CONFIDENTIAL

		1				
1	** CONFIDENTIAL **					
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
3	** CONFIDENTIAL ** UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK					
4						
5	x					
6	IN RE OPTIMAL U.S. : CASE NO.: 10-cv-4095(SAS)					
7	LITIGATION :					
8	x					
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14	DEPOSITION OF BERNARD L. MADOFF					
15	(Taken by the Plaintiffs)					
16	Butner, North Carolina					
17	August 7, 2012					
18	7:51 a.m.					
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24	Reported by: Lisa A. DeGroat, RPR					
	Notary Public					
25						

CONFIDENTIAL

```
2
                                                                                                        STIPULATIONS
 1
                        APPEARANCES
                                                                                             Before testimony was taken, it was stipulated by and between counsel representing the respective
        For the Plaintiffs:
 3
        JAVIER BLEICHMAR, Esq.
                                                                                             parties as follows:

    That any defect in the notice of the taking of this deposition, either as to time or

        ALAN I. ELLMAN, Esq.
        Labaton Sucharow, L.L.P.
                                                                                             place, or otherwise as required by statute is expressly waived, and this deposition shall have the
                                                                                        5
        140 Broadway
                                                                                             same effect as if formal notice in all respects as required by statute had been given and served upon
 5
        New York, New York 10005
        (212) 907-0887
                                                                                             the counsel in the manner prescribed by law.

2. That this deposition shall be taken for
  6
        jbleichmar@labaton.com
                                                                                             the purpose of discovery or for use as evidence in
                                                                                             the above-entitled action, or for both purposes.

3. That this deposition is deemed opened and
        For the Defendants:
                                                                                             all formalities and requirements with respect to the opening of the same, expressly including notice of
 9
        SHAWN PATRICK REGAN, Esq.
        GUSTAVO J. MEMBIELA, Esq.
                                                                                              the opening of this deposition, are hereby waived.
                                                                                              and this deposition shall have the same effect as if all formalities in respect to the opening of the
10
        Hunton & Williams, L.L.P.
                                                                                       12
        200 Park Avenue
                                                                                             same had been complied with in detail.

4. That the undersigned, Lisa A. DeGroat,
11
        New York, New York 10166
        (212) 309-1046
                                                                                              Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public,
                                                                                       15
                                                                                              is duly qualified and constituted to take this
12
        sregan@hunton.com
                                                                                              deposition.
                                                                                       16
13
                                                                                                  5. Objections to questions, except as to the
14
                                                                                       17
                                                                                             form thereof, and motions to strike answers need not
be made during the taking of this deposition, but
15
                                                                                       18
                                                                                             before any judge or any court of competent
jurisdiction for the purpose of ruling thereon, or
16
17
                                                                                             at any other hearing or trial of said case at which
said deposition might be used, except that an
objection as to the form of a question must be made
18
               DEPOSITION OF BERNARD L. MADOFF, taken by
19
        the Plaintiffs, at the Federal Correctional
                                                                                             at the time such a question is asked or objection is waived as to the form of the question.
20
        Institution - Butner Medium I, Old N.C. Highway 75,
                                                                                       21
22
                                                                                                  6. That the signature of the witness to the
21
        Butner, North Carolina, on the 7th day of August,
                                                                                              deposition is hereby reserved.
        2012, at 7:51 a.m., before Lisa A. DeGroat,
22
23
        Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public
                                                                                             7. That the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall control concerning the use of the deposition
                                                                                       24
24
        of the State of North Carolina.
25
                                                                                 3
                                                                                                                                                                       5
                             CONTENTS
                                                                                                              PROCEEDINGS
 1
                                                                                       1
 2
                                                                                       2
                                                                                                                  Whereupon,
 3
        The Witness: Bernard L. Madoff
                                                                                       3
                                                                Examination
                                                                                                               BERNARD L. MADOFF,
 4
        By Mr. Bleichmar .....
                                                                                       4
                                                                                                             having been duly sworn,
 5
                                                                                       5
                                                                                                      was examined and testified as follows:
 6
                                                                                       6
                                                                                                   DIRECT EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS
 7
                 INDEX OF THE EXHIBIT
                                                                                       7
                                                                                                      BY MR. BLEICHMAR:
 8
                                                                                       8
                                                                                                   Q. All right. Good morning, Mr. Madoff.
 9
                                           Identified Marked
        Plaintiffs'
                                                                                       9
                                                                                                       Could you, please, state your name for the
10
        Exhibit 1 Picture of the board of directors
                                                                                      10
                                                                                              record?
                  of Banco Santander, 1 pg. 166
                                                                       166
                                                                                      11
                                                                                                  A. Bernard Madoff.
11
                                                                                      12
                                                                                                       MR. BLEICHMAR: And, because there's been
12
                                                                                      13
                                                                                                  no introductions by the usual videographer, I
13
                                                                                      14
                                                                                                  will lay out on the record, my name is Javier
14
                                                                                      15
                                                                                                  Bleichmar. With me is Alan Ellman, from Labaton
15
                                                                                      16
                                                                                                  Sucharow.
16
                                                                                      17
                                                                                                       We represent the plaintiffs in the -- in
17
                                                                                      18
                                                                                                 re: Optimal Securities litigation in the United
18
                                                                                      19
                                                                                                 States Federal District Court, in the Southern
19
                                                                                      20
                                                                                                  District of Manhattan.
20
                                                                                      21
                                                                                                       And, Mr. Regan, if you'd like to
21
                                                                                      22
                                                                                                  introduce --
22
                                                                                      23
                                                                                                       MR. REGAN: Sure.
23
                                                                                      24
                                                                                                       MR. BLEICHMAR: -- counsel for the
24
                                                                                      25
25
                                                                                                  defendants.
```

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

market in a list of securities that he registers

25

At some point in time defense counsel may

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10 12

1 for.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We traded the complete 500 S&P securities, as well as about 200 NASDAQ securities as well. We carried an inventory, which at times could be as much as a billion

And our clients are primarily all of the discount firms, like Schwab and Fidelity, and the retail brokerage firms, anywhere from Merrill Lynch to Goldman Sachs and so on.

- Q. When you say you were registered with the SEC, is that registration as a broker-dealer?
 - A. A broker-dealer. Correct.
- Q. So is the market -- when you're referring to the market making business, is that effectively what's also known as the broker-dealer side of the business?

A. Yes.

Q. And what types of clients did BMIS have in the broker-dealer side of the business?

A. We had a few hundred -- about maybe 300 other broker-dealers. As I said, from -anywhere from Fidelity and Schwab and regional firms, like A.G. Edwards, to full-service firms, like Morgan Stanley, Goldman Sachs and Merrill

advisors, as opposed to just a broker-dealer.

The main reason that was was because investment -- once you register as an investment advisor, you're subject to the fraud statutes. So all brokerage firms, without exception, you know, only register as an investment advisor if deemed to be necessary based upon the regulations which require you to register if you do a certain kind of business.

When that happens, most firms will choose to build another entity where they will maintain the investment advisement business under that umbrella of the investment advisor, which is separate from the broker-dealer.

There is an exemption for broker-dealers to not register as an investment advisor, which was the exemption that we followed, which is an exemption that says as long as you did not have what they deem special compensation, in other words, you weren't charging a fee, other than a commission, which was incidental to the transaction, then you -- and you weren't doing a discretionary account, and that discretion was exempt.

25 The definition of discretion was where

11

1 Lvnch.

> We also had a number of retail clients. Some of them were very large investors, but you would classify it as institutional-type investors. Although, they were individuals or wealthy families.

And then we also had -- we started out investing for basically family and friends, doing a bona fide arbitrage strategy, which is a strategy of trading convertible securities in an arbitrage fashion.

We never did -- well, we primarily did not do any retail business, in the sense of if a client wanted to buy General Motors or IBM, then we would not handle that transaction.

We did handle transactions for some of these large investors outside of arbitrage, which were primarily hedge type of transactions in high capital vision and securities.

- Q. When you refer to investing for families and friends, is that what has been referred to as the investment advisory side of the business?
- A. No. You have to understand that the brokerage industry is basically -- has always had an issue with registering as investment

1 you -- you could have discretion for a time in 2 place of execution, but you couldn't choose the 3 security. If you followed those rules, then you

- 4 fell under the exemption of a -- of not having 5
 - to register as an investment advisor.

And we chose that exemption for 50 years or 40 some odd years. Then in the -- starting in the 2000's the SEC, because of the growth of hedge funds and the problems that were developing, wanted firms to register as investment advisors.

That was met with a huge amount of opposition from the industry, which I was part of, because I was at that time on various committees and boards in the industry.

And the fight went on for a number of years. Primarily because of the reason that I stated, about firms not wanting to have to register as an investment advisor, which included even hedge funds, who had no registration, even as broker dealers.

The -- there was an issue in -- that started, I guess, in maybe 2004 or '05, where the SEC went to some of our clients, and we were executing trades for hedge funds, large hedge

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

funds. And because those firms were deeming us to be an advisor on their offering documents, the SEC chose to take the position that they felt that we should register.

We objected to registering at that time, and we employed the firm of Wilmer Cutler, who was by far supposed to be the expert in securities litigation at that time.

And I had known partners in the firm, primarily Brandon Becker, through my work with the SEC and the NASD, who was the past head of market regulation.

And we -- we got into negotiations with the SEC as to whether we should register or not. It was Wilmer Cutler's position that we did not have to register because of the type of business we were doing and the exemptions that existed.

The SEC, you know, objected to that. They felt that -- that we were using discretion with a number of -- of clients, including the hedge funds.

The -- Wilmer Cutler said, no, we weren't, because of the documents that we required all of our clients, both small and large, to sign that basically stated that we are

forms, with the assistance of Wilmer Cutler and their investment management people.

And took the position that we only had a certain number of discretionary accounts, which we put on the forms. And the other accounts were nondiscretionary accounts.

Some of the forms -- some of the funds, because of documents that they had filed and wouldn't change, we considered them to be investment advisory clients. Others we did not.

The SEC then -- they lost in court a case against the hedge funds that required -- and that said you did not have to register.

At that time Wilmer Cutler called me up and said, you can give up your registration, if you so choose, because it's clear now the courts have decided they're -- you're not required to register.

At that point we said, look, we've already gone through the effort. This is going to be an ongoing battle with the SEC. We're going to keep the registration.

And all of our investment advisory business, with the funds and those clients that were -- were done -- actually, at that stage

not authorized discretion on their accounts,
 other than time and place, which was allowed,
 and that we used the same model type of
 transaction for all of our clients, large or

4 transaction for all of our clients, large or5 small, except a handful of large clients, which

6 we did not have discretion for. And we used to

7 get the instructions from those individual8 clients. Anyhow --

9 Q. So you registered as an investment 10 advisor --

A. Well, we --

Q. -- in 2006?

A. We -- right. In 2006 there was a conference call for probably two -- two or three hours between the SEC, Wilmer Cutler and myself, where they argued this issue.

The conference call ended basically with nothing being resolved, other than the fact that we were not going to register.

The -- I then decided in December of 2006, based upon rumblings from the SEC about they were going to force everybody to register anyhow, to register as an investment advisor.

We, in fact, did register as an investment advisor in 2006, filled out the

everything was pretty much done through the investment advisory side.

Q. At the beginning you mentioned that BMIS had essentially three aspects to its business, market making, proprietary trading and money management; right?

A. Correct.

Q. And this aspect of the registration as an investment advisor is the aspect that refers to the money management business; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Could you describe briefly just the proprietary trading part of the business?

A. Proprietary trading is similar to the market making business, except they're -- it's -- it's where you're trading solely for your own account as principal. You're not trading as agent for your other clients.

So primarily your firm allocates a certain amount of capital, which is deemed to be risk capital, where you maintain an inventory for either long-term or short-term.

And was -- was typical in our firm, that inventory was always hedged using various derivative products, like options and futures

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

CONFIDENTIAL 18 20 1 and convertibles to -- to limit the risk. 1 A. Yeah. It was just a broker-dealer 2 2 registration. It was, you know, with -- that Q. And was that generally a profitable 3 3 business? everybody had to have to register. 4 4 A. Yes. It was a very profitable business, O. And was it allowed to hold certain specific 5 5 as was the market making business, but securities or any types of securities? 6 6 A. Any types of securities. regulations required you to have -- to wall off 7 7 and have what's in the industry known as Chinese O. So was BMIS allowed to hold treasuries? 8 walls between the different divisions of the 8 Q. Who did the broker-dealer settle and clear 9 business. 9 10 10 So we had separation basically between through? 11 11 three businesses. We had the market making A. We cleared ourselves. 12 12 business, which was run by one of my sons, Mark Q. So it was -- it was self-clearing? 13 13 Madoff. And there was a proprietary business, A. It was a self-clearing firm from -- from 14 14 which was run by my son, Andy Madoff. 15 15 My brother basically was the compliance Q. And what does that mean, that it was 16 16 officer on both of those -- of those firms. self-clearing? 17 17 The money management side, the A. In other words, we had a back office 18 18 investment advisory business was run by me. I operation that was capable of receiving and 19 19 was also the compliance officer of that, of the delivering securities, you know, through -- with 20 money management or the investment advisory 20 your own bank accounts. 21 21 business. You didn't have what they called an 22 22 omnibus or a clearing arrangement with another They used different computer systems. 23 23 firm, like a Bear Stearns or Merrill Lynch, who There was -- we had different managers. The 24 24 rules were -- that we followed were based upon actually cleared the firms, and you just 25 an SEC no action letter that basically said you executed -- the trades, and you just executed 19 21 1 1 had to have separate managers, separate P&Ls for them. 2 2 the divisions. We had some clearing arrangements with a 3 3 There could be no communications between London operation through Barclays Bank in 4 the managers or the individuals in those 4 London. That was a separate entity, a separate 5 divisions. So they operated basically as three 5 broker-dealer, registered with the FSA in 6 6 separate firms. They could operate under the London, and was a member of the London Stock 7 7 Exchange. same trading room. 8 8 And that was formed in 19 -- I think it Also, that was basically a no action 9 9 letter, because before that time the industry was '83 or '84. That had its own capital. 10 10 Q. When you -- when you first started the had sort of absurd types of arrangements where 11 they would have a locked room in the middle of 11 firm, I think you said, approximately 1960? 12 the trading room, and that was deemed to be --12 A. That's correct. 13 13 Q. That was clearly before the advent of all basically First Boston filed for a no action 14 14 letter that said this is insane, to have that of this technological advancement; right? 15 15 A. That is correct. type of a system. 16 16 So that was when the SEC said, okay. Q. Could you describe for me mechanically how 17 17 Fine. As long as you have separate management the clearing process worked when the securities were 18 18 and P&L, you can all have it under -- under one actually physical?

> 20 handled by messengers. In other words, if you 21 bought 100 shares of IBM from Merrill Lynch, it 22

19

23

24

25

Q. And the market making and proprietary trading business were clearly part of the broker-dealer business; correct?

A. Yes.

24 Q. And was there a specific type of 25 registration that the broker-dealer had?

was a seven-day settlement. Seven days after you purchased the

A. They were done -- securities were

transaction -- well, immediately you would send out a confirmation, which is, you know, a

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

19

20

21

22

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

22

24

1 document that basically mirrors what the trade 2 was, the monies involved.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On settlement day, which was seven days originally, Merrill Lynch would deliver the securities over what's called a window to your back office operation.

And you would pay for those securities either with a certified check or a regular check from the bank, or they might take it to be certified and so on.

Q. You would hold physically the securities?

A. You would physically hold the securities in -- in your vaults, bank vaults or your own vault, depending upon what your -- what your capability was.

Q. And if you weren't a self-clearing organization, did that mean that that exchange of the security and the cash occurred somewhere else?

A. Yes. You would -- you had a -- normally you'd have a clearing arrangement with a clearing firm, like a Bear Stearns or a Merrill Lynch, who would act as your back office.

The securities from -- that you had bought from Merrill Lynch would be delivered to the clearing firm of -- for your account.

And at that time, you know, as I say, you were doing a few trades a day. So it was not that difficult, but most -- there were many, 4 many firms that had capital in the thousands of 5 dollars.

To give you an example, as recently as the '50s Morgan Stanley's total capital was 15 million dollars, which more people are shocked to hear that today. So it was just a totally different -- a different business.

Q. So once technology became more prevalent in the financial world, how did the clearing mechanism change?

A. Well, I guess you could blame me for that partly, because -- which I get blamed for everything it seems.

Sometime in the '70s there was a paperwork crisis, where knowing -- the volumes of business grew, and no one knew -- no one knew -- no one knew what was happening in the industry. People working 24 hours a day to try and sell their trades.

And there were five of us that came up with the concept of having a centralized clearing organization. That was a very

23 25

You would have money on deposit with 1 2 that clearing firm, and the transaction would be 3 handled completely by them. And they would 4 typically hold the securities in safekeeping 5 for -- for you. 6 7

O. Was it customary for firms like BMIS in the early days, in the 1960s and '70s, to be self-clearing firms?

A. Yeah, yeah. It was -- the business was very, very different. It was much, much smaller scale. It was a time that there were many, many boutique -- what you would now call boutique type of firms.

We were unique when we registered, because we registered with less than \$500 worth of capital, which was something that the SEC had

never seen to that point. The --I was in law school at the time, was primarily doing business with a handful of family and friends. It was not uncommon to have small firms like that, but, as I say, \$500 probably stretched the imagination, to the point that the SEC required me to have an audience with them to make sure that I was for real,

which I did. And they couldn't object to it.

1 controversial position.

> Q. Which -- who were the five, out of curiosity?

A. Bennett, who was from A.G. Edwards & Sons. I think it was Charlie Allen, from Allen & Company. I think Oppenheimer was involved.

And I don't recall the others any longer. My brain is somewhat fried with everything that's happened here.

So -- but at that time the -- the clearing -- the industry was basically handled by either large brokerage firms, like Bear -like a Bear Stearns or Merrill Lynch, or large banks, like Chemical Bank, you know.

Most of those banks have now been merged into other ones, but -- Manufacturers Hanover. And also cleared for brokerage firms.

So they saw a centralized clearing and depository organization as a big threat to their business, which it was.

Well, we -- we, you know, struggled through a period of time where the SEC realized that this -- the industry had to change, in spite of the objections by the turf wars that

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

were going on between the banks.

And we formed a clearing organization
called National Securities Clearing Corporation.
And the idea of that -- that business was to
basically act as a central clearing organization
for firms, so that if we bought stock from
Merrill Lynch, Merrill Lynch would deliver those
securities to the clearing corporation.
The clearing corporation that same day

The clearing corporation that same day would bill us for the transaction. We would have on deposit certain monies that they would hold in escrow for us to assure that we were --you know, in a crisis mode we're able to sell the trades.

But the trades basically still at the end -- on the settlement day, on seven days, we -- the clearing corporation would let us know, okay. You have net settlements, net buys of X number of dollars. And we would -- we would pay them by wiring money in to settle the transactions.

And pretty much, with the SEC's prodding, everybody joined the clearing corporation, providing it had enough capital to -- to apply as a member. The --

trades within one day.And when you buy securit

And when you buy securities now, I may buy from Merrill Lynch, and I may sell to someone else. At the end of the day you never even know who you bought and sold the securities from, because the clearing corporation is on the -- is on the -- is the counterparty to the transaction.

Q. And the clearing corporation today in this instance was DTC?

A. Yes.

Q. So what is the difference between clearing through DTC and having self-custody?

A. Well, there virtually is very little self-custody anymore in the industry today, because of the fact that all of the business is done through the clearing corporation.

So the clearing corporation holds those securities as a custodian for its -- for its members.

The only time you would hold custody in securities in your own vault would be if, in fact, it was an instrument that was not handled by DTC.

Government bonds were -- treasury bonds

Then that morphed into the Depository Trust Company, which now it's one organization. You know, referred to as DTC, where the --

everything is done through -- through oneorganization.

I served as -- as chairman of the clearing corporation from 19 -- I guess it was '83 or '4 through 1987. I -- and was on the board of the clearing corporation.

My brother was a board member of the Depository Trust Company.

The -- and those -- that organization cleared primarily equities. It then grew -- it eventually cleared government bonds and -- and other bonds and also international securities.

I was chairman of the International Clearing Corporation, which is part of that organization as well. And that basically, you know, allowed the industry to grow to the level that it grew until presently, because it was a seamless type of a transaction.

And to where it is now, settlement really basically happens in one day, rather than seven days. Although, it's still a three-day settlement, but you have to sort of match the

1 were handled.

2 Primarily it was -- it could have
3 been -- it could be held as just custody at DTC
4 as well, or a lot of firms held it with a
5 custodian bank that was a primary dealer in

custodian bank that was a primary dealer in securities.

We had billions of dollars worth of treasuries in custody at Morgan Stanley, JPMorgan, Bank of New York, Bear Stearns. We typically, you know, up until pretty much the end of my firm --

Q. Is this on the market making business side?

A. No. In the -- in the investment advisory firm.

We typically had, you know, upwards of four billion dollars worth of treasury bills in -- in custody at those firms. Where -- all of our equities were held at DTC.

Q. So let's -- let me take a step back and discuss the money management, slash, investment advisory side of the business.

So who are -- who are your investors generally in that side of the business?

A. The investment -- the management?

Q. Yes.

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

30 32 1 A. Well, primarily hedge funds and banks. let's say that it was all basically deemed to be 2 The lines were blurred between the hedge funds investment management, handled by myself, was a 3 3 and the banks, because a lot of the hedge funds completely legitimate business, where we 4 cleared and settled through banks or owned by 4 actually were going out and purchasing 5 5 banks and so on. So -- but primarily the bulk securities involved and holding the securities. 6 6 of the business was hedge funds and -- and And those were completely legitimate 7 7 transactions. 8 8 Q. So, if I understand this correctly, the In the late '80s I got myself into a bit 9 hedge funds and the banks would provide you with 9 of difficulty with a number of large investors, 10 primarily four investors that had been investors funds to invest on their behalf? 10 11 MR. REGAN: Objection. 11 of mine for many, many years, who were doing a 12 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. form of hedging with me to -- basically the goal 13 13 MR. REGAN: You can answer. was to obtain long-term gains on security 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. 14 positions that they held. 15 15 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: At the -- during the crash of '87 -- and 16 Q. And -- and how did you invest that money? 16 let me just back up. 17 17 The -- those -- those transactions A. Well, we -- let's talk pre --18 18 Q. Let me take it back. involved buying a portfolio of securities and 19 19 How did -- what did you tell these then hedging them with options, but not with a 20 investors of how you invested that money? 20 model, as I was doing with the others. It's a 21 21 MR. REGAN: Objection. distinct situation. 22 You can answer. 22 The idea would be you would hold 23 THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, the investment 23 those -- they would hold those securities for at 24 24 strategy that we used for all of the hedge that time a one-year period, which was the 25 funds, which were in banks, which are the same, holding period for long-term gains, and they 31 33 1 as well as individual clients that we had, was 1 would hedge those securities by selling -- doing 2 2 basically a form of option arbitrage, where we what's known as covered rights options or buy 3 3 developed a model where we bought originally 15 inputs against those securities. 4 securities. That then grew into 50 securities 4 At that same time, starting in 1980, I 5 5 in the S&P 500. was doing a large arbitrage business in 6 6 And we hedged those transactions using S&P convertible securities with European banks, 7 100 index options, which had a correlation to 7 primarily a bank called Banque Privee, de 8 that -- to those securities. Gestion Français, which is a Paris bank, private 9 That was -- that started in the -- in the 9 investment bank, which -- who was introduced to 10 10 '80s. And that was a -- a business that we did me by a Swiss banker that I knew. 11 for everyone, including hedge funds and so on. 11 And primarily there was a French client 12 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: 12 by the name of Albert Igoin, I-g-o-i-n, who was 13 13 Q. And is that -an ex-banker, who was primarily a private 14 14 A. A hedge -investor. 15 15 Q. Is that business generally referred to And they were -- they had approached me 16 16 as -- or that strategy referred to as the

And they were -- they had approached me in 1980 to do convertible security arbitrage for them, which was the buying of convertible securities and selling simultaneously the equity side of the business, which was something that we had done for many, many years and had developed a business that was --

We were one of the largest convertible securities on Wall Street. Traded convertible securities as a market maker.

This -- this business went on from 1980

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

split-strike conversion strategy?

Q. I didn't mean to interrupt. Go ahead.

A. No. The -- the hedge fund money

basically came in in the '90s. And up until the

the -- for everybody in the investment advisory

or investment management side, even though I

wasn't registered as an investment advisor, but

'90s the business was -- that I was doing for

A. Yes. Right.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

into the '90s, and simultaneous to me doing that business.

And they -- that -- that bank was also the counterparty on the equity sides of the business that I was doing for the four large investors.

It's relevant -- and hopefully it'll become a little bit clearer a little bit as I get into the story. The -- so -- and it was a good fit for everybody.

There was also a -- I was approached at -- at the same time by this bank and some other French banks that were interested in utilizing a strategy to hedge their positions in the French franc.

In those days French citizens could not hedge currencies. There were currency controls in -- that existed in 1980, when Mitterrand came into France. Things were in a turmoil. He started nationalizing the bank. He nationalized Rothchild and some other banks.

And everybody was worried about them becoming -- going communist. So there was a tremendous move to try and hedge the currency, but you couldn't do that.

They would buy -- they would take those
 million dollars and pay for the million dollars
 worth of securities we had. In this way they
 owned dollars.
 Now, of course, that put them at risk of

Now, of course, that put them at risk of the U.S. equity market. So they approached me with -- because we were known as a big hedging firm at that time, they said, can you hedge our market risks?

We don't -- we're not looking to make any money in the market, quite frankly. We won't object to it, but we primarily are willing to -- to make our money from the currency, from being long dollars and out of francs, as long as we didn't lose money in the equity side.

So I went about -- and this transaction was simple -- according to them was -- was prior to this handled by Goldman Sachs and other large firms, but they were charging them large -- large fees to do this.

At that stage our reputation was a low cost execution provider, because of the technology that we already developed, and because of the large amounts of order flow we had.

35 37

If you were a French citizen, you
 weren't even allowed to take francs out of the
 country. When a French citizen traveled, they
 could only take enough money to basically not
 even buy hotel rooms.
 So they needed friends to give them

So they needed friends to give them money to pay for these things. It was, you know, absurd, but that's the way it was.

Anyhow, the banks approached me with a strategy that allowed them to hedge the currency -- the French currency by the following procedure.

They were allowed to sell French francs and buy dollars, providing the dollars that they were purchasing were used to pay for U.S. equities, which, obviously, was a requirement.

If you -- if we bought stock for a client, we didn't want to be paid in francs. We wanted to be paid in dollars. So they would -- they would take their French francs and sell them.

And if they needed a million dollars, they would sell a million of those French francs. The bank would convert it to a million dollars in -- in dollars.

So we negotiated with them that we would do the hedging transaction, handle the whole thing for them at a lower -- lower rate than they were charged.

This made a natural fit for these large clients that I was trading for, who were interested in buying a large portfolio of U.S. equities.

So I was able to, you know, cross the transactions in the U.S. equities with the equities that the bank was doing, hedge their transaction with options and so on.

Okay. I don't know if you're all following this, because the SEC had a great deal of difficulty --

- Q. And at that point --
- A. -- with this.
- Q. Let me -- let me try to break that up a little bit in pieces.
- A. Okay.
- Q. So, in other words, the French banks send you French francs to purchase equities --
 - A. No.
- 24 Q. -- correct? 25 A. That's don
 - A. That's done by the -- they --

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

the option transaction, and Mr. Shapiro, Mr. Levy,

Q. How is this related to the French banks?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

42

44

1 Stanley Chase and Picower were on the other side?

A. Yes, but --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

24

25

Q. And you were in the middle?

A. But I was in the middle, as -- because those transactions were basically handled as principal transactions, which is typically the way the market makers trade.

Q. So when did -- where did it go wrong?

A. Okay. When the market crashed in '87, these four clients, primarily Picower and Shapiro, were concerned that the market was going to continue to go into a free-fall, and they were going to lose the advantage of their long-term gains that they had been holding. Now, of course, from 1980 until 1987 the

market -- when I -- when -- I devised the strategy for them in 1980. The strategy was dependent upon the market going up, because you can't get long-term gains unless the market goes

Prior to this they were using Silver Straddles and all of these different types of Mickey Mouse type of hedging strategies, tax shelters, which the government was disallowing anyhow.

they, as typical retail clients, even though

- they were wealthy retail clients, would do is
- 3 they decided that they did not want to lose
- 4 these gains, which they always objected to
- 5 selling over the years, even though their --
- 6 their holding period was -- was long past, but 7 they were --

Not only now did they want the long-term gains, they wanted to defer paying the taxes on the long-term gains as well, which is, you know, the -- not that hard to understand, if you knew -- if you did a client business.

So this led to them basically saying, well, look, we've got to sell, because you can't guarantee the market is going to go down.

16 I said, well, that's true. Now, you're 17 hedging. You're not going to lose anything, but 18 you will lose the long-term gain aspect of it.

> At that time also there was rumblings from the IRS about shelter -- about Straddle --Silver Straddles and long-term gains and hedging and all of this stuff that was going on.

> > So they basically --

Q. When you say there was rumors from the IRS that they would disallow the --

43 45

1 So I went to them at that time, and I 2 said, look, the only way you're going to get 3 long -- you're going to -- you really get

sheltered income is by trying to develop

4

5 long-term gains in the equity market. 6

Their concern was, well, that means the market going up. And I said, look, well, that's for sure. I said, I can't guarantee that, but at that time I felt strongly about the market, because it just looked to me to be bottoming out.

And I said, you know, you have nothing to lose by trying it. So they gave me the go ahead, and we developed this.

Well, by the time 1987 came we had huge -- billions of dollars worth of long-term gains.

- Q. And by, "we," who are you referring to?
- 18 19 A. Meaning the clients, you know. All I 20 was making was the commissions and markups on 21 the transactions. I was not a party to the 22 transactions.
 - Q. And, "the clients," meaning Mr. Shapiro and Picower?
 - A. Shapiro, Picower and Chase. The -- so

1 A. That they --

Q. -- ability not --

A. -- were changing the rules -- the

4 Straddle rules on hedges, that basically said

5 that, if, in fact, you are long one security and

6 short a similar security, which was part of the 7

strategy, they were going to disallow that, because there was no risk involved in that.

So --

to --

A. The long-term gain. Q. The long-term gain. Correct.

A. Right.

The -- I was put in an awkward position, because I was being pressured by these clients to sell their long equity positions, take their profits.

Q. They were going to disallow the ability not

And they then said, but they -- I said, well, look, it's a problem for me, because I can't -- if I sell the equities, then I'm open -- you're open on the -- on the hedge side of the transaction, and you're at risk.

Well, they said, well, the market is going to go down anyhow. So, therefore, they --

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

46

48

49

the money that they would -- they were short, the hedges they were short, were going to be a profit as well.

I said, well, that's not -- that's not a quarantee.

So the -- there was a -- there was a -a lot of negotiation between me and the four clients, because I felt obligations to the French clients, who were on the other side of the hedges. And --

- Q. And who were the French clients?
- A. Banque Privee.
- O. Banque Privee.
- 14 A. And Albert Igoin.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I said, look, this has, you know, put me in an awkward position. The understanding, which we all agreed to, was that these trades were going to be held for -- you know, until they were ready to unwind the transaction on their side.

So I foolishly decided that I would step in, and I would take their position on the short side of the option, which meant that basically I was now at risk for the -- for the market, you know, going up, because I was now short the

for all of them becoming billionaires. And we were -- you know, our families were close.

So they said to me, look, we will change our trust agreements and our wills, so that you will be held harmless.

Meaning now they couldn't -- they said, look, you are in charge of investing for us forever. And even after we die -- because by now Picower -- not Picower, but Shapiro was, you know, in his late 80s. Levy was the same.

I said, look, you know, I don't want to have to deal with your children, you know, you know, on a -- to say basically, your father told me so.

So their lawyers put together -- they changed their trust agreements, that basically said that I was the only one that could invest. I was not liable for any risk involved in this.

As a matter of fact, Levy's bank was the trustee of his -- and the bank said, look, you know, we want to be the -- we want to be the executor. We want to be responsible for investing, not Madoff.

And he said, no, no. So he -- I then became the executor of his estate and all of his

47

options that they were short and the -- and I didn't have the equities to cover that, which -- children's trusts and so on and so forth.

And the -- there were other arrangements made between their foundations and me, where I would invest money for their foundation accounts, which I was investing. And --

O. So what -- so what went wrong?

A. Well, the market, as I had feared, went up. I theoretically was covered by them, even though it was sort of a bizarre arrangement, to be -- to be guite honest with -- but --

And that was a major, major blunder on my part, which is still hard for me to understand. And hard for my -- probably wife to understand and my sons.

Although, quite frankly, they weren't even aware of this. My sons are still not aware of it. My wife just became aware of it, you know, recently.

