were on the Gagnon  
4 case.  
5 Q. You didn't discuss the McGuires?  
6 A. There may have been a word or something,  
7 but that's not what he was there for.  
8 Q. He never gave you an opinion one way or  
9 the other whether the settlement was appropriate?  
10 A. I don't believe Brad did, no. Like I  
11 said -- I don't think he did.  
12 Q. At some point after your accident did you  
13 hire the Daley Disability Law Firm?  
14 A. Yes.  
15 Q. Was that for --  
16 A. I didn't hire.  
17 Q. I know you're anticipating what I'm  
18 saying.  
19 A. I was trying to correct myself. I did  
20 not hire.  
21 Q. Either way, let me try to get out my  
22 question before you raise any kind of response, just  
23 so she can take down --  
24 A. Count before I answer.

Page 43

1 Q. That's a good idea.  
2 Did you ever retain the Daley Disability  
3 Law Firm?  
4 A. NO.  
5 Q. Did you have any relationship with Daley  
6 Disability --  
7 A. Yes.  
8 Q. -- Law? Let me finish it before you  
9 answer. I know you're anticipating what you think  
10 I'm going to say, but it might not come out the way  
11 you think. Either way, she can't take down both of  
12 us talking over each other.  
13 What relationship did you ever have with  
14 the Daley Disability Law Firm?  
15 A. They stepped in as a substitute counsel  
16 for the law firm that I did hire.  
17 Q. You originally hired some other law firm  
18 to represent you in connection with social security  
19 disability?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. What was the name of that original law --  
22 A. The lady's ladies name was  
23 Margaret Bradshaw.  
24 Q. You terminated your relationship with her

Page 44

1 one way or another?  
2 A. No.  
3 Q. Why did Daley Disability Law substitute  
4 in for her?  
5 A. I was told by -- I have to go back and  
6 look at the communications exactly how it happened,  
7 but I was told that, basically, they are going to be  
8 taking over the hearing part of it. I don't know  
9 why. I don't know whether they sub out work. I  
10 don't know how it works.  
11 Q. Would it be fair to say that you first  
12 retained Ms. Bradshaw in 2012 sometime?  
13 A. I'd have to go back and look.  
14 Q. Is that approximately when you applied  
15 for social security?  
16 A. It sounds like it.  
17 Q. The Daley Disability Law Firm came in  
18 sometime in 2012 as well?  
19 A. I don't know exactly when. I don't know.  
20 Q. Would it be 2012 or 2013?  
21 A. I know that they were there and -- I know  
22 that something had to be signed when we went in for  
23 the hearings. Margaret Bradshaw had to sign  
24 something for the judge allowing Daley Disability to

Page 45

1 represent me at the hearings. I don't know when  
2 exactly they got involved. That's behind the  
3 scenes. I didn't have anything to do with that.  
4 Q. Did you file for bankruptcy while your  
5 personal injury case was pending?  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. When did you file for bankruptcy?  
8 A. I'd have to look at the paperwork again,  
9 but I don't believe that was until, I want to say,  
10 about eight or nine months, but I'm guessing, after  
11 the McGuire settlement.  
12 MS. WILLIAMS: The question was what month and  
13 year.  
14 BY THE WITNESS:  
15 A. I don't know exactly. I'd have to go  
16 back and look at the paperwork.  
17 BY MR. FLYNN:  
18 Q. Did you hire a lawyer to represent you in  
19 a bankruptcy?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. Who was that lawyer?  
22 A. David Stretch.  
23 MS. WILLIAMS: If it helps, we can stipulate to  
24 the date the bankruptcy was filed.

Page 46

1 MR. FLYNN: That's fine. I think we've got  
2 some e-mails that may reflect when it was. I just  
3 wondered if he knew offhand.  
4 MS. WILLIAMS: I can stipulate, at least, that  
5 it was 2014.  
6 BY MR. FLYNN:  
7 Q. You filed for bankruptcy while the  
8 Popovich firm was still representing you --  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. -- in the underlying case, correct?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. Sometimes I'll still pause in my question  
13 so if you could please pause before you answer.  
14 In the underlying case you answered  
15 written discovery; is that true?  
16 A. I believe so.  
17 Q. Then you later testified at your  
18 deposition January 24, 2013, correct?  
19 A. If that's the date, yes.  
20 Q. Ultimately, David Gagnon was also  
21 deposed, true?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. Were you present for his deposition?  
24 A. No.

Page 47

1 Q. Did Caroline McGuire give a deposition in  
2 that case?  
3 A. I believe so, yes.  
4 Q. Were you present for that dep?  
5 A. No.  
6 Q. What about Bill McGuire's deposition?  
7 A. I was not present.  
8 Q. Did you e-mail back and forth with  
9 Hans Mast a fair amount during the Popovich firm's  
10 representation of you?  
11 A. By "fair amount," what do you mean?  
12 Q. Did you regularly e-mail with Hans Mast?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. Those e-mail communications have all been  
15 produced in this case?  
16 A. Yes.  
17 Q. On to the exhibits. This will be 1.  
18 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
19 marked Exhibit No. 1, for  
20 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
21 BY MR. FLYNN:  
22 Q. Let me show you what's been marked as  
23 Exhibit 1. These are one set of your Answers to  
24 Interrogatories in our case, the current legal

Page 48

1 malpractice case you filed against the Popovich firm  
2 and Hans Mast.  
3 Do you recognize this document?  
4 A. Yes.  
5 Q. We've been providing you with various  
6 copies of the signature page in the case that's been  
7 back and forth between me and your counsel.  
8 I don't, frankly, know if this  
9 verification that's attached is the one that went  
10 with this document, but I'll just ask you, for the  
11 record, if these are your answers, that's your  
12 signature, and that this verification is accurate?  
13 A. That is my signature on there, yes.  
14 Q. What was the e-mail address you used  
15 in the communication with Hans Mast?  
16 A. Primarily it was pdulberg@comcast.net.  
17 Q. His address was hansmast@comcast.net?  
18 A. And he switched it to at&t.net.  
19 Q. Did you use some other e-mail address as  
20 well?  
21 A. I may have accidentally e-mailed him a  
22 couple of times from a Yahoo account.  
23 Q. In answering discovery in our case, the  
24 legal malpractice case, did you search through both

Page 49

1 of those e-mail accounts of yours?  
2 A. I no longer have the Yahoo account.  
3 Q. Did you search through the Comcast  
4 account?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. Did you search for PDFs or attachments to  
7 those e-mails that you produced?  
8 A. Everything that I got, I turned over. I  
9 had converted the e-mails to PDFs because Comcast  
10 started purging the e-mails after so many years, so  
11 I turned them all into PDFs.  
12 MS. WILLIAMS: The question was what did you  
13 search in your in box.  
14 BY THE WITNESS:  
15 A. What did I search?  
16 BY MR. FLYNN:  
17 Q. Let me ask you a different question.  
18 You produced e-mails in this case?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. You turned e-mails into PDFs and sent  
21 them to your lawyer; is that right?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. Some of the e-mails I reviewed have an  
24 icon that indicates there was a PDF or some other

Page 50

1 attachment to the e-mail. Do you understand that?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Did you produce the attachments to each  
4 of the e-mails in this case?  
5 A. We went through that. I produced the  
6 attachments that I still had.  
7 Q. There were some that were not available,  
8 correct?  
9 A. Yeah. When I looked at them, 99 percent  
10 of them were already part of some other document  
11 that we turned over. I think 100 percent of them.  
12 Q. At some point in time while Hans was  
13 handling your case, did he start to communicate with  
14 you relative to his analysis of the McGuires'  
15 liability in the case?  
16 A. Yes.  
17 Q. Did he start to generally advise you that  
18 he didn't believe that there was a strong case for  
19 liability against the McGuires?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. Is it fair to say that Hans' opinion was  
22 that the McGuires did not have liability in the case  
23 because they did not control the work that  
24 David Gagnon was doing?

Page 51

1 A. Yes.  
2 Q. That's generally a fair summary of Hans'  
3 opinion?  
4 A. Not quite exactly those words, but yeah.  
5 Q. The McGuires' liability as property  
6 owners was questionable because based on Hans'  
7 analysis of the evidence, they did not control the  
8 work or the manner of work of David Gagnon on the  
9 date of the accident; is that a fair summary?  
10 A. Depends on which time he said that.  
11 Q. Did he say things like that over and over  
12 again?  
13 A. He did say things like that, yes.  
14 Q. Again, I don't want to go over the facts  
15 you already testified to with regards to the date of  
16 the accident. At some point in time was  
17 William McGuire swimming in the swimming pool?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. Was that an above ground pool or --  
20 A. Above ground.  
21 Q. Was there a fair amount of time during  
22 the day that Mr. McGuire was inside the house  
23 watching television?  
24 A. Maybe -- he went inside the house for

Page 52

1 probably about 45 minutes before the accident  
2 happened. I don't know that he was watching  
3 television.  
4 MR. FLYNN: Let's mark the next exhibit as 2.  
5 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
6 marked Exhibit No. 2, for  
7 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
8 BY MR. FLYNN:  
9 Q. Showing you what's been marked as  
10 Exhibit 2, which is an e-mail chain including  
11 e-mails from November 18, 2013, are these e-mails  
12 between you and Hans Mast?  
13 A. It looks like it, yes.  
14 Q. I think the time stamps on these e-mails  
15 go from the bottom, which would be page 2, to the  
16 top of the first page, correct?  
17 A. It's backwards, yes.  
18 Q. In the original e-mail at 1:28 p.m., did  
19 Hans Mast relay to you a \$5,000 settlement offer  
20 from the McGuires?  
21 A. Which -- where are you at?  
22 Q. We're on Exhibit 2, which is also labeled  
23 as Bates label POP 181. At the bottom of the page,  
24 does Hans relay to you a settlement offer for

Page 53

1 \$5,000?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. He was telling you that the McGuires'

4 attorney offered to settle the case for \$5,000?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Did you have an understanding that that

7 was a settlement just for the McGuires, not

8 including David Gagnon?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. In the e-mail Hans says, quote, "As we

11 discussed, they have no liability in the case for

12 what Dave did as property owners. So they will

13 likely get out of the case on a motion at some

14 point, so my suggestion is to take the \$5,000 now."

15 Is that an accurate reading?

16 A. Of that sentence, yes.

17 Q. Is it fair to say that he suggested that

18 you take the \$5,000 but didn't force you to take it?

19 A. It says, "So my suggestion is..."

20 Q. Then did you respond to the e-mail?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Hans replied again at 8:07 p.m. that same

23 day, right?

24 A. Yes.

Page 54

1 Q. He said, "Paul, whether you like it or

2 not, they don't have a legal liability for your

3 injury because they were not directing the work."

4 Is that right?

5 A. Part of it, yes.

6 Q. Was my prior summary of Hans' legal

7 analysis a fair summary in view of these e-mails and

8 his opinion that he relayed to you?

9 A. I think it went further than this, and

10 other things, but yes.

11 Q. As far as these e-mails, I've

12 accurately --

13 A. This e-mail, yes.

14 Q. What else did he tell you about the

15 McGuires and why he didn't think they would be found

16 liable in the case?

17 A. I'm pulling out of memory because I can't

18 quote which document it's off of.

19 Q. That's what we're here for.

20 A. I can only give you the gist.

21 Q. I'll ask you for the exact language, but

22 if you don't have it --

23 A. At one point he defined what an

24 independent contractor is for me and he said that

Page 55

1 David was an independent contractor and that the

2 McGuires weren't liable because they had hired

3 somebody outside even though it's their own son,

4 he's an adult, outside to do the work and that they

5 weren't responsible.

6 Q. By the way, how old was David at the time

7 that this accident occurred?

8 A. I'm adding. If I was 41 -- I don't know

9 what his birthday is, but I'm assuming he would be

10 44, 45.

