

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

IN THE TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
McHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PAUL DULBERG, INDIVIDUALLY, AND
THE PAUL R. DULBERG REVOCABLE
TRUST,
Plaintiffs,

vs.

THOMAS W. GOOCH, SABINA
SERSHON, EDWARD X. CLINTON,
JULIA WILLIAMS, ALPHONSE
TALARICO, GEORGE FLYNN, THOMAS
J. POPOVICH, HANS MAST, THE
GOOCH FIRM, CLINTON LAW FIRM,
LLC, LAW OFFICE OF ALPHONSE A.
TALARICO,
Defendants.

No. 2025 LA 360

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS of the hearing before
the Honorable JUDGE KEVIN G. COSTELLO, commencing on
February 17th, 2026.

APPEARANCES VIA ZOOM:

PAUL DULBERG
Self-Represented Litigant;

ATTORNEY THOMAS GOOCH
Self-Represented Litigant;

ATTORNEY SABINA SERSHON
Self-Represented Litigant;

ATTORNEY ROBERT MERLO
On behalf of Popovich and Mast;

ATTORNEY CAMILLE EVANS
On behalf of the Clinton Law Firm and
Julie Williams;

ATTORNEY JOHN RACANELLI,
On behalf of the Lawfirm of
Alphonse A. Talarico.

RECORDING TRANSCRIBED BY:
Gina Zangara
Official Court Reporter

1 THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, everyone. Our
2 10:00 o'clock matter is Paul Dulberg, et al versus
3 Thomas Gooch, et al, 25 LA 360. If I can get
4 appearances for the record starting with plaintiff?

5 MR. DULBERG: Good morning, Your Honor.
6 Paul Dulberg, plaintiff, pro se.

7 THE COURT: Good morning.

8 MR. GOOCH: Good morning, Your Honor.
9 Thomas Gooch, G-o-o-c-h, appearing pro se.

10 MS. SERSHON: Good morning, Your Honor. Sabina
11 Sershon appearing pro se.

12 THE COURT: Good morning.

13 MR. MERLO: Good morning, Your Honor.
14 Robert Merlo for defendants Popovich and Mast.

15 MS. EVANS: Good morning, Your Honor.
16 Camille Evans on behalf of the Clinton defendants,
17 including Julie Williams.

18 THE COURT: Counsel for the Clinton firm, I'm
19 struggling to hear you, just so you know.

20 MS. EVANS: I'm sorry. Can you hear me better
21 now?

22 THE COURT: A little bit, yeah.

23 MS. EVANS: Okay.

24 MR. RACANELLI: Good morning, Judge.

1 John Racanelli for Alphonse Talarico and the
2 Talarico Law Office.

3 THE COURT: Okay. This is up on plaintiff's
4 motion for substitution of judge for cause. I have
5 read the motion. I may have missed it. I don't
6 know if anyone filed a written response to the
7 motion?

8 MR. GOOCH: I did not, Your Honor.

9 MR. MERLO: No, Your Honor.

10 MR. GOOCH: I do have some brief argument,
11 however.

12 THE COURT: Yeah, we'll certainly let anyone
13 argue orally, but I just want to make sure I didn't
14 miss a written response. Okay. So Mr. Dulberg, it
15 is your motion. You may go ahead and argue whenever
16 you're ready.

17 MR. DULBERG: Well, before I start, can I
18 request -- because there seems to be a lot of
19 pending motions today. Can I ask for that to be
20 continued until this is resolved?

21 THE COURT: The only matter that I'm addressing,
22 I was assigned to address this -- your motion.
23 Depending on my ruling, it will either go back to
24 Judge Berg, or it will be reassigned to another

1 judge, but I will not be addressing any other
2 motions today. Okay?

3 MR. DULBERG: Okay. Then I'm ready.

4 THE COURT: Go ahead and argue your motion
5 whenever you're ready.

6 MR. DULBERG: My argument is simple. It's
7 pretty much in the motion. My concerns are
8 structural under 735 ILCS 5/2-1001(a)(3) and the
9 Supreme Court Rule 63. The motion is not based on
10 dissatisfaction with any rulings. The complaint
11 directly implicates proceedings over which
12 Judge Berg presided, and substitution I believe is
13 required to preserve impartial adjudication.