The -- I just foolishly did this, because I didn't want to ruin the relationship with the -- with the banks.

I never thought the market would run the way it did. You know, I thought it would recover, but not at the levels that it did.

And, unfortunately, Jeffry Picower, who

because they had sold -- I had sold that for

So I said, look, I can't do this, because I think the market is going to go up eventually, and this is going to be a disaster.

So they said, okay. Look, we'll hold you harmless for the option loss, because we think the market is going to go down.

So I said, well, how are you going to do that?

So they said, well, we'll -- we will change our trust in -- you have to understand, these people are like family to me. So it was -- it was a -- a very close relationship. It wasn't just a business relationship.

Q. In what way were they like family?

A. Well, they were sort of like -- Shapiro was sort of like a father figure to me. So was Norman Levy.

Picower, who really was my age, was not, but I was the executor of his estate and all of this -- those things.

And I was basically the one responsible

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

And that was for two reasons. Number

In other words, the hedge funds, as long

one, the hedge fund business was a business that

I really disliked, because it was known as hot

21

22

23

24

25

money business.

me believe that.

Q. Uh-huh.

A. Picower lost money, or at least he let

MR. REGAN: When convenient, could we take

A. And I had no reason to not.

21

22

23

24

as you were making money for them, loved you and
 would stay with you and so on, but at the first
 sign of fire, you know, and trouble, they would
 disappear and take their money back, which, of
 course, would always come at an inopportune
 moment.
 The -- so I basically said to these

The -- so I basically said to these hedge funds, look, you know, I don't want -- I don't want to build up a business with hedge funds and then find it disappearing, you know, for some reason one day overnight.

And they, in turn, said, well, look, if you want long-term money from us, that's a different kind of client than we typically have, and we have to commit to those clients that you're going to invest it.

So, ironically, they were more worried about me not investing -- continuing to invest the money than I was worried about them, you know, running for the exits.

So there was a -- an understanding that I would -- even though there was no guarantee on either side, that the understanding was that I was going to invest this money for them, and that they were going to get the type of client

the court have a hard time believing that, but to this day they've never been able to put forth any evidence that contradicts what I had said.

Q. And how did it become illegitimate?

A. It became a problem, because I had --well, let me just give you a preamble a little bit. I'll try and make it short.

Market makers, like myself, continuously trade sometimes on the short side of the market. In other words, where we're actually obligated by the SEC rules to maintain a continuous market, which means once we put out a quote it has to be a two-sided quote, regardless of whether or not we actually own a security.

So if I happen to be -- if IBM has been constantly moving up, and I don't have any stock in inventory, I am still required to offer stock out to my clients, meaning from the short side of the market.

So most market makers will -- are continuously trading on both sides of the market. Long, meaning they own securities, have an inventory, and short, meaning the -- they're selling stock they don't own, with the expectation of buying it back at a lower price,

55 57

that was going to be a long-term investor.

And they disclosed -- disclosed the

client -- the type of client that they had. And

I met some of those clients, and those clients
 were anywhere from Bernard Arnault, from Louis

were anywhere from Bernard Arnault, from
Vuitton, to L'Oreal, the -- the Bettencourt

7 woman from L'Oreal.

Q. Uh-huh.

A. To Swiss bankers and so on and so forth.

Q. So that was the legitimate strategy for this split-strike conversion strategy; right?

A. Right

MR. BLEICHMAR: Why don't we take a short break and then pick up from here.

MR. REGAN: Yeah.

MR. BLEICHMAR: Let's go off the record. (RECESS FROM 8:53 A.M. TO 9:01 A.M.)

MR. BLEICHMAR: Back on the record.

BY MR. BLEICHMAR:

Q. What -- when did the money management business became illegitimate?

A. Did it become or illegitimate?

Q. Illegitimate.

A. It started in '92, as I've testified.

Although, for some reason, the government and

hopefully, or possibly at a higher price at a loss. It is very common, and there is -- as I say, it's part of doing business.

So the idea of -- and, not only that, I mean if you decided you didn't like the market, you could actually go short and just hope the market is going to go down.

But most market makers always have a short condition as a hedge against their long inventory, even if it's a different type of security.

And I, of course, because I was -- I had a business of doing arbitrage since the very beginning, where I was long bonds and short stock and converted them. It was a natural thing for me to do.

So I was in a situation where after I had taken on some money for these funds in the early '90s, that the market went into sort of a -- we -- the market was -- we were in a recession.

The Gulf War, you know, occurred. The market was just doing nothing. And in order for this -- my strategy to work, we basically needed primarily an upmarket. Not necessarily

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

www.veritext.com

58

continuous upmarket, but a market that had a lot of spikes in it, where it would give you the opportunity to trade from the long side, and then also be able to shorten the option side and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The -- the strategy basically was that when I was not in the market I would put the money, the capital, that I had to invest from these funds, or all clients, in treasury bills.

That was part of the stated strategy, which was all laid out in documents of what was something that we called trading authorization and a trading directive.

So I was in a situation where I was being pressured by the funds to put this money to work, because when I -- when they -typically they would send me in money, it would be a million dollars, five million dollars.

The money would immediately go into treasuries, and it would stay there. And it would earn, in those days, a couple of percent in treasuries, as opposed to maybe 12 or 13 percent, which was what the expectation was and the strategy.

So -- but the money would sit there

was violated and so on.

And I assumed that it was going to be a temporary situation. So I realized, obviously, I'm now, in reality, earning two percent on the money and paying out in the sense of profits, you know, 12 or 13 percent. So I have a net loss of ten, 11 percent each transaction.

60

- Q. Explain that to me again.
- A. Well, the confirmation that they were receiving --
 - Q. So you weren't executing the transaction?
- A. I wasn't executing the transaction correctly. So the transaction is now a bogus transaction. It's -- well, in their minds -vou have to understand that they don't -- they couldn't care less, nor could any other client, whether I am actually long on the stock or not.

That's something that is hard for people to understand, but, as I say, when you -- if you go and you call Merrill Lynch and tell Merrill Lynch, I want to buy Apple Computer, and Merrill Lynch, either from their own inventory, if they're a market maker, sells you Apple Computer, they may not own Apple Computer.

You own Apple Computer. And you

59

61

- makes or doesn't make on the Apple Computer.
- 3 Your contract is with Merrill Lynch, and you own
- the Apple Computer. And this is the way 4 5
 - business is done.

As opposed to what most people think, you know, that -- that isn't the way it's done. They think that they actually own the stock, and there's a physical certificate somewhere, and that they are the owner.

And they are the owner, for all intents and purposes, from a legal standpoint, but there is no -- there's nothing on the other side of the transaction, other than the good faith of the broker, that says he is going to produce that if you want to sell it, and you're going to get the -- you're going to get the dividend, if there's a dividend involved in it, and so on with it.

That's coming from a short return, not as academic to you.

- A. I would produce a confirmation, which

1 can't -- couldn't care less what Merrill Lynch 2

Q. So you would produce --

would be no different than if Merrill Lynch came to me and wanted to buy Apple Computer, and I

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

or -- being stored or parked, as they call it in the industry, in treasury bills, waiting for an opportunity to go into the market.

But since -- as the market sort of refused to cooperate, they were sitting in -- in treasuries.

And I started getting phone calls from these guys, saying, look, you know, you've got to start putting the money to work. You know, we're not interested in just making, you know, treasury bill interest. We don't need you for that.

And, of course, their clients, who were all very aggressive clients, are pushing them, you know, to -- you know, what's going on? You know, the first, you know, months' returns are like two percent, you know.

So I made my second blunder, and I said, okay. Look, I'll shorten the position goal, which I was perfectly legal in doing. There was nothing illegal about that.

If you looked at the confirmations that I was supplying, it said that I am acting as principal. I'm selling stock for them, and this was not a -- not a problem. No SEC regulation

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

was only about 500 million dollars, as opposed

Q. And what was your recollection of Optimal

to, you know, six billion eventually.

A. I don't recall. I don't recall.

BY MR. BLEICHMAR:

20

21

22

23

24

25

in 1995?

short the call.

that, but they basically --

A. Okay. I never stopped doing that. So

they were -- you know, I would just generate the

confirmation. I was short the stock. They were

Again, I don't know if you're following

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

66

68

69

1 Q. What was your understanding of who were the 2 underlying investors in these funds, in these hedge 3 funds or feeder funds?

A. Well, okay. The understanding was that they were all sophisticated investors.

Q. Now, what does that mean to you, "sophisticated investors"?

A. Well, my investors were basically required to do -- well, they signed documents that basically said that they had a net worth of -- a minimum of -- I would say the smallest was a minimum net worth of 250 million dollars.

Q. Million?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Yeah. 250 million dollars -- I'm sorry. \$250,000. Numbers get a little confusing to me. \$250,000. And they had income of \$100,000. And the net worth was exclusive of homes, of real estate.

The -- that was -- they basically deemed to be a sophisticated investor from NCC, you know, regulations and so on. They also signed documents that said that they understood that there was a risk --

24 Q. Uh-huh.

A. -- involved in the type of transaction

other than Tremont. And even they had -- they had sophisticated clients.

And most of them were European. They were all European, you know, hedge funds. And the typical clients that they had --

Q. And why were they typically European?

A. Because most hedge funds, big hedge funds, were registered in tax savings. They were registered in the BVIs or Switzerland and so on for -- for tax purposes and for disclosure purposes.

And that's basically what -- where hedge funds, since the beginning of time. They were -- so --

And I was, you know, told that they were these types of investors, because they said that was the only kind of investor that they could get to commit to a long-term -- you know, to a long-term type of investment.

And that made sense also, because they said, look, these people are going to have to liquidate other investments that they have, and they don't want to liquidate these other investments and then come in to you, and then next month you're going to --

67

Q. Right.

that they were doing, and that the gains were going to be basically short-term trading gains, which inherently had a risk involved in it.

When the feeder funds came to me, I was basically looking at them as typical hedge fund type of investor, which all had net worths of -in the, you know, millions of dollars.

Q. Meaning the underlying investors?

A. The underlying investors.

Q. So your understanding was that the underlying investors in the feeder funds were -- had a net worth in the millions?

A. Yeah. I mean, now, typically the feeder funds had a smaller type of investors than the regular funds, regular hedge funds, but they weren't -- none of them basically were -- all the feeder funds were -- were basically --

I was of the opinion, based upon the conversations I had with them, that they were not soliciting smaller clients. That these were all sophisticated clients of, you know, substantial net worths in the millions.

And typically these -- that was the kind of investor that invested with these funds. These were not domestic, for the most part,

2 A. -- say, you know, game over. So it was 3 understood. And it was a sophisticated type of 4 a trade. This was a -- you know, not your 5 typical type of hedge fund investment, where 6

they would just buy a portfolio of securities.

It was a hedge transaction. The appeal of this strategy was that you could do large -commit large amounts of money in a hedge transaction.

Your returns were going to be lower than you would make in just a straight market, long-only strategy, but you -- you had -- the risk was hedged, which would enable them to commit more money than they normally would to just a risk type of a strategy. So this was understood.

Q. Let's turn to -- to Optimal. When did Optimal begin investing with BMIS?

A. I -- I really do not remember.

Q. Approximately?

A. I would assume in the late '90s. I'm guessing, though.

Q. And who was the -- your original contact

18 (Pages 66 to 69)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

74

76

or down, the hedge moves up or down, and there's always a difference in arbitrage spread between those transactions.

So -- and the strategy that we used we laid out. It was -- it was documented. It was instructions of what -- of what these securities entailed, what the correlation was, and it was easy to monitor --

Q. Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. -- those strategies. So it was -- it -it did not take any rocket science to -- to understand the strategy for -- certainly for a manager, you know.

Q. So you mentioned that you met Mr. Echeverria approximately in the mid '90s; correct?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And --MR. REGAN: Objection, but go ahead. BY MR. BLEICHMAR:

O. And over the years how many times or how often would you have contact with Mr. Echeverria?

A. Well, it varied. There was always -there was the initial meeting or series of meetings.

pressed to find people that knew who I was, but within the industry, both from the regulatory side or from the industry side, we were certainly well-known.

We were doing, by the time they came on stream, ten percent of all of the equity trading, as I said. So our market making operation was highly regarded, and --

Q. When you say, "by the time they came," you're referring to --

A. Echeverria.

O. -- people at Optimal?

A. Yeah. So that would be a meeting. And, you know, then another meeting would be with possibly their due diligence team, which could be one or two people.

Q. Who do you remember from their -- from Optimal's due diligence team?

A. Well, I remember Jonathan Clark, was one person. It was -- I will tell you that I was never 100 percent sure of who I was meeting with.

And this was because a lot of these funds, they would try and bring up people that were not supposed to attend the meetings. In

77 75

Q. Do you remember those?

2 A. Yeah. I mean the original meeting would 3 be a -- an exploratory meeting, where the 4 manager or, you know, a group of people, you know, that was in his organization, could be two 5

or three, would meet me.

We would sort of feel each other out, as to whether or not, number one, I was -- thought they -- they were the type of people that I would want to do business with, that they had the type of clients that I felt the strategy was suitable for and that they basically understood the strategy.

And that, you know, they had a reputation of being, you know, legitimate. Meaning they weren't representing necessarily hot money or, you know, questionable money and so on.

So there was sort of a -- everybody was taking each other's temperature. Of course, you know, I had at that stage a substantial reputation in the industry. So they were -most of them knew me, knew of me.

Their clients certainly did not, because outside of the industry itself you'd be hard

other words --

Q. What do you mean by that?

3 A. Well, I made it very clear that I was not interested in entertaining a competitor. All right. I was not interested in them

5 bringing up a -- someone who ran their

7 derivative desk or run their arbitrage desk or

equity trading, who was going to pick my brains and try and mimic my strategy.

So I said, look, I don't mind meeting with the manager. I don't mind meeting with a legitimate due diligence person, who was not deemed to be a competitor, but that was the understanding.

And that privilege was sometimes followed and sometimes abused. Sometimes people would show up, who -- even though sometimes they would give me business cards. Sometimes they inconveniently didn't have a business card.

Sometimes I would find out that they actually were running the derivative desk or they were running their equity trading desk.

And sometimes they were their clients. Sometimes it was a large investor that was

showing up and just sat there, listening to the

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

78 80 1 Q. Uh-huh.

- 1 presentation. 2 Q. And why didn't you want an investor to meet 3 with you?
 - A. I wouldn't want an investor to meet with me.
 - Q. And why not?

4

5

6

7

8

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Because it was understood that I was not doing retail business. I did not want

9 investors -- basically it was -- there was --

10 there was always an understanding that I was not 11 to be marketed by these funds for the following 12 reason.

> I -- my reputation in the industry was that of a wholesaler. My basic clients in the market making side of my business were other dealers, who would basically not be thrilled with me going after their retail clients or institutional clients.

So Goldman Sachs or Merrill Lynch would not be interested in me, you know, taking their clients away from them, whom might be investing in their own hedge funds or their own investments, and putting money with me.

24 So basically I said, okay. Everyone in 25 the industry knows that -- that funds are fair

A. -- when they're not making the decision? You know, Madoff is the guy, and I can go directly to him.

So there was always this understanding that they didn't want me to deal with their clients. I didn't want -- and I didn't want to deal with -- with their clients.

And this grew up as being this mysterious, secretive type of an atmosphere. In other words -- which, of course, at -competitors in the hedge fund deal -- deal, that were not my competitors, and some of the media looked at this as don't ask, don't tell.

There were articles written, Bernie is very secretive and so on and so forth, but, quite frankly, the hedge fund industry has always been cloaked in mystery.

In other words, the original hedge funds would never consider talking to the clients of -- of a -- someone that's bringing them money.

If you ever called up Michael Steinhardt and said, I want to have a meeting with you, or Paul Tudor Jones or anybody, and said, explain

79 81

game for everybody, but I never would solicit retail clients, whether they be John Q Public or whether they be institutional type of clients.

And I didn't want my reputation as a wholesaler to be, you know, changed. So the -also, what I basically felt was that, look, these funds are making a fee in commission for their transactions for doing this.

O. Uh-huh.

A. Therefore, it is their responsibility and their job to sell and explain the trading that's being done to their clients, not mine. I don't want their clients calling me up and asking me to -- to explain the strategy for them.

I didn't have really retail clients at all, other than this handful of clients, which were not really retail.

And, also, they didn't want their clients back-dooring them. In other words, the last thing they wanted was, you know, Bernard Arnault, just to use a name, saying, listen, why am I paying, you know, Fairfield, you know, you know, five percent, or whatever they're making --

to me what you're doing and tell me what you're investing in the market, they would say, you've got to be kidding.

I used to always use an example that if you think that George Soros would let you know when he's going to -- when he was going short pound, he -- he wouldn't. So --

And what you saw was a typical disclosure that most hedge funds to this day -but it's changing. There was no transparency.

If you were a client of Paul Tudor Jones, with a typical hedge fund, you got a sheet of paper every quarter that said, your equity when you started was X dollars. It's now this dollars. You never knew whether you were in soybeans, potatoes, futures, equities. Nothing. That was it.

The attitude was, you wanted to invest in a hedge fund. You put your money up. You take your chances and don't ask any questions. That's it.

Because everybody was paranoid about everybody else copying their strategies, knowing when to go in the market and so on.

Q. Who else did you meet from Optimal, other

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

82

84

than Mr. Echeverria and Mr. Clark? A. Well, they came up once, I believe, 2 as much -- as much as I --3

with, you know, like one or two due diligence people. It was -- it was difficult for me to remember, because sometimes they had some of the people from Bank Santander coming into meetings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sometimes it was people from Optimal coming up. Sometimes it could have been -- but not necessarily with them, but I don't know, their auditors, you know, coming up.

It -- you know, it was very difficult for me to -- to -- to know or to remember who was coming, who I basically met with.

But clearly did not encourage meetings. It was not -- I would spend endless amounts of time --

Q. And how would you do that? How would you not encourage meetings?

A. Well, I would -- what I would say to people is, look, the strategy is a relatively simple strategy. Okay. It is -- I'm never going to tell you when I'm going into the market or when I'm -- when I'm getting out of the market.

I said, I'm only going to tell you if I

that's what they were getting paid to do. And

Q. What do you mean by that, that that's what they were getting paid to do?

A. Well, that's what -- that's what they're -- they're managers. They're getting paid from -- whether it be Banco Santander or whether it be from their -- from their client.

And, don't forget, most of these clients were investing for other hedge funds. So the fund of funds, their clients, sometimes were large network individuals. Sometimes they were -- they were smaller hedge funds. Sometimes larger hedge funds.

So you had, I guess, somebody like Optimal investing for -- for banks like -- from other Swiss banks, you know, who were saying -who were, you know, pressing them for information.

And the call I would always get is, is Bernie in the market or out of the market? Every time the market was up, they wanted to make sure they were in the market. Every time the market was down, they wanted out of the market.

83 85

change the strategy, which, quite frankly, I'm not allowed to do, you know, without notifying you, and I never did.

I said, so there is no reason for -since I'm never going to tell you when I'm in the market or out of the market until it's after the fact, because I don't want you -- I'm not going to telegraph what I'm doing, for obvious reasons. Nor would anybody.

I said, so that -- and since you are getting more disclosure than you get from any of your other hedge fund investments. In other words, they are getting within a couple of days of the transaction a confirmation telling them exactly what they own, a monthly statement that tells them all of this.

They know what equities they're long, what options they're long or short. They understand all of that. That is something that was unique to -- to our model.

And they didn't -- it was -- there was not a reason to beat it to death all of the time.

That being said, they always felt an obligation to stay in touch with me, because

So there was always this -- and I used to say to them, you -- when you get your confirmation, you'll know what you're -- what you're doing.

Q. You mentioned previously the term due diligence. Are you familiar with the term operational due diligence?

A. Sure.

Q. And what is operational due diligence?

A. Operational due diligence normally means to make sure that your back office, your operations side of the business, my operations side of the business, is equipped to handle things like custody of the -- of their assets, of actually clearing and settling the transactions involved. That there are the risk controls and there -- that -- that the

transactions can settle, take place. It's a crucial part of -- of anybody that has an account at any brokerage firm.

Q. And is it your general understanding that part of operations and due diligence includes making sure that transactions actually take place?

MR. REGAN: Objection. You can answer.

22 (Pages 82 to 85)

90 92 1 third-party institutions? corporation. 2 A. No. 2 But in the options side, since it was an 3 Q. And why is that? 3 over-the-counter option, it would be another 4 4 A. Because it typically was not done. DTC derivative dealer or a -- or a bank, or it could 5 5 would not have accounts typically for -- they have conceivably been an options-clearing 6 6 would have one account for the broker-dealer, corporation. 7 7 and that would be a commingled account, unless Q. Did Optimal or anyone at Optimal ask you to 8 8 disclose the identity of the trading counterparties? the broker-dealer was borrowing money on the 9 securities. 9 10 10 Then they would have the account -- the Q. And did you disclose their identity? 11 11 securities segregated in a loan account at DTC. A. No. 12 12 But since I was never -- I did not have margin Q. And why not? 13 13 accounts with these clients, there was no A. Well, I basically said, number one, I 14 14 mean, typically you would not disclose the name leverage being used for these clients, they 15 15 of your counterparties for competitive reasons. wouldn't have it. Q. Did the counterparties exist? 16 16 Q. Did anyone from Optimal ever ask you 17 17 whether you had set up independent segregated A. No. 18 18 MR. REGAN: I'm just going to object. I accounts on their behalf? 19 19 A. Not at DTC, because they say that was think you have to give the witness a chance to 20 not standard operating procedure. They --20 21 21 they -- they asked. And we told them that on MR. BLEICHMAR: Oh, go ahead. 22 22 MR. REGAN: -- some of these questions. our books and records, in our stock record, in 23 23 our records Optimal had an account, as did all I -- maybe you answered that last question, 24 24 of the other funds in their name. but --25 25 And the securities -- if you looked on a THE WITNESS: No. I mean --91 93 1 stock record, it would show -- it would show 1 MR. REGAN: I think you're fairly 2 2 Optimal, Fairfield, so on and so forth, here on interrupting him. 3 3 X number of securities. THE WITNESS: Well, I -- you know, 4 And the contra side of that would be 4 obviously, I would not want to disclose the name 5 5 what's known as your box or the custodian, which of a counterparty who didn't exist, because they 6 6 would be DTC. And they had a balance, if they might have the ability to check with that 7 were -- if it was being entered properly, which 7 counterparty. 8 8 Now, typically a counterparty would not they were not -- not being, because there were 9 9 necessarily disclose that, but you never know. no securities on the DTC side. 10 10 Q. We've previously discussed counterparties; BY MR. BLEICHMAR: 11 right? 11 Q. What was your understanding about BMIS' 12 A. (WITNESS NODS HEAD UP AND DOWN.) 12 obligation to disclose the name of a counterparty to 13 13 Q. Can you just briefly describe what --Optimal or the other feeder funds? 14 14 again, what the role of the counterparties were in A. Well, in a counterparty, you know, when 15 15 the split-strike conversion strategy? you're acting as agent in a transaction, whether 16 16 it be on equity or whether it be a -- an option, A. A counterparty is the person who is on 17 17 the other side of the transaction. Meaning you're actually required to disclose the name of 18 18 if -- and the counterparties in this situation a counterparty if they ask you that. 19 19 are the -- really are only important on the In other words, on the back of every 20 20 derivative side, on the options side, because in confirmation there's a legend that says, if we 21 21 acted as agent, the -- the -- the time of the the equity side the counterparty was always 22 22 transaction and the -- the -- I forget the basically me, as principal, and the counter --23 23 My counterparty would be another language -- and the party to the transaction 24 24 broker-dealer, or, in reality, after the first will be disclosed upon request. 25 25 day of the trade, it would be the clearing Q. And did Optimal ever request that

94 96 1 information? the money back, because I'm not -- I'm not --2 MR. REGAN: Objection. I'm not going to disclose that. 3 Q. And what did Optimal do? You can answer. 4 THE WITNESS: They never asked it on the 4 A. Nothing. They said to me, don't worry 5 5 about it. equity side, but they asked it on the Optimal --6 6 Q. "Don't worry about it." And what was your on the option side. That was, you know, asked a 7 7 number of times. reaction to that? 8 And my response always was that I do not 8 A. I said, fine. I said, I'm not. 9 disclose the counterparty on the derivatives. 9 Q. Do you believe, as a professional in the 10 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: 10 finance industry for many decades, that that was 11 Q. And what was their reaction to that? 11 reasonable --12 12 A. Well, they weren't happy about it, but MR. REGAN: Objection. 13 13 they knew that was my -- that was going to be my Q. -- from their standpoint? 14 response, because that was my response to 14 MR. REGAN: Objection. 15 15 everybody. THE WITNESS: I would say that you would 16 have to understand the mentality of the typical 16 And, as I said, one fund always spoke to 17 17 another fund. So typically, because I would -hedge fund manager. They -- their livelihood 18 18 it would get back to me. The other fund would depended upon them maintaining their 19 19 say, you know, Optimal just called me up, and, relationship with me, which was a very 20 you know, said that, you know, they were up to 20 profitable relationship for them personally, as 21 21 see you, and you wouldn't disclose the well as for the -- the bank or their fund. 22 22 counterparty. They had every reason to believe that, you 23 And Optimal said, did he disclose the 23 know, if they threatened to take their money 24 24 counterparty to you, meaning Fairfield? And back, I would send it back to them, because 25 25 they would say, no. He won't -- he won't historically whenever they wanted money, 97 95 1 1 disclose it. regardless of the amount, it could be hundreds 2 2 Q. Did anyone at Optimal ever tell you if you of millions of dollars, you know, within days of 3 3 don't disclose the name of the counterparties, we them making the request the money was returned. 4 will withdraw our money? 4 So they never doubted that I was not going 5 A. Well, there was -- no. They never said 5 to release this information. Whether or not, 6 6 that. The closest it came to that was in the you know, that should have been a signal to 7 late 2000's there was, I guess, a change in 7 them, of course, that's a different issue. 8 8 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: regulations. 9 9 Q. When you say, "their" -- "their And I don't know whether it was Ireland 10 10 or Luxembourg, or wherever they were registered, livelihood," what are you referring to? 11 where they -- it was part of the Basel 11 A. Their salary or fee, whatever they were 12 agreement, whatever they -- they had to just --12 13 13 they had to know who the counterparties on the Q. And how -- how -- what was your transactions in order for them to maintain their 14 14 understanding of how that worked? 15 15 A. I never really knew or cared to know registration. 16 16 what their fee was. I know what -- I sometimes So I received a phone call from a number 17 17 of these funds. One being Thema, and another knew what the fee was that the hedge fund was 18 one being Optimal, for sure, that basically said 18 making, because it was part of their offering 19 19 documents, which sometimes I saw and sometimes I they have this directive now that they're 20 20 required to know the counterparty. didn't see. 21 21 But typically in a fund -- I think And I said, well, I'm -- you know, I'm 22 22 Optimal was making one and a half percent of the sorry, but I'm not disclosing that. And I said, 23 23 amount of money that they -- they managed. your -- you know, if -- if your -- if -- your 24 24 choice is to get the name of that or take the Sometimes it was -- it included one to

one and a half percent, plus 20 percent of

25

money back, then you're going to have to take

	98		100		
1	whatever the mustite that I assumed on them	1	A No		
2	whatever the profits that I earned on them, which was standard with a firm like Fairfield.	2	A. No. Q. Why not?		
3	Q. So what would happen if Optimal withdrew	3	A. Well, knowing what I know, it was		
4	the money that was invested with you?	4	something that, you know, I wouldn't you		
5	A. Well, they would lose their fee. I	5	know, I wouldn't do. The but, you know,		
6	mean, I don't Fairfield, for example, made,	6	that's that's with my knowledge of both my		
7	you know, over 100 million dollars a year from	7	own what I was doing here and my knowledge in		
8	me for their managers.	8	the in the business.		
9	I don't know what Manuel's salary or	9	O. Putting		
10	what his cut was, but I think Optimal was on	10	A. No. In other words, based upon my		
11	a sort of a one and a half percent. But one	11	knowledge of what was happening in my own firm,		
12	and a half percent of a lot is a lot.	12	and also my knowledge of what goes on in the		
13	Q. So was it your impression that Optimal	13	industry, I wouldn't be investing in any hedge		
14	didn't press you further on the name of the	14	funds, but that's a different issue.		
15	counterparties, in part because of the fees they	15	Q. What was what was your understanding		
16	were charging?	16	about what was going on in the industry?		
17	MR. REGAN: Objection.	17	MR. REGAN: Objection.		
18	You can answer.	18	You can answer.		
19	THE WITNESS: I well, let's put it this	19	THE WITNESS: Well, I don't know that		
20	way, their choice was I didn't give them a	20	everybody in the industry was was committing		
21	choice. Well, I did give them a choice. Their	21	the crime that I was committing. I would say		
22	choice was to not not get this information	22	that's probably not the case.		
23	and take their money or that was it, you	23	But what I would say is that there is a		
24	know.	24	there is a culture and a systemic problem with		
25	And, of course, if they did that, their fee	25	the industry, with the securities market today,		
	99		101		
1	would have to be they wouldn't have a fee	1	that, quite frankly, makes it unsuitable for		
2	from me. They would have to take put the	2	anybody to invest, other than somebody that just		
3	money somewhere else and hopefully make a fee	3	wants speculation.		
4	and a return, you know, somewhere else.	4	Now, that's that's my feeling. It's		
5	So, I mean, clearly they had the	5	it's always been that that I've always		
6	manager, as did the bank, you know, would have	6	been of that opinion. I've been very I've		
7	an ax to grind, you know, in this situation.	7	been very people have been very critical of		
8	BY MR. BLEICHMAR:	8	me because of my opinion on hedge funds in		
9	Q. What do you mean by, "an ax to grind"?	9	general from since the including the hedge		
10	A. Well, I mean the consequence of them	10	funds that I was dealing with, knew that I felt		
11	pressing me for for the counterparty was	11	that way.		
12	basically to discontinue the relationship. That	12	And I think that now things that I've been		
13	was it.	13	warning people about for years is is being		
14	Q. Did Optimal or Manuel ever ask you to	14	uncovered. It's a big casino.		
15	disclose, perhaps not all of the counterparties, but	15	And, although, not everybody may be doing		
16	perhaps only one counterparty?	16	what I did, and certainly am I assume is not,		
17	A. No.	17	and committing out and outright fraud, but, for		
18 19	Q. Would you have invested in BMIS if you were in Optimal's shoes and BMIS refused to identify any	18 19	all intents and purposes, what they are doing is		
20	of the counterparties?	20	no better. It's just being masked or guised in certain other things.		
21	MR. REGAN: Objection.	21	Now, that may sound self-serving and a		
22	You can answer.	22	rationalization on my part, and I wouldn't blame		
23	THE WITNESS: Me?	23	anybody for for feeling that way, but 50		
24	BY MR. BLEICHMAR:	24	years in the business, in every aspect of this		
1	Q. Yes.	25	business, from the regulatory side to the		

CONFIDENTIAL 102 104 1 operational side, to the marketing side, it's -with that. You know, I destroyed, most 2 it's a total disaster. importantly, my family. 3 3 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: And it is -- it was never done, in spite 4 Q. Going back to the issue of the fact --4 of the fact of what people might think, to be 5 5 excuse me. Going back to the issue of the fact that able to be successful and make money, because I 6 6 you did not disclose any of the counterparties, was worth well over a billion dollars before I 7 7 putting aside that you knew that you were committing came off the tracks. 8 a fraud, if you were in Optimal's shoes, and you 8 It was partly ego. Partly I just was 9 were going to invest in BMIS and BMIS was not going 9 convinced that I would be able to accomplish 10 to disclose the name of the counterparties, would 10 what I wanted to accomplish. I had always done 11 11 you have invested in BMIS? that. You know, I had -- against all odds I had 12 12 MR. REGAN: Objection. built a business, a market making business, that 13 13 You can answer, if you can. everybody said was impossible to build. 14 THE WITNESS: Well, in fairness to Optimal, 14 I had gained a huge amount of respect. 15 15 or to any of my clients, I had a reputation in I fought, you know, the establishment, the 16 the industry that was, you know, a very good 16 industry, the regulators, everybody, to build a 17 17 reputation. business. And I did a lot of good. I also made 18 18 I had a substantial amount of capital that a lot of people very, very wealthy. 19 19 ranked me within the top couple of percent of And, in spite of what I did, no one in 20 20 the securities industry in capital. And, my opinion will be a net loser on this 21 21 considering the type of business I did, that was situation. Of course, none of that gets 22 even more substantial. 22 reported or hasn't yet. 23 The -- and, you know, I had a pedigree from 23 Although, people understand that, but 24 the regulatory side and an image, which, of 24 for 35, 36 years I ran a perfectly legitimate 25 course, now had been totally, you know, business and made a great deal of wealth 103 105 1 discredited. 1 possible for everyone, including myself. 2 2 So the big question, quite frankly, in So when you do that, you -- you develop 3 3 everybody's mind, from the day that this thing a sense of confidence that you can pretty much, 4 was uncovered until probably today, present day, 4 you know, do anything, you know. 5 5 was why did Bernie do this. And you also have to understand that --6 I mean, everybody was -- it was an 6 which is something that I'm trying to work with 7 embarrassment to the SEC, to the NASD, to -- to 7 with Harvard and other people in, is that 8 8 everyone. there's a culture that exists in Wall Street and 9 9 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: in business in general that, you know, things 10 10 Q. So why did you do it? are done that the lines get blurred, and that 11 A. Well, because I allowed myself 11 as, I guess, even Steve Jobs felt in his book, 12 foolishly, as I said, to be trapped into 12 rules don't apply to -- to everybody. 13 13 something. And what I looked at as being a It's -- it's -- it's ridiculous, but 14 14 temporary situation, that was going to work out it's a fact of life. 15 15 well for everyone, my clients, as well as And I -- I wish I could -- I wish I 16 16 myself, I, you know, decided to take the risk could acknowledge the fact that I knew that what 17 17 and convinced myself that it was going to work I was doing -- that I didn't know what I was 18 out. 18

doing was wrong or that it was against the law, but I operated in a business that every day people do that to a certain extent, and it works

And, quite frankly, which is being demonstrated now as at every level of the business, from the highest level on, people

break rules, violate trust, violate the

27 (Pages 102 to 105)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

out.

to -- to fess up to it.