11 Q. Is it fair to say that there were two

12 40-plus-year-olds, a 41- and a 44-year-old trimming

13 trees with a chainsaw in David's parent's backyard

14 that day, correct?

15 A. I was not using it. There was one

16 44-year-old using a chainsaw.

17 Q. You, the 41-year-old was holding some

18 branches for him?

19 A. Yes. Just before the accident, yes.

20 Q. Up until this point in time when Hans is

21 providing this legal analysis to you, you had a fair

22 number of occasions to interact with lawyers, as

23 we've discussed today, correct?

24 A. At this point, the only lawyer that I

Page 56

1 interacted with was the first one.

2 Q. I'm talking about in your lifetime. You

3 had a corporate lawyer, you had a criminal lawyer,

4 another personal injury lawyer --

5 A. I didn't hire --

6 Q. Let me finish. You had experience with

7 lawyers representing you up to this point in time?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Did you have an understanding that

10 lawyers evaluate cases differently?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And judges evaluate cases differently?

13 A. Sure. That's fair.

14 Q. Would it be fair to say that some laws in

15 our country are clearer and some are open to

16 interpretation?

17 A. I think all of them are.

18 MS. WILLIAMS: Objection. Calls for

19 speculation.

20 If you understand the question, you can

21 answer it.

22 BY MR. FLYNN:

23 Q. Would you say, for example, that the tax

24 code is a little more clearcut than common law

Page 57

1 that's created by cases and case precedent?  
2 A. I'm not real familiar with tax law. I  
3 have accountants for that.  
4 Q. How about an easier question. The stop  
5 sign means that you stop, and if you go through it,  
6 it's pretty clear that you're liable for a traffic  
7 violation?  
8 A. I'll agree with that.  
9 Q. The legal liability for a property owner  
10 in Illinois might be a little more complicated; is  
11 that a fair statement?  
12 A. I don't know.  
13 Q. Would it be fair to say, in your opinion  
14 or your knowledge of the law, the property owner  
15 isn't necessarily liable because somebody is injured  
16 on their property?  
17 A. Are you talking about what I know now or  
18 what I knew back when this was?  
19 Q. At any time.  
20 A. What I know now is in the circumstances  
21 that we were in, they were very liable.  
22 Q. I'm just asking if -- just because  
23 somebody is injured on a property owner's property,  
24 they are not necessarily liable, correct? Other

Page 58

1 factors are required too.  
2 MS. WILLIAMS: I'm going to object for -- he's  
3 not an expert and can't testify to legal analysis.  
4 BY MR. FLYNN:  
5 Q. As you sit here today, do you know  
6 whether a premises liability case involves multiple  
7 factors to prove liability against the property  
8 owner?  
9 A. I don't know. I'd say that's fair.  
10 You're asking the wrong person for that.  
11 Q. It was Hans' opinion that the McGuires  
12 did not control the work based on the evidence,  
13 correct?  
14 A. In my opinion?  
15 Q. That's not what I'm asking.  
16 Was it Hans' opinion --  
17 A. I can't --  
18 Q. Let me just finish.  
19 Did Hans tell you that it was his opinion  
20 that the McGuires were not liable because they did  
21 not control the work?  
22 A. He said that right there, yes.  
23 Q. Do you believe that he truly felt that  
24 way? That was his legal opinion?

Page 59

1 A. Do you want the Monday morning  
2 quarterbacking version or at the time?  
3 Q. I'm asking if at that time you felt that  
4 he truly believed that the McGuires did not have  
5 liability?  
6 A. At the time I trusted him, yes. I hired  
7 him to represent me, and yeah.  
8 Q. You believed that he was relying his  
9 honest legal opinion to you at that time?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. Including on November 18, 2013?  
12 A. Yes.  
13 Q. You did not accept the settlement offer  
14 of \$5,000 that he relayed to you on that day,  
15 correct?  
16 A. Correct.  
17 Q. Did you ultimately meet with Hans to  
18 discuss the settlement offer?  
19 A. I think it was the day before this, but  
20 I'm not sure. It was either the day before or the  
21 day after.  
22 MS. WILLIAMS: I think the question was, did  
23 you meet with him, at all, not the date.  
24

Page 60

1 BY THE WITNESS:  
2 A. Yes.  
3 MR. FLYNN: Can we mark this as Exhibit 3,  
4 please.  
5 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
6 marked Exhibit No. 3, for  
7 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
8 BY MR. FLYNN:  
9 Q. Showing you what's been marked as  
10 Exhibit 3. Do you recognize this memorandum?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. You may have seen it from the document  
13 production that we made in this case. This is a  
14 memorandum drafted by Hans Mast, which purportedly  
15 memorializes a meeting that he had with you on  
16 November 20, 2013.  
17 Does this refresh your memory as to when  
18 you met with him or if you met with him?  
19 A. If he took the memorandum on the same  
20 day, then sure.  
21 Q. In the memo Hans says, "I met with Paul  
22 and his friend."  
23 Do you see that?  
24 A. Yes.

Page 61

1 Q. Did you meet with Hans and some third  
2 person --  
3 A. Yes.  
4 Q. -- at or about this time regarding the  
5 case?  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. Who was that friend?  
8 A. Tom Kost.  
9 Q. Who is Tom Kost?  
10 A. My brother.  
11 Q. Not that it matters necessarily for  
12 privilege purposes, but can you tell me how Tom Kost  
13 is your brother?  
14 A. We have the same mom.  
15 Q. He was with you and observed the meeting  
16 between you and Hans?  
17 A. Yes.  
18 Q. The \$5,000 settlement offer was  
19 discussed, correct?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. At that time did Hans, again, relay his  
22 opinion as to the questionable liability about the  
23 McGuires -- strike that.  
24 Did he relay to you his opinion about the

Page 62

1 questionable nature of the McGuires' liability?  
2 A. At the meeting with Tom, yes.  
3 Q. He advised you they maintain they were  
4 not directing Dave's work. That was the McGuires'  
5 position, correct?  
6 A. I don't know that he stayed on that at  
7 that meeting. At different times he gave different  
8 reasons.  
9 Q. The next line says, "Paul maintains the  
10 McGuires controlled everything that Dave was doing."  
11 Is that an accurate reflection of your  
12 opinion?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. As you sit here today, do you know if  
15 that statement is consistent with your own  
16 deposition testimony from the underlying case?  
17 A. Yes.  
18 Q. We'll come back to that. Did you tell  
19 Hans that you wanted to read the depositions of the  
20 McGuires and David Gagnon's depositions?  
21 A. Say that again.  
22 Q. Did you tell Paul that you wanted to read  
23 the depositions of the McGuires and Dave Gagnon's  
24 depositions?

Page 63

1 A. Did I tell Paul?  
2 Q. I'm sorry. Did you tell Hans that?  
3 A. That I wanted to read the McGuires and  
4 David Gagnon's depositions?  
5 Q. Yes.  
6 A. Yes, I did.  
7 Q. What was the purpose of your wanting to  
8 review those depositions?  
9 A. Hans had told me that what they said in  
10 their depositions meant that they had no liability.  
11 Q. You wanted to review the testimony to  
12 determine whether you wanted to consider the \$5,000  
13 settlement offer; is that correct?  
14 A. Right.  
15 Q. Did you do that?  
16 A. Eventually, yes.  
17 Q. Before you accepted the offer?  
18 A. I think so.  
19 Q. So sometime after this meeting on  
20 November 20, 2013 and before you accepted the  
21 settlement offer on January 29, 2014, did you review  
22 those three deposition transcripts?  
23 A. I'll correct you. I did not accept the  
24 offer on January 20th. I signed a release on

Page 64

1 January 29th.  
2 Q. Fair point. Did you read the depositions  
3 between those two dates, November 20, 2013 and  
4 January 29, 2014?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. Those are --  
7 A. I believe I asked him -- I don't know --  
8 it may be a little earlier because I don't know that  
9 I asked him before or after the meeting. I don't  
10 remember. I'd have to go back in the e-mails to  
11 give the date.  
12 Q. Some point in time between those two  
13 dates you read the depositions?  
14 A. I may have asked for them before. I  
15 don't know without seeing the e-mail. It was,  
16 roughly, in the last quarter of that year, yes. Or  
17 the first month. I don't remember the first time  
18 that I asked to read them. I don't remember off the  
19 top of my head.  
20 Q. At any point in time did you ever grant  
21 Hans authority to make a settlement demand in the  
22 case?  
23 A. No.  
24 MR. FLYNN: Mark this as Exhibit 4.



Page 65

1 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
2 marked Exhibit No. 4, for  
3 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
4 BY MR. FLYNN:  
5 Q. Showing you what's been marked as  
6 Exhibit 4. This is a copy of the original complaint  
7 in this instant case. It reflects a filing date of  
8 November 28, 2017.  
9 Is this your original legal malpractice  
10 complaint against the Popovich firm and Hans Mast?  
11 A. I believe so.  
12 Q. Did you review and approve the  
13 allegations in this complaint?  
14 A. For the most part. I wanted to reword  
15 some things, but the lawyer, they do their thing.  
16 Q. At the time you were represented by the  
17 Gooch firm is when you filed this lawsuit, correct?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. Directing your attention back to  
20 Exhibit 1, if you still have it. If you could turn  
21 to page 10.  
22 The answer to Interrogatory No. 24  
23 indicates that on November 4, 2013, Mast was granted  
24 authority to investigate a settlement but a specific

Page 66

1 dollar amount was never provided. Do you see that?  
2 A. He was verbally granted authority to  
3 investigate, yes.  
4 Q. Who did you want him to investigate a  
5 settlement with?  
6 A. The McGuires.  
7 Q. Just the McGuires or the McGuires and --  
8 A. He wanted to do it. I didn't. I said,  
9 "If you want to look at that, go ahead."  
10 Q. Did you grant him authority to  
11 investigate a settlement with David Gagnon as well?  
12 A. I don't know if I did or not, off the top  
13 of my head, but that would have been much later.  
14 Q. Eventually did you tell Hans that you  
15 would agree to accept the \$5,000 settlement offer  
16 from the McGuires?  
17 A. Eventually did I tell him that?  
18 Q. Yes.  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. When did you tell him that?  
21 A. I want to say just before Christmas in  
22 December of 2013.  
23 Q. There's no doubt in your mind that you  
24 relayed your acceptance of the \$5,000 settlement

Page 67

1 offer to Hans Mast before Christmas Day, which would  
2 be December 25, 2013?  
3 A. Right.  
4 Q. Then did Hans mail to you a settlement  
5 release by letter dated January 24, 2014?  
6 A. I'd like to see the letter, but yeah, I  
7 believe so.  
8 Q. I believe it's --  
9 A. I believe he had to mail it a couple  
10 times because I didn't get it.  
11 MR. FLYNN: Let's mark Exhibit 5.  
12 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
13 marked Exhibit No. 5, for  
14 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
15 BY MR. FLYNN:  
16 Q. Showing you what's been marked as  
17 Exhibit 5. I'll represent to you that this is a  
18 copy of the second amended complaint that you filed  
19 in this case by your new lawyers, your current  
20 lawyers. If I could direct your attention to  
21 Exhibit D attached to this Exhibit 5.  
22 Is Exhibit D a January 24, 2014 cover  
23 letter from Hans Mast to you enclosing the general  
24 release and settlement agreement from defense

Page 68

1 counsel for Caroline and Bill McGuire?  
2 A. That's what it says.  
3 Q. In the letter did he ask you to -- it  
4 looks like it might be a typo. It says, "Please  
5 release and return it to me in the enclosed  
6 self-addressed stamped envelope at your earliest  
7 convenience."  
8 A. Right, but I believe it was just a  
9 release -- it was all tied into one.  
10 Q. This letter is unsigned. Did you receive  
11 the letter unsigned?  
12 A. Did I receive this unsigned?  
13 Q. Yes.  
14 A. Yes.  
15 Q. Have you ever seen a signed copy of this  
16 letter?  
17 A. No.  
18 Q. If I could direct your attention to the  
19 next page of Exhibit D. Is that page 1 of the  
20 general release and settlement agreement?  
21 A. Exhibit D?  
22 Q. Correct.  
23 MS. WILLIAMS: Turn the page.  
24

Page 69

1 BY MR. FLYNN:  
2 Q. Is this what you received attached to the  
3 cover letter?  
4 A. I don't think so. Let me see. Yes, this  
5 looks like it because it's got these things I  
6 remember.  
7 Q. When did you receive this letter and the  
8 attachment?  
9 A. I would say I wrote back on January 29th  
10 and I probably got it that day, signed it and sent  
11 it back.  
12 Q. The copy of the release is also unsigned.  
13 It's attached as exhibit -- part of Exhibit D to  
14 your second amended complaint.  
15 Do you see the signature lines and the  
16 notary signature here that's missing?  
17 A. Yes.  
18 Q. Is this the document that you signed and  
19 sent back to Hans Mast?  
20 A. The document that I signed had my  
21 signature.  
22 Q. I'm asking if this is the same document  
23 that you signed and sent back to him?  
24 A. Yes.