14 I would inform the Court that I have
15 submitted two additional exhibits, BI-11 and BI-12
16 on February 9th, and they are not to impugn any
17 judge but only to reflect how the circuit has
18 addressed similar prior judicial involvement in the
19 past. I rest on the motion and written filing, and
20 that's it.

21 THE COURT: I -- what exhibits are you referring
22 to, and when would you have filed them?

23 MR. DULBERG: February 9th. I can give you the
24 docket number.

1 THE COURT: All right. Let me see if I can find
2 it. I see a notice of exhibits, so bear with me.
3 The computers are a little bit sluggish today, so.

4 MR. DULBERG: It would be docket --

5 THE COURT: Yeah, I opened it up, so give me a
6 moment. Okay. So you're referencing in your
7 supplemental exhibit a case that I handled,
8 Interrante versus Popovich. And how do you -- what
9 is the relevance of that?

10 MR. DULBERG: I believe that all I'm showing is
11 that where judges have been involved in the prior
12 proceedings, they recuse, and I'm showing the way
13 the circuit usually handles it. That's all.

14 THE COURT: Well, okay. In that case I can
15 explain it to you, not that I think I have to, but I
16 will. Mr. Popovich represented Ms. Interrante in a
17 family law matter, which I did -- I was the
18 presiding judge over that matter. And then
19 Ms. Interrante then sued Mr. Popovich for
20 malpractice related to that.

21 That was assigned to me when I had been
22 transferred to the civil division, and under those
23 unique circumstances based on my knowledge of the
24 underlying action, I recused myself. So I think

1 that's a little bit of apples and oranges.

2 But you reference in your motion that
3 Judge Berg would be a witness in this case. How
4 would that be?

5 MR. DULBERG: I -- without -- without giving
6 away my trial strategy, I can say that there's a
7 high probability that he will be a witness.

8 THE COURT: Well, I'm not trying to have you
9 give away your trial strategy, but that's -- that
10 would be something I would have to consider, but I
11 would need some kind of basis as to why he would be
12 a witness in -- so this is essentially a malpractice
13 claim against a number of attorneys?

14 MR. DULBERG: Some are not malpractice claims.

15 THE COURT: Okay. Well, just tell me a little
16 bit about the nature of the claims if you could
17 then.

18 MR. DULBERG: Civil conspiracy to commit fraud
19 against the court. Conspiracy to commit fraud
20 against the court. Civil conspiracy to commit fraud
21 against me. Conspiracy to commit fraud against me.
22 And some of the defendants are a, what I call a --
23 well, what the Supreme Court calls prima facie
24 negligent conduct legal malpractice.

1 THE COURT: Okay. So how does Mr. Popovich fit
2 into all of that?

3 MR. DULBERG: Conspiracy charges.

4 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't hear all of
5 that?

6 MR. DULBERG: He falls not -- he does not fall
7 under legal malpractice. Everything else.

8 THE COURT: Okay. So as I understand it, and I
9 read your motion again, so Judge Berg disclosed that
10 he recused himself on Mr. Popovich's divorce case
11 involving his now ex-wife, correct?

12 MR. DULBERG: Say that again, Your Honor. I
13 missed that.

14 THE COURT: Okay. As I -- you referenced in
15 your motion I believe that Judge Berg put on the
16 record that he had recused himself in Mr. Popovich's
17 divorce case with his wife.

18 MR. DULBERG: Yes. He did state that, yes.

19 THE COURT: Okay. And so that's the basis for
20 why you believe he needs to recuse himself from any
21 matters involving Mr. Popovich?

22 MR. DULBERG: No. This is structural. This is
23 a Rule 63 structural problem. He oversaw the
24 underlying case, and he most likely will be called

1 as a witness.

2 THE COURT: Okay. And the underlying case
3 you're referring to is 17 LA 377?

4 MR. DULBERG: That is correct, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Okay. And what was the nature of
6 that case?

7 MR. DULBERG: That was a legal malpractice case
8 against Thomas Popovich and Hans Mast.

9 THE COURT: Okay. And --

10 MR. DULBERG: We're looking at a structural
11 overlap, I believe.

12 THE COURT: You've said that several times. I
13 don't really know what you mean by that, so.
14 What -- was that a jury or was that a bench?