I then, after awhile, became aware of

extricate myself from this mess, and then didn't

And it's something that, you know, I

have the courage or the character, you know,

live with every day and try to come to grips

the fact that I was not going to be able to

19

20

21

22

23

24

106 108

fiduciary capacity, and nothing goes unpunished.

It's, you know, from the treasury secretary, you know, on down, and everybody stands there. And there's one article or editorial after another in the newspapers today that basically confirms that.

It's -- you know, it doesn't make me feel any better. It's something that I knew all along, and maybe had a greater impact on my psyche than I thought that allowed me to -- to do this.

But you have to understand that for 50 years I operated at every level of this industry and was witness to all of the rules and regulations. I -- I've framed most of them in the trading industry.

I was on the committees that built them. I served on the federal regulation committee, which includes the general counsels of every firm, primary firm, in Wall Street, and for longer than anybody in the industry.

And I watched general counsels of the major firms acknowledge that their firms were violating the rules left and right, that the CEOs knew what was going on, to the point where I live with that, you know, with that -- my son took his own life because of -- because of what I did. So --

But me feeling sorry, it doesn't change anything, you know. The only thing I -- that's -- the only thing that I feel good about was that when offered a deal by the prosecutor to -- to, you know, come forward and cooperate to get a lower sentence, I refused to do that.

And my attorneys didn't understand it, advised me not to do this, but -- you know, not to not cooperate, but I said at the time, and since then has been proven to be correct, that the best thing I could do for my clients was to -- to get the money back from the people that were complicit in the crime. Namely, Picower, Shapiro, Levy and some of these other people.

I said that --

Q. Why were they complicit?

A. Well, because they had violated tax laws based upon what I discussed with them and other things that I knew that they were doing with people in my firm, bookkeepers, who are all now under investigation.

And I said, look, I have nothing to lose

... |

they refused to certify what the SEC wanted them to certify that everything was okay.

And their response was, I'm not certifying this. And you're going to jail, because I know -- let the CEO certify them, these documents, and that way they'll have the money. You know, I'm not expendable, but -- I mean, I'm expendable. They're not.

So none of this makes me feel any better. Okay. And it's probably not going to make anybody else feel any better, but it's -- it's a -- it's pathetic, but that's what is -- that is what is going on, and it had an impact on me.

So when you ask, why did I do it, I ask myself that every day, every day. And I'm sure my family asks that every day. And the regulators ask it.

Mary Shapiro has probably been mortified and embarrassed, you know, as the chairman of the SEC, you know, who has a close relationship with me. So does a lot of the other attorneys work there.

- Q. Are you sorry about what you did?
- A. Of course I'm sorry. I mean, you know,

at this stage. No matter what I do, no matter how I cooperate, I'm going to be sentenced to a long term. I'm going to wind up probably dying in prison.

And these people are all aware of the fact that I have information that will send them to prison. That, you know, the best thing I can do would be to let these people know that unless they come forward with the money, return it, and the investors get -- become whole, then I am going to give the evidence to the government that I have.

This was not good enough for the government to reduce my sentence or anything else. And I said, okay. I said, it's sort of academic, as far as I'm concerned.

I said, you want criminal information. I said, criminal information is not going to matter, because these people are going to be dead anyhow by the time you bring it.

They're 90 some odd years old, other than Picower. I said, his health is questionable. He'll never survive long enough anyhow. He's had four quadruple bypasses, you know.

28 (Pages 106 to 109)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

110

112

I said, it's -- you'd have to let me do this my way. I contacted these people, and I said to them -- I laid it out to them. I said, look -- when I was on bail, I said, you either come forward or I'm going to release the information.

Q. When you say, "these people," who are you referring to?

A. Picower, Shapiro.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then -- believe me, I had it. And it took a year for Picower to finally say to me, okay. I'll come down. Let me have this information, you know. He said --

And I said, I'm not -- you know, fine. I said, it's -- there's no conditions attached to it. I said, I'll give you the information. I'll tell you where to look.

By that time, you know, Picower --

Q. Picower?

A. Yeah -- no. Picower was dead.

Q. Okay. So who came down?

A. He drowned in a swimming pool. Picard and his attorneys. They came

down for two days. They had six or eight attorneys spend two days -- four days here. And

an estate of nine billion dollars. So I thought, not only was I stupid, you know, the guy lied to me. Which, of course, you know, I guess, I lied to a lot of other people. So --

Well, his wife, of course -- he -- he died of a heart attack in a pool. I'm sure it was inflicted by knowing what was going to happen.

She came forward with the seven billion dollars. Shapiro came forward with close to a billion dollars in reality. Levy's family came through with 250. Other banks came through with 500. This one did a billion. This one --

The reality of it is, the money is all going to be recovered. At least that's my -and this -- this has nothing to do with the billions of dollars that all of these people made for the first 35 years of doing business with me.

So it's a longwinded way of saying, how did it happen, why did it happen, do I feel remorse. I don't have a -- a son. I lost my son. For all intents and purposes I've lost the rest of my family, and I turned what would have been a great legacy into a total disaster.

111

113

1 I laid out all of this information. 2

Of course, Picard said, well, we sort of know about this, because we can see what you did and this. I said, fine. I said, look, I said, you know, you're going to get the money back. And, of course, everybody said it was a

pipe dream. They said, this is not going to happen. You know, no one is going to come forward with all of this money.

And I said, it -- I can't guarantee it, but I -- I said, I know it's going to happen, because these people, you know, really have no choice.

And at this time I became aware of the fact that Picower had an estate of nine billion dollars. It was reported in the papers. So, in spite of the fact that he told me he was wiped out and couldn't have -- didn't have the money, which is why I started doing all of this, because I realized he's not going to be able to make me whole, and I'm not going to be able to make the money I lost on the hedges. So that's what started this whole cycle.

You can imagine how I felt when being in prison I read in the newspapers that the guy had

So, you know, do I feel guilty with some of my investors? Yes. There were some people that were friends of mine, who could never imagine or believe that I would do this.

And, of course, they'll never believe that I thought it was a temporary situation, but, you know, I would be less than human.

But, according to my psychologist, who I spend endless time with, for someone who never believed in getting help, was not a thing that Jewish people did, as you know, the -- people compartmentalize things, is the term, the psychological term they use. That's how --

Q. Is that what you did?

A. Yeah. I mean, that's what she claims. I mean, mafia people kill people all day long. And I sit out in the yard with one of them, who is, you know, Carmine Persico, who was accused of killing 21 people, and he's the sweetest man.

And family comes down and visits him, and he sits here. And you talk to this guy, and you think this can't be someone that would be a cold-blooded murderer. And I'm sure people say that about me, you know.

So, look, I never understood how people

29 (Pages 110 to 113)

114 116 1 go to war and kill people, and it turns out that A. Well, they -- they -- in the beginning, 2 they don't survive, a lot of them, you know. 2 I would say that most people would not disclose 3 3 This posttraumatic stress is becoming more and how much money they had to work. 4 4 There was a difference between me and a more common, you know. So people do it. 5 5 And I guess -- look, and I -- I -- I hedge fund. A hedge fund always had to disclose 6 6 can't tell you that I didn't sit there every day how much money they had working. It was part of 7 7 and say, what I'm doing is wrong, and I should their marketing thing. 8 be punished. I knew I would be eventually, but 8 The more money that they had working for 9 I didn't know how to get out of it. 9 them, the more people felt comfortable with 10 And I was responsible for 200 employees 10 them. It showed that they had, you know, a lot 11 11 that never worked for anybody, other than me, of credibility. They had a lot of power and so 12 12 and were following me blindly, not knowing 13 13 what -- not having a clue as to what I was Brokerage firms, for the most part, 14 14 would never disclose this. I mean, some of the doing. 15 15 My own son didn't -- sons didn't know bigger ones do now. Again, for the same reason 16 this, nor did my wife, nor did my brother. 16 that hedge funds do it. 17 17 They --But smaller hedge funds, or the 18 18 You know, how I did that is something old-fashioned hedge funds, like George Soros, 19 19 I -- I still can't figure out. I -- I figured I Julian Robertson, those people, that culture 20 would die from the stress, you know. It's -- I 20 never disclosed any of this kind of information. 21 21 think someone should do a study of my brain to So it was not unusual at that stage for 22 figure out how I -- I don't think anybody can 22 me to say, look, I'm not disclosing that. It's 23 23 figure that out. You know, I certainly can't. substantial. And that was all I would say. 24 24 So if you ask me, do I have remorse? I At a later date, when the number became 25 25 don't know how you could have any more remorse so large, it would have then been a signal that 115 117 1 than I have. 1 there was a potential problem. 2 2 MR. BLEICHMAR: Why don't we take a break. Q. And did Optimal or anyone at Optimal 3 3 MR. REGAN: Okay. pressure you in any way to disclose the amount of 4 (RECESS FROM 10:17 A.M. TO 10:48 A.M.) 4 assets under management? 5 MR. BLEICHMAR: All right. Let's just go 5 MR. REGAN: Objection. 6 6 back on the record. You can answer. 7 7 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: THE WITNESS: Periodically people would ask 8 8 the same question, you know. Q. Mr. Madoff, earlier we were discussing 9 9 Optimal and the disclosures that you made to BY MR. BLEICHMAR: 10 10 Q. And when you say, "people," who -- who are Optimal; correct? 11 A. Uh-huh. 11 you referring to? 12 Q. Did Optimal ask you to disclose the amount 12 A. Managers. 13 of assets under management of BMIS? 13 Q. So other managers, other than Optimal? 14 14 A. Yes, they did. 15 15 Q. And did you disclose that? Q. And why would the size of the assets under 16 16 management that you had, in your view, would have A. No. 17 17 Q. And why not? indicated a problem? 18 18 A. Well, the real reason was that I didn't A. The market impact. 19 want them to know how much money was under 19 Q. And what does that mean? 20 20 management, because it was a large amount. And A. Meaning that when I was moving in and 21 it would have made the credibility of the 21 out of the market it would be more difficult to 22 ability to put that much money to work, you 22 not move the prices. 23 23 know, very difficult at that stage when they Q. We talked about counterparties earlier; 24 24 started to ask me that. correct?

25

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And why -- go ahead.

118 120 1 Q. Did Optimal ever ask you or anyone at 1 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: 2 Optimal ever ask you to see copies of option 2 Q. And why would that have been important? 3 3 agreements with the counterparties? A. Well, it would have eliminated a lot of 4 4 the dealers. I mean, there's maybe 20 dealers A. No. 5 5 Q. And why would the option agreements with theoretically. You may have called 15 of them. 6 6 the counterparties have been important? You're not getting an answer. 7 7 MR. REGAN: Objection. Now, if I was doing business with them, 8 8 they probably would have said, I can't disclose You may answer. 9 THE WITNESS: Well, typically you would 9 that. But since I wasn't doing business with 10 want to see them to make sure that you had them. 10 them, they would say, no. And I do know that -- or at least I read 11 11 I mean, it was standard operating procedure of 12 12 an over-the-counter option for there to be a that in some documents that I received from 13 13 contract. somebody, from some lawyers, that a question was 14 Now, typically the contract would have the 14 asked of some dealers, and they said, no. 15 15 name of the counterparties on them. Our Q. And what -- and what does that mean to you? 16 particular option contract did not have the 16 A. It calls into question whether or not I 17 17 was doing the contract. name, but it did say that the name would be 18 18 Q. Did Optimal ask you whether Optimal -disclosed upon a default, because they had --19 19 that would have been necessary in order for them well, let me start a step before that. 20 20 Does the phrase doing a walkthrough of a to be able to settle the transaction, because 21 21 they -- since I was acting as an agent, they trade --22 would have to know who the other party was. 22 A. Do what? 23 But the thing that Optimal did not pick up 23 Q. Do a walkthrough of a trade, is --24 24 on, nor did any of the other funds pick up on, A. A walkthrough of a trade? 25 was that because I was acting as an agent, that 25 Q. Yeah. 119 121 1 information was required to be disclosed if 1 What does that mean to you? 2 2 somebody asked for it. A. A walkthrough of a trade would be, 3 3 So what they should have done was say, explain to me what you do, how you put -- set 4 look, you're required to disclose this 4 the trade up. And typically -- and we would --5 5 information. They never did that, nor did we would do that. 6 6 anybody else. Some people did ask us that. And we 7 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: 7 would say -- you know, we would explain that 8 8 Q. Is there anything else that, in your view, we -- first of all, they were of -- we had a 9 9 they should have done that they didn't do? system, an electronic system, that we had built 10 10 MR. REGAN: Objection, but you can answer. that used to do the -- used to do the trades 11 THE WITNESS: There was nothing else that 11 that would --12 they really could have done. What they could 12 It was a system called -- well, it was a 13 13 have done, which I'm not sure whether they did system that we developed, called Primex Trading 14 or did not do, was speak to other derivative 14 System, which was a system that we originally 15 15 built that we developed. Meaning BMIS developed dealers and find out did I -- because they were 16 16 of the opinion that I was using derivative it. 17 17 dealers. And took on as partners Merrill Lynch, 18 18 Now, there's a limited number of derivative Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley and Smith Barney. 19 dealers that were in the -- that would handle 19 So the five of us were partners in this system. 20 20 this kind of business, people like Credit We owned 50 percent. The rest of them all owned 21 Suisse, Goldman, Merrill, so on. 21 lesser amounts. 22 Now, they -- they may have asked them, and 22 Which was a trading platform that was 23 23 they may have, you know, said, are you doing going to compete with the New York Stock 24 24 business with Madoff? Since they weren't, they Exchange. Very similar to what's now referred 25 25 would have typically gotten an answer, no. to as the Dark Pools, but at that time it --

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

122

1 that did not exist.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That was a system that was developed that was -- had a tremendous amount of fanfare, because of who my partners were and the fact that we had developed it.

So there was huge coverage in the Wall Street Journal and so on about this. And this, I guess, must have been in the early 2000's, something of that sort.

And it was such a threat to the New York Stock Exchange that the New York Stock Exchange bought off my partners by making side deals with them on the specialists posted on the floor, rather than have them send the business to me.

So all of a sudden all of my partners, except Citicorp, which was now -- which was part of -- Smith Barney was part of, were all basically out of the system, and it just was myself and Citicorp.

And that system we wound up never really getting off the ground, but we sold it -- we sold parts of it to NASDAQ, and NASDAQ used this for their opening -- to open their markets and close it today.

It's a system that was owned by a

It would -- the software would -- and it had artificial intelligence in it that would do all of this. And we would -- so we would -when the system gave us a signal that this is the time to go into the market, because of the decision that I had made that the market looked like it was going to have a spike up, and the system said, okay, you can buy these securities at these prices in these denominations. Go into the market to do it.

124

Now, it would be limited to how much size you could do in that system without moving the market itself, which was another reason why we never wanted to disclose how much we were managing.

But from the walkthrough stage we would explain that what we would do is we would have this system that would give us this information, that we would go out into the marketplace and interact and buy these securities.

Once we did that, sometimes afterwards we'd call it a leg-in, we would sell the options against those transactions. And then we would have nothing to do, other than to have the trade settle. That was -- that was the walkthrough.

123 125

1 separate company that I owned. And my brother 2 was primarily the -- the main person in it. So 3 we had that system available. 4

And what I did was -- was jerry-rigged that system so that we could use it as a routing mechanism to broker-dealers in Europe that theoretically could have executed this trade -these trades the way we were going to use Morgan Stanley, Merrill Lynch and so on and on.

So the system was a legitimate system. It was used for that. But after it -- after we basically closed the system down, I took that system down for myself and used it as a -- what was going to be the mechanism to do trades, if I was doing it legitimately. And while it never

got to that level. So we -- the walkthrough of the trade would be typically -- whether we were using that system or not, we would say, look, we go out. We have a model, which was a real model that would tell us when we -- what securities we would buy, which of the 50 or 35 securities we would buy, and what prices we should bid for them, how many shares we should buy and then how many hedges we should put on and so on.

1 It was a typical arbitrage-style 2 transaction. A little bit more complicated than 3 just going out and buying stock, because you 4 also had to buy the options, and you had to buy 5 the stocks at various levels and so on and so 6 forth.

But we had -- we had the technology to do that, because it was well-known that we had probably the most advanced order execution technology that existed on Wall Street and were able to handle hundreds of thousands of transactions, which was why people believed -people that understood it, you know, knowing what we could -- were capable of, doing this kind of trading was not so unusual to them.

- Q. You mentioned that a certain amount of assets could be seen as indication of being able to move the market; right?
 - A. Right.
- Q. In your mind what amount of assets would lead to that effect?

MR. REGAN: Objection. BY MR. BLEICHMAR:

Q. Towards the end of, you know, the time where you were actually -- towards -- closer to

32 (Pages 122 to 125)

126 128 1 2008. BY MR. BLEICHMAR: 2 MR. REGAN: Objection. 2 Q. Switching to another topic. Did -- in 3 3 talking about the reporting of the trades and the Go ahead. 4 THE WITNESS: Well, the only -- the only 4 fact that BMIS did the reporting, did Optimal ever 5 5 amount that we actually disclosed, which was ask you whether the reporting of the trades could be 6 6 when we filed our -- in 2006, when we filed our changed, that there would be an external reporting 7 7 investment advisory form, and that was a number entity? 8 8 A. Yeah. Optimal -- Optimal, as well as 9 So 16 billion was a number. Although, it 9 other firms, wanted to -- asked if we would 10 10 was always bandied around that it was much report the trades to them through DTC. DC --11 larger than that. So the rumors were that we 11 DTC had what they called a -- it was a DTC ID 12 12 were managing 21 billion. system. 13 13 I don't think anyone ever thought it was 60 And a lot of the hedge funds used -- the 14 some odd billion dollars, but -- which is what 14 brokers would report the trades electronically 15 it was at the end with all of the artificial 15 to DTC, and DTC would report it to the hedge 16 profits. 16 funds. 17 17 But I would say that most people did not It was -- it was -- I don't remember 18 18 believe that it was only 16 billion, and were what year it came on stream, but certainly in 19 19 probably relieved when they only saw it was 16 the 2000's that was what was -- was being done. 20 20 billion, because the story was that it was, you Not every firm -- hedge -- you know, did 21 21 know, in the 20's. it. We refused to do it, in spite of the fact 22 Which no one really had any knowledge, 22 that we were asked to do it. I mean, for 23 except one fund spoke to another. So if one 23 obvious reasons. 24 24 fund said, well, how much is Fairfield, because Q. And what were those reasons? 25 25 those numbers were available. A. The obvious reasons were we weren't 127 129 1 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: doing the trades. So we couldn't report air to 2 2 Q. Right. DTC. So we said that, no. We're not going to 3 A. So if you did a little homework, and you 3 do that. 4 said, well, Fairfield says they have six 4 And some firms balked at that, but no 5 5 billion, and Thema has four billion, and this -one withdrew their business, that we know of, 6 Optimal has four billion, or whatever the 6 numbers are, you could add it up. And --The -- it was just something that we 7 7 8 8 But, as I say -- so -- well, we'll -said, look, we have our own systems. We're not 9 9 you know, the fact that we had 16 billion that going to rely upon DTC. We don't want to 10 10 we claimed, which was based upon our -- our disclose that information to DTC. 11 investment advisory form, was the right number 11 We don't want them -- no one really 12 to disclose, according to our attorneys. 12 trusted the -- quite frankly, no one trusted the 13 13 The -- the funds always thought it depositories. There had been situations where 14 14 people found out from DTC by favors that people was -- they knew -- they could have known, or 15 15 should have known, that it was -- it was more would do with them, they would send the guy ball 16 16 than that. game tickets and that, would just be able to 17 17 Q. And at the end technically, with all of the find out what each firm's long positions were or 18 18 inflation, did you just say the number was closer to short positions were. 19 60 million -- 60 billion? 19 So this was when I was -- even when I 20 20 A. Sixty -was chairman, it was something we warned firms 21 MR. REGAN: Objection. 21 about doing, saying -- you know, we said, look, 22 22 Go ahead. you're talking about a clerk, who is making 23 23 THE WITNESS: Sixty billion was the amount \$30,000 a year, all of a sudden being offered, 24 in the accounts at the end of the demise of the 24 you know, a new Mercedes to disclose what 25 25 Goldman Sachs' positions were.

I said, you know, I don't know how you -- you -- you solve that problem.

So firms -- it wasn't that unusual that we wouldn't use that system, but I guess if you add up all of the different things that we were mysterious about, it would ring alarm bells with certain firms.

Q. And why would that be?

A. Well, because, you know, it's just that it became -- you know, there were -- look, there were hedge funds that blew up. There was Bayou Capital.

There were other ones that had -- were doing similar things that I was doing that what -- that turned out to be total frauds.

And whenever -- whenever one of those things would occur and surface, I would get a ton of phone calls from my nervous clients. They'd say, you're not Bayou Capital, are you? You're not the same thing?

And I would laugh it off and say, no. When, in fact, I was.

- Q. Did Optimal ever ask you if you were --
- 24 A. They all were.
 - Q. -- Bayou Capital?

original types of hedge funds, as I said, they were very secretive and very -- gave you no disclosure, no transparency, no questions asked.

Those types of funds were -- were sort of replaced by the fund to funds, the feeder funds, as they're called, and these other big macro funds, which basically started doing business with institutional business, like pension funds and so on, which were required to get this information.

So the industry -- the original -- as I said, the original hedge fund industry was by sophisticated people, who were Europeans mostly, who were perfectly happy to not have you ask them where their money was from, whether it was legitimate money, whether it was tax money or whatever.

Because you have to understand that you're very hard pressed to find a European investor that doesn't have a Swiss bank account or money somewhere offshore for perfectly good reasons.

They -- you know, when you -- when your -- when your country is taken over and your industries are nationalized or your country goes

A. Everyone asked me that. Everyone would
 do that, and - O. Did they press you to get answers to the

Q. Did they press you to get answers to the questions you refused to answer --

MR. REGAN: Objection.

Q. -- as a result of Bayou? MR. REGAN: Objection.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I mean, people -people would ask me these questions. I would
say, I'm not going to do it, or I would answer
them to the best of my ability, which sometimes
made sense, sometimes didn't make sense.

But with enough -- there was always enough truth to it, you know, that it was okay. Plus the fact that, you know, I had this reputation of being secretive and independent.

BY MR. BLEICHMAR:

- Q. And why didn't sometimes the explanations make sense?
- A. Because I was -- I was the exception, rather than the rule, as far as giving this information out.
 - Q. In what way were you the exception?
- A. Well, the hedge fund business hadchanged over the years. From the handful of

to war, and you worry about all of a sudden

- 2 everything disappearing, except what you can put
- 3 on your back or carry in your teeth, you
- 4 always -- if you make enough money, you
- 5 immediately take that money, and you put it6 somewhere else.

So Europeans, that's their culture. That's their nature. They don't trust their governments, for very good reason. As recently, as I said, in 1980, when Mitterrand came into France.

So they don't disclose that. So if you -- and every one of them has -- has a bank account that is prohibited for them to disclose. The bank will not disclose this information, which is one of the problems the IRS has today with UBS and Credit Suisse and so on.

So you had a whole breed of investors, the original hedge fund investors, that said, look, I don't need to know anything. Don't ask me about my money, and I'm not asking you about yours and so on and so forth. And, I'm a big boy, and I'll put my money up and take my chances, and that's it.

That was replaced -- and they wouldn't

deal with pension funds or any of those people,
because the rules wouldn't allow pension funds
to do it.

They have to have independent custodians. They have lots of different things. And they have all of these risk managers and due diligence people, and these guys didn't want to be bothered with that.

So it became -- people realized there's an opening here, that if -- if -- if these feeder funds can now give you all of this disclosure, they can give you this transparency, then they can capture all of this business that was up to this point not being solicited by anybody in the hedge fund field.

So, as a matter of fact, the hedge funds started to retire. Mike Steinhardt left.
Julian Robertson said, I'm not -- forget it.
I'm not dealing with these characters, because then the average -- then their investors started asking them for this information. They said, I'm not doing it.

So you had a whole group of Manuel types, okay, that were not decision makers, other than deciding where to put the money

Optimal ever did?
 MR. REGAN: Objection.
 THE WITNESS: I don't remember.
 BY MR. BLEICHMAR:

Q. Okay. What did the other hedge fund clients do?

A. Well, they would -- they would ask me that, you know, with a smile. Like, you know, somebody would say, you know, you're not -- you're not a Bayou, they said, which is a hedge fund which blew up. Or, you're not -- are you really doing these trades, or -- you know, and so on and so forth.

And sometimes I would say, no, I'm not. They would laugh, and then that would be the end of it. They didn't want to believe it.

Q. Did Optimal ever ask you if BMIS had been audited by the SEC or any other regulatory agency?

A. Yes, and we were routinely. I used to get two ASD audits a year at a minimum. One was always the financial, and then we -- actually, three of them.

And then two of them were market making exams, which concentrated on our -- on our market making buying and selling.

that -- their primary function was to do due
 diligence, to find managers and keep the
 managers happy and to keep their -- their
 investors happy.

And that was the role, and nobody wanted to rock the boat. And the more they rocked the boat, the more problems they had.

So, you know, that was -- that was typical of what went on in the business. And I was more of the old school, you know. So --

And I used to say to people, look, you know, I don't need this. I was very cavalier. If you want to do business with me, fine. If you won't do business with me, that's also okay.

And, to a certain extent, that was like -- you know, the more I said that, the more they'd want to do business with me.

Q. Did Optimal ever ask you point blank whether you were running a Ponzi scheme?

A. I don't think they -- I don't recall them saying it in those terms, but there was no question that a lot of the hedge fund clients, that's what they worried about. But they worried -- they worried about --

Q. But let's talk about, do you remember if

Then I would get an SEC audit typically every five years, which was standard throughout the industry.

Q. And was this audit on the broker-dealer side of the business or on the money management side of the business?

A. Well, it was supposed to be on both, but it was clearly because the SEC was not aware of the fact, certainly in the '90s, when it -- by the time I started doing not doing the business, then the SEC was not aware of -- or nor were the NASD of the -- well --

Q. They were not aware of what? I'm sorry.

A. They were not aware of the volumes of business that I was doing with hedge funds or clients. That became -- showed up on their radar screen, as far as I know, like in 2000.

The -- but we were doing so much other business that it wouldn't have been shocking for them -- and maybe they did know. I don't know.

Look, now, in -- you know, I keep reading that there were people, whistle blowers and that. There were inquiries and letters and all of this stuff that went on at the SEC, which they never followed up on. So I really don't

35 (Pages 134 to 137)

138 140

1 know what they knew or not.

I know for a fact that in -- 2002 was the first time that I received a direct inquiry from the SEC in Washington as to what my hedge fund business was. And that was part of a hedge fund sweep that they were doing with hedge funds.

They -- they -- part of that sweep involved Fairfield, which was a big -- my biggest client. And during that -- that sweep, Lori Richards and her department, which was the -- she was the head of all -- of compliance and inspections at the SEC, became aware of the fact that I was -- she thought I had a hedge fund.

So I received a phone call from her, saying, Bernie, are you -- do you have a hedge fund?

And I said, no. I do not have a hedge fund.

And she said, because I'm being told that you have a big hedge fund.

I said, no. I execute trades for hedge funds. I have -- and I explained to her, I have a model, you know, that I use. I do trades for information. So we shipped down to
 Washington -- I don't know how many trans files.
 Probably 50 trans files of documents, trading
 runs and so on.

And it all had to do with my market making business at that time.

Q. Not your money management?

A. Well, it did both, but I mean the volume of trading was on my market making side. So when she looked at -- when she looked at this information, it was obvious that I wasn't running in front of any orders, because we weren't.

You know, first of all, we weren't executing the trades for the hedge fund clients at this time. It was 2002. So the trading that she saw was part of my market making business. So she looked at that.

And even when -- when I was doing the legitimate business, we never ran ahead, because we -- we operated from a different floor, different traders and so on in the systems.

So, you know, up until '92, when we were doing this type of trading, it was perfectly legitimate trading. No front running or

1 hedge funds and so on and so forth.

And she said, oh, I didn't think so. So she said, well, all right. You know, we may need some more -- we may have some more questions for you after the first of the year, because we're -- we noticed your name come up on some of these hedge fund sweeps that we're doing, and we just want to try and understand what it was.

And it related to this whether or not I was being an advisor to a hedge fund and so on. So after the first of the year, she sent me a list of all sorts of information she wanted, documents as to who are my hedge fund clients at that time, what the strategy was, because she was -- they were concerned about front running.

Front running is a practice where market makers or proprietary traders become aware of a large order that an institutional client or a hedge fund has, and they run ahead of that order, which is illegal to do that.

So she was concerned that maybe we were
front running, which she couldn't believe,
because of my reputation with her.

But I said, fine. I'll send you the

anything.

So they didn't go back that far anyhow. They only wanted -- they went back, I guess, maybe a year or two. So they saw that. It was fine, and nothing came of it. That was the end of it.

It was at a later date, at a subsequent investigation involving another group of hedge funds, that the investment advisor issue came up. And that was, as I say, in 2000 -- 2006.

So there was -- all broker-dealers were involved in inspections, and we -- in 50 years I think we've had two violations that showed up in inspections, and they were minor things. From a fine of \$500 for volume reporting. Which was probably one of the cleanest records that existed in Wall Street.

Q. Was it your impression that you were able to conceal the illegitimate business from the SEC in part by putting forward the broker-dealer side of the business?

A. No. I think that the broker-dealer side of the business most people would understand was separate. We -- we made that very clear to the client. That was a question that every -- every

36 (Pages 138 to 141)

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

142 144

1 hedge fund asked us.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They wanted to know, because the -- the original stories going around, Switzerland particularly, was the reason Bernie can do these trades was because he has this huge amount of order flow available from the market making side, and he must be front running the orders.

O. When you say, "Switzerland," what are you referring to?

A. Because the hedge fund -- the Swiss hedge funds were the ones that started this rumor. Now --

Q. By that are you including Optimal in that?

A. All of them. I mean, you know, I would say -- look, you have to understand, the Swiss, by their very nature, are always very suspicious, okay, because everything they do is secretive and deceptive, you know.

The -- what -- to a certain extent they loved that theory, you know. This -- because this front running was not illegal in Switzerland. So this now -- and I -- I saw -- I

24 saw humor in this.

It was like, ah, now I know how you can

would tell -- eventually they would get to their general counsel, and would say, we found out how Bernie is able to do this. He's front running 4 all of these orders.

The general counsel, you know, would hopefully say, that's illegal. He can't do that.

So then they -- they had this -- this tug of war. Well, do we -- what -- what happens if the SEC shuts him down, because he's doing this illegal stuff?

And some of them -- I read this subsequently in some of the e-mails. They said, all right. He shuts them down. He'll give us the money back.

This is better than not doing the trades in their mind, you know. You know, they'll say, you can't do this anymore, return the money, and that's the end of it.

All right. So I would say, I -- you know, they all -- almost every fund would, you know, have another meeting with me and say, well, okay. So you're front running, or, are you front running?

And I'd say, I'm not front running. I'd

145

143

1 say, I can't. It's illegal. 2 And they're saying, well, how could a 3 market maker be doing both businesses? That was

their big thing. The Swiss, you know, that was their big thing. The market maker can't be.

And I would say -- and I guess the

6 spearheading of that was Thema and, you know, 7 8 Kingate. They -- they were the ones who were 9 focusing in on that, and probably Optimal as 10 well.