Page 70

1 Q. Right now we don't have a signed copy. I  
2 don't know that I've seen one in the case.  
3 MS. WILLIAMS: Can we go off the record for a  
4 second?  
5 MR. FLYNN: Sure.  
6 (WHEREUPON, discussion was had  
7 off the record.)  
8 BY MR. FLYNN:  
9 Q. Is there any doubt, in your mind, that  
10 Exhibit D is the letter and attachment that you  
11 received from Hans Mast?  
12 A. No. I believe that this is it.  
13 Q. You signed some copy of this release and  
14 sent it back to Hans on January 29; is that correct?  
15 A. Yes.  
16 Q. You accepted the settlement offer prior  
17 to Christmas and presumably defense counsel or Hans  
18 drafted the settlement release and then Hans mailed  
19 it to you, correct?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. At any point in time from December 25th  
22 until you received this settlement release, did you  
23 contact any lawyer to discuss whether it would be  
24 appropriate to let the McGuire's out for 5,000?

Page 71

1 A. I believe I contacted Hans again.  
2 Q. Besides Hans, did you talk to anyone  
3 else?  
4 A. No.  
5 Q. Was there anything preventing you from  
6 seeking a second opinion from some other lawyer at  
7 that time?  
8 A. No.  
9 Q. Directing your attention to Exhibit E  
10 attached to the second amended complaint, the second  
11 amended complaint, again, being Exhibit 5. Is this  
12 an e-mail from you to Hans on January 29, 2014?  
13 A. This is the e-mail chain between me and  
14 Hans, yes.  
15 Q. Down below at the bottom of the page,  
16 January 29 at 10:51 a.m., it appears that you were  
17 questioning Hans regarding some of the language in  
18 the release, including social security disability  
19 check boxes. Do you see that?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. Hans responded to you and then at the top  
22 of the page here at 1:59 p.m. it says, "Okay, it's  
23 signed and in the mail."  
24 A. Correct.

Page 72

1 Q. What did you mean by that?  
2 A. I signed it and mailed it.  
3 Q. Did you -- where did you mail it from?  
4 A. My home.  
5 Q. How did you do that?  
6 A. Put a stamp on the envelope and put it in  
7 the mailbox, put the flag up and waited for the  
8 mailman.  
9 Q. Is the mailbox attached to your home or  
10 is it --  
11 A. It's out on the street.  
12 Q. You walked down there and you put the  
13 mail -- the envelope in the mailbox, put the flag up  
14 and --  
15 A. That is correct.  
16 Q. Your understanding of signing that  
17 release and sending it back to your lawyer was that  
18 you would agree to take the \$5,000 settlement,  
19 correct?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. Hans didn't deliver the letter to you  
22 personally. He mailed it to you, correct?  
23 A. He mailed it to me?  
24 Q. He mailed it to you.

Page 73

1 A. Correct. U.S. mail.  
2 Q. Do you recall an allegation in your  
3 complaint or amended complaint or second amended  
4 complaint in this case alleging that you were  
5 pressured or alleging undue influence by Hans in  
6 urging you to accept the \$5,000 settlement from the  
7 McGuires?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 Q. How is it, as you sit here today, can you  
10 tell me how Hans unduly influenced you to accept the  
11 \$5,000 settlement offer?  
12 A. I don't know what Hans was thinking. How  
13 did I feel influenced?  
14 Q. Unduly influenced.  
15 Let me put it this way. He didn't put a  
16 gun to your head?  
17 A. No.  
18 Q. He suggested that you take the  
19 settlement?  
20 A. Correct.  
21 Q. He didn't force you to take the  
22 settlement?  
23 A. Correct.  
24 Q. It was your decision?

Page 74

1 A. Correct.  
2 Q. You signed it and you sent it back to him  
3 in the mail?  
4 A. Yes.  
5 Q. Aside from your e-mails with Hans on  
6 January 29, did you call him that day?  
7 A. I believe so.  
8 Q. Did you also discuss whether it was  
9 appropriate to accept the McGuires' \$5,000  
10 settlement offer at that time?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. You deliberated on it and decided to take  
13 it, correct?  
14 A. There wasn't much -- it was take it or  
15 get nothing.  
16 Q. You had the opportunity to deliberate on  
17 it, correct?  
18 A. For that day, yeah.  
19 Q. You had reviewed the transcripts of the  
20 McGuire depositions and David Gagnon's depositions  
21 in order to provide you with some information in  
22 order to determine whether to accept the settlement  
23 offer, correct?  
24 A. I believe I did try to read those, yes.

Page 75

1 Q. Did you call Hans or e-mail him and  
2 question him with respect to the evidence, the  
3 testimony contained in those deposition transcripts?  
4 A. Yes.  
5 Q. What did you say to him and what did he  
6 say to you?  
7 A. There were many conversations over the  
8 phone and I'm sure some through e-mails.  
9 Q. He continued to tell you that it was his  
10 opinion that the liability on the McGuires is  
11 questionable because they did not control  
12 David Gagnon's work that day, correct?  
13 A. It depends on which time. Sometimes he  
14 said because they didn't tell them how to squeeze  
15 the trigger. It depends which time you are talking  
16 about.  
17 Q. Again, there was nothing preventing you  
18 from seeking a second opinion from some other lawyer  
19 at the time you signed the settlement release and  
20 sent it back to Hans, correct?  
21 A. From the time I received it, signed it  
22 and sent it back?  
23 Q. Right.  
24 A. No. It was a matter of hours. I got it

Page 76

1 that morning.  
2 Q. You decided to mail it that day, right?  
3 A. He needed it. He said now or you're not  
4 going to get anything.  
5 Q. There was nothing preventing you from  
6 seeking the advice of another attorney at that time?  
7 A. At that time it was time. It was now or  
8 nothing.  
9 Q. You were in the comfort of your own house  
10 when you received the letter, correct?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. You had the ability to go find another  
13 lawyer and ask them to discuss the case at that  
14 time. You had done it hundreds of times earlier --  
15 strike that.  
16 After the settlement with the McGuires,  
17 you continued to prosecute the case against Gagnon,  
18 correct?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. Did you have an understanding as to what,  
21 if any, insurance coverage he had?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. How much was that?  
24 A. What time frame are you talking about?

Page 77

1 Q. What was your initial understanding as to  
2 the limits on David Gagnon's insurance coverage?  
3 A. Hans Mast told me he had \$100,000.  
4 Q. Was that in an e-mail?  
5 A. There were -- not initially, no, but  
6 later on he reiterated that in e-mails, yes.  
7 Q. Did you, ultimately, learn that there was  
8 some additional amount of coverage with respect to  
9 Gagnon's policy?  
10 A. Long after Hans Mast was gone, not part  
11 of the case.  
12 Q. How much was the coverage?  
13 A. The Allstate coverage, I believe, was  
14 300,000.  
15 Q. We'll talk about the settlement later,  
16 but did you ultimately settle the case again Gagnon  
17 for 300,000?  
18 A. I believe it went to binding mediation.  
19 Q. Was there an award of \$300,000 based on a  
20 high/low agreement?  
21 A. Yes.  
22 Q. Is it fair to say that if Hans made a  
23 mistake about the \$100,000 in coverage, that that  
24 was corrected and there was never any harm done as a

Page 78

1 result of his --  
2 A. No.  
3 Q. Explain to me how you were harmed by the  
4 representation that there was \$100,000 in coverage.  
5 A. You want me to explain?  
6 Q. Yes.  
7 A. Had I known the value of the case, I  
8 would have not filed for bankruptcy.  
9 Q. Explain to me why one has something to do  
10 with the other.  
11 A. Is my family and me going to dump money  
12 into a black hole that we can't recover or is there  
13 a light at the end of the tunnel where I can pay  
14 them back.  
15 Q. At the time that you filed for  
16 bankruptcy, had any settlement offer been made from  
17 David Gagnon or his lawyers to you?  
18 A. At the time of when?  
19 Q. When you filed for bankruptcy.  
20 A. I don't think so. I'd have to check the  
21 dates, but I don't think so.  
22 Q. As the case was progressing against  
23 David Gagnon, were your doctors deposed?  
24 A. As the case progressed with David Gagnon,

Page 79

1 I believe they were deposed. I don't remember. I'd  
2 have to look at the dates.  
3 Q. Discovery continued on in the case?  
4 A. I believe one doctor was deposed after  
5 the McGuire settlement. I'm not sure, though.  
6 Q. Did Hans continue to represent you for  
7 some period of time?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 MR. FLYNN: I'll have you mark this as  
10 Exhibit 6.  
11 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
12 marked Exhibit No. 6, for  
13 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
14 BY MR. FLYNN:  
15 Q. Showing you what's been marked as  
16 Exhibit 6. Do you recognize this e-mail chain?  
17 A. Yes.  
18 Q. This is from September 23, 2014. If we  
19 go from the bottom up, it appears that Hans said to  
20 you that he wanted to give you the option of finding  
21 other counsel at this point if you really want to  
22 take the case to trial, which I think ultimately  
23 will be necessary. Correct?  
24 A. Are we at "before I proceed" or "that's

Page 80

1 the very reason"?  
2 Q. "That's the very reason."  
3 Is it fair to say he was suggesting you  
4 find another counsel in the case at that point?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. He also said, "I just do not believe  
7 strongly that defense counsel will offer much in the  
8 way of settlement."  
9 Do you see that?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. That's his opinion regardless of what he  
12 believed the coverage limits to be; is that a fair  
13 statement?  
14 A. Yes.  
15 Q. You responded to him, he responded to you  
16 and then you wrote an e-mail to him at 8:25 p.m.  
17 that night?  
18 A. Okay.  
19 Q. Do you see that? Did you say, "First,  
20 I'm sorry that I'm not a better witness to help  
21 prove David cut me with a chainsaw"?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. Did you start to look for other lawyers  
24 to help you in your case against Gagnon at that

Page 81

1 point in time?  
2 A. I believe I did, that summer. This is  
3 fall, September.  
4 Q. You had already started looking for new  
5 lawyers?  
6 A. I believe that Hans had told me to start  
7 looking for a new lawyer in April of that year.  
8 Q. Did he say why?  
9 A. We'd have to read his thing. He says  
10 why.  
11 Q. Do you recall why he said that to you?  
12 A. He did not feel that the case was  
13 provable against David. He did not feel the value  
14 of the case was worth it. He did not feel --  
15 actually, this is 2014. The dates are rough.  
16 Q. He thought the case against David was  
17 difficult, correct?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. Have you ever described the case as a he  
20 said, she said with respect to the facts of the  
21 accident?  
22 A. He described that to me many times.  
23 Q. Have you also --  
24 A. And I used that back, yes.