15 MR. DULBERG: It never got anywhere. It was let
16 go on a summary judgment.

17 THE COURT: Okay. So Judge Berg entered summary
18 judgment. And now just explain to me what is the
19 relationship between this case and what you describe
20 as the underlying case of 17 LA 377?

21 MR. DULBERG: That I'd refer to my complaint.
22 It spells it out.

23 THE COURT: Okay. Give me a minute. All right.
24 Directing your attention to paragraph 24, you

1 write -- or 224, I apologize. You write this
2 complaint presents evidence to the Court and to the
3 public that Judge Thomas A. Meyer and
4 Judge Joel D. Berg also acted as co-conspirators
5 working towards the same common purpose as the named
6 defendants. What evidence do you have that
7 Judge Berg is acting as a co-conspirator?

8 MR. DULBERG: I believe we have that as an
9 exhibit attached to there.

10 THE COURT: Okay. So your complaint is -- it
11 appears hundreds of pages long. I'm doing my best
12 to get through it, but what can you tell me about
13 it? What was -- I mean it's not an everyday
14 occurrence for someone to allege that a judge is a
15 co-conspirator, so I'm curious as to what evidence
16 you have.

17 MR. DULBERG: I'm not asking the Court to find
18 bias here, okay? I'm asking the Court to apply the
19 structural safeguards of Rule 63.

20 THE COURT: Okay. For motion for substitution
21 of judge for cause you have to establish actual
22 prejudice. I'll cite the case of In Re Marriage of
23 O'Brien, 211 IL 109039. So this is not -- it's a
24 judge's decision whether to recuse him or herself

1 from a case, okay? It's not a litigant's decision.
2 It's a judge's decision. So what evidence do you
3 have that Judge Berg is prejudiced against you?

4 MR. DULBERG: You're asking me to divulge
5 evidence that's going to come out through discovery
6 and is going to come out at trial.

7 THE COURT: Well, I'm not trying to have you --
8 I'm sure you -- as you seem to be familiar with the
9 Supreme Court Rules, I assume you're familiar with
10 Supreme Court Rule 137?

11 MR. DULBERG: I would have to look it up.

12 THE COURT: Okay. It's -- it states, I'm
13 paraphrasing, but it provides that any complaint
14 filed or any pleading filed has to be done in good
15 faith after a reasonable investigation.

16 MR. DULBERG: Yes.

17 THE COURT: Okay. So what is your -- what
18 investigation have you done that led you to
19 conclude -- to plead that Judge Berg and Judge Meyer
20 is acting as a co-conspirator?

21 MR. DULBERG: I've thumbed through -- we
22 reference quite a bit the court's records. Years of
23 investigating this.

24 THE COURT: Okay. Can you enlighten me on that?

1 I mean you say -- I mean you make those allegations
2 against Judge Berg, and you say he may be a witness,
3 and I'm just trying to determine whether that's just
4 something you're pleading to try and use as a
5 vehicle to not have him hear your case or you have
6 some legitimate evidence of that.

7 MR. DULBERG: I never made allegations against
8 Judge Berg. He is not named as a witness.

9 THE COURT: Okay. I just read from your
10 complaint. Should I read it again?

11 MR. DULBERG: He has --

12 THE COURT: You allege him to be a
13 co-conspirator. That's alleging essentially a
14 crime. So that's a fairly big deal.

15 MR. DULBERG: He has -- essentially he has
16 judicial immunity, and he can't be named in the
17 complaint.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Then why are you -- I realize
19 you haven't named him as a defendant. Just again,
20 you've alleged criminal conduct by him. Whether or
21 not you can recover for that, that's what you've
22 alleged. Do you disagree with that statement?

23 MR. DULBERG: Yes.

24 THE COURT: Okay. What does a co-conspirator

1 mean to you then?

2 MR. DULBERG: I never said the words
3 co-conspirator.

4 THE COURT: Okay. I just read it from your
5 complaint, sir. Okay? Would you like me to read it
6 to you again?

7 MR. DULBERG: I'd like to be able to pull it up.

8 THE COURT: Okay. It's paragraph 224.

9 MR. DULBERG: Give me a second. I don't know
10 what it has to do with the structural problem, but
11 I'll look. Can you tell me what page you're on,
12 Your Honor?