And I said, look, there is nothing wrong with a market maker, you know, running an investment management business, which they were convinced we couldn't do.

And I said, don't be ridiculous. I said, every major bank and brokerage firm has money management and also has market making operations and proprietary operations. And as long as they keep them separate and they have Chinese wall procedures, they're fine.

Well, most of them, you know, had the ability to check this out by calling the regulators or their own general counsels, and, yeah, that's right. They can do that. Then they -- Goldman had it. Merrill Lynch had it,

do this. Before we couldn't figure out how you could do things that nobody else could do, you know.

Why can't Merrill Lynch do this, and this one do this, and this one do this? But Bernie Madoff has more business than anybody, because he has all of this market making business, which gets him great information, and so he must be front running.

Q. Did that make sense to you?

A. It did, except it wasn't true. And it was illegal in the United States. It wasn't illegal in Switzerland.

There was -- to them it was, you know, like having a Swiss bank account. It was, you know, you know, of course -- of course, we -- we front run. Of course, we have, you know, dirty money.

So this was like -- this -- this was -they finally -- you know, the light bulbs went off, and they said, God, this is okay. We don't mind dealing with a guy who is doing it. Now it makes sense.

And they -- but there was some that said, well, this is illegal. The smarter ones

1 and everybody else had it.

So, now, okay. Bernie, as long as he does -- follows the rules, it's okay. But he still has all of this order flow. So he must be getting these great signals.

And we would say, yeah, the market making gives us the signals, you know, about the market in general, but that's perfectly legal. You just can't buy against individual orders.

So then all of a sudden there was this merger mania going on. Everybody woke up and said, the market making business was a great business.

Because you have to understand that the average return on capital in the market making and special business for most of the years in the industry was 36 percent return on capital. That's what people made.

It was a gold mine. Us included. You know, we never -- our returns were never that high, because we basically were involved in arbitrage and hedging, which was less risky, but we certainly always made in excess of 20, you know, 25 percent return on capital.

So this became a very attractive

that time, because of decimalization, was over, but nobody realized that. It was as obvious as the nose on your face.

And it was certainly obvious to us, because we were involved in decimalization at the very beginning. We knew that the spreads were going to close and be different. And --

So my sons, who ran the market making business, said, let's sell. My brother refused to, because that was his baby. He didn't want to sell that.

I didn't want to sell, because it was like the Emperor's New Clothes. How was I going to be able to do the due diligence?

And in spite of the fact that Morgan -that Sandy Weil and Bart Rubin, from Smith Barney, said, listen, how can you turn down two, three billion? Just meet with us at least, you know.

I knew that I couldn't open my books up to them. As much as they liked me, as nice a reputation as I had, they weren't going to give me a check for two or three billion dollars.

Q. Why couldn't you open up your books to them?

business. And I think that probably started in 2002, there was this merger frenzy. And --

So all of a sudden the hedge funds that were suspicious about this front running or this issue of having a market making, which was a conflict of interest with the money management, said, wait a minute. This is obviously okay.

Because Goldman was buying Spear Leeds, which was one of my biggest competitors, you know. Merrill Lynch bought Herzog, another big competitor.

And people were trying to buy us. Smith Barney and Morgan Stanley both were offering us, you know, two to three billion dollars to buy our -- our operation.

Part of it was they thought we also had this money management side, but they -- the market making side was what they were interested in

Now, I couldn't -- my sons -- that became a big issue with my sons and brother, because my sons wanted me to sell. They -- you know, they said, two, three billion dollars? Let's take it and go home, you know.

Because the market making business at

A. Because they would have -- they would have seen that I wasn't doing the trades and the money management side of the business.

Q. And why would they have been able to see that, as opposed to an investor in a -- from a hedge fund?

A. Well, they would have sent a team of auditors in there that knew what they were doing, and they would have -- you know, they would have wanted to see the -- the business on the market -- on not only the market making, because one of the big attractions was also the investment management side. So --

Because they -- not only that, but they said to me was, look, give back all of your money from hedge funds. You know, we'll give you all of the money you need. You don't need money from them.

Get rid of these guys. They're all a pain in the ass; right? You always say you don't like hedge funds. Return all of the money.

Merrill Lynch will do -- because Merrill Lynch was already to the point of also hammering on my door to give me money to manage as well.

38 (Pages 146 to 149)

1 They all had internal hedge funds.

So there was this -- I couldn't admit to my sons or my brother that I had this fraud going on. It was a very uncomfortable situation for me.

And I just said, look, I'm not selling out to anybody. I don't want partners. I never had any partners. I'm just not doing it. And that was it.

And that led to a lot of arguments internally from my sons, who said -- because they couldn't figure it out. They said -- as a matter of fact, their response was, look, Dad, you're, you know, 70 years old.

You love your boat. Go on your boat. Cruise the Mediterranean with Mom. We'll manage -- you know, we'll each take a billion dollars, and we'll manage it privately ourselves.

Don't deal with customers. Don't deal with hedge funds. Don't deal with nothing, you know.

That was -- and it made sense, you know.
My wife didn't want to side between one
or the other.

A. Friehling & Horowitz, which was
 basically David Friehling.

Q. And they ran an audit at BMIS; correct?

A. Yeah, but they had no idea -- they ran BMIS, and they also ran an audit of the investment management side. But they also never -- never followed through with the depository.

There's a -- look, there's a basic auditing practice with any audit, regardless of whether you're making, you know, basketballs or whether you're buying stock.

When you do an audit, you do an inventory audit, and you check the inventory. Whether it means counting bolts of clothing on a shelf or basketballs or whether it's securities, getting an independent audit.

If the securities aren't physically in the location, in your vault, they have to be somewhere, and you would check and get that.

Q. Did Friehling & Horowitz not do an inventory?

A. They didn't do it. They failed to do it also, because they had -- they looked at -- we had -- by that time we had records of --

And I just said, I'm not doing it. And, again, you know, my personality was such that everybody accepted that I was a pain in the ass and hard to deal with. And that was that.

So I'm not sure that I -- I remember the question you originally asked me.

Q. Well, let me ask this question: Where -- where would the auditors or the team of auditors that you said, for example, Smith Barney, would have sent in found in your books that, you know, you were running a fraud?

A. They would see that I don't have the securities. I mean, it wasn't that complicated.

Q. Where would they see that?

A. Well, they typically would have, you know, wanted to confirm with the DTC, if you're doing a full-blown audit. The same thing the SEC failed to do or the NASD.

They never -- they never -- even when I asked -- when they asked me in 2006, where are these securities held? By then they had already been suspicious, and they had gotten some tips from people that I was running a Ponzi scheme.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ And who were -- who were the auditors at BMIS?

falsified records of the depository.

It's hard for me to acknowledge all of this now, but it doesn't matter.

Q. So Friehling & Horowitz never went to DTC independently and --

A. No.

Q. -- and cross-referenced the records you gave them?

A. Which is why -- which is why they have a problem. Yes. They never -- they never did an independent audit with DTC.

Q. Do you have an understanding as to why they didn't do that?

A. There was nothing -- there was nothing -- they were never told not to do it. It was -- they believed when they looked at our stock record it showed it at DTC.

And at some point we had actually reproduced DTC information. And a real audit, an important, thorough audit would have been to confirm directly.

Which, as you're seeing now in this latest thing that happened with this Peregrine Capital, with the clearing corporation, nobody did that. Nobody -- nobody got an audit.

39 (Pages 150 to 153)

He -- he created his own statements, and they sent to -- the accountant sent them to a post office box number.

You really couldn't do that with DTC, because it was just impractical. But people did that with Bayou. They did that with Bear Stearns. They reproduced Bear Stearns' statements.

People have been doing that since the beginning of time. I mean --

Q. Falsifying records?

A. Yeah. I mean it happens with -- with the biggest banks, you know. With the one with Barings, and it was the same thing.

These guys get involved -- they get somebody in the back office that they go into cahoots with, and they produce records. I mean, you know, it's -- it's -- it's the way it is.

- Q. Are you familiar with the term big four when you refer to accounting firms?
 - A. Yeah.

- Q. And who are the big four?
- A. That would basically be Coopers and -it used to be big five before Arthur Andersen was put out of business, but it was -- you know,

books.
 I had checked with my friends, who were

officers at -- the treasurer of Bear Stearns.
They said, are you kidding me? They said, we
would never let another -- if we have a client
that insists upon that, we'd say, close your
account.

Now, they had the advantage that they weren't using Friehling & Horowitz. Those firms were using one of the big four firms. So they had enough credibility that they didn't need to be checked.

But since I didn't have that, HSBC said, well, you know, this is what we require. So my back was to the wall on that. And I said, okay. Send them in.

So HSBC came in twice over a period of two years and spent a couple of weeks each time, doing a complete audit of the investment advisory business.

- Q. Did that audit independently confirm with DTC the existence of the securities?
 - A. No.
- $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ And how did it not -- how did they not do that?

- PricewaterhouseCoopers was one. Ernst & Young
 was another one. Deloitte was another one. I
 don't remember the other three.
 - Q. Did any of the big four ever come and conduct an audit of BMIS?
 - A. Yeah. HSBC sent in -- that was the auditor for the new audit in London of me.
 - Q. KPMG?
 - A. KPMG. KPMG was the other one, the fourth audit. Yeah, KP -- I got a call from HSBC, who was the custodian for a lot of the funds, saying that part of their due diligence was they're required to do an independent audit, which, quite frankly, was not true.

It was unusual. I checked with other firms, like Bear Stearns and Merrill Lynch, and said they would never let another auditing firm come in and audit their books. They said --

- Q. When you said, "another auditing firm," youmean --
 - A. Other than their own.
 - Q. -- a firm that is not their own; right?
- 23 A. They would never -- they would never
- have an -- an outside auditing firm come in,
- other than their own auditor, to audit their

- A. Because they couldn't do that without my permission. DTC wouldn't do it.
- Q. And did you refuse to give them your permission?
- A. They never asked.
- Q. Why was your back to the wall?
- A. Well, because they made it clear that they had no choice, but they -- and they had too many clients. So if they all of a sudden said, look, you know, we're going to have to -- they represented, you know, Thema or Kingate. They had a lot of clients. So I had no choice but to let them come in.
- Q. And they did an audit of the investment -- the money management side of the business?
- A. Yeah. They did a complete audit for two weeks. They did everything, and they -- they confirmed the custody issue by reviewing the stock record.

And I believe the second time they came they looked at -- they had -- we had produced DTC records. Meaning people in my office. Frank Dipascali produced DTC records for them.

But they never did what they should have done, which was directly contact DTC. Which

40 (Pages 154 to 157)

	158		160			
1	they could have done, if I gave them permission.	1	she interviewed me a couple of times.			
2	Q. But they never asked?	2	Q. She interviewed you here?			
3	A. They never asked to do that.	3	A. Here. Yes.			
4	Q. Did any did anybody ever ask you to give	4	Q. So after 2008?			
5	them permission to independently confirm with DTC?	5	A. Yeah.			
6	A. No.	6	Q. I'm going to go to the third paragraph from			
7	Q. Nobody ever did?	7	the top. See where it says, "but during a private			
8	A. No.	8	two-hour interview"? It's the third paragraph.			
9	Q. Optimal never asked you that?	9	A. Right.			
10	A. No.	10	Q. Yeah.			
11	Q. Let me	11	And on the second line it says, quote, "He			
12	MR. REGAN: Javier, let's give	12	asserted that unidentified banks and hedge funds			
13	MR. BLEICHMAR: Yeah.	13	were somehow complicit in his elaborate fraud."			
14	MR. REGAN: Can we just take a quick break?	14	Do you let me just first establish, do			
15	MR. BLEICHMAR: Yeah. We can take a quick	15	you remember giving that interview and saying that?			
16	break.	16	A. Yes, I do.			
17	MR. REGAN: Yeah, stretch and	17	Q. Okay. And what did you mean by			
18	MR. BLEICHMAR: Let's go off the record.	18	unidentified banks and hedge funds were somehow			
19	(RECESS FROM 11:41 A.M. TO 11:55 P.M.)	19	complicit?			
20	BY MR. BLEICHMAR:	20	A. Well, I felt that they they were			
21	Q. Let me show you an article I'm not going	21	they lacked to do the proper due diligence that			
22	to mark as an exhibit that was printed in the	22	they should have done, you know, to to			
23	New York Times.	23	discover whether or not there was a fraud			
24 25	MR. REGAN: Did you say you're not going to mark this?	24 25	involved.			
25		25	And basically it was all of the things			
	159		161			
1	MR. BLEICHMAR: I'm not going to mark it as	1	that I've discussed, you know, here, that now			
2	an exhibit.	2	you know, whether or not I guess this sort of			
3	MR. REGAN: Okay.	3	relates to what, you know, should have known, as			
4	MR. BLEICHMAR: I'm just going to use it to	4	opposed to actually knowing.			
5	refresh his recollection.	5	I have no way of knowing that a bank			
6	BY MR. BLEICHMAR:	6	actually knew that I was committing a fraud.			
7	Q. That is it states that it's February 15,	7	You know, no one asked me, are you committing a			
8	2011, "From Prison, Madoff Says, Banks Had to Know	8	fraud? And I said, yes.			
9	of Fraud," by Diana Henriques. Did you give an	9	And I thought that they believed me, you			
10	interview taken by Diana Henriques?	10	know. If I said, yes, it was, you know, in an			
11	A. Yes.	11	offhanded way, as a joke, you know. So			
12	Q. And does did you read this article at	12	But I felt that that certain of these			
13 14	the time? A. She wrote	13	people just you know, had they been doing the			
15		14 15	job properly, would have should have known			
16	MR. REGAN: I'm sorry. Did you say, "did you read this article"	16	that something was wrong. Q. Would you include Optimal in in that			
17	MR. BLEICHMAR: Yeah.	17	A. Yeah.			
18	MR. REGAN: "at the time"?	18	Q subset of people?			
19	THE WITNESS: Yeah, yeah. I yeah. I	19	A. Uh-huh.			
20	I read this. I read it in her book, I guess.	20	Q. Is that a, yes?			
21	BY MR. BLEICHMAR:	21	A. Yes.			
22	Q. And just, very briefly, who is Diana	22	MR. REGAN: Objection.			
23	Henriques?	23	BY MR. BLEICHMAR:			
24	A. She's a was a writer for the New York	24	Q. Let me move on to what's the sixth			
25	Times, and she wrote a book about my case, and	25	paragraph. The one that starts, "In many ways,			

CONFIDENTIAL 162 164 1 however." Do you see that? fund, that I'm aware of, had that strategy. 2 2 But, by the same token, there were very It says -- the second sentence in that 3 3 paragraph says, quote, "He spoke with great few other hedge funds that did what we did. You 4 4 intensity and fluency about his dealings with know, that used this particular strategy. And 5 5 there was some -- there was some confusion as to various banks and hedge funds, pointing to their 6 6 willful blindness and their failure to examine what you were required to report. 7 7 discrepancies between his regulatory filings and I can't remember what the confusion was. 8 8 But as a market maker you -- there were certain other information available to them," end quote. 9 Do you see that? 9 exemptions, but we clearly would not be -- I 10 A. Okay. Yeah. 10 don't believe that we would have been exempt. 11 11 Q. Did you say that? So that was one thing that, to me, was 12 12 A. Yes. somewhat unusual. 13 13 Q. And what did you mean by that? Again, you know, it depends upon -- you 14 14 sort of have to -- in my mind I felt, as a A. Well, the regulatory filings -- there 15 15 were -- there were two regulatory filings that matter of what -- when you say, "willful 16 16 blindness," people believe what they want to were important. 17 17 First of all, there was what they believe. 18 18 call -- I can't remember. Investment managers And if you don't connect the dots --19 19 are required to file quarterly the assets that look, I always had a theory that I used to 20 20 say -- and it's not only my theory. If you they have. 21 Q. Is that the ATV form? 21 don't understand a strategy or you don't 22 22 understand a business, you don't go into it. A. No. That they have under management. 23 23 It -- it meant -- it's position reporting. Because there is nothing that 24 24 O. 13-F? complicated about the stockmarket. In spite of 25 A. 13-F. Right. 13-F filings, which the fact that everybody tries to make it seem as 163 165 1 disclose the positions that you have. 1 though it's very mysterious and very 2 2 Now, we, in order to conceal that -complicated, there's no rocket science. 3 3 So if you don't understand something, well, it wasn't in order to conceal that. I 4 shouldn't -- I should not say that. 4 there's a reason why you don't understand 5 5 The -- the strategy that we employed something, you know. 6 6 always went into treasuries at the end of a Q. Did you feel that the hedge fund investors 7 7 did not understand what you were doing? quarter. That was part of the strategy, because 8 8 the options were usually 90-day options. A. I thought they didn't want to 9 9 understand. I thought that was --And most of the hedge funds liked the 10 10 idea that we would be liquid at the end of a Q. And what --11 particular quarter. It was basically a way of 11 A. -- willful blindness. 12 showing that there was liquidity in the 12 Q. What gave you that impression? 13 13 marketplace and so on. A. Because they never -- they never really 14 14 objected. There was -- it was always sort of a And that was the way the strategy was 15 15 passive, you know, well, I wish you would tell originally designed, when it was a legitimate 16 16 me this, but, okay. You're not going to. strategy. 17 17 So even when it became illegitimate, we Q. And you're including Optimal in this 18 18 carried that forward. So that because we were subset? 19 19 A. Yeah. always in treasuries at the end of a quarter, a 20 20 reporting quarter, there would be no positions Q. Moving on to the paragraph below, which

42 (Pages 162 to 165)

says, quote, "They had to know," end quote,

Do you remember saying that?

to know," end quote.

"Mr. Madoff said," quote, "but the attitude was sort

of, if you're doing something wrong, we don't want

21

22

23

24

25

to -- to report.

procedure.

But that was -- that was an unusual

Well, because probably no other hedge

Q. Why was it unusual?

21

22

23

24

		'EIN I	
	166		168
1	A. Yeah.	1	A. That sounds familiar.
2	Q. You said that?	2	Q. Okay.
3	A. Uh-huh.	3	A. I met with her and her husband.
4	Q. And what did you mean by that?	4	Q. And when did that happen approximately?
5	A. What I just said, that they basically	5	A. Oh, sometime in 2008, I believe.
6	I believe that they couldn't resist the profits	6	Maybe I met with her twice.
7	that were being generated from them.	7	Q. Let's start with the first time. So you
8	They were there was the hedge funds.	8	met with Ana Patricia Botin and her husband?
9	It was my own clients, you know. The individual	9	A. Uh-huh.
10	clients, the same thing.	10	Q. An how do you know it was her husband?
11	I mean, they just it's the greed	11	A. She told me.
12	overtakes them, and they just they just	12	Q. And do you remember his name?
13	didn't want to know.	13	A. No.
14	Q. And this included Optimal?	14	Q. If I told you that his name is Guillermo
15	A. This included Optimal.	15	Morenes, would that refresh your recollection?
16	MR. BLEICHMAR: Let me switch gears. I'm	16	A. All of these Spanish names sound the
17	going to mark this as Exhibit 1.	17	same to me.
18 19	(PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBIT 1 WAS MARKED FOR	18 19	Q. But you knew it was her husband?
20	IDENTIFICATION.) BY MR. BLEICHMAR:	20	A. Yeah.
21	Q. I've marked as Exhibit 1 what is entitled,	21	Q. And when did the first meeting take place more or less?
22	"Board of Directors of Banco Santander, London,	22	A. Up in my office. I don't remember the
23	November 21, 2011."	23	timeframe. The first time she came up I
24	Do you see, Mr. Madoff, that there's a	24	believe the first time she came up she came up
25	picture of the board of directors in this page?	25	with with him. She came up again once after
	167		169
1	A. Uh-huh.	,	that havealf though Thallava it was only
2		1 2	that herself, though. I believe it was only twice.
3	Q. Do you see that there is there's only one woman in that picture?	3	Q. And let's just remain focused on the first
4	A. Yeah.	4	meeting with Ms. Botin and her husband. What
5	Q. Do you recognize who that is?	5	were what was the purpose of that meeting?
6	A. Yes.	6	A. She just wanted to meet me, and she
7	O. And who is that?	7	seemed very knowledgeable. I was very impressed
8	A. I believe she's the granddaughter of the	8	with her.
9	founder of the bank.	9	Not so much knowledgeable necessarily in
10	Q. And what is her name?	10	the strategy, but knowledgeable about the bank
11	A. Well, I'd have to look at it to tell	11	and I mean, she had an important position at
12	you. I don't remember her name. She	12	the bank at the time.
13	Q. Let me ask it a different way. Do you	13	So, you know, I knew she she was
14	have you ever met with the individual who is in this	14	someone of of importance and you know, and
15	picture?	15	she just seemed very sharp and very, you know,
16	A. Yes.	16	knowledgeable.
17	Q. Okay. And do you remember her name?	17	Q. And was the discussion in English?
18	MR. REGAN: Objection. Asked and answered.	18	A. Yes. No, she spoke perfect English. So
19 20	THE WITNESS: No.	19	did her husband.
20 21	BY MR. BLEICHMAR: Q. Okay. Below, it says, "Director, Ms. Ana	20 21	Q. And you said this meeting took place in
22	Patricia Botin-Sanz;" do you see that?	22	your offices? A. Yeah.
23	A. Yeah.	23	Q. This is your office in the Lipstick
24	Q. Does that refresh your recollection of	24	Building?
25	whether you met with her?	25	A. Yeah, in my conference room.
	THICKICS YOU THEE WILLTHEET.		7 Tean, in my contende room.

170 172 1 Q. Was that on the 19th floor or on the 17th 1 Q. -- as a result of that meeting? 2 2 A. No, other than she came once -- once -floor? 3 A. 19th floor. I always met with clients 3 you know, an additional time. And at that 4 4 on the 19th floor. meeting the discussion primarily centered around 5 5 the difficulties in the banking industry itself. Q. And more or less how long did the meeting 6 last? 6 She spent a lot of time --7 7 A. Probably an hour. Q. This is the second meeting? 8 Q. And who else was there? 8 9 A. Her husband. 9 -- telling me about what a sad state the Q. Nobody else? 10 10 Spanish banks were in, which, you know, I had no 11 11 clue at that time how true it was. A. No. 12 12 Q. Just the three of you? But it was a general meeting, you know. 13 13 Right. Sort of at that -- it was almost like a social 14 Q. And how did the meeting come about? 14 meeting at that meeting. 15 A. I guess I must have -- typically I would Well, the first meeting was actually --16 get a call from Manuel to say that she was --16 she invited me to come while -- it was during 17 17 you know, that mostly that she's in New York for the America's Cup, actually, that meeting, 18 18 some business, and she would like to come up and because I remember --19 19 meet me. Q. The first meeting? 20 And I said -- and he would tell me, you 20 A. I think the first meeting. Because she 21 21 know, who she was. And I would say, fine. said, why don't you come -- you know, we're one 22 I mean, she was -- obviously, you would 22 of the sponsors for the America's Cup, and you 23 23 can watch the boat -- watch the race on our say, she was an important person at the bank. 24 24 So, you know, I wouldn't -- wouldn't object to boat. 25 meeting her. 25 And I said, well, at that time I'm 171 173 1 And we discussed, you know, I guess, the 1 usually in the South of France and on my own 2 strategy. You know, it was awhile ago. So I 2 3 3 don't remember. We must have discussed the And I just really didn't want to --4 strategy and just discussed the market. 4 didn't want to go. So I thanked her, and that 5 5 We spent more time discussing the market was it. 6 6 in general and what was going on in the So that -- I remember that was during 7 7 industry. the -- it must have been during the summer, 8 8 Q. Anything specifically about the strategy during the America's Cup race. 9 9 that you discussed that you remember? Q. Why didn't you want to go? 10 10 A. Nothing unusual, you know. It basically A. I -- for the most part I really tried 11 would have been sort of the same explanation 11 not to socialize with any of my clients. It 12 that I give everybody about how the strategy 12 was -- first of all, it was hard enough for me, 13 13 worked and what the advantages were, so on. putting on this sort of charade, you know, when 14 14 Q. And did you say this meeting took place I had to. The last thing I wanted to do was --15 15 approximately in 2008? was develop a social relationship with them. 16 16 A. I don't know. It might have been --And as much as I would have liked to go 17 17 there was one meeting that was later, that was to the America's Cup race, it was just not 18 close to the end. So the first meeting could 18 something that I really would want to do. 19 19 have been 2007. I don't recall. And I -- I didn't do that -- I really 20 Q. Anything else you remember about that --20 had no social relationship with any of my 21 21 the discussion in that meeting? clients for the same reason. 22 22 A. Nothing unusual. Q. Was this invitation to go to Spain to the 23 23 Q. Was there any subsequent followup or --America's Cup? 24 24 that arose --A. I believe it was in Spain. Yeah. 25 25 A. No. Focusing on the second meeting. You

174 176 1 mentioned that it was -- entailed a discussion of didn't really say that much. He was pretty much 2 the banking industry in Spain. Did that meeting --2 in the background. 3 3 did you say it also took place in your offices? He was -- it was clearly -- she was, you 4 4 A. Yeah. know -- she was sort of in charge of -- I mean, 5 5 Q. And was it just the two of you? she would -- you know, I don't know that he -- I 6 6 don't recall that he was related to the bank in A. Yes. 7 7 O. And how long did that meeting last? any way or Optimal in any way. 8 A. Probably similar; an hour. That's 8 So he was sort of there with her, as usually how long my meetings would take. they were both in New York at the same time. He 10 Q. And how did that meeting, the second 10 wanted to meet me as well, but it wasn't any --11 11 meeting, come about? he didn't solicit doing business with me 12 12 A. I believe -- again, the same as the directly or anything else like that. 13 first. Either she called me or Manuel called me 13 So he seemed, you know, very -- you 14 or Jonathan Clark called me. 14 know, an elegant guy and intelligent and very 15 15 Q. You didn't -- you didn't use e-mail; polite. correct? 16 16 Q. Did Manuel Echeverria call you after the 17 17 meeting and ask you what had happened at the A. No. 18 Q. And was there any specific purpose for the 18 meeting? 19 19 second meeting with Ms. Botin? A. He might have, you know. He might have, 20 20 you know. I mean, typically he would -- he --A. Not that I'm aware of. 21 21 Q. And approximately when did it happen, to he would, you know, stay in touch with me 22 the best of your recollection? 22 periodically and tell me that the meeting went 23 A. It was sometime in 2008. 23 well or didn't go -- I mean, it never didn't go 24 24 Q. Do you know if it was in the -- in the well. 25 summer of 2008? 25 So he would usually call me up and thank 175 177 1 A. No. I can't remember. me for, you know, seeing these people, and, you 2 2 Q. Do you remember if it was after -- or know, having the meeting and so on. 3 3 before Bear Stearns collapsed? Q. Let me go back to Exhibit 1 and to the 4 A. I don't -- I don't recall. 4 picture. Have you met or do you recognize anyone 5 Q. Anything else you remember about the second 5 else in this picture that you believe you have met 6 6 meeting with Ms. Botin? with? 7 7 A. This fellow here seems -- looks familiar A. No. 8 Q. You discussed -- do you remember discussing 8 to me. 9 the -- the split-strike conversion strategy again? 9 Q. And, for the record, are you pointing to 10 MR. REGAN: Objection. 10 the fellow to the right of Ms. Botin? 11 You can answer. 11 A. Yes. 12 THE WITNESS: I don't recall. 12 Q. And -- and why does he seem familiar? 13 13 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: A. He just looks familiar to me. I -- I 14 Q. What was your impression of Mr. Morenes, or 14 thought I possibly met with him at one of the 15 15 Mrs. Botin's husband, at the first meeting? meetings. 16 16 A. He was -- I believe either had his own Q. Do you see that below his name, at least in 17 17 fund or was a professional. I don't -- I don't the picture, he's identified as Mr. Rodrigo 18 18 think he was related to the bank so much, but he Echenique Gordillo? 19 was some sort of a money manager or a fund 19 A. Yes. 20 20 manager or a head -- some -- I believe, Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to 21 something like that. That's my recollection. 21 whether you met with him? 22 Q. And what was your impression of him, in 22 A. No. 23 23 terms of -- you said that you were very impressed by Q. Okay. Anybody else in the picture that you 24 24 Mrs. Botin. recognize · 25 25 A. He was -- you know, he was sort of --

	178		180				
1	Q that you	1	for me to meet, you know, to do some due				
2	A. I	2	diligence or, you know, to meet me.				
3	Q have met with?	3	Not that he did any due diligence, quite				
4	A. On Thanksgiving of 2008 I met with one	4	frankly, other than what everybody else does,				
5	of the directors of the bank. He came up and	5	just meet me.				
6	he came up with a group of people.	6	But there was some my recollection				
7	Q. Uh-huh.	7	was that someone said it was important for me to				
8	A. I don't see him here. At least you	8	meet him, because he's in charge of this issue,				
9	know, it I don't recognize him from this	9	whether there was going to be some sort of a				
10	picture, but he was I remember that at that	10	vote as to whether to expand the business or				
11	meeting and he came up with a younger fellow,	11	something of that sort.				
12	who was actually, I believe, took the place of	12	But at that time it was there was				
13	Manuel.	13	sort of a lot of changes taking place in the				
14	Q. Does the name Mr. Esteban Estevez	14	bank. There was there was a rumor that they				
15	A. I think so.	15	were going to be taken over, they were going to				
16	Q. Okay.	16	merge, they were going to get rid of or they				
17	A. He was a handsome, young guy.	17	were going to get rid of their money management				
18	Q. I'll represent to you that Mr. Estevez	18	position or				
19	A. Okay.	19	You know, there was all sorts of stuff				
20	Q replaced Mr. Echeverria.	20	that started basically when Manuel left, but				
21	A. Right.	21	everybody assured me that nothing was going to				
22	Q. I can also represent if if it if it	22	change.				
23	refreshes your recollection, that our understanding	23 24	So they wanted me to meet with this				
24 25	is that it was Mr. Echenique who was present at the Thanksgiving day meeting.	25	with this fellow, and I said, fine. Q. So your understanding was that there was				
23		25	Q. 30 your understanding was that there was				
	179		181				
1	The picture may be different than the	1	I don't know how you put it, but there was something				
2	one	2	going on with at the on the board with respect				
3	A. Echenique.	3	to investment?				
4	MR. REGAN: Objection.	4	A. I thought there was				
5	Go ahead.	5	MR. REGAN: Objection.				
6	I thought that you were going to represent	6	You can answer.				
7	that he was handsome.	7	THE WITNESS: I thought that my				
8	THE WITNESS: Okay. I can't remember any	8	recollection was that there was it was				
9	of these guys, but I think at that meeting there	9	important for me to meet him as a board member,				
10 11	were three or four people. BY MR. BLEICHMAR:	10 11	because, you know, there was some decision, you				
12		12	know, as to maybe whether to expand the amount				
13	Q. Okay.A. It was an unusual meeting, because it	13	of money that I had with them or not. That's all I that is just, you know, a				
14	took place on Thanksgiving. My office was	14	feeling I had.				
15	closed. It was a meeting that was had been	15	BY MR. BLEICHMAR:				
16	delayed, canceled a number of times, because his	16	Q. And when did you what was discussed at				
17	plans changed of being in New York, this one	17	that meeting, at the Thanksgiving 2008 meeting?				
18	director.	18	A. The same as discussed at every meeting.				
19	And the purpose of that meeting was	19	Sort of a replay of at that time the markets				
20	that there was something about they were	20	were in turmoil in general. There were				
21	leverage that they were I think it was it	21	redemptions sort of flowing around the whole				
22	was	22	industry.				
23	I was led to believe that this there	23	The industry was in a the whole hedge				
24	was something coming up at the board meeting at	24	fund industry, as well as the market, was sort				
25	the bank, and that he was an important person	25	of in in turmoil. So it was really sort of a				

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

182

184

1 hold -- hold-your-hand type of a -- of a 2

Q. Did they -- did anyone from Optimal request to withdraw funds?

5 A. Yeah. I mean -- well, not at that 6 particular meeting, but I'm not sure -- there 7 was already -- prior to the meeting there was --8 there were withdrawals of funds, and there was 9 a -- a schedule of additional monies that were going to come out. 10 11

Q. So prior to the meeting Optimal had requested that --

A. I believe so.

3

4

12

13

14

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Q. -- to withdraw some money?

15 A. Part of the -- my recollection was that 16 there were monies already being withdrawn, and 17 there were more monies to be withdrawn, you 18 know, after the meeting. 19 Q. Do you remember the amounts?

A. They were large amounts. I mean, there was a couple hundred million dollars. There may have been 250 million at one shot.

There may have been another 50 or 200 that actually never was withdrawn at the end, because I went out of business. So --

Q. At the Thanksgiving 2008 meeting did you try to dissuade Optimal from making the last redemption?

A. Well, I believe that at that time I already told them that if they withdrew money, I wasn't going to take it back. I --

That was a time that I was -- I knew that I wasn't going to be able to meet all of these liquidity withdrawals, or I chose not to.