Page 82

1 Q. Have you ever described this case as a he  
2 said, she said case?  
3 A. I may have. I don't know.  
4 Q. It is your word against David Gagnon's as  
5 to what happened and whose fault it was that day?  
6 A. That's what Hans explained to me as what  
7 the problem was.  
8 Q. Did you ever describe the accident as a  
9 he said, she said?  
10 A. I don't think I called David a "she said"  
11 or me a "she said." I don't know. Right here I do.  
12 Q. What do you say there?  
13 A. I said, "I'm sorry that I'm not a better  
14 witness to help prove David cut me with a chainsaw."  
15 Q. He was denying that he even cut you,  
16 correct?  
17 A. No, he never denied that.  
18 Q. What was your reason for writing this  
19 sentence in that way?  
20 A. Because Hans said that he believed David  
21 over me.  
22 Q. With respect to what fact at issue?  
23 A. His deposition versus mine. He said that  
24 I didn't make a good witness.

Page 83

1 Q. With respect to what points?  
2 A. All of it. He was dumping me and he was  
3 coming up with his own excuses.  
4 Q. You and David were the only ones that  
5 witnessed this accident?  
6 A. Correct.  
7 Q. Based on your understanding of how the  
8 evidence came out in the case, would you agree that  
9 there were differences with respect to the version  
10 of events?  
11 A. Oh, yeah.  
12 Q. There were differences between what he  
13 said happened and what you said happened?  
14 A. Oh, definitely.  
15 Q. Would it be fair to say, then, it would  
16 be up to the trier of fact, whether it be a judge or  
17 a jury, to determine who they believed?  
18 MS. WILLIAMS: Objection. Calls for a legal  
19 conclusion.  
20 You can answer, if you understand.  
21 BY THE WITNESS:  
22 A. I believe it would be up to a judge or  
23 jury, sure.  
24

Page 84

1 BY MR. FLYNN:  
2 Q. At the bottom of Exhibit 7 you say,  
3 "Bottom line Hans... do the best you can with what  
4 you got."  
5 I'm sorry. I didn't mark this one yet.  
6 My apologies.  
7 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
8 marked Exhibit No. 7, for  
9 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
10 BY MR. FLYNN:  
11 Q. Showing you what's been marked as  
12 Exhibit 7. Is this an e-mail chain between you and  
13 Hans?  
14 A. I don't think it's a chain. I think it's  
15 one.  
16 Q. Point is well taken. It's you writing to  
17 Hans?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. At the bottom it sounds like you had been  
20 in the hospital with a migraine and then you wrote,  
21 "Bottom line, Hans... do the best you can with what  
22 you got."  
23 A. Yes.  
24 Q. What did you mean by that?

Page 85

1 A. He wanted to settle, and I can tell you  
2 right now this letter was written after a very  
3 traumatic experience and -- let me read it and  
4 refresh myself. I'm melting down in this letter.  
5 Q. You said after a traumatic experience.  
6 Are you referring to the bankruptcy filing from that  
7 day?  
8 A. That, in combination with migraines, yes.  
9 Q. David Stretch was your lawyer that filed  
10 bankruptcy for you?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. Did you meet with Mr. Stretch and discuss  
13 the bankruptcy process before you hired him?  
14 A. Yes.  
15 Q. How long did you meet with him?  
16 A. I think I asked about it. I don't know.  
17 It may have been a couple of months or a couple  
18 weeks before it got filed. I wanted to learn about  
19 it.  
20 Q. Did you, ultimately, list the case  
21 against David Gagnon as an asset in your bankrupt  
22 filing?  
23 A. Yes, I did.  
24 Q. Is that why the bankruptcy trustee became

Page 86

1 involved with the binding mediation?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Did you ever meet the bankruptcy trustee?  
4 A. Yes. The first one.  
5 Q. What was the name of that person?  
6 A. The first one was Heeg was her last name.  
7 H-e-e-g, I think.  
8 Q. Again, we established that Brad Balke  
9 became your lawyer in the case on March 19, 2015,  
10 correct?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. Is it fair to say that your relationship  
13 with Hans Mast was deteriorating over the fall and  
14 beginning of the winter of 2015?  
15 A. I would say it had been deteriorating  
16 long before that. You can see from the last exhibit  
17 I'm melting down and it was already started  
18 deteriorating.  
19 Q. By the time you drafted Exhibit 7, had  
20 you talked to other lawyers about taking your case?  
21 A. I have to go back and look, but probably.  
22 If he told me to look at other lawyers in April  
23 before this, yes.  
24 Q. How many lawyers would you say you talked

Page 87

1 to between April and the time you drafted this  
2 e-mail on September 26?  
3 A. I couldn't count that high, probably.  
4 Q. Quite a few?  
5 A. Yeah.  
6 Q. Did any of them take your case?  
7 A. No.  
8 MR. FLYNN: Mark this as Exhibit 8.  
9 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
10 marked Exhibit No. 8, for  
11 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
12 BY MR. FLYNN:  
13 Q. Showing you what's been marked as  
14 Exhibit 8. Is this an e-mail from you to Hans Mast?  
15 A. Yes. It's an e-mail chain, yes.  
16 Q. On February 22, 2015 at 7:42 p.m. you  
17 wrote to Hans, correct?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. Halfway down in that e-mail message you  
20 said, quote, "Now I'm left wondering... how hard it  
21 is to sue an attorney?"  
22 A. That is true.  
23 Q. You wrote that?  
24 A. Yes.

Page 88

1 Q. The next line you wrote, "And yes, I am  
2 and have been looking for someone who will take this  
3 case..."  
4 A. That is not in reference to suing the  
5 attorney. That was in reference to the Gagnon case.  
6 Q. What did the reference to suing an  
7 attorney mean?  
8 A. That was me being angry.  
9 Q. With Hans?  
10 A. Yes. I was seeing red.  
11 Q. You're suggesting that you may sue him?  
12 A. Yeah. I didn't know that I could. I'm  
13 wondering about it.  
14 Q. You, basically, made a threat, whether it  
15 be a veiled threat or an overt threat to sue him,  
16 correct?  
17 A. Yes.  
18 Q. You, ultimately, sued him for legal  
19 malpractice, right?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. Is that what you had in mind when you  
22 wrote this?  
23 A. No. This was about dropping Gagnon. The  
24 malpractice is about dropping the McGuires.

Page 89

1 Q. This --  
2 A. We're talking -- this is 2015.  
3 Q. In this 2015 e-mail you are suggesting to  
4 Hans that you may sue him because of the McGuire  
5 settlement; is that right?  
6 A. No.  
7 Q. Then what is it that you're saying to  
8 him?  
9 A. That if he damaged the Gagnon case, I  
10 didn't know if he did or didn't, and I'm threatening  
11 because I'm angry. You can see, again, I'm melting  
12 down here. These are emotional outbursts, I guess.  
13 Q. Moving up the page a little bit also on  
14 February 22, 2015 at 8:14 p.m., you say, "To be  
15 honest, you took this case knowing it was my word  
16 versus his."  
17 A. Yes.  
18 Q. He said, he said, right?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. Is that a fair characterization of the  
21 case, your word against David's?  
22 A. That's how Hans kept describing it.  
23 That's the way I put it back to him, yes.  
24 Q. You didn't correct him or dispute his

Page 90

1 characterization, did you?  
2 A. No. I used his characterization.  
3 Q. You agreed with it?  
4 A. He said -- how did it go? We had  
5 conversations between these e-mails on the phone.  
6 Then we would hang up and I would get angry and type  
7 it in an e-mail, type whatever it was that bothered  
8 me so he had it.  
9 Q. Let me ask another question, if that's  
10 okay.  
11 Did you ever correct Hans if he called  
12 this a he said, he said case? Did you ever say it's  
13 more than that?  
14 A. Do I ever say it's more than that?  
15 Q. Did you ever correct him? If he said  
16 it's a he said, he said case, did you say no, that's  
17 not right?  
18 A. He said there's no witnesses. I said,  
19 "I'm a witness."  
20 Q. You're one of the hes. It's your word  
21 against David Gagnon's, as you said in this e-mail?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 MR. FLYNN: If I could have you mark that as  
24 Exhibit 9.

Page 91

1 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
2 marked Exhibit No. 9, for  
3 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
4 BY MR. FLYNN:  
5 Q. Exhibit 9, is that Brad Balke's  
6 substitute appearance that was filed on March 19,  
7 2015 in the case against Gagnon?  
8 A. It looks like it, yes.  
9 Q. Back to Exhibit 5, which is the second  
10 amended complaint. If I could direct your attention  
11 to Exhibit F. This appears to be a more complete  
12 copy of another e-mail we just talked about. Is  
13 Exhibit F more of the February 22, 2015 e-mail  
14 chain?  
15 A. I'm not sure if that's separate or the  
16 same. Oh, it looks like it.  
17 Q. At 7:20 p.m. Hans wrote to you and said,  
18 "Paul, I can no longer represent you in the case.  
19 We obviously have differences of opinion as to the  
20 value of the case."  
21 Right?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. He says, "I've been telling you over a  
24 year now the problems with the case and you just

Page 92

1 don't see them."  
2 Correct?  
3 A. That's what it says.  
4 Q. Obviously, a difference of opinion,  
5 right?  
6 A. Yes. Are you talking about difference of  
7 opinion as to the value or difference of opinion of  
8 the problems within the case?  
9 Q. Let's go on. He says, "You keep telling  
10 me how injured you are and completely ignore that it  
11 doesn't matter if you passed away from the accident  
12 because we still have to prove that the defendant  
13 was at fault. While you think it is very clear, it  
14 is not. My guess is that seven out of ten times you  
15 will lose the case outright. That means zero.  
16 That's why I've been trying to convince you to agree  
17 to a settlement. You clearly do not want to."  
18 Did I accurately read that?  
19 A. Just that part of that paragraph, yes.  
20 Q. So Hans is telling you that in his  
21 opinion your case against Gagnon you're going to  
22 lose it seven out of ten times, correct?  
23 A. In this one, yes.  
24 Q. He's acknowledging that you may have a

Page 93

1 chance.  
2 A. I think later on he says nine out of ten.  
3 Q. In this e-mail he says seven out of ten  
4 you will lose.  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. He's recognizing three times out of ten  
7 you may win, right?  
8 A. I don't know what Hans is thinking.  
9 Q. Is that what he said?  
10 A. He says seven out of ten times you lose.  
11 Q. You understood that there are risks in  
12 taking the case to trial that you could lose?  
13 A. There are unforeseen risks, yes.  
14 Q. There are always risks, period, in taking  
15 a case to trial?  
16 A. Yes.  
17 Q. Before you hired Brad Balke and after  
18 Hans told you he couldn't represent you, did you  
19 talk to any other lawyers about taking your case?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. How many?  
22 A. I can't tell you. A lot.  
23 Q. Did any of them tell you that they  
24 wouldn't take the case because they didn't think you

Page 94

1 could prevail against Gagnon?  
2 A. No.  
3 Q. Not one?  
4 A. No.  
5 Q. What are the names of any of the lawyers  
6 you talked to about taking your case over from  
7 Popovich?  
8 A. I can't tell you without looking at  
9 documents who it was and what date it was, what it  
10 was between these two.  
11 Q. I don't think documents I produced would  
12 help you in that regard.  
13 I'll just ask you based on your memory  
14 the names of any lawyers you met with from the time  
15 Hans wrote this February 22 e-mail --  
16 A. I believe --  
17 Q. Let me finish.  
18 A. I believe --  
19 MS. WILLIAMS: He has not finished his  
20 question.  
21 THE WITNESS: Sorry.  
22 BY MR. FLYNN:  
23 Q. From the time that Hans wrote this  
24 February 22 e-mail and the time that Brad Balke

Page 95

1 enters an appearance on March 19. Just the name of  
2 any lawyer you --  
3 A. I believe that Sal Ferris that I was  
4 talking about was one of the lawyers that I talked  
5 to.  
6 Q. You're not sure? You believe that he  
7 was?  
8 A. In between this time and this time?  
9 Q. Yes.  
10 A. I believe it's right around then.  
11 Q. What type of law practice does Sal Ferris  
12 have?  
13 A. I believe personal injury.  
14 Q. Did you ever talk to him about taking  
15 your case before that date?  
16 A. Before the date of this e-mail?  
17 Q. Yes.  
18 A. I'd have to look at it.  
19 Q. He wasn't one of the original attorneys  
20 that you spoke with at the beginning of the case?  
21 A. No.  
22 Q. Fair to say once Balke entered his  
23 appearance on March 19, 2015 that Mast and Popovich  
24 were no longer your attorneys, correct?