13 THE COURT: It's paragraph 224. It looks like
14 it's probably around page 81 or so.

15 MR. DULBERG: Thank you. It's the statute of
16 limitations argument.

17 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I don't know what you
18 mean by that.

19 MR. DULBERG: Judge Berg only sat over the court
20 case for one day, and he heard arguments over the
21 statute of limitations, and it favored -- it was
22 dispositive to me, and it favored Mr. Popovich, and
23 that furthered a conspiracy that was happening, and
24 that's a real problem.

1 THE COURT: Okay. But just so the record is
2 clear, do you agree that paragraph 224 says this
3 complaint presents evidence to the Court and to the
4 public that Judge Thomas A. Meyer and
5 Judge Joel D. Berg also acted as co-conspirators
6 working towards the same common purpose as the named
7 defendants? Did you write that?

8 MR. DULBERG: Yes.

9 THE COURT: Okay. You reference paragraph or
10 Supreme Court Rule 63 a number of times. What is --
11 can you point to me what is the specific violation
12 you believe of Supreme Court Rule 63 that mandates a
13 disqualification for cause?

14 MR. DULBERG: I would have to pull up the exact
15 wording, but --

16 THE COURT: Okay. If you want to do that, go
17 ahead.

18 MR. DULBERG: Give me a second. Right off the
19 top of my head, you can't sit in adjudication over a
20 case where you may be called as a witness.

21 THE COURT: Okay. So I guess we're kind of
22 going 'round and 'round in circles. What is the
23 basis -- why would he be called as a witness? You
24 said he's involved in the underlying -- as you

1 describe, the underlying case for one day.

2 MR. DULBERG: Did that ruling further a
3 conspiracy that had a goal. It's a statute of
4 limitations argument.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else? Can you --
6 can you just elaborate or explain what actual
7 prejudice you would suffer by Judge Berg continuing
8 to hear this case?

9 MR. DULBERG: I think if you pulled anybody off
10 the street, and they asked -- and given them, showed
11 them that the judge who presided over the underlying
12 case is going to sit in adjudication over this case,
13 that's just clear they're going to say there's
14 something wrong with that.

15 THE COURT: Well, okay. I'm not necessarily
16 interested in the unknown opinions of unknown people
17 but more what -- what is the actual prejudice that
18 you can demonstrate? And when you say the
19 underlying case, and again, I apologize, it's a
20 little bit difficult to digest a several hundred
21 page complaint. But it appears that the 17 LA case
22 was in essence a malpractice case against
23 Mr. Popovich, in essence, and that this case is in
24 essence a malpractice case against Mr. Gooch, who

1 brought the malpractice action against Mr. Popovich.
2 Is that a fair summary?

3 MR. DULBERG: Basically it's Gooch firm, Clinton
4 firm, Talarico firm, but yes.

5 THE COURT: Okay. All right. And because
6 Judge Berg made a ruling in the case against
7 Mr. Popovich, you believe he would be a witness in
8 this case?

9 MR. DULBERG: Absolutely.

10 THE COURT: Is that correct?

11 MR. DULBERG: Yes, sir.

12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything else you
13 want to add before I let the other attorneys weigh
14 in?

15 MR. DULBERG: No, sir.

16 THE COURT: Thank you. All right. I guess
17 we'll start with Mr. Gooch and go from there.

18 MR. GOOCH: Your Honor, I would only point out,
19 and I think you've already touched on it, that
20 motion does not set forth any factual allegations as
21 to any actual prejudice by Judge Berg against the
22 plaintiff. Secondly, I mean saying you're going to
23 call the judge as a witness doesn't make it
24 automatic. I mean there is a long row to hoe before

1 you're allowed to call a judge as a witness, and he
2 hasn't established anything close to the prima facie
3 reasons for being able to do so. So that's a
4 nullity.

5 And I'm sure if Judge Berg believed that he
6 was going to become a witness, he would voluntarily
7 recuse himself, but there's nothing in that motion
8 that would indicate that he would be a witness. And
9 this business about keeping very secret and all that
10 is just a lot of nonsense. So obviously the motion
11 needs to be denied.