I mean, I had the ability to take in additional monies, if I wanted to. I had -- at the end had commitments from the Pritzker family of Chicago for hundreds of millions of dollars.

I had -- Picower was going to contribute 250 million. Shapiro was going to put money in, because they basically owed me the money that they had sort of guaranteed me from the losses that I had taken.

But by that time I was burned out. I mean, I realized that I just couldn't continue this. It was just too much for me.

And I just felt guilty about taking money from new clients, who I had never made any profits for, other than Picower and so on.

But I had a couple of other hedge funds

185

183

Q. So did Optimal's request to withdraw funds in November of 2008 contribute to the demise of

A. Yes.

BMIS?

O. In what sense?

A. Well, at that time I was getting

withdrawals from everyone. With -- I mean, there was a liquidity issue coming in -- going on in the hedge fund industry, and everybody was

10 withdrawing money. 11

And because I was one of the few hedge funds that didn't have any restrictions of withdrawals -- you know, there wasn't particular dates they could sort of withdraw the money on demand, which was one of the big attractions of these hedge funds.

There was no 30-day notice or anything of that sort. Which was typical. Usually there was a timeframe that you couldn't -- you had to withdraw money at the end of a quarter or so on. With me, there wasn't.

22 It was sort of like the -- they could --23 can withdraw, and did withdraw, you know, at any 24 given time, with no notice, other than, you 25 know, three days settlement type of notice.

1 that were new clients that could. So I -- I --

2 I had the ability to take an additional billion

3 dollars that would have kept me -- that would

4 have covered all of my redemptions, including

5 Banco Santander, but at that stage, mentally I 6

iust couldn't.

I just -- I couldn't handle it any longer. So I just said, you know, I'm not --I'm just not going to continue. And --

So I tried to delay -- discourage people from taking money out, like Fairfield and -- but they were all in a position where they -- they had -- they were getting redemptions from their clients, and they had no choice.

So I realized that, and that was the end.

So, yeah, I probably said to Optimal, look, if you take money out -- because that was the only threat that I had, was to say, you're not coming back.

Because what they all did was say, I'm taking money out temporarily, but I'll be back, you know, as soon as I get the money from these other funds, which I can't withdraw until the, you know, 30 days. But as soon as I get that

47 (Pages 182 to 185)

	186		188			
1	money back, I'm going to re-liquify you.	1	know, I see his picture in the newspaper all of			
2	And I realized that I just it was	2	the time. So as chairman of the bank.			
3	going to be too late, you know.	3	You know, I I thought I had met him			
4	Q. How long did this meeting last?	4	at one point in time, but, you know, I don't			
5	A. Two hours at the most.	5	know. I don't know whether it was just because			
6	Q. Two hours.	6	I've seen his picture or not.			
7	Did they ask you about the counterparties?	7	As I say, a lot of times they people			
8	A. My guess would be, yes, but I don't	8	come up to meetings with me, and I never knew			
9	really I can't say for sure.	9	really who they were.			
10	Q. Do you remember anything else specifically	10	Q. You don't have any specific recollection			
11	about the meeting?	11	one way or the other?			
12	A. No. I thought the meeting went well. I	12	A. No.			
13	mean, you know, there was no I never I	13	MR. BLEICHMAR: Okay.			
14	didn't feel any	14	(DISCUSSION HELD OFF THE RECORD.)			
15	But, look, you know, everybody was great	15	BY MR. BLEICHMAR:			
16	actors, including myself. So it's hard to	16	Q. Do you recognize the individual in this			
17	hard to determine whether they what they	17	picture?			
18 19	thought.	18 19	A. (INDICATING.)			
20	I I had the opinion that they had no choice, that they they had to cover these	20	Q. No?			
21	redemptions from their clients.	21	A. He looks like a drug dealer. I don't know.			
22	And they also said they were going to	22	Q. We won't identify it, for the record.			
23	replace them, but it was other than that,	23	A. Not that I've ever met anyway. No.			
24	there was no difference in that meeting.	24	Q. Let me switch gears a little bit. You and			
25	Q. You mentioned that Manuel Echeverria had	25	I have met before; correct?			
	187		189			
1	been replaced; correct?	1	A. Yes.			
2	A. Yeah.	2	Q. And when we've met, who else has been			
3	Q. And that Manuel Echeverria had left; is	3	present?			
4	that right?	4	A. Alan.			
5 6	A. Right.Q. What is your understanding of that?	5 6	Q. Mr. Alan Ellman? A. Yeah.			
7	A. The way it was explained to me was	7	Q. And can you describe how you and I first			
8	that by him	8	came into contact?			
9	Q. By Mr. Echeverria?	9	A. You sent me a letter, stating that you			
10	A. Yeah.	10	wanted to come up and meet with me about you			
11	was that the bank was changing their	11	were representing some clients in a potential			
12	compensation arrangement with him, and that was	12	action against Optimal and the bank, I guess it			
13	not acceptable to him. They were changing it,	13	was, and wanted to know whether I would be			
14	because there was something internal being done	14	willing to to meet with you. And, you know,			
15	at the bank with, you know, how they were going	15	I said, yes.			
16	to handle things.	16	Q. And how did you say, yes? How did you			
17	And he either he wanted an equity	17	contact me?			
18	he wanted a percentage, or something, of the	18	A. I either e-mailed you or called you up.			
19	return, and they just weren't going to give it	19	Q. So we have exchanged telephone			
20	to him. So he left and went to Notz Stucki, I	20	conversations and e-mails; correct?			
21	guess it was.	21	A. Correct.			
22	Q. Do you recognize the individual all of the	22	Q. How many times have we met?			
	way to the right of the picture, the one who is	23	 I believe this is the third time. 			
23						
24 25	identified as the chairman, Mr. Emilio Botin? A. Well, yeah. I mean, it's funny. You	24 25	Q. And approximately for how long have we met in the past?			

190 192 1 A. Typically about two hours. swore to tell the truth; correct? 2 Q. And generally what did we discuss? 2 A. Correct. 3 3 A. Pretty much a similar conversation to Q. Why should we believe that you're telling 4 4 what we've been having this morning. the truth now? 5 5 Q. Anything that you think that we've A. Well, first of all, I have nothing to 6 6 discussed in the past that we haven't covered today? lose by telling the truth. And if, in fact, the 7 7 A. No. bank or the fund acted improperly, then, you 8 Q. What kind of -- when we communicated by 8 know, I feel it's my obligation basically to --9 e-mail, if you could, please, describe how the 9 to say that. 10 10 e-mail system works with somebody in a correctional It's not going to be my -- you know, I'm 11 facility. 11 not going to be the one to determine that, 12 12 A. Well, we -- in order for us to contact obviously, but, you know, basically I've been 13 13 somebody by e-mail, we have to put them -- we willing to see anyone that's requested -- you 14 have to apply, you know, to the -- to the 14 know, whether they be a defendant's lawyer or a 15 15 prison. plaintiff's lawyer, I have been willing to see 16 16 We have to register a person -- e-mail them. 17 17 address and -- and who they are and their So as to whether or not to believe me or 18 18 address and so on and what their relationship, not, you know, I -- I have no ax to grind, you 19 19 you know, is. know, one way or the other. 20 At which point I would say, an attorney, 20 Q. When you say you have nothing --21 21 which would cover -- could be anyone from my A. Other than do the right thing. You 22 attorney, to another attorney and so on. 22 know, I'm not sure what is the right thing any 23 And you have to -- the person has to 23 longer, but, to me, I'm -- my feeling is people 24 acknowledge that they want to receive the 24 are going to ask me questions. 25 e-mail. And once they do that, then you're 25 I'm going to answer them, you know, to 191 193 registered to receive and send e-mails to me. 1 1 the best of my knowledge in a truthful manner, 2 2 Q. And is there a name for this system? because it's -- I feel at this stage of the game 3 3 A. It's called the CorrLinks system. it's -- it's what I want to do. 4 Q. So is it an Internet-based system? 4 O. Is there anything else that you would like 5 5 A. Yeah. to add? 6 Q. So, in other words, you don't have an 6 A. No, not -- not really. Nothing that I 7 Outlook e-mail account in a computer? 7 can think of. 8 8 You access the Internet and your e-mail MR. BLEICHMAR: Let's go off the record. 9 9 through CorrLinks; correct? (RECESS FROM 12:36 P.M. TO 12:44 P.M.) 10 10 A. Correct. I mean, we can't use the MR. BLEICHMAR: Back on the record. 11 Internet, other than for internal prison matters 11 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: 12 and just to go in and out on an e-mail. 12 Q. Mr. Madoff, we -- I just have a few more 13 13 And all of the e-mails are reviewed questions. 14 by -- my e-mails, anyhow, are monitored by -- by 14 A. All right. 15 15 the Bureau of Prisons. Q. Not a lot more. 16 16 Q. Have we offered to pay you any -- in any We previously talked about your firm being 17 17 way to appear at this deposition? technologically advanced; correct? 18 18 A. Uh-huh. A. No. 19 Q. Have we promised you anything of value? 19 Q. When BMIS sent the trading records to 20 20 A. No. Optimal, did it send them electronically or a paper 21 Q. Have you entered into any agreements with 21 copy? 22 me or my firm or anyone in connection with this 22 A. Paper copy. 23 23 Q. And why didn't BMIS provide electronic deposition? 24 24 A. No. trading records? 25 You -- when we began this deposition, you 25 A. With the exception of -- of Citgo, who

49 (Pages 190 to 193)

CONFIDENTIAL 194 196 1 was the custodian for Fairfield, we sent 1 2 2 everybody just paper copies of the Q. And did anybody at BMIS generally use 3 3 e-mail? confirmations. 4 4 Primarily we didn't want to have --A. Yeah. Everybody else in the firm used 5 5 we -- we were very concerned about anybody e-mail, other than the advisory side. 6 6 having a direct access to our computer system Q. And how did you -- why not? 7 7 for -- you know, for -- I forgot what the term A. Well, until I came to prison I was very 8 8 opposed to e-mails in general. I just -- I is, but we didn't want -- we didn't want people having access to our system. never had an e-mail -- personally I never had an 10 So, other than our wholesale clients, 10 e-mail address. 11 11 who had order execution capability through our There was also a -- an issue of the --12 12 system, we didn't have any -- we didn't want the industry was always afraid of e-mails, from 13 13 anybody else to -- to have -day one. They fought having e-mail, because 14 14 e-mails had to be retained. O. Did Optimal ever --15 A. -- access. 15 And I remember sitting on a federal 16 16 Q. Sorry. Are you finished? regulations committee meeting, when e-mail --17 17 A. No. That's it. when the SEC was going to propose requiring of 18 18 Q. Did Optimal ever raise -- or find it odd treating e-mails like they did all 19 19 that you were providing paper copies when you customer-related information. 20 20 I remember the then general counsel of were -- when BMIS was known as a 21 technologically-advanced company? 21 Merrill Lynch saying this was going to be the 22 22 downfall of the securities industry, because now A. Well, I would say that they all would 23 have preferred to have that. First of all, 23 all of this information, all of these 24 it -- it was a cost issue for them. It saved 24 communications, which typically in the past 25 errors on their part. could be torn up, you know, are now going to be 195 197 1 I mean, we -- we -- it was not uncommon 1 saved. 2 2 for the people receiving -- it was -- it was a And it -- they -- he turned out to be 3 3 manually -- it was a -- it was a, you know, correct. It was the undoing of endless amount 4 pretty intensive manual operation. 4 of -- so -- but that wasn't a concern so much 5 I mean, we would send the confirmations. 5 for me. 6 6 We would actually fax them, because they didn't It was just the whole general industry. 7 want to wait for the mail. So typically we 7 Nobody wanted their phone calls recorded. 8 8 would fax them con --Nobody wanted to have e-mails, you know, 9 9 And the confirmations came out typically retained. 10 10 But most firms lost that ability. We 24 hours after the trade was executed. And then 11 it would be mailed. And -- you know, first 11 were one of the few firms on Wall Street that 12 class mail, and they would get it. 12 were not required to record our trading room 13 13 But most of the funds requested to have conversation. 14 14 that information faxed to them that day. So That was because we were one of the few 15 15 they would get -- get it like within 48 hours. firms that was not involved in the price-fixing 16 16 And then their -- their -- their litigation in the industry, which required 17 17 clerical people would have to type in, key punch everybody to record their phone calls. So we 18 18 in, to their systems. never had any recording device at all in our --19 So it -- in order to them -- to avoid 19 in our office.

50 (Pages 194 to 197)

As far as e-mails are concerned, e-mails

We were required -- as a broker-dealer

for all employees was a pain in the neck,

because they spent all day, you know, on

you're required to monitor all of your firm's

e-mails, on the Internet.

20

21

22

23

24

25

get it electronically.

advisory side use e-mail?

having the key punch operators make mistakes,

which they frequently did, it would have been --

Q. Did anyone at -- at BMIS on the investment

it was an -- an easier process for them to -- to

20

21

22

23

24

198 200 1 e-mails, because this was the way they e-mails all of the time, and it was very labor 2 functioned in general. intensive. 3 3 And it had to be done by the compliance So we had very strict rules with it, but we allowed it. 4 4 department. And, quite frankly, when we 5 5 monitored our trading room e-mails, it was a But the people in the investment 6 6 total disaster. I mean -management side, they had no reason to have 7 7 O. In what sense? e-mails. I don't need to have your wife tell 8 8 you to bring home a quart of milk over the A. You can't imagine what -- what people -you know, not only e-mail, what they do on the 9 e-mail. 10 10 Internet. I mean, we had to require -- I mean, Q. Let me switch topics for -- for a moment 11 11 everything from these sex 800 e-mails. I and go back to Manuel Echeverria. Over the years 12 12 mean --Mr. Echeverria was involved in conducting some due 13 13 Q. So it was a liability concern? diligence over you; correct? 14 14 A. Uh-huh. A. It wasn't a liability concern. We 15 15 had -- my compliance officer, my brother's Q. And what was your impression of his ability 16 16 to conduct due diligence? daughter, who was the -- who was with us, said, 17 17 A. You know --I'm not monitoring these e-mails, because, you 18 18 MR. REGAN: Objection. know --19 19 I mean, we -- we had -- we had people You can answer. 20 20 THE WITNESS: He -- he was typical of -that were monitoring lesbians-of-size e-mails, 21 21 you know. It was ridiculous. I mean, we had you know, he -- he sort of knew the questions to 22 22 ask, which was -- they all knew. guys that were, you know -- that's what they do 23 23 Most of them, quite frankly -- frankly, had all day long. So --24 24 questionnaires that their due diligence people And we said, you're not allowed to use 25 25 e-mail for any personal -- we had -- my would -- would provide them with to ask. 199 201 1 1 secretary was shopping on e-mails all day long, And he understood the strategy. So he was 2 2 you know, using the Internet, and -as knowledgeable as anybody else with, you know, 3 3 Q. But you, personally, didn't have e-mail the questions he asked and the due diligence he 4 either; right? 4 5 A. I never had an e-mail. I saw -- I was a 5 BY MR. BLEICHMAR: 6 6 firm believer -- I returned every phone call Q. Was it your impression that he asked enough 7 7 questions? anybody ever gave me within an hour after I got 8 8 A. Yeah. it, no matter where I was in the world, no 9 9 Q. Did you feel that he was pushy? matter who it was. 10 10 I was well known for that. I said, if A. No. He was -- he was considerate. In 11 you want to talk to me, call me up. But make 11 other words, I didn't have to tell him more than 12 sure it's important. And I'm going to return 12 twice, or three times at the most, you know, 13 13 the call. that I would provide or would not provide what 14 14 it was. I found that it was common knowledge 15 15 that -- because I know other people that had But it was pretty well laid out from the 16 16 first meeting what information I would provide e-mails, like my sons and my brother, you know. 17 17 People fire off e-mails, you know, blast e-mails and what I wouldn't provide. 18 18 off to -- you know, with jokes and everything. MR. BLEICHMAR: I'll reserve the rest of my 19 19 That was the big thing with Wall Street, time for redirect. 20 20 (DISCUSSION HELD OFF THE RECORD.) half of the e-mails going through were jokes 21 21 MR. REGAN: Mr. Madoff, thank you for your that everybody would tell each other. 22 22 time. We -- as you and I discussed briefly So there was nothing sinister in why we 23 23 earlier, the judge in this case has entered an didn't want e-mails. I tried to stop it in the 24 24 whole firm, but my traders, you know, felt they order that gives each side a day of up to seven

25

hours to depose you. We're going to reserve our

had to have instant messaging. They had to have

	202				:	204
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	opportunity to do that. I'm not certain that we will THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. MR. REGAN: find it necessary, but if we do, we will certainly let you know through the Bureau of Prisons. THE WITNESS: Right. Okay. MR. REGAN: Other than that, again, just thank you for your time, and we will THE WITNESS: You're welcome. MR. BLEICHMAR: We can go off the record. (SIGNATURE RESERVED.) (DEPOSITION CONCLUDED AT 12:55 P.M.)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		OPTIM AUGUS	R A T A S H E E T AL U.S. LITIGATION ST 7, 2012 CORRECTION AND REASON	
25		25	(DATE)		BERNARD L. MADOFF	
	203					205
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I have read the foregoing transcript of my deposition and except for any corrections or changes noted on the errata sheet, I hereby subscribe to the transcript as an accurate record of the statements made by me. BERNARD L. MADOFF SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN before and to me this day of, 20	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	IN RE:	OPTIM AUGUS LINE	SHEET CONTINUED AL U.S. LITIGATION ST 7, 2012 CORRECTION AND REASON	— — — — —
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	NOTARY PUBLIC My Commission expires:	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25			BERNARD L. MADOFF	

52 (Pages 202 to 205)

	206	
1	STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA	
2	COUNTY OF PERSON	
4	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I, Lisa A. DeGroat, a Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the aforesaid county and state, do hereby certify that the foregoing deposition of BERNARD L. MADOFF, was taken by me and reduced to typewriting under my direction; and the transcript is a true record of the testimony given by the witness. I further certify that I am neither attorney or counsel for, nor related to or employed by any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto or financially interested in the action. This the 9th day of August, 2012.	
18 19 20 21 22 23	LISA A. DeGROAT Registered Professional Reporter Notary Public #19952760001 Expiration Date: December 8, 2015	
25		

	A CIMIONIA ED C	02.15.21.110.21	1.7.21.1.00.0
A	ACKNOWLEDG	93:15,21 118:21	Ana 167:21 168:8
ability 45:2,10	203:1	118:25	Andersen 154:24
71:15 72:15 86:2	act 22:22 26:5	aggressive 59:14	Andy 18:14
86:11,21 89:9 93:6	acted 93:21 192:7	ago 6:21 51:10	answer 7:16 8:2
115:22 131:11	acting 59:23 93:15	73:19 171:2	30:13,22 65:15
145:22 184:10	118:21,25	agreed 46:17	73:5 85:25 86:17
185:2 197:10	action 4:9 18:25	agreement 95:12	88:5,23 92:20 94:3
200:15	19:8,13 189:12	agreements 48:4,16	98:18 99:22
able 26:13 37:9 56:2	206:16	118:3,5 191:21	100:18 102:13
58:4 103:20 104:5	actors 186:16	ah 142:25	117:6 118:8
104:9 111:20,21	add 127:7 130:5	ahead 31:19 43:14	119:10,25 120:6
118:20 125:11,17	193:5	74:19 92:21	131:4,10 175:11
129:16 141:18	additional 172:3	115:25 126:3	181:6 192:25
144:3 148:14	182:9 184:11	127:22 139:20	200:19
149:4 184:8	185:2	140:20 179:5	answered 92:23
above-entitled 4:9	address 88:10	air 129:1	167:18
absurd 19:10 35:8	190:17,18 196:10	Alan 2:3 5:15 189:4	answers 4:17 131:3
abused 77:16	admit 150:2	189:5	anybody 50:22
academic 61:21	advanced 125:9	alarm 130:6	80:25 83:9 85:19
109:16	193:17	Albert 33:12 39:16	101:2,23 106:21
acceptable 187:13	advancement 21:14	46:14	107:11 114:11,22
accepted 151:3	advantage 42:13	Allen 25:5,6	119:6 134:15
access 191:8 194:6,9	156:8	allocate 72:6	143:6 150:7 158:4
194:15	advantages 171:13	allocates 17:19	177:23 194:5,13
accomplish 104:9	advent 21:13	allow 134:2	196:2 199:7 201:2
104:10	advised 108:11	allowed 15:2 20:4,7	anymore 28:15
account 12:23 17:17	advisement 12:12	27:19 35:2,10,13	144:18
22:25 85:20 90:6,7	advisor 9:5 12:4,6	83:2 103:11	anyway 188:23
90:10,11,23	12:13,16 13:5,19	106:10 198:24	appeal 69:7
132:20 133:14	14:2 15:10,23,25	200:4	appear 191:17
143:15 156:7	17:9 31:25 139:11	America's 172:17	Apple 60:21,23,24
191:7	141:9	172:22 173:8,17	60:25 61:2,4,25
accountant 154:2	advisors 12:1 13:11	173:23	apply 26:25 105:12
accounting 154:20	advisory 11:22	amount 13:12 17:20	190:14
accounts 15:1 16:4	16:10,23 17:2	50:14 97:1,23	approached 33:15
16:5,6 20:20 39:6	18:18,20 29:14,21	102:18 104:14	34:11 35:9 36:6
39:6 49:5 89:22,25	31:23 126:7	115:12,20 117:3	approximately 6:20
90:5,13,18 127:24	127:11 156:20	122:3 125:16,20	21:11 62:6 69:21
accurate 203:6	195:25 196:5	126:5 127:23	74:15 168:4
accused 113:18	aforesaid 206:7	142:5 181:11	171:15 174:21
acknowledge	afraid 196:12	197:3	189:24
105:16 106:23	age 47:22	amounts 36:24 69:9	arbitrage 11:9,11
153:2 190:24	agency 136:18	82:15 121:21	11:17 31:2 33:5,16
	agent 17:18 86:22	182:19,20	57:13 72:22 74:2
	1	<u> </u>	I

		1	1
77:7 146:22	assured 51:1 180:21	103:19 109:5	bandied 126:10
arbitrage-style	atmosphere 80:10	111:14 137:8,11	bank 20:20 21:3
125:1	attached 110:15	137:13,14 138:13	22:9,13 25:15 29:5
argued 15:16	attack 112:6	139:18 164:1	29:9 33:7,8,9 34:3
arguments 150:10	attend 76:25	174:20	34:12,20 35:24
Arnault 55:5 79:22	attitude 81:18	awhile 38:19 103:19	37:11 40:7 41:18
arose 171:24	165:22	171:2	48:19,20 53:15
arranged 50:11	attorney 190:20,22	awkward 45:15	82:6 86:20 92:4
arrangement 20:22	190:22 206:13,15	46:16	96:21 99:6 132:20
22:20 39:1,20 49:9	attorneys 107:22	ax 99:7,9 192:18	133:13,15 143:15
187:12	108:10 110:23,25	A.G 10:24 25:4	145:16 161:5
arrangements 19:10	127:12	a.m 1:18 2:22 55:17	167:9 169:10,12
21:2 49:2	attractions 149:12	55:17 115:4,4	170:23 175:18
Arthur 154:24	183:15	158:19	176:6 178:5
article 106:4 158:21	attractive 146:25		179:25 180:14
159:12,16	ATV 162:21	<u>B</u>	187:11,15 188:2
articles 80:15	audience 23:23	B 3:7	189:12 192:7
artificial 124:2	audit 137:1,4	baby 148:10	banker 33:10
126:15	151:17 152:3,5,10	back 8:18 20:17	bankers 55:9
ASD 136:20	152:13,14,17	22:6,22 29:19	banking 172:5
aside 53:13 102:7	153:11,19,20,25	30:18 32:16 54:4	174:2
asked 4:20 90:21	155:5,7,10,13,18	55:18 56:25 70:15	banks 25:15,16 26:1
94:4,5,6 119:2,22	155:25 156:19,21	85:11 88:10 89:3	30:1,3,4,5,7,9,25
120:14 128:9,22	157:14,16	93:19 94:18 95:25	33:6 34:13,21 35:9
131:1 132:3 142:1	audited 136:18	96:1,24,24 102:4,5	37:21 38:10 39:25
151:6,20,20 157:5	auditing 152:10	108:15 111:5	40:7,16 41:18,24
158:2,3,9 161:7	155:17,19,24	115:6 133:3 141:2	49:21 53:15 84:16
167:18 201:3,6	auditor 155:7,25	141:3 144:15	84:17 89:16
asking 79:14 133:21	auditors 82:10	149:15 154:16	112:12 154:13
134:21	149:8 151:8,8,24	156:15 157:6	159:8 160:12,18
asks 107:17	audits 136:20	177:3 184:6	162:5 172:10
aspect 17:8,9 44:18	August 1:17 2:21	185:20,22 186:1	Banque 33:7 46:12
88:2 101:24	204:3 205:3	193:10 200:11	46:13 53:16
aspects 17:4	206:17	background 8:11	Barclays 21:3
ass 149:20 151:3	authorization 58:12	71:21 176:2	Barings 154:14
asserted 160:12	authorized 15:1	backside 64:8	Barney 121:18
assets 53:3 85:14	available 123:3	back-dooring 79:20	122:17 147:13
115:13 117:4,15	126:25 142:6	Bacon 72:13	148:17 151:9
125:17,20 162:19	162:8	bail 110:4	Bart 148:16
assistance 16:1	Avenue 2:10	balance 91:6	based 12:7 15:21
assume 69:22	average 134:20	balked 129:4	18:24 62:11 67:18
101:16	146:15	ball 129:15	87:24 100:10
assumed 60:2	avoid 195:19	Banco 3:10 65:10	108:21 127:10
assure 26:12	aware 49:16,16,17	84:7 166:22 185:5	Basel 95:11
	1	1	1

	I	I	1
basic 73:12 78:14	began 191:25	103:2 132:6	128:1 131:17
152:9	beginning 17:3	133:22 138:9,22	136:4 158:13,15
basically 9:5,13	57:14 68:13 116:1	145:4,5 147:10,21	158:18,20 159:1,4
11:8,24 14:25	148:6 154:10	149:12 154:19,22	159:6,17,21
15:17 18:10,15,25	behalf 30:10 89:25	154:24 155:4	161:23 166:16,20
19:5,8,13 22:1	90:18	156:10 183:15	167:20 175:13
25:12 26:5,15	believe 51:22 70:8	199:19	179:11 181:15
27:18,23 31:2,21	73:2 82:2 96:9,22	bigger 51:18 116:15	188:13,15 193:8
32:1,12 35:4 40:4	110:10 113:4,5	biggest 138:10	193:10,11 201:5
40:21 42:5 44:13	126:18 136:16	147:9 154:13	201:18 202:11
44:23 45:4 46:23	139:23 157:20	bill 26:10 59:11	blew 130:11 136:11
47:25 48:13,16	164:10,16,17	billion 10:5 29:16	blindly 114:12
52:11 53:10 54:7	166:6 167:8 168:5	50:23 52:20 65:21	blindness 162:6
57:24 58:6 63:25	168:24 169:1	104:6 111:15	164:16 165:11
66:8,10,19 67:2,5	173:24 174:12	112:1,9,11,13	blowers 137:22
67:16,17 68:12	175:16,20 177:5	126:8,9,12,14,18	blunder 49:11 59:18
70:20 71:10,19	178:12 179:23	126:20 127:5,5,6,9	blurred 30:2 105:10
72:23 75:12 78:9	182:13 184:4	127:19,23 147:14	blurry 70:10
78:16,24 79:6	189:23 192:3,17	147:23 148:18,23	BMIS 8:19,21 10:19
82:13 91:22 92:13	believed 113:10	150:17 185:2	17:3 20:7 23:6
95:18 99:12 106:6	125:12 153:16	billionaires 48:1	38:15 69:19 87:16
122:18 123:12	161:9	billions 29:7 43:16	87:18,23 89:21,24
132:7 146:21	believer 199:6	50:24 112:17	93:11 99:18,19
152:2 154:23	believing 56:1	bills 29:16 58:9 59:2	102:9,9,11 115:13
160:25 163:11	bells 130:6	bit 7:9 32:8 34:8,8	121:15 128:4
166:5 171:10	Bennett 25:4	37:19 56:7 125:2	136:17 151:25
180:20 184:16	Bernard 1:14 2:18	188:24 bizarre 49:9	152:3,5 155:5
192:8,12 basketballs 152:11	3:3 5:3,11 8:14 55:5 79:21 203:10	blame 24:14 101:22	183:3 193:19,23 194:20 195:24
152:16	204:25 205:25	blamed 24:15	194.20 193.24
battle 16:21	204.23 203.23	blank 135:18	
Bayou 130:11,19,25	Bernie 53:9 80:15	blast 199:17	BMIS-prepared 87:25
131:6 136:10	84:21 88:16 103:5	Bleichmar 2:3 3:4	board 3:10 27:9,10
154:6	138:17 142:4	5:7,12,15,24 6:11	166:22,25 179:24
Bear 20:23 22:21	143:6 144:3 146:2	6:15,17 30:15	181:2,9
25:13,14 29:9	best 108:14 109:7	31:12 52:2,21	boards 13:15
86:24,25 87:2,5,6	131:11 174:22	55:13,16,18,19	boat 135:6,7 150:15
87:6,8,13 88:14	193:1	65:22 73:9 74:20	150:15 172:23,24
154:6,7 155:16	Bettencourt 55:6	86:5 87:12 88:7	173:2
156:3 175:3	better 101:19 106:8	92:21 93:10 94:10	Boesky 50:9
beat 83:22	107:10,11 144:16	97:8 99:8,24 102:3	Boesky's 50:7
Becker 14:10	bid 123:23	103:9 115:2,5,7	bogus 60:13
becoming 34:23	big 25:20 36:7 68:7	117:9 119:7 120:1	bolts 152:15
48:1 114:3	72:14 87:2 101:14	125:23 127:1	bona 11:9
	1	<u> </u>	