Page 96

1 A. When Balke enters his appearance?  
2 Q. Yes.  
3 A. I would believe that, yes.  
4 Q. They were terminated and Balke stepped  
5 in?  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. Can you tell me how the binding mediation  
8 which proceeded on December 8, 2015 evolved and came  
9 to be.  
10 A. I was ordered into it from a bankruptcy  
11 court.  
12 Q. Why is that?  
13 A. I believe that the trustee put a motion  
14 up. I don't know who did it. I assume it was the  
15 trustee and the court ordered that it be put into  
16 binding mediation.  
17 Q. Did you appear at the mediation?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. Do you recall the name of the mediator?  
20 A. Not off the top of my head, no.  
21 Q. One of the exhibits to your second  
22 amended complaint indicates it was retired Judge  
23 James Etchingham.  
24 A. That sounds familiar.



Page 97

1 Q. Do you recall how long the mediation  
2 lasted?  
3 A. All day.  
4 Q. Do you know if the parties submitted  
5 mediation briefs or statements to the judge?  
6 A. I believe both sides submitted a whole  
7 bunch of things.  
8 Q. The Boudins represented you in this  
9 mediation?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. Because you had fired Balke by this  
12 point?  
13 A. Oh, yes.  
14 Q. Directing your attention, again, to  
15 Exhibit 5, the second amended complaint and Exhibit  
16 G. Exhibit G is, apparently, a memorialization of  
17 the mediation award. Do you see that?  
18 A. It's how the judge decided to break it  
19 down, yes.  
20 Q. Do you see that there's an award for  
21 future medical expenses of \$200,000?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. Since that date of December 8, 2015, have  
24 you received any medical treatment relative to your

Page 98

1 injuries --  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Let me finish. Strike the question.  
4 Since that date, December 8, 2015, have  
5 you received any medical treatment for your injuries  
6 incurred on January 28, 2011?  
7 A. You're asking since the date of the  
8 binding mediation?  
9 Q. That's right.  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. What medical treatment have you received?  
12 A. I do an ongoing with the neurologist for  
13 the dystonia.  
14 Q. That's in your right arm?  
15 A. Yes.  
16 Q. Have you calculated the medical bills  
17 that you've incurred since that day?  
18 A. No, I have not.  
19 Q. Are they anywhere near \$200,000?  
20 A. It depends if you calculate with or  
21 without insurance. I know what I pay, but then I  
22 have to pay for the insurance that pays for that.  
23 Q. How much have you paid out of pocket  
24 since that date for medical treatment on your arm?

Page 99

1 A. I don't know, offhand.  
2 Q. Was there any doctor that opined that you  
3 would require \$200,000 in future medical expenses?  
4 A. I believe so.  
5 Q. Who was that?  
6 A. I believe that was Dr. Patel. I don't  
7 know that she said \$200,000. She was the doctor  
8 that was handling it at the time.  
9 Q. Did you discuss your injury with the  
10 mediator at the mediation?  
11 A. He did ask me a few questions.  
12 Q. How much time did you spend with him?  
13 A. On and off. He would come in and ask me  
14 questions and then go away and then come in and  
15 would ask me questions and then go away.  
16 I don't remember which one was the  
17 mediator, which one was the Allstate adjuster, which  
18 one was the -- I don't remember.  
19 Q. You're not sure which one was the  
20 mediator?  
21 A. They came in and they said they are going  
22 to ask you some questions and I answered them.  
23 Q. As you sit here today, you don't know how  
24 much face time you had with the mediator that day?

Page 100

1 A. I don't remember the face of which one is  
2 which.  
3 Q. Did the issue of lost wages ever come up?  
4 A. At the mediation with me?  
5 Q. Yes.  
6 A. I don't remember.  
7 Q. Did you ever make a claim of lost wages  
8 of \$250,000?  
9 A. I may have.  
10 Q. Do you know what that was based on?  
11 A. Yeah.  
12 Q. What is that based on?  
13 A. Past and future.  
14 Q. What past wages had you ever earned that  
15 could lead to an award of \$250,000?  
16 A. To me, that's not a very high number. I  
17 think I asked for more than that. It would be an  
18 average over a certain number of years plus benefits  
19 and that's all lost.  
20 Q. Would it be fair to say that your income  
21 would be accurately reflected in the tax returns  
22 you've produced in this case, so I don't want to ask  
23 you about each one of them?  
24 A. I would say my personal income, yeah.

Page 101

1 Q. Have you filed personal tax returns since  
2 2015?  
3 A. Tried.  
4 Q. I didn't ask you if you tried.  
5 A. No. They won't let me. They said I  
6 don't make enough anymore.  
7 MR. FLYNN: I believe the next exhibit is 10.  
8 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
9 marked Exhibit No. 10, for  
10 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
11 BY MR. FLYNN:  
12 Q. I'm handing you what's been marked as  
13 Exhibit 10. This is a six-page binding mediation  
14 agreement. The copy I have is unsigned.  
15 Do you recognize this as the mediation  
16 agreement that governed your December 8, 2016  
17 mediation?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. If I could direct your attention to --  
20 first, let me ask you.  
21 Do you know why the bankruptcy trustee or  
22 the bankruptcy court ordered binding mediation as  
23 opposed to nonbinding?  
24 A. I have no idea.

Page 102

1 Q. On page 4, section F, subsection B -- I'm  
2 sorry, 1B. It says, "The parties agree that for  
3 this mediation the minimum award to Paul Dulberg  
4 will be \$50,000. Also, the maximum award to  
5 Paul Dulberg will be \$300,000."  
6 Do you see that?  
7 A. Yes.  
8 Q. Do you know why the parties agreed to  
9 this high/low agreement?  
10 A. No.  
11 Q. Do you recall alleging in your original  
12 complaint against Popovich that there was a high/low  
13 agreement?  
14 A. There is. There was.  
15 MS. WILLIAMS: Can you repeat the question,  
16 please.  
17 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by  
18 the reporter as requested.)  
19 BY THE WITNESS:  
20 A. I don't know. I'd have to read it.  
21 MS. WILLIAMS: I asked her to read it. And you  
22 had answered it previously.  
23 BY MR. FLYNN:  
24 Q. Directing your attention back to

Page 103

1 Exhibit 4, which is the original complaint in this  
2 case. Page 4, paragraph 16.  
3 A. Okay.  
4 Q. There's a sentence that begins with,  
5 "Unfortunately, a high/low agreement had been  
6 executed by Dulberg reducing the maximum account he  
7 could recover to \$300,000 based upon the insurance  
8 policy available."  
9 Do you see that?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. It's not your position or testimony that  
12 Popovich had anything to do with the high/low  
13 agreement?  
14 A. That was a mistake in there. No.  
15 Q. You would agree that Popovich had nothing  
16 to do with the high/low agreement?  
17 A. I believe that events that unfolded the  
18 way they did was due to Hans Mast's initial  
19 assessment of the value of the case.  
20 Q. Let me ask it a different way.  
21 Did Popovich have any idea that this  
22 high/low agreement existed when it was entered into?  
23 A. I don't know.  
24 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that he

Page 104

1 did?  
2 A. I don't know. I don't know how much the  
3 Boudins were in contact with them because they  
4 worked together. I don't know.  
5 Q. What do you mean, "they worked together"?  
6 A. They worked together on all different  
7 cases. That's a small county out there.  
8 Q. Did you ever write to Hans and accuse  
9 Popovich of having a conflict of interest because he  
10 may have gone to high school with David Gagnon?  
11 A. I did learn that.  
12 Q. Do you believe the fact that someone went  
13 to high school with another person may give rise to  
14 a conflict of interest in a lawsuit?  
15 A. I was shooting in the dark and guessing  
16 why they didn't see this as a viable case.  
17 Q. Do you think that was appropriate to send  
18 to your lawyer at the time?  
19 A. When you're wondering why they are doing  
20 what they are doing and you learn that and they were  
21 pretty much in the same class and they all knew each  
22 other and it's a small town, let me ask you, are you  
23 friends with the guy I'm suing? That's an  
24 appropriate question.

Page 105

1 Q. You didn't say that. You asked if they  
2 went to school together.  
3 A. Correct.  
4 Q. Popovich did not enter into this high/low  
5 agreement on your behalf, correct?  
6 A. Popovich, no.  
7 Q. When I say "Popovich," I mean generally  
8 the Popovich firm and your lawyers.  
9 A. This was years later. No.  
10 Q. They had nothing to do with it, right?  
11 A. I wouldn't say anything to do with it.  
12 Q. Withdrawn.  
13 Who drafted this high/low agreement  
14 that's contained in the mediation agreement?  
15 A. I'm not sure who drafted it.  
16 Q. Would it have been either the mediator,  
17 the bankruptcy trustee, your lawyers or the defense  
18 attorneys?  
19 A. I assume that this would have been an  
20 agreement of all of them.  
21 Q. You don't think Popovich had anything to  
22 do with drafting this high/low agreement, do you?  
23 A. I don't know that he did or didn't.  
24 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that he

Page 106

1 did?  
2 A. At this point, no.  
3 Q. Continuing on in Exhibit 4. Directing  
4 your attention to the bottom of page 4,  
5 paragraph 10.  
6 A. Exhibit 4. Say it again.  
7 Q. The bottom of page 4, paragraph 20. This  
8 is your complaint against Popovich and Mast.  
9 A. This has been amended since then.  
10 Q. I understand. Paragraph 20 reads,  
11 "Following the execution of the mediation agreement  
12 with the high/low agreement contained therein and  
13 the final mediation award, Dulberg realized for the  
14 first time that the information Mast and Popovich  
15 had given Dulberg was false and misleading and that,  
16 in fact, the dismissal of the McGuires was a serious  
17 and substantial mistake."  
18 Do you see that?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. Can you tell me, as you sit here today,  
21 what false and misleading information did Mast and  
22 Popovich give you?  
23 A. That I realized on the day of the --  
24 following the execution of the mediation agreement?

Page 107

1 Q. Correct.  
2 A. The liability of the McGuires.  
3 Q. What was false about it?  
4 A. What made them liable and what didn't.  
5 Q. What is it you learned to dispute what  
6 you were told?  
7 A. I learned from a reliability expert that  
8 had the report there that day that the McGuires  
9 provided the tools which made Gagnon an agent of the  
10 McGuires. He was working at their behest.  
11 Q. Who was this liability expert?  
12 A. What's his name?  
13 Q. He's a doctor?  
14 A. Yes.  
15 Q. Continue on with that paragraph.  
16 "Following mediation, Dulberg was advised to seek an  
17 independent opinion from an attorney handling legal  
18 malpractice matters and received that opinion on or  
19 about December 16, 2016."  
20 Do you see that allegation?  
21 A. Yeah.  
22 Q. Who advised you to seek an independent  
23 opinion from an attorney handling legal malpractice  
24 matters?