12 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

13 MR. GOOCH: Thank you, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Go ahead. Were you
15 done? All right. Anyone else wish to weigh in?

16 MR. MERLO: Judge, briefly, Robert Merlo for
17 defendants Popovich and Mast. The plaintiff's
18 motion, as Your Honor nailed down there, is based
19 entirely upon Judge Berg's prior ruling in a prior
20 case. As Your Honor knows, that can't be a basis to
21 disqualify him for cause.

22 And in any event, if the judge was called
23 to sit as a witness, he would not -- he would not
24 testify because the law is such that the judge has

1 no obligation to testify about his deliberative
2 process in making a ruling, revealing trial process,
3 or trial mental impressions.

4 Rule 213 requires you to disclose your
5 witness and what they're going to testify about. So
6 I agree with Mr. Gooch that that's a bunch of
7 nonsense. And you know, one ruling about -- one
8 ruling with which Mr. Dulberg disagrees about the
9 underlying case's statute of limitation is simply
10 not the deep-seeded favoritism or antagonism, which
11 is the requirement, the burden to prevail on a
12 substitution for cause motion.

13 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anyone else
14 wish to take a position?

15 MR. DULBERG: If I may, Your Honor?

16 THE COURT: Yeah, I just want to make sure that
17 all the defense attorneys have had a chance to --
18 all right. It doesn't sound like anyone else is
19 looking to weigh in, so go ahead, Mr. Dulberg. You
20 may reply.

21 MR. DULBERG: The motion before you is not based
22 on dissatisfaction with any ruling. It doesn't
23 state that.

24 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm not trying to beat

1 a dead horse here, but is the basis of it that he
2 may be a witness, or that he made some kind of
3 adverse ruling in what you describe as the
4 underlying case, or that he has some kind of
5 relationship with Mr. Popovich based on his recusal
6 in the Popovich divorce case, or any combination of
7 the three?

8 MR. DULBERG: He sat in the underlying case to
9 this case. That's structural.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else? Anything
11 else, Mr. Dulberg.

12 MR. DULBERG: No. I rested on my motion.

13 THE COURT: Okay. I just want to make sure you
14 had an opportunity to conclude your argument. Okay.
15 All right. This matter came before the Court on
16 plaintiff's motion for substitution of judge for
17 cause against Judge Berg. I have read the motion.
18 As I stated earlier in the hearing, the law is clear
19 that to prevail on a substitution of judge for cause
20 in a civil case, it must be definitively shown that
21 the petitioner must demonstrate actual prejudice
22 rather than a mere appearance of impropriety. I
23 cite the case of *In Re Marriage of O'Brien*,
24 211 IL 109039, 2011. And that case goes on also and

1 provides that the petitioner bears the burden of
2 establishing actual prejudice through specific
3 factual allegations supported by affidavit.

4 In this case, again, I've read the motion.
5 The motion itself seemed to be raising an issue
6 related to the fact that Judge Berg had recused
7 himself and advised Mr. Dulberg and the other
8 litigants that he had recused himself from
9 Mr. Popovich's divorce case against Mr. Popovich's
10 now ex-wife and that Mr. Popovich has appeared
11 before him hundreds of times.

12 To address that, I would certainly be happy
13 to put on the record that I also recused myself from
14 Mr. Popovich's divorce case, as did I believe a
15 number of other judges in this building, but I have
16 also continued to hear Mr. Popovich's cases as a
17 attorney where he represents a party, not as a
18 litigant as he was in his divorce case, which are
19 two very different matters. I certainly -- I don't
20 know if it's been hundreds of cases, but it
21 certainly well could have been hundreds of cases
22 where Mr. Popovich as an attorney representing a
23 client has appeared before me. So I don't see any
24 issues there or any impropriety.