	Ī		
bond 50:15	25:18 85:20 86:7	53:22,22,24 54:9	bypasses 109:24
bonds 27:14,15	116:13 145:16	55:21 57:3,13 61:5	
28:25,25 57:14	brokers 128:14	75:10 77:18,19	<u> </u>
book 105:11 159:20	broker-dealer 10:12	78:8,15 85:12,13	C 2:1 3:1 5:1 205:1
159:25	10:13,16,20 12:1	86:22 87:18 88:3	cahoots 154:17
bookkeepers 108:23	12:14 19:22,25	88:14 100:8	California 39:8
books 89:23 90:22	20:1,9 21:5 90:6,8	101:24,25 102:21	call 15:14,17 23:12
148:20,24 151:10	91:24 137:4	104:12,12,17,25	59:1 60:20 62:21
155:18 156:1	141:20,22 197:24	105:9,19,24	62:22,24,25 63:3,8
borrowing 90:8	broker-dealers	112:18 119:20,24	63:23 84:20 86:24
Boston 19:13	10:22 12:15 123:6	120:7,9 122:14	95:16 124:22
bothered 134:8	141:11	129:5 131:24	138:16 155:10
Botin 168:8 169:4	brother 9:1 18:15	132:8,8 134:13	162:18 170:16
174:19 175:6,24	27:10 114:16	135:9,13,14,17	176:16,25 199:6
177:10 187:24	123:1 147:21	137:5,6,10,15,19	199:11,13
Botin's 175:15	148:9 150:3	138:5 140:6,17,20	called 8:14 9:22
Botin-Sanz 167:22	199:16	141:19,21,23	16:14 20:21 22:5
bottoming 43:10	brother's 198:15	143:6,8 145:13	26:3 33:7 58:12
bought 21:21 22:24	build 12:11 53:3	146:12,13,16	80:23 94:19 120:5
26:6 28:5 31:3	54:9 104:13,16	147:1,25 148:9	121:12,13 128:11 132:6 174:13,13
35:17 65:8 122:12	Building 169:24	149:3,10 154:25	174:14 189:18
147:10	built 104:12 106:17	156:20 157:15	191:3
boutique 23:12,12	121:9,15	164:22 170:18	calling 79:13 145:22
box 91:5 154:3	bulbs 143:20	176:11 180:10	calls 59:7 62:15
boy 53:8 133:23	bulk 30:5	182:25	72:16 120:16
brain 25:9 114:21	Bureau 191:15	businesses 18:11	130:18 197:7,17
brains 77:8 Brandon 14:10	202:6	145:3 bust 50:12	canceled 179:16
break 7:20,23 37:18	burned 184:19 burnt 50:8		capability 22:15
41:16 52:1,3 55:14	business 8:12,14 9:3	Butner 1:16 2:20,21 buy 11:14 28:2,3	51:8 194:11
105:25 115:2	9:5,7,10 10:15,17	33:2 35:5,14 36:1	capable 20:18
158:14,16	10:20 11:13,22	39:20 60:21 61:25	125:14
breed 70:22 133:18	12:9,12 14:16	62:20,21 69:6	capacity 7:6 106:1
briefly 8:21 17:12	16:24 17:4,10,13	73:13,13,21	capital 11:19 17:20
91:13 159:22	17:15 18:3,4,5,9	123:22,23,24	17:21 21:9 23:16
201:22	18:12,13,18,21	124:8,20 125:4,4	24:4,7 26:24 50:10
bring 76:24 109:20	19:21,22 23:9,19	146:9 147:12,14	58:8 102:18,20
200:8	24:10,19 25:21	buying 32:18 33:17	130:12,19,25
bringing 77:6 80:21	26:4 28:16 29:12	37:7 56:25 71:18	146:15,17,24
Broadway 2:4	29:21,23 30:6	73:17 88:15,19	153:24
broker 13:21 40:22	31:10,15,22 32:3	125:3 136:25	capture 134:13
61:15	33:5,19,21,25 34:2	147:8 152:12	card 77:19
brokerage 10:9	34:5 38:19 41:9	buys 26:18	cards 77:18
11:24 12:5 25:13	44:12 47:17 53:4	BVIs 68:9	care 51:2 60:16 61:1
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	I		I
cared 97:15	chance 92:19	Citgo 193:25	15:4,5,8 16:10,24
Carl 39:4	chances 81:20	Citicorp 122:16,19	17:18 31:1 37:6
Carmine 113:18	133:24	citizen 35:1,3	39:2,3,12 40:15
Carolina 1:16 2:21	change 16:9 24:13	citizens 34:16	42:10 43:19,23
2:24 206:1	25:24 47:14 48:3	civil 4:23 7:4	44:1,2 45:16 46:8
carried 10:4 163:18	83:1 95:7 108:4	claimed 127:10	46:9,11 50:17
carry 133:3	180:22	claims 113:15	53:12 54:15 55:4,4
case 1:6 4:19 16:12	changed 48:16 79:5	clambering 53:5	56:18 58:9 59:13
86:14 100:22	128:6 131:25	Clark 76:19 82:1	59:14 67:20,21
159:25 201:23	179:17	174:14	68:2,5 70:24 71:23
cash 22:18	changes 180:13	class 195:12	75:11,24 77:23
casino 101:14	203:5	classify 11:4	78:14,17,18,21
cavalier 135:12	changing 41:14 45:3	cleanest 141:16	79:2,3,12,13,16,17
caveats 53:18	81:10 187:11,13	clear 16:16 20:9	79:20 80:7,8,20
CDOs 41:6	character 103:22	77:3 86:23 141:24	84:9,11 86:12,13
CDSs 41:6	characters 134:19	157:7	90:13,14 102:15
centered 172:4	charade 173:13	cleared 20:11,24	103:15 108:14
central 26:5	charge 48:7 176:4	25:18 27:13,14	130:18 135:22
centralized 24:24	180:8	30:4 86:19	136:6 137:16
25:19	charged 37:4	clearer 34:8	139:14 140:15
CEO 107:5	charging 12:20	clearing 20:22 21:2	157:9,12 166:9,10
CEOs 106:25	36:19 98:16	21:17 22:20,21,25	170:3 173:11,21
certain 12:9 16:4	Charlie 25:5	23:2 24:12,25	184:23 185:1,14
17:20 20:4 26:11	Chase 39:8 42:1	25:12,19 26:2,3,5	186:21 189:11
101:20 105:20	43:25	26:8,9,17,23 27:7	194:10
125:16 130:7	cheap 71:16,17	27:9,17 28:6,9,12	cloaked 80:18
135:15 142:20	check 22:8,8 89:10	28:17,18 41:1,2	close 9:19 47:16
161:12 164:8	93:6 145:22	85:15 86:22 88:13	48:2 107:21
202:1	148:23 152:14,20	88:13 91:25	112:10 122:24
certainly 50:3 70:15	checked 155:15	153:24	148:7 156:6
74:12 75:24 76:4	156:2,12	clearly 19:21 21:13	171:18
101:16 114:23	Chemical 25:15	82:14 99:5 137:8	closed 123:12
128:18 137:9	Chicago 184:13	164:9 176:3	179:15
146:23 148:4	children 48:12	clerical 195:17	closer 125:25
202:5	children's 49:1	clerk 129:22	127:18
certificate 61:9	Chinese 18:7 145:20	client 11:14 33:11	closest 95:6
206:4	choice 95:24 98:20	35:18 38:13 44:12	Clothes 148:13
certified 22:8,10	98:21,21,22	54:14,25 55:3,3	clothing 152:15
certify 107:1,2,5	111:13 157:8,12	60:16 81:11 84:8	clue 114:13 172:11
206:8,13	185:14 186:20	86:10,24 87:9 89:1	cold-blooded
certifying 107:4	choose 12:11 13:2	138:10 139:19	113:23
chairman 27:6,16	16:16	141:25 156:5	collapsed 175:3
107:20 129:20	chose 13:6 14:3	clients 10:7,19 11:2	come 54:5 68:24
187:24 188:2	184:9	13:24 14:20,24	103:25 108:8
	-	-	

100 0 110 7 12	107.10	1 1555	50.1
109:9 110:5,12	187:12	conduct 155:5	58:1
111:8 139:6 155:4	compete 121:23	200:16	continuously 56:8
155:18,24 157:13	competent 4:18	conducted 87:18	56:21
170:14,18 172:16	competitive 92:15	conducting 200:12	contra 91:4
172:21 174:11	competitor 9:16	conference 15:14,17	contract 61:3 64:1,2
182:10 188:8	77:4,13 147:11	169:25	64:3,4 118:13,14
189:10	competitors 80:12	confidence 105:3	118:16 120:17
comes 113:20	80:13 147:9	confidential 1:1 6:8	contradicts 56:3
comfortable 116:9	complete 10:2	6:9	contribute 183:2
coming 61:20 82:6,8	156:19 157:16	confirm 86:21	184:14
82:10,13 88:21	completely 23:3	151:16 153:21	control 4:24
179:24 183:8	32:3,6 62:23	156:21 158:5	controls 34:17 85:17
185:20	compliance 18:15	confirmation 21:25	controversial 25:1
commingled 90:7	18:19 138:12	60:9 61:23 63:22	convenient 7:24
commission 12:21	198:3,15	83:14 85:3 87:4,5	51:25
79:7 203:20	complicated 73:7	87:24 93:20	conversation 190:3
commissions 43:20	125:2 151:13	confirmations 38:13	197:13
commit 54:15 68:18	164:24 165:2	59:22 87:15,25	conversations 67:19
69:9,15	complicit 108:16,19	89:18 194:3 195:5	189:20
commitments	160:13,19	195:9	conversion 31:17
184:12	complied 4:13	confirmed 157:18	52:15 55:11 73:3
committee 106:18	computer 18:22	confirming 86:13	91:15 175:9
196:16	60:21,24,24,25	confirms 106:6	convert 35:24
committees 13:15	61:2,4,25 191:7	conflict 147:6	converted 57:15
106:17	194:6	confusing 66:15	convertible 11:10
committing 100:20	con 195:8	confusion 164:5,7	33:6,16,17,22,23
100:21 101:17	conceal 141:19	connect 164:18	63:6
102:7 161:6,7	163:2,3	connection 191:22	convertibles 18:1
common 57:2 114:4	conceivably 92:5	consequence 99:10	convinced 103:17
199:14	concentrated	consider 80:20	104:9 145:14
commonly 40:11	136:24	considerate 201:10	cooperate 59:5
64:25	concept 24:24	considered 16:9	108:8,12 109:2
communicated	concern 43:6 197:4	considering 102:21	Coopers 154:23
190:8	198:13,14	constantly 56:16	copies 118:2 194:2
communications	concerned 42:11	88:16	194:19
19:3 196:24	62:8 109:16	constituted 4:15	copy 193:21,22
communist 34:23	139:16,22 194:5	contact 69:24 74:22	copying 81:23
company 25:6 27:2	197:20	157:25 189:8,17	corporation 26:3,8
27:11 123:1	concerning 4:24	190:12	26:9,17,24 27:7,9
194:21	CONCLUDED	contacted 110:2	27:17 28:6,9,17,18
compare 65:11	202:13	continue 42:12	41:1,2 92:1,6
compartmentalize	condition 57:9	184:20 185:9	153:24
113:12	conditions 53:19	continuing 54:18	correct 7:10 8:6,9
compensation 12:19	110:15	continuous 56:11	8:10,15 10:13 17:7
	Į	1	I

	I		
19:22 21:12,15	county 206:2,7	173:8,17,23	201:24 203:13
37:24 38:3,4,6,17	couple 52:20 58:21	curiosity 25:3	206:17
38:19,20 41:19,20	83:13 102:19	currencies 34:17	days 21:23 22:3
45:13 63:14 74:16	156:18 160:1	currency 34:17,24	23:7 26:16 27:24
88:1 89:19,20	182:21 184:25	35:11,11 36:13	34:16 40:20 58:21
108:13 115:10	courage 103:22	custodian 28:19	83:13 97:2 110:24
117:24 152:3	course 36:5 42:15	29:5 89:10,12 91:5	110:25,25 183:25
174:16 187:1	54:5 57:12 59:13	155:11 194:1	185:25
188:25 189:20,21	64:11,17 75:20	custodians 134:5	DC 128:10
191:9,10 192:1,2	80:11 97:7 98:25	custodied 88:18	de 33:7
193:17 197:3	102:25 104:21	custody 28:21 29:3	dead 109:20 110:20
200:13	107:25 111:2,6	29:8,17 85:14	deal 37:14 48:12
CORRECTION	112:3,5 113:5	157:18	51:4 80:6,8,12,12
204:4 205:4	143:16,16,17	customary 23:6	104:25 108:7
correctional 2:19	court 1:2 4:18,24	customers 150:20	134:1 150:20,20
190:10	5:19 7:13,17 16:11	customer-related	150:21 151:4
corrections 203:4	56:1 206:6	196:19	dealer 29:5 92:4
correctly 30:8 60:13	courts 16:16	cut 98:10	188:20
correlated 73:24	cover 47:2 186:20	Cutler 14:6,22	dealers 13:21 78:16
correlation 31:7	190:21	15:15 16:1,14	119:15,17,19
73:22 74:7	coverage 122:6	Cutler's 14:15	120:4,4,14
CorrLinks 191:3,9	covered 33:2 49:8	cyberspace 41:15	dealing 52:15
cost 36:22 194:24	73:12,19 185:4	cycle 111:23	101:10 134:19
counsel 4:2,7 5:6,24	190:6		143:22
7:25 8:3,6,9 144:2	crash 32:15	D 2 7 5 1 205 1	dealings 162:4
144:5 196:20	crashed 38:25 42:9	D 3:7 5:1 205:1	deals 51:5,14 122:12
206:14,15	created 154:1	Dad 150:13 Dark 121:25	death 83:22
counsels 106:19,22	credibility 115:21	date 116:24 141:7	decades 96:10
145:23	116:11 156:11		December 15:20
counter 41:13 91:22	Credit 119:20	204:3,25 205:3,25 206:24	206:24
counterparties 40:1	133:17	dates 183:14	deceptive 142:19
41:13 91:10,14,18	crime 100:21 108:16	daughter 198:16	decided 15:20 16:17
92:8,15,16 95:3,13	criminal 109:17,18	David 152:2	44:3 46:21 53:17
98:15 99:15,20	crisis 24:18 26:13	day 2:21 9:18 22:3	57:5 103:16
102:6,10 117:23	critical 88:2 101:7	24:2,21 26:9,16	deciding 134:25
118:3,6,15 186:7	cross 37:9	27:23 28:1,4 54:11	decimalization
counterparty 28:7	cross-referenced	56:2 81:9 91:25	148:1,5 decision 72:5 80:2
34:4 91:16,21,23	153:7	103:3,4,25 105:19	
93:5,7,8,12,14,18	crucial 85:19 Cruise 150:16	107:16,16,17	124:6 134:24 181:10
94:9,22,24 95:20	culture 100:24	113:16 114:6	decisions 71:3,13
99:11,16 counting 152:15	105:8 116:19	178:25 195:14	decisions /1:3,13 deem 12:19
country 35:3 41:5	133:7	196:13 197:22	deemed 4:10 12:7
132:24,25	Cup 172:17,22	198:23 199:1	17:20 19:12 32:1
132.27,23	Cup 1/2.1/,22		17.20 17.12 32.1

	I		I
66:19 71:7 77:13	27:1,11 89:13	difficult 24:3 82:4	133:14,15 163:1
deeming 14:1	152:8 153:1	82:11 115:23	disclosed 55:2,2
default 118:18	derivative 17:25	117:21	93:24 116:20
defaulted 40:25	41:4 77:7,21 91:20	difficulties 172:5	118:18 119:1
defect 4:4	92:4 119:14,16,18	difficulty 32:9 37:15	126:5
defendants 2:8 5:25	derivatives 41:10	diligence 71:24 72:3	disclosing 95:22
6:2	94:9	72:4 76:15,18	116:22
defendant's 192:14	describe 8:17,21	77:12 82:3 85:6,7	disclosure 68:10
defense 7:25 8:3	9:12 17:12 21:16	85:9,10,22 134:7	81:9 83:11 132:3
defer 44:9	91:13 189:7 190:9	135:2 148:14	134:12
definition 12:25	designate 6:7	155:12 160:21	disclosures 115:9
DeGroat 1:24 2:22	Designated 6:8	180:2,3 200:13,16	discontinue 99:12
4:14 206:6,23	designation 6:12	200:24 201:3	discount 10:8
delay 185:10	designed 163:15	Dipascali 157:23	discourage 185:10
delayed 179:16	desk 77:7,7,21,22	direct 5:6 138:3	discover 160:23
deliver 22:4 26:7	destroyed 104:1	194:6	discovery 4:8
delivered 22:24	detail 4:13	direction 206:10	discredited 103:1
deliveries 88:20	determine 71:16	directive 58:13	discrepancies 162:7
delivering 20:19	186:17 192:11	95:19	discretion 12:23,25
Deloitte 155:2	develop 43:4 105:2	directly 80:4 153:21	13:1 14:19 15:1,6
demand 183:15	173:15	157:25 176:12	discretionary 12:23
demise 127:24 183:2	developed 31:3	director 167:21	16:4
demonstrated	33:21 36:23 43:14	179:18	discuss 29:20 190:2
105:23	52:14 53:10 70:23	directors 3:10	discussed 91:10
denominations	121:13,15,15	166:22,25 178:5	108:21 161:1
124:9	122:2,5	dirty 143:17	171:1,3,4,9 175:8
department 138:11	developing 13:10	disallow 44:25 45:7	181:16,18 190:6
198:4	device 197:18	45:10	201:22
depended 96:18	devised 42:16	disallowing 42:24	discussing 115:8
dependent 42:18	Diana 159:9,10,22 die 48:8 114:20	disappear 54:4	171:5 175:8 discussion 169:17
depending 22:14 depends 164:13	died 112:6	disappearing 54:10 133:2	171:21 172:4
DEPONENT 203:1	difference 28:12	disaster 47:7 102:2	174:1 188:14
depose 201:25	63:5 64:21 74:2	112:25 198:6	201:20
deposed 6:18,20,22	87:2,15,19 116:4	disclose 86:10 87:9	disliked 53:23
deposit 23:1 26:11	186:24	88:25 92:8,10,14	dissuade 184:2
deposition 1:14 2:18	different 18:8,22,23	93:4,9,12,17 94:9	distinct 32:21
4:4,5,8,10,11,12	23:10 24:10,10	94:21,23 95:1,3	District 1:2,3 5:19
4:15,17,19,22,24	38:12 42:22 54:14	96:2 99:15 102:6	5:20
7:10 191:17,23,25	57:10 61:24 64:6	102:10 115:12,15	dividend 61:17,18
202:13 203:4	97:7 100:14 130:5	116:2,5,14 117:3	division 8:24
206:9	134:5 140:21,22	119:4 120:8	divisions 18:8 19:2
depositories 129:13	148:7 167:13	124:14 127:12	19:5
depository 25:20	179:1	129:10,24 133:12	document 22:1
	<u> </u>		

documented 74.5	126.14 147.14 22	aggiow 105:22	and ad 15:17
documented 74:5	126:14 147:14,23	easier 195:22	ended 15:17
documents 14:2,23	148:23 150:18	easy 74:8	endless 82:15 113:9
16:8 58:11 66:9,22 97:19 107:6	182:21 184:13 185:3	Echenique 177:18 178:24 179:3	197:3 endorsed 40:21
120:12 139:14			
140:3	domestic 67:25 door 149:25	Echeverria 70:1,2	English 169:17,18 entailed 74:7 174:1
doing 11:9 12:22	dots 164:18	73:2 74:15,22 76:11 82:1 176:16	entails 9:12
14:17 23:19 24:2	doubted 97:4	178:20 186:25	entans 9.12 entered 41:21 91:7
31:22 32:11,20	downfall 196:22	187:3,9 200:11,12	191:21 201:23
33:1,5 34:1,5	dream 111:7	editorial 106:5	entertaining 77:4
37:11 51:8 53:11	drowned 110:22	Edwards 10:24 25:4	entirety 6:9
53:14 57:3,13,23	drug 188:20	effect 4:6,12 125:21	entitled 166:21
59:20 63:17,20	DTC 27:3 28:10,13	effectively 10:15	entitled 100.21 entity 12:11 21:4
67:1 72:18,22,24	28:24 29:3,18 38:9	effort 16:20	128:7
76:5 78:8 79:8	90:4,11,19 91:6,9	ego 104:8	equipped 85:13
81:1 83:8 85:4	128:10,11,11,15	eight 110:24	equiped 65:15 equities 9:20 27:13
100:7 101:15,18	128:15 129:2,9,10	either 4:4 17:22	29:18 35:16 37:8
105:17,18 108:22	129:14 151:16	22:8 25:13 38:9	37:10,11,22 38:3,8
111:19 112:18	153:4,11,17,19	54:23 60:22 110:4	40:14 41:19 45:21
114:7,14 119:23	154:4 156:22	174:13 175:16	47:2 73:25 81:16
120:7,9,17,20	157:2,22,23,25	187:17 189:18	83:17
123:15 125:14	158:5	199:4	equity 33:18 34:4
129:1,21 130:14	due 71:24 72:2,4	elaborate 160:13	36:6,15 38:11 41:9
130:14 132:7	76:15,18 77:12	electronic 121:9	43:5 45:17 64:9,10
134:22 136:12	82:3 85:5,7,9,10	193:23	76:6 77:8,22 81:14
137:10,10,15,18	85:22 134:6 135:1	electronically	91:21 93:16 94:5
138:6 139:8	148:14 155:12	128:14 193:20	187:17
140:19,24 143:22	160:21 180:1,3	195:23	Ernst 155:1
144:10,16 145:3	200:12,16,24	elegant 176:14	errata 203:5
149:2,9 150:8	201:3	eliminated 120:3	errors 194:25
151:1,17 154:9	duly 4:15 5:4	Ellman 2:3 5:15	escrow 26:12
156:19 161:13	dying 109:3	189:5	Esq 2:3,3,9,9
165:7,23 176:11		embarrassed	essentially 17:4
dollars 10:6 24:5,8	E	107:20	establish 160:14
26:19 29:7,16	E 2:1,1 3:1,7,7,7 5:1	embarrassment	establishment
35:14,14,19,22,25	5:1 204:1,1,1	103:7	104:15
35:25 36:2,2,4,14	205:1,1,1,1	Emilio 187:24	estate 39:7 47:23
38:1,2 41:18 43:16	earlier 115:8 117:23	Emperor's 148:13	48:25 66:18
50:24,25 52:20	201:23	employed 14:6	111:15 112:1
58:18,18 65:20	early 23:7 57:19	163:5 206:14,15	Esteban 178:14
66:12,14 67:7	122:8	employees 114:10	Estevez 178:14,18
81:14,15 97:2 98:7	earn 58:21	197:21	Europe 123:6
104:6 111:16	earned 98:1	enable 69:14	European 33:6
112:1,10,11,17	earning 60:4	encourage 82:14,18	53:15 68:3,4,6

132:19	138:23	exposed 63:2	Fairfield 53:6 64:23
Europeans 132:13	executed 20:25,25	exposure 41:22	65:4,17,19 71:6
133:7	123:7 195:10	expressly 4:5,11	79:23 91:2 94:24
event 51:9	executing 13:25	expressly 4.5,11 extent 105:20	98:2,6 126:24
eventually 27:14	60:11,12 89:6	135:15 142:20	127:4 138:9
47:7 65:8,9,21	140:15	external 128:6	185:11 194:1
88:3 114:8 144:1	execution 13:2	extricate 103:21	fairly 93:1
everybody 15:22	36:22 125:9	extricate 103.21 ex-banker 33:13	fairness 102:14
20:3 26:23 31:23	194:11	e-mail 174:15 190:9	faith 61:14
34:10,22 75:19	executor 47:23	190:10,13,16,25	falsified 153:1
79:1 81:22,23	48:22,25	190:10,13,10,23	Falsifying 154:11
94:15 100:20	exempt 12:24	191.7,8,12 193.23	familiar 7:9 9:11
101:15 103:6	164:10	198:9,25 199:3,5	85:6 154:19 168:1
104:13,16 105:12		200:9	
104.13,16 103.12	exemption 12:15,17 12:18 13:4,6	e-mailed 189:18	177:7,12,13 families 11:6,20
146:11 151:3	exemptions 14:17	e-mails 144:13	48:2
164:25 171:12	164:9	189:20 191:1,13	family 11:8 23:20
180:4,21 183:9	exhibit 3:10 158:22	191:14 196:8,12	39:5 47:15,18
186:15 194:2	159:2 166:17,18	191:14 190:8,12	51:11 104:2
196:4 197:17	166:21 177:3	197:20,20,23	107:17 112:11,24
190.4 197.17	exist 92:16 93:5	197.20,20,23	113:20 184:12
everybody's 103:3	122:1	198:1,3,11,17,20	fanfare 122:3
evidence 4:8 56:3	existed 14:17 34:18	199:1,10,17,17,20	far 14:7 62:8 109:16
109:11	125:10 141:17	199.23 200.1,7	131:21 137:17
exactly 83:15	existence 156:22	$\overline{\mathbf{F}}$	141:2 197:20
Examination 3:3	exists 105:8	F 3:7	fashion 11:11
5:6	exits 54:20	face 148:3	father 47:20 48:13
examine 162:6	expand 180:10	facility 190:11	favorable 53:1
examined 5:5	181:11	fact 15:18,24 28:16	favors 129:14
example 24:6 62:16	expectation 56:25	28:23 45:5 48:19	fax 195:6,8
72:13 81:4 98:6	58:23	52:25 83:7 86:14	faxed 195:14
151:9	expendable 107:7,8	87:1 102:4,5	feared 49:7
exams 136:24	expert 7:1,2,6,8	103:20 104:4	February 159:7
exception 12:5	14:7	105:14,16 109:6	federal 2:19 4:23
131:20,23 193:25	Expiration 206:24	111:15,17 122:4	5:19 106:18
excess 146:23	expires 203:20	127:9 128:4,21	196:15
exchange 9:15,17	explain 60:8 79:11	130:22 131:15	fee 12:20 79:7 97:11
21:7 22:17 121:24	79:14 80:25 121:3	134:16 137:9	97:16,17 98:5,25
122:11,11	121:7 124:17	138:2,14 148:15	99:1,3
exchanged 189:19	explained 138:24	150:13 164:25	feeder 65:1,3,7 66:3
exchanges 41:11	187:7	192:6	67:4,11,13,17 71:4
exclusive 66:17	explanation 171:11	failed 151:18 152:23	71:7,9 87:23 89:4
excuse 102:5	explanations 131:18	failure 162:6	89:22,25 93:13
execute 63:15	exploratory 75:3	fair 78:25	132:5 134:11
	l	I	<u> </u>

	1		I
feel 75:7 106:8	77:20 119:15	160:14 162:17	formal 4:6
107:9,11 108:6	129:17 132:19	168:7,20,23,24	formalities 4:10,12
112:21 113:1	135:2 194:18	169:3 171:18	formed 21:8 26:2
165:6 186:14	202:4	172:15,19,20	former 8:14
192:8 193:2 201:9	fine 19:17 52:8 96:8	173:12 174:13	forms 16:1,5,7
feeling 101:4,23	110:14 111:4	175:15 189:7	forth 41:14 49:1
108:4 181:14	135:13 139:25	192:5 194:23	55:9 56:2 62:13
192:23	141:5,15 145:20	195:11 201:16	80:16 91:2 125:6
fees 36:20 98:15	170:21 180:24	fit 34:10 37:5	133:22 136:13
fell 13:4	finish 7:15 52:2	five 24:23 25:2 52:4	139:1
fellow 177:7,10	finished 52:6 194:16	58:18 79:24	forward 108:8
178:11 180:24	FINRA 9:23	121:19 137:2	109:9 110:5 111:9
felt 14:4,19 43:9	fire 54:3 199:17	154:24	112:9,10 141:20
46:8 75:11 79:6	firm 8:23,24,25 14:6	floor 9:15 122:13	163:18
83:24 101:10	14:9 17:19,23	140:21 170:1,2,3,4	fought 104:15
105:11 111:24	20:13,23 21:11	flow 36:24 142:6	196:13
116:9 160:20	22:21,25 23:2	146:4	found 129:14 144:2
161:12 164:14	29:11,14 36:8	flowing 181:21	151:10 199:14
184:22 199:24	85:20 86:20 87:21	fluency 162:4	foundation 49:4
fess 103:23	88:13 98:2 100:11	focused 169:3	foundations 49:3
fiasco 50:16	106:20,20 108:23	focusing 145:9	founder 167:9
fide 11:9	127:25 128:20	173:25	four 29:16 32:10
Fidelity 10:8,23	145:16 155:17,19	follow 62:12	34:5 39:2,3,12
fiduciary 106:1	155:22,24 191:22	followed 12:17 13:3	42:10 46:7 109:24
field 134:15	193:16 196:4	18:24 77:16	110:25 127:5,6
fight 13:16	199:6,24	137:25 152:7	154:19,22 155:4
figure 47:20 88:9	firms 10:8,9,24,24	following 35:11	156:10 179:10
114:19,22,23	12:5,10 13:10,18	37:14 63:24 78:11	fourth 155:10
143:1 150:12	14:1 18:16 19:6	114:12	framed 106:15
figured 114:19	20:24 23:6,8,13,21	follows 4:3 5:5	franc 34:15
file 162:19	24:4 25:13,18 26:6	146:3	Français 33:8
filed 16:8 19:13	29:4,17 36:19 86:8	followup 171:23	France 34:19
126:6,6	106:23,23 116:13	foolishly 46:21	133:11 173:1
files 140:2,3	128:9 129:4,20	49:19 103:12	francs 35:2,13,18,20
filings 162:7,14,15	130:3,7 154:20	force 15:22	35:24 36:14 37:22
162:25	155:16 156:9,10	foregoing 203:3	Frank 157:23
filled 15:25	197:10,11,15	206:8	frankly 36:11 49:15
finally 110:11	firm's 129:17	forever 48:8	73:7 80:17 83:1
143:20	197:25	forget 84:9 93:22	86:3 101:1 103:2
finance 96:10	first 8:11 19:13	134:18	105:22 129:12
financial 24:12	21:10 54:2 59:16	forgot 194:7	155:14 180:4
136:21	91:24 112:18	form 4:17,20,21	198:4 200:23,23
financially 206:16	121:8 138:3 139:5	31:2 32:12 126:7	fraud 12:4 101:17
find 54:10 76:1	139:12 140:14	127:11 162:21	102:8 150:3
	1	I	1

	 		1
151:11 159:9	149:6 164:1 165:6	Gaddafi's 51:11	given 4:6 183:24
160:13,23 161:6,8	175:17,19 181:24	gain 44:18 45:12,13	206:11
frauds 130:15	183:9 192:7	64:16	gives 146:7 201:24
free 87:8	funds 13:9,20,25	gained 104:14	giving 131:21
free-fall 42:12	14:1,21 16:7,12,24	gains 32:13,25	160:15
French 33:11 34:13	30:1,2,3,6,9,10,25	42:14,19 43:5,17	go 6:6 31:19 42:8,12
34:15,16 35:1,3,11	31:11 52:13 53:5	44:4,9,10,21 67:1	43:13 44:15 45:25
35:13,20,23 37:21	53:25 54:8,10	67:2	47:6,10 55:16 57:6
37:22 39:25 40:7,7	57:18 58:9,15 64:1	game 69:2 79:1	57:7 58:19 59:3
41:18,24 46:9,11	64:2 65:1,3,5,6,12	129:16 193:2	60:20 74:19 80:3
frenzy 147:2	66:2,3,3 67:4,11	gears 166:16 188:24	81:24 92:21 114:1
frequently 195:21	67:14,15,15,17,24	general 11:14 71:18	115:5,25 123:19
fried 25:9	68:4,7,8,13 70:22	85:21 101:9 105:9	124:5,9,19 126:3
Friehling 152:1,2,21	70:24,25 71:4,5,7	106:19,22 144:2,5	127:22 141:2
153:4 156:9	71:9,12 76:24	145:23 146:8	147:24 150:15
friendly 51:6	78:11,22,25 79:7	171:6 172:12	154:16 158:18
friends 11:8,21	80:19 81:9 84:10	181:20 196:8,20	160:6 164:22
23:20 35:6 113:3	84:11,13,14 87:23	197:6 200:2	173:4,9,16,22
156:2	89:4,22,25 90:24	generally 8:17 18:2	176:23,23 177:3
front 139:16,17,23	93:13 95:17	29:23 31:15 190:2	179:5 191:12
140:12,25 142:7	100:14 101:8,10	196:2	193:8 200:11
142:22 143:9,17	116:16,17,18	generate 63:21	202:11
144:3,23,24,25	118:24 127:13	generated 166:7	goal 32:12 59:19
147:4	128:13,16 130:11	generating 89:18	God 143:21
FSA 21:5	132:1,4,5,6,7,9	genius 53:8	goes 42:19 64:12
full-blown 151:17	134:1,2,11,16	George 81:5 116:18	100:12 106:1
full-service 10:24	137:15 138:7,24	Gestion 33:8	132:25
function 135:1	139:1 141:9	getting 50:20 53:2	going 7:12 15:19,22
functioned 200:2	142:12 147:3	59:7 82:23 83:11	16:20,22 26:1 32:4
fund 31:20 39:9,11	149:16,21 150:1	83:13 84:1,4,6	34:23 40:10 42:12
50:12 53:22 65:6,7	150:21 155:12	97:12 113:10	42:13,18 43:2,3,7
67:5 69:5 70:11	160:12,18 162:5	120:6 122:21	44:15,17,22 45:7
71:11 80:12,17	163:9 164:3 166:8	146:5 152:17	45:10,25 46:2,18
81:12,19 83:12	182:4,8 183:1,12	183:6 185:13	46:25 47:6,7,10,11
84:11 94:16,17,18	183:16 184:25	give 16:15 24:6 35:6	50:19 51:2,3,4
96:17,21 97:17,21	185:24 195:13	51:3,5 56:6 58:2	52:18,18,24 53:20
116:5,5 126:23,24	funny 187:25	77:18 92:19 98:20	54:16,24,25 55:1
131:24 132:5,12	further 6:6,10 98:14	98:21 109:11	57:7 59:15 60:2
133:19 134:15	206:13	110:16 124:18	61:15,16,17 67:2
135:22 136:5,11	futures 17:25 81:16	134:11,12 144:14	68:21,25 69:11
138:5,6,15,18,20	G	148:22 149:15,16	70:15 72:6 77:8
138:22 139:7,11	$\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G}}$ 5:1	149:25 157:3	78:17 81:6,6 82:22
139:14,20 140:15		158:4,12 159:9	82:22,25 83:5,8
142:1,11 144:21	Gaddafi 51:13,18	171:12 187:19	86:10 92:18 94:13