Page 108

1 A. I believe that was Boudin.  
2 Q. You believe that or you know that?  
3 A. I know that.  
4 Q. You alleged it in this complaint so it's  
5 important that we know who that was.  
6 A. Yes, that was Boudin.  
7 Q. Boudin told you to seek an independent  
8 opinion from an attorney that handles malpractice  
9 matters?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. It says you received that opinion on or  
12 about December 16, 2016.  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. That's separate and apart from any  
15 opinion you may have received from a liability  
16 expert, a doctor, an expert on chainsaws?  
17 A. Yes.  
18 Q. Who was the lawyer that you received a  
19 legal opinion from on December 16, 2016?  
20 A. I believe that would be Thomas Gooch.  
21 Q. The drafter of this complaint?  
22 A. I'd have to look at the dates because I  
23 think -- December 8th was the mediation; is that  
24 right?

Page 109

1 Q. Correct.

2 A. So the 16th would sound about right to be

3 meeting with Gooch, but I can get that date.

4 Q. You met with Gooch --

5 A. Soon, within weeks. It was quick.

6 Q. Now that the door has been opened, you

7 fired Gooch in this case, correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. He drafted this complaint and he's also

10 the one that gave you an opinion about legal

11 malpractice liability on the part of my clients?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. What is it that he told you on

14 December 16, 2016?

15 MS. WILLIAMS: Objection. I don't think we've

16 waived that privilege, but -- can we go off the

17 record for a second?

18 MR. FLYNN: I don't want to go off the record.

19 I've asked this interrogatory in about five

20 different ways and it hasn't been answered

21 appropriately.

22 The allegation was made in the complaint.

23 That's why I drafted the interrogatory the way I

24 did. I don't think that there's been a square

Page 110

1 answer to it. This is clear that you're talking

2 about a legal opinion.

3 BY THE WITNESS:

4 Q. Is this the same wording as we have in

5 the current complaint?

6 BY MR. FLYNN:

7 Q. It's not exactly.

8 A. What would this be valid for, then?

9 Q. You've raised a response to a statute of

10 limitations defense in this case and placed your

11 knowledge of the malpractice and the date of

12 incurring of an injury at issue.

13 Because your discovery of malpractice has

14 been placed at issue, it's our position that you've

15 waived privilege anyhow with respect to this

16 conversation on December 16, 2016.

17 A. I'm not sure --

18 MS. WILLIAMS: There's not a question pending.

19 I'm going to make a standing objection as to

20 privilege with Gooch.

21 If we can agree that that objection will

22 stand, we can go through this line of questioning

23 and then if we need to later, have a judge determine

24 whether or not that line of questioning is

Page 111

1 admissible. Are you agreeable to that?

2 MR. FLYNN: I'm agreeable to continuing on for

3 a few minutes. I want to explore. I'll try to lay

4 foundation for -- to confirm this wasn't anyone

5 else, for starters. Why don't we continue on and if

6 you need to raise it again, we can talk.

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Otherwise, I'm just going to

8 raise it to every single question you ask. I just

9 don't want to have to continue to make the objection

10 as to -- if questions are asked about advice given

11 by a legal malpractice attorney, I'm going to raise

12 an objection as to that.

13 MR. FLYNN: Okay. But this is why we had the

14 201K conferences, multiple 201K conferences. It was

15 made clear, to me, that there was a waiver with

16 respect to subsequent counsel.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Tom Gooch isn't subsequent

18 counsel.

19 MR. FLYNN: The allegation has been made in

20 this complaint and apparently this is subsequent

21 counsel subsequent to my client's representation.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: It is a different case. It's

23 not subsequent counsel in the underlying case. It's

24 a new case.

Page 112

1 MR. FLYNN: We'll get to the interrogatory in a

2 few minutes. I'll pull that out.

3 BY MR. FLYNN:

4 Q. Let me ask you. Is there any other

5 attorney besides Mr. Gooch that gave you an opinion

6 that's referenced here on December 16?

7 A. No one that isn't privileged.

8 Q. Could it have been anyone else?

9 A. No.

10 Q. So Gooch is the only person that's being

11 referenced here in this allegation that's in your

12 complaint that's a public record?

13 I'm not asking you right now what the

14 opinion is. I'm going to do that later. I'm asking

15 you who gave it to you. It's not anyone besides

16 Mr. Gooch, correct?

17 A. Yes. It was Thomas Gooch.

18 Q. He drafted the very complaint that that

19 allegation is contained in?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Dr. Landford was the liability expert

22 that you referenced earlier, correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Back to the allegation that Gooch and --

Page 113

1 that Popovich and Mast provided you false and  
2 misleading information. That information was simply  
3 their legal opinion on the McGuire's liability;  
4 isn't that correct?  
5 A. No. There was nothing simple about that.  
6 That's a very complex series of things that go all  
7 the way back to before the McGuire settlement.  
8 Q. They didn't lie to you, did they?  
9 A. It depends on how you define lie.  
10 Q. How do you define lie?  
11 A. If you know better and you say something  
12 else, that's a lie. Omission is a lie.  
13 Q. Did they provide you with anything other  
14 than a legal opinion as to the McGuire's liability?  
15 A. Yes. They provided me with case laws.  
16 They provided me with all different stuff. Yes.  
17 Q. Whatever the advice that was given to you  
18 on December 16, 2016, you felt that you were misled  
19 by Popovich and Mast at that point in time, correct?  
20 A. At that point in time it was confirmed to  
21 me that I had a valid case against Popovich.  
22 Q. You had a valid malpractice case against  
23 Popovich?  
24 A. Yes. I did not know before that.

Page 114

1 Q. As of December 16, 2016?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Why is it that you didn't file that  
4 lawsuit until nearly a year later on November 28,  
5 2017?  
6 A. I believe because Thomas Gooch had some  
7 health issues and then his wife had some health  
8 issues. It took a while.  
9 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
10 marked Exhibit No. 11, for  
11 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
12 BY MR. FLYNN:  
13 Q. I'm handing you what has been marked as  
14 Exhibit 11. This is one set of your supplemental  
15 Answers to Interrogatories.  
16 First, I'll ask you if that is your  
17 verification and signature at the end?  
18 A. That is my signature.  
19 Q. Again, I don't know if that verification  
20 was attached to this original document. It may have  
21 been. But there's been some confusion with respect  
22 to these verification pages. This is your signature  
23 and you answered these interrogatories, correct?  
24 A. Yeah.

Page 115

1 Q. So this is a valid verification page with  
2 respect to this discovery document; is that a fair  
3 statement?  
4 A. This is supplemental to original answers.  
5 Q. That's your signature and you agree these  
6 are your answers?  
7 A. I've reviewed them and we went over them  
8 and yes, I agree.  
9 Q. And they are accurate?  
10 A. As accurate as we can be.  
11 Q. If I could direct your attention to  
12 Interrogatory No. 26. Do you see that?  
13 A. Okay. Yes, I see it.  
14 Q. This is similar to what we just talked  
15 about a few minutes ago. I'll read the  
16 interrogatory to you. "Identify and describe the  
17 false and misleading information Mast and Popovich  
18 provided to you and explain how you realized for the  
19 first time in December of 2016 that the information  
20 was false and misleading and the dismissal of the  
21 McGuire's was a serious and substantial mistake as  
22 alleged in paragraph 56 of your second amended  
23 complaint."  
24 Do you see your supplemental answer here?

Page 116

1 A. I see it, yes.  
2 Q. You reference the mediation award and  
3 then you state, quote, "At that time Dulberg  
4 realized that Mast's advice to settle with the  
5 McGuire's for \$5,000 was incorrect because Mast had  
6 cited Dulberg being able to recover in full from  
7 Gagnon as his reasoning."  
8 A. I do.  
9 Q. Can you explain what that means because I  
10 don't quite understand it.  
11 A. Hans Mast assured me -- I want to go back  
12 to 2013, the Fall between October and the signature  
13 of the final release for the McGuire's.  
14 He assured me that, he said -- at that  
15 time he didn't tell me what anybody's policies were.  
16 He assured me that if we let the McGuire's out of the  
17 case, Gagnon has enough insurance, you're going to  
18 get everything from him, so it doesn't matter that  
19 you're carrying the McGuire's in the case.  
20 Q. The next interrogatory is 27. "Identify  
21 and describe the expert opinions provided to you in  
22 December 2016 as alleged in paragraph 57 of your  
23 second amended complaint including the identity of  
24 the expert, any opinions and any other information

Page 117

1 provided by the expert which caused you to learn in  
2 the summer of 2016 and became reasonably aware that  
3 Mast and Popovich did not properly represent you."  
4 What does the summer of 2016 have to do  
5 with your discovery of malpractice?  
6 A. Technically, I was sent Dr. Landford's  
7 report -- I might be off a little by a couple months  
8 here, but I think in July of that year. And I read  
9 it, but I didn't -- you don't catch everything the  
10 first time you read it.  
11 It was not until later that I caught the  
12 part of the report that was brought to the  
13 attention -- it caught my eye when I was sitting  
14 there and reading it.  
15 Q. You didn't read any of this interrogatory  
16 or the original interrogatory as requesting legal  
17 opinions that you had alleged that gave you notice  
18 that there was a malpractice claim against Mast and  
19 Popovich?  
20 A. Excuse me?  
21 MR. FLYNN: Can you read that back.  
22 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by  
23 the reporter as requested.)  
24

Page 118

1 BY THE WITNESS:  
2 A. The way she said it, I don't understand.  
3 BY MR. FLYNN:  
4 Q. I'll rephrase it.  
5 We've known about this allegation in the  
6 original complaint since it was filed. You received  
7 some legal opinion in 2016. That's why you didn't  
8 know you had a malpractice case against Mast and  
9 Popovich.  
10 We asked you in discovery answers a  
11 couple different ways what those legal opinions are.  
12 You didn't read 26 and 27 as requesting information  
13 about legal opinions?  
14 A. I don't know that an expert witness would  
15 be considered a legal opinion. Wouldn't that be  
16 more like an attorney?  
17 Q. I'll ask you again. Why is it that you  
18 first became aware of a legal malpractice matter  
19 against Mast and Popovich on or about December 16,  
20 2016?  
21 A. December 16th I was talking to a legal  
22 malpractice attorney.  
23 Q. You were told that there was a case  
24 against --

Page 119

1 A. A valid case, yes.  
2 Q. -- Mast and Popovich?  
3 A. Yes.  
4 Q. Why is it you didn't know about this  
5 valid case prior to that date?  
6 A. Because I hadn't talked to anybody that  
7 was a lawyer that specialized in that area.  
8 Q. Whatever it is that he said to you gave  
9 you the basis for believing you had a valid case  
10 against Mast and Popovich?  
11 A. Very much so, yes.  
12 Q. You're withholding that information from  
13 me right now, as we sit here. You won't tell me  
14 what that expert said, correct?  
15 MS. WILLIAMS: Repeat the question.  
16 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by  
17 the reporter as requested.)  
18 MS. WILLIAMS: I'm asserting attorney-client  
19 privilege on behalf of my client for Gooch's advice  
20 on December -- in December of 2016.  
21 However, because I want to move forward  
22 with this deposition, if he can answer the question,  
23 I believe we should go ahead and move forward and  
24 have him answer the question.