1 In regard to the issue of Judge Berg making
2 a ruling in what is referred to as the underlying
3 case, which I believe is 17 LA 377, I suppose there
4 is some overlap in the cases, but they are in
5 essence different cases. That case, as Mr. Dulberg
6 acknowledged, in essence was a malpractice claim
7 against Mr. Popovich and which was dismissed
8 apparently related to a statute of limitations
9 issue, and this case appears to be in essence a
10 malpractice case against Mr. Gooch who apparently
11 was involved in representation of Mr. Dulberg in
12 that 17 LA case, 17 LA 377 case, representing
13 Mr. Dulberg in regard to his malpractice claim. So
14 I don't see any basis just on that why Mr. -- why
15 Judge Berg couldn't hear this case.

16 The last claim that I can surmise from the
17 motion is that Judge Berg may be a witness in this
18 case. I have asked Mr. Dulberg a number of
19 occasions if he could explain how that would be. I
20 read the complaint as best I can digest, and he has
21 not provided me with any concrete information as to
22 why Judge Berg just because he made a certain ruling
23 in an underlying case would therefore be a witness
24 in this case.

1 I think one of the counsel for defendants
2 alluded to that. It certainly would not be proper
3 to call a judge as a witness to have him discuss
4 about his deliberative process in reaching rulings,
5 and I haven't been provided with any other
6 information by Mr. Dulberg as to what would be the
7 basis for Judge Berg appearing as a witness in this
8 case. And just because a litigant says that a judge
9 is going to be a witness doesn't mean that in fact
10 they will be a witness.

11 As I explained I believe near the start of
12 this hearing, it is a judge's decision to recuse or
13 not recuse himself or herself in a case based on
14 following the Supreme Court Rules, including
15 Rule 63, and that is a decision for the judge to
16 make. It is not for a litigant to impose upon a
17 judge. Obviously Judge Berg is aware of the
18 situation and did not see a need to recuse, and I am
19 not sitting here to second guess that decision.

20 What I'm looking for, as I explained a few
21 minutes ago, is whether Mr. Dulberg can demonstrate
22 any actual prejudice by Judge Berg continuing to
23 preside over this case, and I've concluded that he
24 has demonstrated no actual prejudice for that to

1 happen. And therefore, for all those reasons, his
2 motion for substitution of judge will be denied. So
3 this matter will be returned to Judge Berg for
4 further proceedings. When would be a good --

5 MR. GOOCH: Your Honor, Your Honor, is there a
6 chance that we can go to Judge Berg's courtroom now
7 seeing as how we're all together?

8 THE COURT: No. I'm sure he has finished his
9 call for the day. I would have no idea where that
10 is, and we need to give it another status date. If
11 people want a short status date, that's fine.

12 MS. SERSHON: Your Honor, I think we have
13 another date already set with Judge Berg.

14 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MR. MERLO: February 26th at 9:00.

16 THE COURT: Okay. February 26th at 9:00. Okay.
17 So we'll just keep that date. I will prepare the
18 order denying the motion for substitution of judge,
19 and that will be your next date then February 26th
20 at 9:00 a.m. before Judge Berg. All right?

21 MS. SERSHON: Thanks, Your Honor.

22 MR. MERLO: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Thank you for your time.

24 MR. RACANELLI: Judge, just one last thing on

1 behalf of Mr. Talarico.

2 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

3 MR. RACANELLI: On behalf of Mr. Talarico and
4 the law office, we're just coming into the case, and
5 I had noticed a motion to quash for today. Can we
6 just have that entered and continued to the next
7 date then in front of Judge Berg?

8 THE COURT: Yeah, I'll -- I will put language in
9 the order that all pending motions will be entered
10 and continued to that date.

11 MR. RACANELLI: Great. Thanks, Judge.

12 MS. SERSHON: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. MERLO: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Take care.

16

17 (Which were all the proceedings
18 had in the above-entitled cause
19 this date.)

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2) SS:
3 COUNTY OF McHENRY)
4

5 I, GINA ZANGARA, an official Court Reporter
6 for the Circuit Court of McHenry County,
7 Twenty-Second Judicial Circuit of Illinois,
8 transcribed the electronic recording of the
9 proceeding in the above-entitled cause to the best
10 of my ability and based on the quality of the
11 recording, and I hereby certify the foregoing to be
12 a true and accurate transcript of said electronic
13 recording.

14
15 *Gina Zangara*
16 Certified Shorthand Reporter

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Dated this 17th day of February, 2026.