05.05.06.0.05.4	100 11 14	150.15	01.10.100.10
95:25 96:2 97:4	109:11,14	178:17	91:12 138:12
100:16 102:4,5,9,9	governments 133:9	guys 59:8 134:7	175:20
103:14,17,20	granddaughter	149:19 154:15	headed 8:25
106:25 107:4,10	167:8	179:9 198:22	heading 9:8
107:13 109:2,3,11	great 37:14 104:25	H	health 109:22
109:18,19 110:5	112:25 143:8	H 3:7,7 204:1 205:1	hear 24:9
111:5,7,8,11,20,21 112:7,15 121:23	146:5,12 162:3 186:15	half 97:22,25 98:11	hearing 4:19 heart 112:6
123:8,14 124:7		98:12 199:20	hedge 11:18 13:9,20
125.8,14 124.7	greater 106:9 greed 166:11	hammering 149:24	13:25,25 14:21
131:10 142:3	grew 24:19 27:13,20	handful 15:5 23:19	16:12 30:1,2,3,6,9
146:11 148:7,13	31:4 80:9	79:17 131:25	30:24 31:11,14,20
148:22 150:4	grind 99:7,9 192:18	handle 11:15,16	33:1 34:14,17,24
157:10 158:21,24	grips 103:25	37:2 85:13 119:19	35:10 36:8 37:11
159:1,4 160:6	ground 122:21	125:11 185:7	39:9,10 41:22
165:16 166:17	group 75:4 134:23	187:16	45:22 50:12 51:12
171:6 179:6 180:9	141:8 178:6	handled 21:20 23:3	52:13 53:22,25
180:15,15,16,17	grow 27:19	25:12 28:23 29:1	54:8,9 57:9 64:1,2
180:21 181:2	growth 13:8	32:2 36:18 42:5	66:2 67:5,15 68:4
182:10 183:8	guarantee 43:8	handles 41:2	68:7,7,12 69:5,7,9
184:6,8,14,15	44:15 46:5 54:22	handsome 178:17	70:11,22,24,25
185:9 186:1,3,22	111:10	179:7	71:11 72:24 74:1
187:15,19 192:10	guaranteed 184:17	Hanover 25:17	78:22 80:12,17,19
192:11,24,25	guess 13:23 24:14	happen 50:19 56:15	81:9,12,19 83:12
196:17,21,25	27:7 51:10 65:10	98:3 111:8,11	84:10,13,14 96:17
199:12,20 201:25	65:16 84:15 95:7	112:8,21,21 168:4	97:17 100:13
gold 146:19	105:11 112:4	174:21	101:8,9 116:5,5,16
Goldman 10:10,25	114:5 122:8 130:4	happened 25:10	116:17,18 128:13
36:18 50:1,2,11,11	141:3 145:6	153:23 176:17	128:15,20 130:11
50:16 51:1,6,7,10	159:20 161:2	happening 24:20	131:24 132:1,12
51:12,19,20 52:25	170:15 171:1	100:11	133:19 134:15,16
78:19 119:21	186:8 187:21	happens 12:10	135:22 136:5,10
121:18 129:25	189:12	27:23 144:9	137:15 138:4,5,6
145:25 147:8	guessing 69:23	154:12 hanny 04:12 122:14	138:14,17,19,22
good 5:8 34:10	Guillermo 168:14	happy 94:12 132:14 135:3,4	138:23 139:1,7,11
61:14 64:20 72:7	guilty 113:1 184:22	hard 44:11 49:12,13	139:14,20 140:15
102:16 104:17	guised 101:19	56:1 60:18 75:25	141:8 142:1,11,12
108:6 109:13	Gulf 57:22	132:19 151:4	147:3 149:5,16,21
132:21 133:9	Gus 6:3,4	153:2 173:12	150:1,21 160:12
Gordillo 177:18	GUSTAVO 2:9	186:16,17	160:18 162:5
gotten 119:25	guy 39:14 80:3	harmless 47:9 48:5	163:9,25 164:3
151:22 government 27:14	111:25 112:3 113:21 129:15	Harvard 105:7	165:6 166:8 181:23 183:9,11
28:25 42:24 55:25	143:22 176:14	head 14:11 52:11	183:16 184:25
20.23 42.24 33.23	143.22 1/0.14	1000 11.11 52.11	103.10 104.23

hedged 17:24 31:6	153:4 156:9	illegitimate 55:21	inconvoniently
38:5 40:2,17 63:10	hot 53:23 75:17	55:22,23 56:4	inconveniently 77:19
69:14	hotel 35:5	63:17 88:3 141:19	independent 87:20
hedges 45:4 46:2,10	hour 170:7 174:8	163:17	90:17 131:16
111:22 123:25	199:7	image 102:24	134:4 152:17
hedging 32:12,19	hours 15:15 24:21	image 102.24 imagination 23:22	154.4 152.17
36:7 37:2 42:23	186:5,6 190:1	imagine 111:24	independently 89:5
44:17,21 146:22	195:10,15 201:25	113:4 198:8	153:5 156:21
held 29:3,4,18 32:14	HSBC 155:6,11	immediately 21:24	158:5
38:8 40:13,14	156:13,17	58:19 133:5	index 31:7 62:21,25
46:18 48:5 89:17	huge 13:12 43:16	impact 106:9 107:13	73:20,23
151:21 188:14	50:14 104:14	117:18	indicated 117:17
201:20	122:6 142:5	importance 169:14	INDICATING
help 113:10	human 113:7	important 91:19	188:18
Henriques 159:9,10	human 113.7 humor 142:24	118:6 120:2	indication 125:17
159:23	hundred 10:21	153:20 162:16	individual 15:7 31:1
hereto 206:15	182:21	169:11 170:23	72:17 146:9 166:9
Herzog 147:10	hundreds 97:1	179:25 180:7	167:14 187:22
He'll 109:23 144:14	125:11 184:13	181:9 199:12	188:16
high 11:19 146:21	Hunton 2:10 6:1,3	importantly 104:2	individuals 11:5
higher 57:1	husband 168:3,8,10	importantly 104.2 impossible 104:13	19:4 84:12
highest 105:24	168:18 169:4,19	impractical 154:5	industries 132:25
highly 76:8	170:9 175:15	impressed 169:7	industries 132.23
Highway 2:20	170.9 173.13	175:23	13:13,15 18:7 19:9
hindsight 70:15	I	impression 98:13	24:21 25:12,24
historically 96:25	IBM 11:14 21:21	141:18 165:12	27:19 28:15 41:5
hold 20:4,7 22:11,12	56:15 71:18 73:17	175:14,22 200:15	59:2 70:11,12
23:4 26:12 28:21	73:17	201:6	72:14 75:22,25
32:22,23 47:8	ID 128:11	improperly 192:7	76:2,3 78:13,25
182:1	idea 26:4 32:22 57:4	inception 20:14	80:17 96:10
holding 32:5,25	152:4 163:10	incestuous 70:12	100:13,16,20,25
42:14 44:6 62:3	IDENTIFICATI	incidental 12:21	102:16,20 104:16
holds 28:18	166:19	include 161:16	106:13,16,21
hold-your-hand	identified 3:9	included 13:20	132:11,12 137:3
182:1	177:17 187:24	97:24 146:19	146:17 171:7
hole 52:19	identify 99:19	166:14,15	172:5 174:2
home 147:24 200:8	188:22	includes 85:22	181:22,23,24
homes 66:17	identity 92:8,10	106:19	183:9 196:12,22
homework 127:3	Igoin 33:12 39:16	including 4:11	197:6,16
honest 49:10	46:14	14:20 31:11 101:9	inflation 127:18
hope 57:6	illegal 59:21 139:21	105:1 142:14	inflicted 112:7
hopefully 34:7 57:1	142:22 143:12,13	165:17 185:4	information 84:19
99:3 144:6	143:25 144:6,11	186:16	86:25 94:1 97:5
Horowitz 152:1,21	145:1	income 43:4 66:16	98:22 109:6,17,18

	1	1	1
110:6,13,16 111:1	206:16	17:2,9 18:18,20	141:9 147:5,21
116:20 119:1,5	internal 150:1	29:13,20,24 30:23	157:18 180:8
124:18 129:10	187:14 191:11	31:23,24,25 32:2	183:8 194:24
131:22 132:10	internally 150:11	33:9 53:4 68:19	196:11
133:15 134:21	international 27:15	69:5 126:7 127:11	issued 87:14
139:13 140:1,11	27:16	141:9 145:13	it'll 34:7
143:8 153:19	Internet 191:8,11	149:13 152:6	Ivan 50:7,9
162:8 195:14	197:23 198:10	156:19 157:14	I-g-o-i-n 33:12
196:19,23 201:16	199:2	162:18 181:3	
inherently 67:3	Internet-based	195:24 200:5	J
initial 74:24	191:4	investments 68:22	J 2:9
inopportune 54:5	interrupt 31:19	68:24 71:3,13	jail 107:4
inputs 33:3	interrupting 93:2	78:23 83:12	Javier 2:3 5:14
inquiries 137:23	interview 159:10	investor 33:14 39:8	158:12
inquiry 138:3	160:8,15	50:1,10 55:1 66:20	jbleichmar@laba
insane 19:14	interviewed 160:1,2	67:6,24 68:17	2:6
insists 156:6	introduce 5:22	77:24 78:2,4	Jeffry 39:4 49:25
inspections 138:13	introduced 33:9	132:20 149:5	jerry-rigged 123:4
141:12,14	70:7,8	investors 11:3,5,17	Jewish 113:11
instance 28:10	introductions 5:13	29:22 30:20 32:9	job 79:11 161:14
instant 199:25	39:16 70:13	32:10,10 34:6 50:8	Jobs 105:11
institution 2:20	inventory 10:4	64:22 66:2,5,7,8	John 79:2
87:14	17:21,24 56:17,23	67:8,9,11,14 68:16	joined 26:23
institutional 78:18	57:10 60:22 64:17	72:16 78:9 109:10	joke 161:11
79:3 132:8 139:19	152:14,14,22	113:2 133:18,19	jokes 199:18,20
institutional-type	invest 30:10,16	134:20 135:4	Jonathan 76:19
11:4	48:17 49:4 52:13	165:6	174:14
institutions 90:1	54:16,18,24 58:8	invitation 173:22	Jones 71:1 72:13
instructions 15:7	71:14 81:18 101:2	invited 172:16	80:25 81:12
74:6	102:9	involved 22:2 25:7	Journal 122:7
instrument 28:23	invested 30:20 50:7	32:5,18 45:8 48:18	JPMorgan 29:9
64:7	67:24 98:4 99:18	61:18 66:25 67:3	judge 4:18 201:23
intelligence 124:2	102:11	85:16 138:9	Julian 71:1 116:19
intelligent 176:14	investigation 108:24	141:12 146:21	134:18
intensity 162:4	141:8	148:5 154:15	jurisdiction 4:18
intensive 195:4	investing 11:8,20	160:24 197:15	jury 9:10
198:2	48:7,23 49:5 54:18	200:12	
intents 61:11 62:10	69:19 78:21 81:2	involving 141:8	<u>K</u>
101:18 112:23	84:10,16 100:13	Ireland 95:9	keep 16:22 41:13
interact 124:20	investment 8:15 9:4	ironically 54:17	89:21,24,24 135:2
interest 59:11 147:6	11:22,25 12:3,3,6	IRS 44:20,24 133:16	135:3 137:21
interested 34:13	12:12,13,16 13:5	issue 11:25 13:22	145:19
37:7 59:10 77:4,5	13:11,19 15:9,23	15:16 64:11 97:7	kept 185:3
78:20 147:18	15:25 16:2,10,23	100:14 102:4,5	key 195:17,20
	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

1.11. 01.2.156.4	71.10.70.0.10.70.0	142.20.144.5.17	161.4.5
kidding 81:3 156:4	71:10 72:8,13 73:8	143:20 144:5,17	161:4,5
kill 113:16 114:1	73:11,20 74:13	144:17,21,22	knowledge 100:6,7
killing 113:19	75:4,5,14,15,17,21	145:4,7,12,21	100:11,12 126:22
kind 12:9 54:14	76:14 78:20 79:5	146:7,20,24	193:1 199:14
67:23 68:17	79:21,23,23,24	147:10,14,23,24	knowledgeable
116:20 119:20	80:3 81:5 82:3,9	148:19 149:9,16	169:7,9,10,16
125:15 190:8	82:10,11,12 83:2	150:14,17,22,23	201:2
Kingate 53:6 64:23	83:17 84:17,18	151:2,10,16	known 10:16 14:9
65:5 71:6 145:8	85:3 86:2 87:4	152:11 154:13,18	18:7 33:2 36:7
157:11	88:16,24 93:3,9,14	154:25 156:14	53:23 73:19 91:5
knew 24:19,20,20	94:6,19,20,20 95:9	157:10,11 159:8	127:14,15 161:3
33:10 44:12 50:3	95:13,20,21,23	160:22 161:1,2,3,7	161:14 194:20
51:7 70:5 75:23,23	96:23 97:2,6,15,16	161:10,10,11,13	199:10
76:1 81:15 94:13	98:7,9,24 99:4,6,7	164:4,13 165:5,15	knows 78:25
97:15,17 101:10	100:3,4,5,5,19	165:21,24 166:9	Kohn 53:7 70:9
102:7 105:16	102:16,23,25	166:13 168:10	KP 155:10
106:8,25 108:22	103:16,22,24	169:13,14,15	KPMG 155:8,9,9
114:8 127:14	104:1,11,15 105:4	170:17,21,24	
138:1 148:6,20	105:4,9,17 106:2,3	171:1,2,10,16	L
149:8 161:6	106:7 107:5,7,20	172:3,10,12,21	L 1:14 2:18 3:3 4:1
168:18 169:13	107:21,25 108:1,5	173:13 174:24	5:3 8:14 203:10
184:7 188:8	108:8,11 109:7,8	175:25 176:4,5,5	204:25 205:25
200:21,22	109:25 110:13,14	176:13,14,19,20	206:9
know 7:21 12:6	110:18 111:3,5,8	176:21 177:1,2	Labaton 2:4 5:15
14:18 20:2,19	111:11,12 112:2,3	178:9 180:1,2,19	labor 198:1
21:25 24:1 25:15	113:1,7,11,18,24	181:1,10,11,13	lacked 160:21
25:22 26:13,18	114:2,4,9,15,18,20	182:18 183:13,23	laid 58:11 74:5
27:3,19 28:5 29:10	114:23,25 115:19	183:25 185:8,23	110:3 111:1
29:15 35:8 37:9,13	115:23 116:10	185:25 186:3,13	201:15
38:9 39:6 40:7	117:8 118:22	186:15 187:15	language 93:23
43:12,19 44:10	119:23 120:11	188:1,3,4,5,5,21	large 11:3,17 13:25
46:15,19,25 48:2	121:7 125:13,24	189:13,14 190:14	14:25 15:4,5 25:13
48:10,11,12,13,21	126:21 127:9	190:19 192:8,10	25:14 32:9 33:5
49:18,23 50:4,19	128:20 129:5,21	192:12,14,18,19	34:5 36:18,19,20
50:23 51:2,4,9,16	129:24 130:1,1,9	192:22,25 194:7	36:24 37:5,7 39:6
52:20 53:7 54:3,8	130:10 131:14,15	195:3,11 196:25	39:7 40:15 50:1
54:10,20 57:22	132:23 133:20	197:8,22 198:9,18	69:8,9 71:8 77:24
59:8,9,10,15,15,16	135:8,10,12,16	198:21,22 199:2	84:12 115:20
59:16,17 60:6 61:7	136:8,8,9,12	199:15,16,17,18	116:25 139:19
62:18 63:12,21,24	137:17,20,20,21	199:24 200:17,21	182:20
64:5,7 65:21 66:21	138:1,2,25 139:3	201:2,12 202:5	larger 71:5 84:14
67:7,21 68:4,15,18	140:2,14,23 142:2	knowing 24:18	87:21 126:11
69:2,4 70:9,9,13	142:15,19,21,25	81:23 100:3 112:7	largest 9:16 33:22
70:14,15,19,23	143:3,14,16,16,17	114:12 125:13	65:17
			I

late 32:8 48:10	158:12,18 168:7	188:24	123:19 129:8,21
69:22 95:7 186:3	169:3 193:8	live 103:25 108:1	130:10 133:20
latest 153:23	level 27:19 105:23	livelihood 96:17	135:11 137:21
laugh 130:21 136:15	105:24 106:13	97:10	142:16 145:11
law 4:7 23:18	123:16	loan 90:11	149:15 150:6,13
105:18	levels 49:24 125:5	location 152:19	152:9 157:10
laws 108:20	leverage 50:6 90:14	locked 19:11	164:19 167:11
lawsuit 6:2,23	179:21	London 21:3,4,6,6	185:18 186:15
lawsuits 51:17	Levy 39:7 41:25	155:7 166:22	looked 43:10 52:17
lawyer 192:14,15	47:21 48:10	long 12:18 19:17	59:22 71:9,10
lawyers 48:15	108:17	36:14,14 43:3 44:6	80:14 90:25
120:13	Levy's 48:19 112:11	45:5,17 53:25	103:13 124:6
lay 5:14	liability 198:13,14	56:22 57:9,14 58:3	140:10,10,18
lead 125:21	liable 48:18	60:17 62:14,14	152:24 153:16
leaps 40:11	liberty 88:25	63:1 64:15,17,20	157:21
led 44:13 150:10	lied 112:3,4	83:17,18 86:8	looking 36:10 62:9
179:23	life 105:14 108:2	87:10 109:3,23	67:5 72:10,11,18
Leeds 147:8	light 143:20	113:16 129:17	72:19
left 106:24 134:17	liked 148:21 163:9	145:19 146:2	looks 62:10 177:7
180:20 187:3,20	173:16	170:5 174:7,9	177:13 188:20
legacy 112:25	limit 18:1	186:4 189:24	Lori 138:11
legal 59:20 61:12	limited 39:9 86:2,4	198:23 199:1	lose 36:15 42:13
64:7 146:8	86:12,13 119:18	longer 25:9 106:21	43:13 44:3,17,18
legend 93:20	124:11	185:8 192:23	98:5 108:25 192:6
legitimate 32:3,6	line 52:3 160:11	longwinded 112:20	loser 104:20
38:19 55:10 75:15	204:4 205:4	long-only 69:13	losing 50:2 64:12,14
77:12 104:24	lines 30:2 105:10	72:12	loss 47:9 57:2 60:7
123:10 132:16	Lipstick 169:23	long-term 17:22	losses 184:17
140:20,25 163:15	liquid 9:24 163:10	32:13,25 40:10,19	lost 16:11 50:13,14
legitimately 123:15	liquidate 68:22,23	42:14,19 43:5,16	51:12,20,21
leg-in 124:22	liquidity 163:12	44:8,10,18,21	111:22 112:22,23
lesbians-of-size 198:20	183:8 184:9 Lisa 1:24 2:22 4:14	45:12,13 50:10 53:20 54:13 55:1	197:10 lot 29:4 30:3 46:7
lesser 121:21	206:6,23	68:18,19	51:12 58:1 76:23
letter 18:25 19:9,14	list 9:25 139:13	look 16:19 43:2,7	98:12,12 104:17
189:9	listen 79:22 148:17	44:14 45:20 46:15	104:18 107:22
letterhead 38:16	listening 77:25	47:5,8 48:3,7,11	112:4 114:2
letters 137:23	litigation 1:7 5:18	48:20 52:17 54:8	116:10,11 120:3
let's 29:19 30:17	7:4 14:8 197:16	54:12 59:8,19	128:13 135:22
32:1 55:16 63:17	204:2 205:2	68:21 77:10 79:6	150:10 155:11
64:22 69:18 72:11	little 7:9 28:14 34:8	82:20 108:25	157:12 172:6
87:21 88:14 98:19	34:8 37:19 38:21	110:4,17 111:4	180:13 188:7
115:5 135:25	51:8 56:6 66:15	113:25 114:5	193:15
147:24 148:9	125:2 127:3	116:22 119:4	lots 134:5
11,121110.5	120.2 127.0	110.22 117.1	
			·

Louis 55:5 72:13	maker 9:21,23	managans 19.22	78:15 81:2,24
love 150:15	33:24 60:23 145:3	managers 18:23 19:1,4 71:12 84:6	82:22,24 83:6,6
loved 54:1 142:21	145:5,12 164:8	98:8 117:12,13	84:21,21,22,23,24
low 36:21	makers 42:7 56:8,20	134:6 135:2,3	84:25 86:9 100:25
	57:8 134:24		
lower 37:3,3 56:25 69:11 108:9	139:18	162:18	104:12 117:18,21
		managing 124:15 126:12	124:5,6,10,13 125:18 136:23,25
lucky 53:2	making 8:23 9:2,6,9		-
Luxembourg 95:10	9:12,13 10:15 17:5	Manhattan 5:20 mania 146:11	139:17 140:5,9,17 142:6 143:7 145:3
Lynch 10:10 11:1 20:23 21:21 22:4	17:15 18:5,11 19:20 29:12 43:20	manner 4:7 193:1	142.6 143.7 143.3
20:23 21:21 22:4 22:22,24 25:14	54:1 59:10 64:15	manual 195:4	145.3,12,17 146.6
26:7,7 28:3 60:20			140.8,12,13 147.3
11	64:16 71:2 72:5,16 76:7 78:15 79:7,25	manually 195:3	147.18,23 148.8
60:21,22 61:1,3,24 78:19 121:17		Manuel 70:1,2,3,3,4	
123:9 143:4	80:2 85:22 97:3,18 97:22 104:12	70:5,6 99:14 134:23 170:16	171:4,5 181:24 marketed 78:11
145:25 147:10	122:12 129:22	174:13 176:16 178:13 180:20	marketing 70:21 71:19 102:1 116:7
149:23,24 155:16	136:23,25 140:6,9		
196:21	140:17 142:6	186:25 187:3	marketplace 124:19
L'Oreal 55:6,7	143:7 145:17	200:11 Manualla 70:17 08:0	163:13
L.L.P 2:4,10	146:7,12,15 147:5	Manuel's 70:17 98:9	markets 122:23
M	147:18,25 148:8	Manufacturers	181:19
macro 72:15 132:7	149:11 152:11	25:17	markups 43:20
Madoff 1:14 2:18	184:2	margin 90:12	Mary 107:19
3:3 5:3,8,11 6:18	man 113:19	mark 18:12 158:22	masked 101:19
8:15 18:13,14	manage 149:25	158:25 159:1	match 27:25
48:23 53:9 80:3	150:17,18	166:17	matter 48:19 86:18
115:8 119:24	managed 70:25 97:23	marked 3:9 166:18 166:21	109:1,1,19 134:16
143:6 159:8			150:13 153:3
165:22 166:24	management 8:25	market 8:23 9:2,6,9	164:15 199:8,9
193:12 201:21	16:2 17:6,10 18:17	9:12,13,21,23,25	matters 191:11
203:10 204:25	18:20 19:17 29:20	10:14,15 14:12	mean 6:11 20:15 22:17 31:19 40:25
205:10 204:23	29:24 31:24 32:2	17:5,15 18:5,11	57:5 62:19 66:6
mafia 113:16	53:4 55:20 115:13	19:20 29:12 33:24	
mail 195:7,12	115:20 117:4,16	36:6,9,11 38:6,25	67:13 70:22 71:23
mailed 195:11	137:5 140:7	41:22 42:7,9,11,16	72:2 73:6 75:2
main 12:2 123:2	145:13,17 147:6	42:18,19 43:5,7,9	77:2 84:3 92:14,25
maintain 12:12	147:17 149:3,13	44:15 45:24 46:24	98:6 99:5,9,10
17:21 56:11 95:14	152:6 157:15	47:6,10 49:7,22	103:6 107:8,25
maintaining 9:24	162:22 180:17	50:15 53:2 56:8,9	113:15,16 116:14
96:18	200:6	56:12,19,20,22	117:19 118:11
major 49:11,11	manager 70:19	57:5,7,8,19,20,23	120:4,15 121:1 128:22 131:8
64:11 106:23	72:12 74:13 75:4	58:1,7 59:3,4 60:23 64:12 69:12	
145:16	77:11 96:17 99:6		140:8 142:15
173.10	175:19,20	71:16 72:17 76:7	151:13 154:10,12
<u> </u>			

	I		I
154:17 155:20	174:11,19 175:6	167:14,25 168:3,6	Mom 150:16
160:17 162:13	175:15 176:17,18	168:8 170:3 177:4	moment 54:6
166:4,11 169:11	176:22 177:2	177:5,14,21 178:3	200:10
170:22 176:4,20	178:11,25 179:9	178:4 188:3,23,25	money 8:25 17:5,10
176:23 182:5,20	179:13,15,19,24	189:2,22,24	18:17,20 23:1
183:7 184:10,20	181:17,17,18	Miami 6:4	26:20 29:20 30:16
186:13 187:25	182:2,6,7,11,18	Michael 71:1 80:23	30:20 31:20 35:4,7
191:10 195:1,5	184:1 186:4,11,12	Mickey 42:23	36:11,13,15 46:1
198:6,10,10,12,19	186:24 196:16	mid 74:15	49:4 50:2,13,15,21
198:21	201:16	middle 19:11 42:3,4	51:12,20,21 52:13
meaning 43:19,23	meetings 74:25	Mike 134:17	52:24 53:1,8,17,20
48:6 56:18,22,23	76:25 82:6,14,18	milk 200:8	53:24 54:1,4,13,19
67:8 73:13,22	174:9 177:15	million 24:8 35:22	54:24 55:20 57:18
75:16 88:12 91:17	188:8	35:23,24 36:2,2	58:8,15,17,19,25
94:24 117:20	member 21:6 26:25	58:18,18 65:20	59:9 60:5 64:12,14
121:15 157:22	27:10 181:9	66:12,13,14 98:7	69:9,15 71:14 72:6
means 43:6 56:12	members 28:20	127:19 182:21,22	75:17,17 78:23
85:10 152:15	Membiela 2:9 6:3	184:15	80:22 81:19 90:8
meant 40:22 46:23	mentality 96:16	millions 67:7,12,22	95:4,25 96:1,23,25
70:20 162:23	mentally 185:5	97:2 184:13	97:3,23 98:4,23
mechanically 21:16	mentioned 17:3	mimic 77:9	99:3 104:5 107:7
mechanics 7:10	39:14 64:23 74:14	mind 77:10,11	108:15 109:9
mechanism 24:12	85:5 125:16 174:1	103:3 125:20	111:5,9,18,22
123:6,14	186:25	143:22 144:17	112:14 115:19,22
media 80:13	Mercedes 129:24	164:14	116:3,6,8 132:15
Mediterranean	merge 180:16	minds 60:14	132:16,16,21
150:16	merged 25:16	mine 32:11 38:13	133:4,5,21,23
Medium 2:20	merger 146:11	79:12 113:3	134:25 137:5
meet 70:6 75:6 78:2	147:2	146:19	140:7 143:18
78:4 81:25 148:18	Merrill 10:10,25	minimize 38:5	144:15,18 145:17
169:6 170:19	20:23 21:21 22:4	minimum 66:11,12	147:6,17 149:3,16
176:10 180:1,2,5,8	22:21,24 25:14	136:20	149:17,18,22,25
180:23 181:9	26:7,7 28:3 60:20	minor 141:14	157:15 175:19
184:8 189:10,14	60:20,21 61:1,3,24	minute 147:7	180:17 181:12
meeting 74:24 75:2	78:19 119:21	minutes 52:4	182:14 183:10,14
75:3 76:13,14,21	121:17 123:9	mirrors 22:1	183:20 184:5,15
77:10,11 80:24	143:4 145:25	mistakes 195:20	184:16,23 185:11
144:22 168:20	147:10 149:23,23	Mitterrand 34:18	185:18,22,23
169:4,5,20 170:5	155:16 196:21	133:10	186:1
170:14,25 171:14	mess 103:21	mode 26:13	monies 22:2 26:11
171:17,18,21	messaging 199:25	model 15:3 31:3	53:19 182:9,16,17
172:1,4,7,12,14,14	messengers 21:20	32:20 52:14,14	184:11
172:15,17,19,20	met 13:12 55:4	53:8 83:20 123:20	monitor 74:8 197:25
173:25 174:2,7,10	74:14 82:13	123:20 138:25	monitored 191:14
	1	ı	1

198:5	191:2	81:15 82:21 83:3,5	4:14 203:17 206:7
monitoring 198:17	named 53:9	90:12 93:9 94:4	206:24
198:20	named 33.9 names 72:14,14	95:5 97:4,15 104:3	noted 203:5
monitors 73:23	168:16	109:23 113:3,5,9	notice 4:4,6,11
month 68:25	NASD 9:22 14:11	113:25 114:11	183:17,24,25
	103:7 137:12	116:14,20 119:5	noticed 139:6
monthly 38:14,15 83:15	151:18	122:20 123:15	
months 59:16	NASDAQ 10:3	124:14 137:25	notifying 83:2 Notz 187:20
Morenes 168:15	•		November 166:23
175:14	122:22,22 National 26:3	140:20 146:20,20 150:7 151:19,19	183:2
Morgan 10:25 24:7	nationalized 34:20	150:7 151:19,19	number 11:2 13:16
29:8 121:18 123:8	132:25	153:10,15 155:17	14:20 16:4 26:19
147:13 148:15		155:23,23 156:5	32:9 39:5 52:13
	nationalizing 34:20 natural 37:5 57:15	*	
morning 5:8 190:4 morphed 27:1	natural 37:3 37:13 nature 40:11,19	157:5,24 158:2,3,9 165:13,13 176:23	53:11,21 65:5,5 75:8 86:7 91:3
morphed 27.1 mortified 107:19	133:8 142:17	182:24 184:23	92:13 94:7 95:16
motions 4:17	NCC 66:20	186:13 188:8	116:24 119:18
Motors 11:14 71:18	necessarily 57:25	196:9,9 197:18	126:7,9 127:11,18
Mouse 42:23	75:16 82:9 93:9	190.9,9 197.18	154:3 179:16
move 34:24 63:7	169:9	new 1:3 2:5,5,11,11	numbers 66:15
73:25 117:22	necessary 12:7	6:5 9:17 29:9	126:25 127:7
125:18 161:24	118:19 202:4	121:23 122:10,11	N.C 2:20
moves 63:8 74:1	neck 197:21	129:24 148:13	11.0 2.20
moving 56:16	need 4:17 7:20 8:3	155:7 158:23	0
117:20 124:12	59:11 133:20	159:24 170:17	O 3:1,7 4:1 5:1
165:20	135:12 139:4	176:9 179:17	205:1
murderer 113:23	149:17,17 156:11	184:23 185:1	object 6:12 8:1,4
myriad 41:15	200:7	news 51:9	23:25 36:12 92:18
mysterious 80:10	needed 35:6,22	newspaper 188:1	170:24
130:6 165:1	40:16 57:24	newspapers 106:5	objected 14:5,18
mystery 80:18	negotiated 37:1	111:25	44:4 165:14
	negotiation 46:7	nice 148:21	objection 4:20,20
N	negotiations 14:13	nine 111:15 112:1	30:11,21 65:14,14
N 2:1 3:1,1,7 4:1 5:1	neither 206:13	NODS 91:12	73:4 74:19 85:24
205:1,1	nervous 52:10	nondiscretionary	86:16 88:4 94:2
name 5:9,14 33:12	130:18	16:6	96:12,14 98:17
79:22 87:20 89:22	net 26:18,18 60:6	normal 62:11	99:21 100:17
90:24 92:14 93:4	66:10,12,17 67:6	normally 22:19	102:12 117:5
93:12,17 95:3,24	67:12,22 104:20	69:15 85:10	118:7 119:10
98:14 102:10	network 84:12	Norman 39:7 47:21	125:22 126:2
118:15,17,17	never 11:12 23:17	North 1:16 2:21,24	127:21 131:5,7
139:6 167:10,12	28:4 39:10 49:22	206:1	136:2 161:22
167:17 168:12,14	52:18 56:2 63:20	nose 148:3	167:18 175:10
177:16 178:14	76:21 79:1 80:20	Notary 1:24 2:23	179:4 181:5