Page 120

1 I'll assert the privilege with the  
2 understanding that this may have to be briefed  
3 later.  
4 MR. FLYNN: To be stricken later?  
5 MS. WILLIAMS: Right.  
6 MR. FLYNN: The substance of the answer he can  
7 put on the record. You're just saying you may move  
8 to strike it later?  
9 MS. WILLIAMS: Right. I want to maintain the  
10 privilege with the objection, but I don't want to  
11 have to call the judge right now. I don't think  
12 it's something we should have to call the judge  
13 about right now.  
14 MR. FLYNN: Just for the record, I believe it's  
15 been placed at issue by virtue of the first amended  
16 complaint. The responses to the statute of  
17 limitation defenses that were raised in very  
18 dispositive motions before Gooch withdrew from the  
19 case, the gist of that is the discovery rule has  
20 been raised and, therefore, it's our position that  
21 the date of discovery has been placed at issue and,  
22 accordingly, any legal opinions that were provided  
23 to this plaintiff have been exposed and that we're  
24 entitled to know what those are.

Page 121

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Can I also note one more thing?  
2 MR. FLYNN: Sure.  
3 MS. WILLIAMS: In the supplemental -- in the  
4 request it specifically refers to paragraph 57 of  
5 the second amended complaint, which is different.  
6 MR. FLYNN: It is different. I'll acknowledge  
7 that. I believe that the prior original  
8 interrogatories asked for any opinions relative to  
9 the discovery of the malpractice. I could be wrong.  
10 There was a reason I asked this and that's why I  
11 believe that's what it was about.  
12 MS. WILLIAMS: So --  
13 MR. FLYNN: That particular one I agree with  
14 you is not phrased as calling for --  
15 MS. WILLIAMS: Right. That's the question that  
16 was asked. We answered the question that was asked,  
17 which that particular paragraph does not refer to a  
18 legal expert. It just merely -- I'll read it out  
19 loud. "It was not until the mediation in December  
20 of 2016 based on the expert's opinion that Dulberg  
21 retain for mediation that Dulberg became reasonably  
22 aware."  
23 I just want it clear that he did answer  
24 the question that was asked. I understand your line

Page 122

1 of questioning and we'll agree to move forward.  
2 MR. FLYNN: I believe there were other  
3 discovery requests that did point to that and I  
4 think we can take a break here and I can find them  
5 fairly quickly because I think we're getting close  
6 to the end anyway.  
7 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.  
8 BY MR. FLYNN:  
9 Q. Did you ever receive any money from the  
10 mediation award?  
11 A. No. I received money from the bankruptcy  
12 itself. It was a surplus bankruptcy.  
13 Q. There was a \$300,000 award given in the  
14 mediation.  
15 A. That did not go to me. That went to  
16 bankruptcy.  
17 Q. It was collected on your behalf and paid  
18 to the bankruptcy trustee, correct?  
19 A. Correct.  
20 Q. All \$300,000?  
21 A. I don't know that because I think -- I  
22 don't know how exactly it works. I heard attorneys  
23 have a lien that's special. I don't know how they  
24 break it up. I assume it goes to the trustee.

Page 123

1 Q. The Boudins weren't working for free.  
2 They got something out of it, right?  
3 A. Yes.  
4 Q. The trustee took the remainder and paid  
5 off some of your creditors, correct?  
6 A. Correct. All of them.  
7 Q. But the award was paid to the trustee on  
8 your behalf?  
9 A. I believe so. I don't know how it  
10 worked.  
11 Q. How much was the surplus after your  
12 creditors were paid?  
13 A. After just the creditors?  
14 Q. How much did you get?  
15 A. How much did I get?  
16 Q. Yes.  
17 A. A third.  
18 Q. I'm asking how much money did you get?  
19 A. A third of the award.  
20 Q. Dollars. How much money did you get?  
21 A. Roughly a hundred.  
22 Q. \$100,000?  
23 A. I don't know the exact number. It's  
24 roughly a hundred.

Page 124

1 Q. Was there a check that was issued to you?  
2 A. By the trustee, yes.  
3 Q. Did you cash it?  
4 A. Yes.  
5 Q. At what bank?  
6 A. McHenry Bank & Trust.  
7 Q. Do you still have an account there?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 Q. Do you have a copy of the canceled check?  
10 A. I'm sure the bank has a photo thing.  
11 Q. You can request a copy of the check,  
12 correct?  
13 A. I could. I could see if they got it.  
14 Q. I would ask you to do that. If you have  
15 any other documentation relative to the payouts that  
16 were made by the bankruptcy trustee on your behalf,  
17 we are requesting that information.  
18 MR. FLYNN: Why don't we take a break and I'm  
19 going to look for one document and then we're just  
20 about done here.  
21 (WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)  
22 MR. FLYNN: Mark these as the next two.  
23  
24

Page 125

1 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
2 marked Exhibit No. 12, for  
3 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
4 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was  
5 marked Exhibit No. 13, for  
6 identification, as of 02/19/2020.)  
7 BY MR. FLYNN:  
8 Q. I'm going to show you what I've marked as  
9 Exhibits 12 and 13. Twelve are your answers to Hans  
10 Mast's interrogatories. Thirteen is your responses  
11 to Popovich's request for production.  
12 Interrogatory No. 1 from Mast asks,  
13 "Identify and describe each and every way that  
14 Popovich or Mast breached any duty of care to you,  
15 the date of the breach, and when and how you became  
16 aware of the breach."  
17 Do you understand that?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. So how is it they committed malpractice?  
20 A. May I see it?  
21 Q. I'm going to show it to you in a second.  
22 I only have one copy.  
23 This is basically, how did you first  
24 become aware that they committed malpractice?

Page 126

1 That's the essence of that interrogatory.  
2 Here is your response. I can show that  
3 to you. It doesn't reflect any discussion with any  
4 malpractice lawyer in December of 2016.  
5 Tell me --  
6 A. Let me read it again. We're talking  
7 about No. 1 on this?  
8 Q. Correct.  
9 A. Okay.  
10 Q. You understand it?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. Would you agree that the legal opinion  
13 you received on December 16, 2016 is responsive to  
14 that interrogatory, whatever it is that you were  
15 told?  
16 A. Yes.  
17 Q. You didn't identify this December 16,  
18 2016 discussion in the answer to that interrogatory,  
19 correct?  
20 A. Say that again.  
21 Q. Your discussion with Mr. Gooch on  
22 December 16, 2016, that's referenced in your  
23 original complaint, you didn't respond and identify  
24 it in this answer to the interrogatory, correct?

Page 127

1 A. This asks for every way Popovich or Mast  
2 breached the duty of care. It didn't ask for  
3 Gooch's opinion.  
4 Q. How did you find out that Mast and  
5 Popovich breached the duty of care to you? Because  
6 Gooch told you, right?  
7 A. Yes.  
8 Q. That's what you've alleged here in this  
9 complaint.  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. Here I'm asking you, each and every way  
12 that they ever breached a duty of care to you. I  
13 covered the waterfront. You didn't answer --  
14 A. On the McGuire case it was between  
15 October 2013 and January 2014. Yes. There's a  
16 multitude of things and that's why I listed a range.  
17 Q. I'm asking when you became aware of it,  
18 in that interrogatory. Do you see that?  
19 A. I became aware of that when Thomas Gooch  
20 read them and said there's a problem here.  
21 Q. That's not the way you answered the  
22 interrogatory, correct?  
23 A. I answered the first part. I did not  
24 answer after the comma and the and.

Page 128

1 Q. There's no objection and indication that  
2 any information is being withheld, correct?  
3 A. Excuse me?  
4 Q. There's no objection and an indication  
5 that you're withholding --  
6 A. I was not withholding.  
7 Q. I'll show you Exhibit 13. It asks --  
8 Exhibit 13 are the production requests to you.  
9 Number 8 asks for you to produce a privilege log  
10 identifying the creator and recipient of any  
11 document withheld, the basis for any claimed  
12 privilege, the date the document was created and the  
13 date the recipient received the document.  
14 The answer is, "The plaintiff is only  
15 withholding attorney-client communication between  
16 his successor counsel."  
17 Is that your answer to the production  
18 request and did I accurately read No. 8?  
19 A. May I consult with her for a minute?  
20 Q. Sure.  
21 THE WITNESS: Can we go off the record?  
22 MS. WILLIAMS: If you can answer the question,  
23 answer the question first.  
24



Page 129

1 BY THE WITNESS:  
2 A. It's been a while since I've done this,  
3 so I'm not sure who the successor counsel is. Is it  
4 her or is it the Boudins or Balke?  
5 BY MR. FLYNN:  
6 Q. I think successor counsel, we can both  
7 agree, the successor counsel in the underlying case  
8 which would be Balke and then Boudin.  
9 You didn't identify any documents  
10 withheld other than documents between you and  
11 successor counsel, correct?  
12 THE WITNESS: I believe we waived those, didn't  
13 we, for Balke and Boudin?  
14 MS. WILLIAMS: For Balke and Boudin we can  
15 represent that we waived those.  
16 BY MR. FLYNN:  
17 Q. Let me ask a different question.  
18 Did Gooch communicate with you in writing  
19 relative to his opinion that you had a legal  
20 malpractice case against Mast and Popovich?  
21 A. In writing?  
22 Q. Yes.  
23 A. I suppose the agreement between us that  
24 he would represent me because I had the case is a

Page 130

1 document in writing.  
2 Q. Did he tell you -- strike that.  
3 The discussion that you reference in the  
4 complaint, paragraph 20 of December 16, 2016, was  
5 that a face-to-face communication with Gooch?  
6 A. What number is that?  
7 Q. Exhibit 4, paragraph 20. The legal  
8 opinion you received, was it verbal, was it written?  
9 A. I believe it was verbal.  
10 Q. Now, I'm going to ask you what he said.  
11 There was an objection and that will be addressed by  
12 the Court later. Please tell me what Gooch told  
13 you.  
14 A. He read what I brought him, looked  
15 through some things, and I don't remember if it was  
16 the same day that we talked to him or he took a day  
17 or two. I don't remember. He got back to me and he  
18 said, "You have a case here. You have a valid  
19 case."  
20 Q. Did he say why?  
21 A. On the basis of what I brought to him.  
22 Yes.  
23 Q. Specifics, though. I don't want to talk  
24 about generalities. Did he tell you what Mast and

Page 131

1 Popovich did wrong and how it injured you?  
2 A. How it injured me? Yeah.  
3 Q. The first part of my question was, did he  
4 tell you exactly what they did wrong in connection  
5 with your -- their representation of you?  
6 A. He probably did. I'm not recalling it  
7 right now. I'm pulling a blank.  
8 The parts of the conversation I'm  
9 remembering, and for some reason I'm not pulling it.  
10 We've been at this a while and this is a long thing.  
11 Yes, he said based on what he saw, he saw reason for  
12 malpractice.  
13 Q. You don't remember any details, as you  
14 sit here? Did you discuss the liability of property  
15 owners in Illinois?  
16 A. Well, if they were just property owners  
17 in the case, that would be one thing, but they  
18 weren't just property owners.  
19 Q. That wasn't my question. I'm asking if  
20 you discussed it?  
21 A. Certainly.  
22 Q. You and Gooch discussed the liability of  
23 the McGuires in the case?  
24 A. Yes.

Page 132

1 Q. What did you say to him and what did he  
2 say to you?  
3 A. I showed him the expert opinion.  
4 Q. The chainsaw expert?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. Did you show him any deposition  
7 transcripts?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 Q. Which ones?  
10 A. All of them.  
11 Q. And he read them before you talked?  
12 A. I don't remember. Like I said, it may  
13 have been a few days between our initial meeting and  
14 bringing the whole file that I had and trying to get  
15 what the Boudins had and letting him go through it.  
16 I don't remember how long that took.  
17 Q. How did you transmit the documents to  
18 him --  
19 A. My brother carried them.  
20 Q. Let me finish.  
21 How did you transmit the documents to  
22 Mr. Gooch, including the deposition transcripts?  
23 A. I believe we brought him a box.  
24 Q. So you physically handed the documents to

Page 133

1 him?  
2 A. I didn't physically hand them. My  
3 brother did.  
4 Q. Did you communicate with Mr. Gooch by  
5 e-mail, at all, leading up to this meeting?  
6 A. No.  
7 Q. Did he ever write you any letters?  
8 A. An e-mail or regular mail or what are you  
9 talking about?  
10 Q. Any letters whatsoever.  
11 A. Throughout the course of his  
12 representation, yes.  
13 Q. What about in December of 2016?  
14 A. I believe we started communicating in  
15 December, yes.  
16 Q. But in writing?  
17 A. In e-mails, sure.  
18 Q. Did he discuss --  
19 A. We may have. I'm not -- whenever we  
20 started -- whenever he started sending me things and  
21 going back and forth, I don't remember the exact  
22 date, but it was right after he started representing  
23 me, sure, we exchanged e-mails and started, yes.  
24 Q. When did Gooch begin representing you?

Page 134

1 A. The day that he agreed to represent me.  
2 I believe it would have been the day that he decided  
3 that he had a case.  
4 Q. On or about December 16?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. At that point in time, or shortly  
7 thereafter, he communicated with you in writing the  
8 details of the breach of the standard of care  
9 committed by Popovich and Mast; is that correct?  
10 A. I believe he started to detail those out  
11 in the complaint and we were working it back and  
12 forth trying to get it right.  
13 Q. When did you first exchange drafts of the  
14 complaint?  
15 A. I'd have to look back in the e-mails. I  
16 don't remember the dates.  
17 Q. Did you look for any of these e-mails in  
18 connection with my discovery requests in this case?  
19 A. At the time I think we thought they were  
20 privileged.  
21 Q. That privilege objection wasn't exactly  
22 made. My question is, did you look for them?  
23 A. Did I look for them? I have them.  
24 Q. I would ask that you preserve each and

Page 135

1 every communication between you and Mr. Gooch, all  
2 written communications, even phone records that  
3 might reflect the dates and times of your phone  
4 communications, if any. Did you use a cell phone  
5 back then?  
6 A. I used VOIP over a data line.  
7 Q. Who was your carrier?  
8 A. Comcast.  
9 Q. Is that still your carrier?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. Do you have the same phone that you  
12 utilized?  
13 A. Same phone number for 50 years, yes.  
14 Q. What else could you remember that Gooch  
15 told you on or about the 16th of December 2016 about  
16 Mast and Popovich breaching the standard of care and  
17 how it damaged you?  
18 A. Say that again.  
19 Q. What, if anything, else do you recall  
20 about your discussions with Gooch on December 16  
21 regarding the breach of the standard of care by  
22 Popovich and Mast and how it injured you?  
23 A. We discussed the whole scenario between  
24 October and January and what happened. It was

Page 136

1 pretty detailed. We discussed everything that you  
2 see that's been communicated in the e-mails. He  
3 didn't have much else to go on other than the  
4 documents and the e-mails.  
5 Q. You're talking about the e-mails between  
6 you and Hans from the fall of 2013?  
7 A. Yes.  
8 Q. Ultimately leading to the \$5,000  
9 settlement?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. Other than you have a case, what did  
12 Gooch say to you?  
13 A. He said that they definitely committed  
14 malpractice.  
15 Q. Did he ever put this in writing?  
16 A. Did he ever put it in writing? I think  
17 he backed it up by filing a suit. That's  
18 documented.  
19 Q. Again, the suit wasn't filed until  
20 November of 2017.  
21 A. Yes, he had some health problems and then  
22 his wife had some health problems. Believe me, I  
23 was pushing for him to get that done.  
24 Q. From December of 2016 until the complaint

Page 137

1 was filed, you exchanged some drafts of complaints  
2 with him?  
3 A. I believe he let me see what he wanted to  
4 put in the complaint. I got to review some things.  
5 Of course I had, do this or that's not right. In  
6 fact, a couple of these things in here we had to  
7 definitely -- you caught one. He totally worded it  
8 wrong. It was wrong. We had to amend.  
9 MS. WILLIAMS: His question was, did he give  
10 you drafts for you to review?  
11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
12 BY MR. FLYNN:  
13 Q. These were exchanged by e-mail?  
14 A. I believe so, yes.  
15 Q. So you would have records of them?  
16 A. Yes.  
17 Q. Any comments with respect to the  
18 pleadings, as well, did you ever ask him questions?  
19 Did he explain to you the basis for the allegations  
20 in the draft complaints, similar to what you did  
21 with Hans?  
22 A. Over many times, yes.  
23 Q. This is all reflected in e-mails?  
24 A. Yes.

Page 138

1 Q. Ultimately, you didn't file until  
2 November of 2017?  
3 A. Correct.  
4 Q. Popovich ceased being your lawyer  
5 March 19 of 2015, correct?  
6 A. That sounds about right.  
7 Q. Until December 16, 2016, you didn't have  
8 any reason to believe there was a malpractice case  
9 against --  
10 A. Say the date again.  
11 Q. Until December 16, 2016, you didn't have  
12 any other reason to believe there was a malpractice  
13 case against Popovich and Mast?  
14 A. I did not know that I had a case, no.  
15 Q. You threatened one with respect to the  
16 Gagnon case --  
17 A. Yes.  
18 Q. -- at another point in time, correct?  
19 A. I think I threatened him a few times in  
20 there. Yeah. I was actually nice to what I really  
21 wanted to say.  
22 Q. Subject to the ruling on these  
23 objections, you don't recall any other specific  
24 details that you discussed with Popovich -- I'm

Page 139

1 sorry -- Gooch on December 16, other than what we  
2 already talked about?  
3 A. I discussed the exact same things that  
4 you -- the same documents that you already have. We  
5 went over the case that Mast and Popovich had  
6 against the McGuires. He followed through all the  
7 way to the end. We went over the whole case. You  
8 see as much as he did.  
9 Q. Did Gooch ever explain to you why the  
10 McGuires would have been liable any more than Mast  
11 explained to you that they wouldn't be liable?  
12 A. He said he agreed right away. He said  
13 that's obvious.  
14 Q. Did Gooch ever provide you with any cases  
15 or statutes?  
16 A. Provide to me, maybe. Maybe. I don't  
17 know.  
18 Q. Would that be by e-mail?  
19 A. It could be. I was in his office quite a  
20 few times. He may have.  
21 Q. As you sit here today, other than you  
22 have a case against Popovich and Mast, what did  
23 Gooch tell you specifically that was any different  
24 than what Mast and Popovich told you with respect to

Page 140

1 the McGuires' liability?  
2 A. That they were definitely liable. He  
3 tried to say that -- like Popovich and Mast were  
4 first- or second-year lawyers and that they may have  
5 made a mistake here.  
6 I said they've got 20 years in this. You  
7 think they'd know the difference. That's the kind  
8 of thing. He agreed with me. Twenty years, yeah,  
9 they should have known better.  
10 Q. Did you ever discuss the specifics of the  
11 McGuires' potential liability with Gooch?  
12 A. Liability with Gooch?  
13 Q. With Gooch, did you ever discuss the  
14 specifics of the McGuires' liability other than he  
15 thinks you have a case?  
16 A. Yes.  
17 Q. Did he ever tell you why? What was it?  
18 A. Because he agreed with the expert's  
19 opinion.  
20 Q. The expert on the chainsaw?  
21 A. Yes. The liability expert.  
22 Q. The expert said you should use safety  
23 goggles and gloves and things like that?  
24 A. He said more than that, but yes.

Page 141

1 Q. Do you know who commissioned that expert  
2 report?  
3 A. Boudins.  
4 Q. Do you know when the first draft of that  
5 doctor's expert report was circulated?  
6 A. I heard that Boudin got it in February,  
7 maybe. I don't think I got it until July, but I'm  
8 not sure about that.  
9 Q. July of what year?  
10 A. The same year as the mediation.  
11 Q. Of 2016?  
12 A. Yeah.  
13 Q. So you actually read it in advance of the  
14 mediation?  
15 A. I talked about this earlier. I said yes.  
16 You don't catch everything the first time you read  
17 it. I was sitting there at the mediating table and  
18 I was reading it and I caught it and I turned to  
19 Randy and I said, after it was over, does this  
20 mean -- that means.  
21 Q. Means what?  
22 A. Does this mean the McGuires are liable?  
23 Yeah, that means they are liable. He said, call my  
24 office after everything and I'll give you a name for

Page 142

1 an attorney you should go see.  
2 MR. FLYNN: Any follow-up, Julia?  
3 MS. WILLIAMS: I have two follow-up questions.  
4 EXAMINATION  
5 BY MS. WILLIAMS:  
6 Q. Did you ever give Hans authority to make  
7 a settlement demand regarding Mr. Gagnon?  
8 A. I think at one time in one of my meltdown  
9 letters I said get whatever you can, but no, I never  
10 actually signed anything saying you have the right  
11 to offer a settlement.  
12 Q. Did you ever give Hans authority to make  
13 a settlement demand with regard to the McGuires?  
14 A. A demand, no. He said he was going to  
15 probe and see what was out there, and I said, if you  
16 want to do that, that's fine.  
17 MS. WILLIAMS: I have no further questions.  
18 MR. FLYNN: Signature?  
19 MS. WILLIAMS: We can waive signature.  
20 THE REPORTER: Are you ordering this?  
21 MR. FLYNN: Yes.  
22 THE REPORTER: Regular delivery, e-tran?  
23 MR. FLYNN: Yes.  
24 THE REPORTER: Copy?

Page 143

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah.  
2 THE REPORTER: Regular delivery, e-tran?  
3 MS. WILLIAMS: PDF.  
4 (WHEREUPON, at 4:00 p.m.,  
5 the deposition of PAUL DULBERG  
6 was concluded.)  
7 \* \* \* \* \*  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

Page 144

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
2 ) SS:  
3 COUNTY OF DUPAGE )  
4 I, KAREN PILEGGI, a Notary Public  
5 within and for the County of DuPage, State of  
6 Illinois, and a Certified Shorthand Reporter of said  
7 state, do hereby certify:  
8 That previous to the commencement of  
9 the examination of the witness, the witness was duly  
10 sworn to testify the whole truth concerning the  
11 matters herein;  
12 That the foregoing deposition  
13 transcript was reported stenographically by me, was  
14 thereafter reduced to typewriting under my personal  
15 direction, and constitutes a true record of the  
16 testimony given and the proceedings had;  
17 That the said deposition was taken  
18 before me at the time and place specified;  
19 That I am not a relative or employee  
20 or attorney or counsel, nor a relative or employee  
21 of such attorney or counsel for any of the parties  
22 hereto, nor interested directly or indirectly in the  
23 outcome of this action.  
24 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto

Page 145		
1	set my hand and affix my seal of office at Chicago,	
2	Illinois this 3rd day of March, 2020.	
3		
4	<i>Karen Pileggi</i>	
5	Notary Public, DuPage	
6	County, Illinois.	
7	My commission expires 1/2/24.	
8		
9	CSR Certificate No. 84-3404	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
Page 146		
1	EXAMINATION	
2		Page Line
3	PAUL DULBERG	
4	Examination by Mr. Flynn	3 6
5	Examination by Ms. Williams	142 4
6		
7		
8	E X H I B I T S	
9	Deposition Exhibit	Page Line
10	Exhibit No. 1.....	47 19
11	Exhibit No. 2.....	52 6
12	Exhibit No. 3.....	60 6
13	Exhibit No. 4.....	65 2
14	Exhibit No. 5.....	67 13
15	Exhibit No. 6.....	79 12
16	Exhibit No. 7.....	84 8
17	Exhibit No. 8.....	87 10
18	Exhibit No. 9.....	91 2
19	Exhibit No. 10.....	101 9
20	Exhibit No. 11.....	114 10
21	Exhibit No. 12.....	125 2
22	Exhibit No. 13.....	125 5
23		
24		