200.10	50.10.62.2.5.62.53	1	50.4.62.6.52.14
200:18	59:19 62:2,5 63:20	operational 85:7,9	58:4 63:6 73:14
objections 4:16 8:2	66:4 78:24 82:21	85:10 102:1	92:3 93:16 94:6
25:25	87:22 107:2,10	operations 85:12,12	118:2,5,12,16
obligated 56:10	109:15 110:12,21	85:22 145:18,18	options 17:25 31:7
obligation 83:25	115:3 124:8	operators 195:20	32:19 33:2 37:12
93:12 192:8	131:14 134:24	opinion 67:18 89:11	38:5 39:22,24,24
obligations 46:8	135:14 136:5	101:6,8 104:20	40:2,6,6,10,12,21
obtain 32:13	142:18 143:21	119:16 186:19	40:23,24 41:2,7,9
obtained 87:24	144:23 146:2,3	Oppenheimer 25:6	47:1 62:17 73:20
obvious 83:8 128:23	147:7 156:15	65:8	83:18 91:20 92:2
128:25 140:11	159:3 160:17	opportunity 8:3	124:22 125:4
148:2,4	162:10 165:16	58:3 59:3 202:1	163:8,8
obviously 6:12	167:17,21 168:2	opposed 12:1 41:1	options-clearing
35:16 60:3 93:4	177:23 178:16,19	58:22 61:6 65:20	92:5
147:7 170:22	179:8,12 188:13	149:5 161:4 196:8	order 6:15 36:24
192:12	202:7	opposition 13:13	57:23 95:14
occur 130:17	old 2:20 109:21	Optimal 1:6 5:18	118:19 125:9
occurred 22:18	135:10 150:14	65:9,11,23 69:18	139:19,21 142:6
57:22	old-fashioned	69:19,25 70:18	146:4 163:2,3
occurring 63:14	116:18	71:6 76:12 81:25	190:12 194:11
odd 13:7 109:21	omnibus 20:22	82:7 84:16 89:4	195:19 201:24
126:14 194:18	once 12:3 24:11	90:16,23 91:2 92:7	orderly 9:24
odds 104:11	56:12 73:19 82:2	92:7 93:13,25 94:5	orders 140:12 142:7
offer 56:17	124:21 168:25	94:19,23 95:2,18	144:4 146:9
offered 108:7	172:2,2 190:25	96:3 97:22 98:3,10	organization 22:17
129:23 191:16	ones 25:17 116:15	98:13 99:14	24:25 25:20 26:2,5
offering 14:2 97:18	130:13 142:12	102:14 115:9,10	27:2,5,12,18 75:5
147:13	143:25 145:8	115:12 117:2,2,13	original 50:8 69:24
offhanded 161:11	one-year 32:24	118:1,2,23 120:18	70:25 75:2 80:19
office 6:4,5 20:17	ongoing 16:21	120:18 127:6	132:1,11,12
22:6,22 85:11	open 45:22,22	128:4,8,8 130:23	133:19 142:3
154:3,16 157:22	122:23 148:20,24	135:18 136:1,17	originally 8:22 22:4
168:22 169:23	opened 4:10	142:14 145:9	31:3 121:14 151:6
179:14 197:19	opening 4:11,11,12	158:9 161:16	163:15
officer 18:16,19	122:23 134:10	165:17 166:14,15	other's 75:20
198:15	operate 19:6	176:7 182:3,11	Outlook 191:7
officers 156:3	operated 19:5	184:2 185:17	outright 101:17
offices 169:21 174:3	105:19 106:13	189:12 193:20	outside 11:17 75:25
offshore 132:21	140:21	194:14,18 204:2	155:24
oh 6:21 39:15 92:21	operating 90:20	205:2	overnight 54:11
139:2 168:5	118:11	Optimal's 76:18	overtakes 166:12
okay 19:16 26:18	operation 9:14,15	99:19 102:8 183:1	over-the-counter
30:23 37:13,20	20:18 21:3 22:6	option 31:2 41:9,21	39:24 40:21 41:7
38:25 42:9 47:8	76:8 147:15 195:4	41:25 46:23 47:9	92:3 118:12
<u> </u>			

owed 194-16	nanting 1.2 10.10	124.1 7 0 125.11	107:7 17 100:6
owed 184:16	parties 4:3 40:18	134:1,7,9 135:11	197:7,17 199:6
owned 30:4 36:4	206:15	137:22 141:23	phrase 120:20
65:10 121:20,20	partly 24:15 104:8,8	146:18 147:12	physical 21:18 61:9
122:25 123:1	partners 14:9 51:7	151:23 154:5,9	physically 22:11,12
owner 61:10,11	121:17,19 122:4	157:22 161:13,18	88:21 152:18
P	122:12,15 150:7,8	164:16 177:1	Picard 110:23 111:2
P 2:1,1 4:1 5:1	partnership 39:10	178:6 179:10	pick 55:14 77:8
page 166:25 204:4	parts 122:22	185:10 188:7	118:23,24 D :
205:4	party 6:22 43:21	192:23 194:8	Picower 39:4,5 40:3
paid 35:18,19 84:1,4	93:23 118:22	195:2,17 198:8,19	40:4,5 42:1,10
84:7	passive 165:15	199:15,17 200:5	43:24,25 47:22
pain 149:20 151:3	pathetic 107:12	200:24	48:9,9 49:25 50:13
197:21	Patricia 167:22	percent 9:19 58:21	50:24 51:20,21
paper 64:16 81:13	168:8 PATRICK 2:9	58:23 59:17 60:4,6	52:22,23 53:13
193:20,22 194:2	Paul 71:1 72:12	60:7 73:25 76:6,21 79:24 97:22,25,25	108:16 109:22
194:19	80:25 81:11	98:11,12 102:19	110:9,11,18,19,20 111:15 184:14,24
papers 111:16	pay 22:7 26:20 35:7	121:20 146:17,24	picture 3:10 166:25
papers 111.10 paperwork 24:18	35:15 36:2 71:23	percentage 41:8	167:3,15 177:4,5
paragraph 160:6,8	71:24 191:16	187:18	177:17,23 178:10
161:25 162:3	paying 44:9 60:5	Peregrine 153:23	177:17,23 178:10
165:20	79:23	perfect 169:18	188:1,6,17
parameters 62:12	pedigree 102:23	perfect 109.18 perfectly 59:20 64:7	pieces 37:19
paranoid 81:22	pension 132:9 134:1	104:24 132:14,21	pipe 111:7
Paris 33:8	134:2	140:24 146:8	pipeline 39:18
Park 2:10	people 16:2 24:8,21	perform 72:21	place 4:5 13:2 15:2
parked 59:1	47:15 52:23 60:18	period 25:23 32:24	85:18,23 86:3,14
part 13:13 17:13	61:6 68:21 70:21	32:25 44:6 156:17	168:20 169:20
19:21 27:17 39:1	71:19,20 72:6 75:4	periodically 117:7	171:14 174:3
45:6 49:12 57:3	75:9 76:1,12,16,24	176:22	178:12 179:14
58:10 62:16 67:25	77:16 82:4,6,7,20	permission 157:2,4	180:13
73:16 85:19,22	101:7,13 104:4,18	158:1,5	places 38:9
95:11 97:18 98:15	104:23 105:7,20	Persico 113:18	plaintiffs 1:15 2:2
101:22 116:6,13	105:24 108:15,17	person 76:20 77:12	2:19 3:9 5:6,17
122:16,17 138:5,8	108:23 109:5,8,19	91:16 123:2	166:18
140:17 141:20	110:2,7 111:12	170:23 179:25	plaintiff's 192:15
	1 1 1 2 4 1 7 1 1 2 2 1 1	190:16,23 206:2	plans 179:17
147:16 155:12	112:4,17 113:2,11	190.10,23 200.2	pians 1/2.1/
147:16 155:12 163:7 173:10	112:4,17 113:2,11 113:11,16,16,19	personal 198:25	platform 121:22
147:16 155:12 163:7 173:10 182:15 194:25	7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_ -
147:16 155:12 163:7 173:10 182:15 194:25 particular 118:16	113:11,16,16,19	personal 198:25	platform 121:22
147:16 155:12 163:7 173:10 182:15 194:25 particular 118:16 163:11 164:4	113:11,16,16,19 113:23,25 114:1,4	personal 198:25 personality 151:2 personally 96:20 196:9 199:3	platform 121:22 player 50:6
147:16 155:12 163:7 173:10 182:15 194:25 particular 118:16 163:11 164:4 182:6 183:13	113:11,16,16,19 113:23,25 114:1,4 116:2,9,19 117:7 117:10 119:20 121:6 125:12,13	personal 198:25 personality 151:2 personally 96:20 196:9 199:3 pg 3:10	platform 121:22 player 50:6 please 5:9 7:15,20 190:9 plus 97:25 131:14
147:16 155:12 163:7 173:10 182:15 194:25 particular 118:16 163:11 164:4 182:6 183:13 particularly 71:3	113:11,16,16,19 113:23,25 114:1,4 116:2,9,19 117:7 117:10 119:20 121:6 125:12,13 126:17 129:14,14	personal 198:25 personality 151:2 personally 96:20 196:9 199:3 pg 3:10 phone 59:7 95:16	platform 121:22 player 50:6 please 5:9 7:15,20 190:9 plus 97:25 131:14 point 6:9 7:25 16:19
147:16 155:12 163:7 173:10 182:15 194:25 particular 118:16 163:11 164:4 182:6 183:13	113:11,16,16,19 113:23,25 114:1,4 116:2,9,19 117:7 117:10 119:20 121:6 125:12,13	personal 198:25 personality 151:2 personally 96:20 196:9 199:3 pg 3:10	platform 121:22 player 50:6 please 5:9 7:15,20 190:9 plus 97:25 131:14

	İ	1	İ
38:18 62:4 63:13	presentation 78:1	196:7	96:20
106:25 134:14	presently 27:20	Prisons 191:15	profits 45:18 60:5
135:18 149:24	preserving 8:1	202:6	98:1 126:16 166:6
153:18 188:4	press 98:14 131:3	Pritzker 184:12	184:24
190:20	pressed 52:12 76:1	private 33:8,13	prohibited 133:14
pointing 162:5	132:19	160:7	promised 51:13
177:9	pressing 84:18	privately 150:18	191:19
polite 176:15	99:11	Privee 33:7 46:12	proper 160:21
Ponzi 135:19 151:23	pressure 117:3	46:13 53:16	properly 91:7
pool 110:22 112:6	pressured 45:16	privilege 77:15	161:14
Pools 121:25	58:15	probably 15:14	propose 196:17
portfolio 32:18 37:7	pretty 17:1 26:22	23:22 49:13	proprietary 8:23
39:21 69:6 73:21	29:10 105:3 176:1	100:22 103:4	9:2,6 17:5,13,14
portfolios 40:2	190:3 195:4	107:10,19 109:3	18:13 19:20
position 14:3,15	201:15	120:8 125:9	139:18 145:18
16:3 25:1 45:15	prevalent 24:11	126:19 140:3	prosecutor 108:7
46:16,22 59:19	previously 85:5	141:16 145:9	protective 6:15
62:24 63:1 64:6	91:10 193:16	147:1 163:25	proven 108:13
162:23 169:11	price 56:25 57:1	170:7 174:8	provide 8:3 30:9
180:18 185:12	prices 117:22	185:17	38:10 193:23
positions 32:14	123:23 124:9	problem 45:20 56:5	200:25 201:13,13
34:14 38:11 40:16	Pricewaterhouse	59:25 100:24	201:16,17
45:17 129:17,18	155:1	117:1,17 130:2	provider 36:22
129:25 163:1,20	price-fixing 197:15	153:10	providing 26:24
possible 105:1	primarily 10:7	problems 13:9	35:14 194:19
possibly 57:1 76:15	11:12,18 13:17	51:19 133:16	psyche 106:10
177:14	14:10 17:19 23:19	135:7	psychological
post 154:3	27:13 29:2 30:1,5	procedure 4:23	113:13
posted 122:13	32:10 33:7,11,13	35:12 90:20	psychologist 113:8
posttraumatic	36:12 39:24 40:14	118:11 163:23	Public 1:24 2:23
114:3	41:12 42:10 53:6	procedures 6:13	4:14 79:2 203:17
potatoes 81:16	57:25 123:2 172:4	145:20	206:7,24
potential 117:1	194:4	process 21:17	punch 195:17,20
189:11	primary 29:5	195:22	punished 114:8
pound 81:7	106:20 135:1	prodding 26:23	purchase 37:22
power 116:11	Primex 121:13	produce 61:15,22	purchased 21:23
practice 139:17	principal 17:17 42:6	61:23 154:17	38:3 40:6 41:19
152:10	59:24 91:22	produced 157:21,23	purchasing 32:4
pre 30:17	printed 158:22	products 17:25 41:4	35:15 64:9,10
preamble 56:6	prior 36:17 42:21	professional 2:23	purpose 4:8,18
preferred 194:23	182:7,11	4:14 96:9 175:17	169:5 174:18
prescribed 4:7	prison 109:4,7	206:23	179:19
present 103:4	111:25 159:8	profit 46:3	purposes 4:9 9:10
178:24 189:3	190:15 191:11	profitable 18:2,4	61:12 62:10 68:10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

(0.11.101.10	102 12 200 21	H 27 22 20 0	150 5 167 24
68:11 101:18	193:13 200:21	really 27:23 39:9	159:5 167:24
112:23	201:3,7	43:3 47:22 51:16	168:15 174:22
pushing 59:14	quick 52:1 158:14	53:23 69:20 71:8,8	175:21 177:20
pushy 201:9	158:15	79:16,18 91:19	178:23 180:6
put 16:5 36:5 45:15	quite 36:11 49:10,15	97:15 111:12	181:8 182:15
46:16 48:15 56:2	73:6 80:17 83:1	119:12 122:20	188:10
56:12 58:7,15	86:3 101:1 103:2	126:22 129:11	record 5:10,14
62:21 64:14 81:19	105:22 129:12	136:12 137:25	55:16,18 72:7,20
98:19 99:2 115:22	155:14 180:3	154:4 165:13	90:22 91:1 115:6
121:3 123:25	198:4 200:23	173:3,10,18,19	153:17 157:19
133:2,5,23 134:25	quote 56:12,13	176:1 181:25	158:18 177:9
154:25 181:1	160:11 162:3,8	186:9 188:9 193:6	188:14,22 193:8
184:15 190:13	165:21,21,22,24	reason 12:2 13:17	193:10 197:12,17
puts 62:14		51:24 54:11 55:25	201:20 202:11
putting 40:22 59:9	$\frac{\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{R}}$	78:12 83:4,22	203:6 206:11
78:23 100:9 102:7	R 2:1 5:1 204:1,1	86:11 88:17 96:22	recorded 197:7
141:20 173:13	205:1,1	115:18 116:15	recording 197:18
P&L 19:18	race 172:23 173:8	124:13 133:9	records 89:23 90:22
P&Ls 19:1	173:17	142:4 165:4	90:23 141:16
P.M 158:19 193:9,9	radar 137:17	173:21 200:6	152:25 153:1,7
202:13	raise 194:18	204:4 205:4	154:11,17 157:22
	ran 9:1 77:6 104:24	reasonable 96:11	157:23 193:19,24
Q 1 100 24	140:20 148:8	reasons 53:21 83:9	recover 49:24
quadruple 109:24	152:3,4,5	86:12 92:15	recovered 112:15
qualified 4:15 72:25	ranked 102:19	128:23,24,25	redemption 184:3
quart 200:8	rate 37:3 63:7	132:22	redemptions 181:21
quarter 81:13 163:7	rationalization 101:22	recall 25:8 65:25,25	185:4,13 186:21
163:11,19,20 183:20	reaction 94:11 96:7	135:20 171:19	redirect 201:19
	read 111:25 120:11	175:4,12 176:6	reduce 109:14
quarterly 162:19		receive 190:24	reduced 206:10
question 4:20,20,21 7:16 92:23 103:2	144:12 159:12,16	191:1	refer 8:19 11:20
	159:20,20 203:3	received 38:15	154:20
117:8 120:13,16	reading 137:22	95:16 120:12	referred 9:9 11:21
135:22 141:25	ready 46:19	138:3,16	27:3 31:15,16
151:6,7 questionable 75:17	real 23:24 39:7 50:4 50:16 66:17	receiving 20:18	40:11 64:25
109:23	115:18 123:20	60:10 195:2	121:24
questioning 52:3	153:19	RECESS 55:17	referring 10:14
questioning 32.3	reality 60:4 91:24	115:4 158:19	43:18 76:10 97:10
200:24	112:11,14	193:9	110:8 117:11
questions 4:16 8:1,2	realized 25:23 60:3	recession 57:21	142:10
8:12 81:20 92:22	111:20 134:9	recognize 167:5	refers 17:9
131:4,9 132:3	148:2 184:20	177:4,24 178:9	refresh 159:5
139:5 192:24	185:15 186:2	187:22 188:16	167:24 168:15
137.3 174.44	103.13 100.2	recollection 65:23	177:20
<u> </u>			

fh		170.9 193.10	164.6 107.12 16
refreshes 178:23 refuse 157:3	registration 10:12 13:21 16:15,22	179:8 182:19 186:10 196:15,20	164:6 197:12,16
refused 59:5 99:19	17:8 19:25 20:2	remorse 112:22	197:24,25
107:1 108:9	95:15	114:24,25	requirement 35:16 requirements 4:10
107.1 108.9		*	requirements 4.10 requiring 196:17
148:9	regular 22:8 67:15 67:15	replace 186:23 replaced 132:5	1 0
Regan 2:9 5:21,23	regulation 14:12	133:25 178:20	reserve 201:18,25 reserved 4:22
6:1,1,14,16 30:11	59:25 106:18	187:1	202:12
30:13,21 51:25	regulations 12:8	replay 181:19	resist 166:6
52:5,8 55:15 65:14	18:6 66:21 95:8	report 128:10,14,15	resolved 15:18
73:4 74:19 85:24	106:15 196:16	129:1 163:21	respect 4:10,12
86:16 88:4 92:18	regulators 104:16	164:6	104:14 181:2
92:22 93:1 94:2	107:18 145:23	reported 1:24	respective 4:2
96:12,14 98:17	regulatory 76:2	104:22 111:16	respects 4:6
99:21 100:17	101:25 102:24	reporter 2:23 4:14	response 94:8,14,14
102:12 115:3	136:18 162:7,14	7:14,17 206:6,23	107:3 150:13
117:5 118:7	162:15	reporting 128:3,4,5	responses 7:13
119:10 125:22	related 39:25 73:15	128:6 141:15	responsibility 79:10
126:2 127:21	87:1 139:10	162:23 163:20	responsible 9:24
131:5,7 136:2	175:18 176:6	represent 5:17 6:2	47:25 48:22
158:12,14,17,24	206:14	178:18,22 179:6	114:10
159:3,15,18	relates 161:3	represented 8:5	rest 112:24 121:20
161:22 167:18	relationship 47:16	9:19 157:11	201:18
175:10 179:4	47:17 49:20 96:19	representing 4:2	restrictions 183:12
181:5 200:18	96:20 99:12	75:16 189:11	restroom 52:1
201:21 202:4,8	107:21 173:15,20	reproduced 153:19	result 131:6 172:1
regarded 76:8	190:18	154:7	retail 10:9 11:2,13
regardless 56:13	relatively 82:20	reputation 36:21	44:1,2 78:8,17
97:1 152:10	release 97:5 110:5	72:19 75:15,22	79:2,16,18
regional 10:23	relevant 34:7	78:13 79:4 102:15	retained 196:14
register 12:3,6,8,16	relieved 126:19	102:17 131:15	197:9
13:5,10,19 14:4,14	rely 129:9	139:24 148:22	retire 134:17
14:16 15:19,22,23	remain 169:3	request 93:24,25	return 61:20 99:4
15:24 16:13,18	remember 69:20	97:3 182:3 183:1	109:9 144:18
20:3 190:16	70:4,16 75:1 76:17	requested 182:12	146:15,17,24
registered 2:23 4:14	76:19 82:5,12	192:13 195:13	149:21 187:19
9:4,22 10:11 15:9	128:17 135:25	require 12:8 156:14	199:12
21:5 23:14,15	136:3 151:5 155:3	198:10	returned 97:3 199:6
31:25 39:10 68:8,9	160:15 162:18	required 4:5,6	returns 59:16 69:11
95:10 191:1	164:7 165:25	14:24 16:12,17	146:20
206:23	167:12,17 168:12	18:6 23:23 56:17	review 6:8,10
registering 11:25	168:22 171:3,9,20	66:9 93:17 95:20	reviewed 191:13
14:5	172:18 173:6	119:1,4 132:9	reviewing 157:18
registers 9:25	175:1,2,5,8 178:10	155:13 162:19	re-liquify 186:1

D. I. 120.11	25.5	L	10615
Richards 138:11	rooms 35:5	Sandy 148:16	196:17
rid 149:19 180:16	Rothchild 34:21	Santander 3:10	second 59:18 157:20
180:17	routinely 136:19	65:10 82:6 84:7	160:11 162:2
ridiculous 105:13	routing 123:5	166:22 185:5	172:7 173:25
145:15 198:21	RPR 1:24	sat 77:25	174:10,19 175:5
right 5:8 6:11,14,16	Rubin 148:16	saved 194:24 197:1	secretary 106:3
7:1 8:16 15:13	ruin 49:20	savings 68:8	199:1
17:6,10 21:14	rule 131:21	saw 25:19 81:8	secretive 80:10,16
31:18 38:7,23	rules 4:23 13:3	88:14 97:19	131:16 132:2
41:23 45:14 55:11	18:24 45:3,4 56:11	126:19 140:17	142:19
55:12 62:7 64:3	105:12,25 106:14	141:4 142:23,24	securities 5:18 8:15
69:1 73:19 74:9	106:24 134:2	199:5	9:25 10:3,4 11:10
77:5 87:17 91:11	146:3 200:3	saying 44:13 59:8	11:19 14:8 20:5,5
106:24 115:5	ruling 4:18	79:22 84:17	20:6,19 21:17,19
117:14 125:18,19	rumblings 15:21	112:20 129:21	22:5,7,11,12,23
127:2,11 139:3	44:19	135:21 138:17	23:4 26:3,8 27:15
144:14,20 145:24	rumor 142:13	145:2 155:12	28:2,5,19,22 29:6
149:20 155:22	180:14	160:15 165:25	31:4,4,8 32:5,5,18
160:9 162:25	rumors 44:24	196:21	32:23 33:1,3,6,18
170:13 177:10	126:11	says 12:18 61:15	33:23,24 36:3 39:2
178:21 187:4,5,23	run 18:12,14,18	93:20 127:4 159:8	39:21 56:22 69:6
192:21,22 193:14	49:22 77:7 139:20	160:7,11 162:2,3	72:17 73:21,22,24
199:4 202:7	143:17	165:21 167:21	74:6 88:15,17,18
rights 33:2 73:12	running 54:20 77:21	scale 23:11	90:9,11,25 91:3,9
ring 130:6	77:22 135:19	schedule 182:9	100:25 102:20
risk 17:21 18:1 36:5	139:16,17,23	scheme 135:19	123:21,22 124:8
38:6 45:8,23 46:24	140:12,25 142:7	151:23	124:20 151:13,21
48:18 66:23 67:3	142:22 143:9	school 23:18 135:10	152:16,18 156:22
69:14,16 85:16	144:3,23,24,25	Schwab 10:8,23	196:22
103:16 134:6	145:12 147:4	science 74:11 165:2	security 13:3 22:18
risks 36:9	151:11,23	scope 65:18	32:13 33:16 45:5,6
risky 146:22	runs 140:4	screen 137:17	56:14 57:11 73:13
Robertson 71:1 116:19 134:18	S	seamless 27:21 SEC 9:22 10:12	73:14,15 87:10,11 SEC's 26:22
rock 135:6	S 2:1 3:1 4:1,1 5:1	13:8,24 14:3,11,14	see 41:5,16 94:21
rocked 135:6	204:1 205:1	14:18 15:15,21	97:20 111:3 118:2
rocket 74:11 165:2	Sachs 10:10,25	16:11,21 18:25	118:10 149:4,10
Rodrigo 177:17	36:18 50:1,3 51:19	19:16 23:16,23	151:12,14 160:7
role 70:18 91:14	78:19 121:18	25:23 37:14 56:11	162:1,9 166:24
135:5	129:25	59:25 103:7 107:1	167:2,22 177:16
roof 19:19	sad 172:9	107:21 136:18	178:8 188:1
room 19:7,11,12	safekeeping 23:4	137:1,8,11,24	192:13,15
169:25 197:12	salary 97:11 98:9	138:4,13 141:19	seeing 153:22 177:1
198:5	salespeople 71:20	144:10 151:18	seen 23:17 125:17
170.0	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	111.10 101.10	Seein 23.17 123.17
	•	•	•

	I	l	I
149:2 188:6	19:1,1,6,17 21:4,4	55:13 56:7,9,18,23	signal 97:6 116:25
segregated 89:21,24	123:1 141:24	57:6,9,14 61:20	124:4
90:11,17	145:19	62:15,22,23,25	signals 146:5,7
self-cleared 86:15	separation 18:10	63:3,4,22,23 64:6	signature 4:22
86:19	series 74:24	64:13,18 81:6	202:12
self-clearing 20:12	served 4:6 27:6	83:18 86:9 87:11	signed 66:9,21
20:13,16 22:16	106:18	88:16 129:18	Silver 42:21 44:21
23:8	set 6:13 90:17 121:3	shorted 62:1	similar 9:14 17:14
self-custody 28:13	settle 20:9 26:20	shorten 58:4 59:19	45:6 51:11 121:24
28:15	85:18 118:20	shorting 62:17	130:14 174:8
self-serving 101:21	124:25	short-term 17:22	190:3
sell 24:22 26:13 28:3	settled 30:4	67:2	simple 36:17 82:21
35:13,20,23 39:22	settlement 21:22	shot 182:22	simultaneous 34:1
44:14 45:17,21	22:3 26:16 27:22	show 77:17 91:1,1	simultaneously
61:16 62:21 73:14	27:25 183:25	158:21	33:18
79:11 124:22	settlements 26:18	showed 116:10	sinister 199:22
147:22 148:9,11	settling 85:15	137:16 141:13	sit 58:25 113:17
148:12	seven 21:23 22:3	153:17	114:6
selling 33:1,18 44:5	26:16 27:24 112:9	showing 77:25	site 52:14
56:24 59:24 63:11	201:24	163:12	sits 113:21
73:17 88:20	seven-day 21:22	shuts 144:10,14	sitting 59:5 196:15
136:25 150:6	sex 198:11	side 9:2 10:16,20	situation 32:21
sells 60:23	Shapiro 39:4 40:3,5	11:22 17:2 18:17	51:11 57:17 58:14
send 21:24 37:21	40:5 41:25 42:11	29:12,21,23 31:24	60:3 87:23 91:18
58:17 96:24 109:6	43:23,25 47:19	33:19 36:15 41:24	99:7 103:14
122:14 129:15	48:9 50:23 53:13	42:1 45:22 46:9,20	104:21 113:6
139:25 156:16	107:19 108:17	46:23 54:23 56:9	150:4
191:1 193:20	110:9 112:10	56:18 58:3,4 61:13	situations 41:15
195:5	184:15	62:24,25 63:1	129:13
sending 87:3	shares 21:21 123:24	64:13,17 76:3,3	six 65:21 110:24
sense 11:13 60:5	sharp 169:15	78:15 85:12,13	127:4
68:20 72:1,9 105:3	Shawn 2:9 6:1	86:8,9 91:4,9,17	sixth 161:24
131:12,12,19	sheet 81:13 203:5	91:20,20,21 92:2	Sixty 127:20,23
143:10,23 150:23	shelf 152:16	94:5,6 101:25	size 65:12,19 117:15
183:5 198:7	shelter 44:20	102:1,1,24 122:12	124:12
sent 38:1,2,13 41:18	sheltered 43:4	137:5,5 140:9	slash 29:20
139:12 149:7	shelters 42:24	141:20,22 142:7	small 8:24 14:24
151:10 154:2,2	shipped 140:1	147:17,18 149:3	15:5 23:21 41:8
155:6 189:9	shocked 24:8	149:13 150:24	smaller 23:10 65:17
193:19 194:1	shocking 137:19	152:6 157:15	67:14,20 84:13
sentence 108:9	shoes 99:19 102:8	195:25 196:5	116:17
109:14 162:2	shopping 199:1	200:6 201:24	smallest 66:11
sentenced 109:2	short 8:19 45:6 46:1	sides 34:4 56:21	smarter 143:25
separate 9:6 12:14	46:2,22,25 47:1	sign 14:25 54:3	smile 136:8
	•	•	•

		 I	 I
Smith 121:18	111:2 122:9 132:4	91:15 175:9	38:15 154:1,8
122:17 147:12	161:2 164:14	spoke 94:16 126:23	203:7
148:16 151:9	165:14,22 171:11	162:3 169:18	states 1:2 5:19
social 172:13 173:15	172:13 173:13	sponsors 172:22	143:12 159:7
173:20	175:19,25 176:4,8	spread 74:2	stating 189:9
socialize 173:11	180:9,11,13	spreads 148:6	statute 4:5,6
software 124:1	181:19,21,24,25	sregan@hunton.c	statutes 12:4
sold 28:5 40:6 47:3	183:14,18,22	2:12	stay 54:2 58:20
47:3 122:21,22	184:17 200:21	stage 16:25 36:21	83:25 176:21
solely 17:16	sorts 139:13 180:19	75:21 109:1	Stearns 20:23 22:21
solicit 79:1 176:11	sound 101:21	115:23 116:21	25:14 29:9 86:24
solicited 134:14	168:16	124:16 185:5	86:25 87:3,5,6,7,8
soliciting 67:20	sounds 168:1	193:2	87:14 88:14 154:7
solve 130:2	South 173:1	stand 9:21	154:7 155:16
somebody 84:15	Southern 1:3 5:19	standard 90:20 98:2	156:3 175:3
101:2 119:2	soybeans 81:16	118:11 137:2	Steinhardt 71:2
120:13 136:9	Spain 173:22,24	standing 40:23,24	80:23 134:17
154:16 190:10,13	174:2	standpoint 61:12	step 7:17 8:18 29:19
somewhat 25:9	Spanish 168:16	96:13	46:21 89:3 120:19
164:12	172:10	stands 106:4	Steve 105:11
son 18:14 108:1	speak 119:14	Stanley 10:25 29:8	stipulated 4:2
112:22,23 114:15	Spear 147:8	39:8 42:1 121:18	stock 9:17 21:6 26:6
sons 9:1 18:12 25:5	spearheading 145:7	123:9 147:13	35:17 56:16,17,24
49:14,16 114:15	special 12:19 51:3	Stanley's 24:7	57:15 59:24 60:17
147:20,21,22	51:14 146:16	start 53:3 59:9	61:8 62:14,15,20
148:8 150:3,11	specialist 9:14	120:19 168:7	63:4,5,11,22 73:18
199:16	specialists 122:13	started 8:22 11:7	88:20 90:22 91:1
Sonya 53:7 70:9	specific 19:24 20:4	13:23 21:10 31:9	121:23 122:11,11
soon 185:23,25	174:18 188:10	34:20 50:1 52:9,10	125:3 152:12
sophisticated 66:5,7	specifically 171:8	55:24 59:7 65:16	153:17 157:19
66:20 67:21 68:2	186:10	81:14 111:19,23	stockmarket 164:24
69:3 132:13	speculation 101:3	115:24 132:7	stocks 125:5
sophisticated-eno	speculator 50:4	134:17,20 137:10	stop 199:23
71:21	spend 82:15 110:25	142:12 147:1	stopped 63:14,20
Soros 81:5 116:18	113:9	180:20	stored 59:1
sorry 66:14 95:22	spent 156:18 171:5	starting 13:7 33:4	stories 142:3
107:24,25 108:4	172:6 197:22	starts 161:25	story 34:9 126:20
137:13 159:15	spike 124:7	state 2:24 5:9 172:9	Straddle 44:20 45:4
194:16	spikes 58:2	206:1,8	Straddles 42:22
sort 19:10 27:25	spite 25:25 104:3,19	stated 13:18 14:25	44:21
47:19,20 49:9 50:8	111:17 128:21	58:10	straight 69:12 73:17
57:19 59:4 70:10	148:15 164:24	statement 83:15	strategies 42:23
70:14 75:7,19	split-strike 31:17	87:6	74:10 81:23
98:11 109:15	52:15 55:11 73:3	statements 38:11,14	strategy 11:9,10

	1		
30:24 31:16,17	subset 161:18	switch 166:16	talk 30:17 64:22
34:14 35:10 42:17	165:18	188:24 200:10	113:21 135:25
42:17 45:7 55:10	substantial 67:22	Switching 128:2	199:11
55:11 57:24 58:6	75:21 102:18,22	Switzerland 68:9	talked 117:23
58:10,24 62:17,20	116:23	142:3,9,23 143:13	193:16
69:8,13,16 71:22	sub-managers	swore 192:1	talking 80:20 128:3
71:25 72:8,23,24	71:14	sworn 5:4 203:12	129:22
73:1,3,7,12,12,16	successful 104:5	system 19:15 121:9	tax 42:23 68:8,10
74:4,12 75:11,13	successfully 53:11	121:9,12,13,14,14	108:20 132:16
77:9 79:14 82:20	Sucharow 2:4 5:16	121:19 122:2,18	taxes 44:9
82:21 83:1 91:15	sudden 122:15	122:20,25 123:3,5	team 76:15,18 149:7
139:15 163:5,7,14	129:23 133:1	123:10,10,12,13	151:8
163:16 164:1,4,21	146:10 147:3	123:19 124:4,8,12	technically 127:17
169:10 171:2,4,8	157:9	124:18 128:12	technological 21:14
171:12 175:9	Suisse 119:21	130:4 190:10	technologically
201:1	133:17	191:2,3,4 194:6,9	193:17
stream 73:20 76:6	suitable 75:12	194:12	technologically-a
128:18	summer 173:7	systemic 100:24	194:21
Street 33:23 53:9	174:25	systems 18:22 129:8	technology 24:11
105:8 106:20	supplying 59:23	140:22 195:18	36:23 125:7,10
122:7 125:10	supposed 14:7 72:25	S&P 10:2 31:5,6	teeth 133:3
141:17 197:11	76:25 137:7	73:23	telegraph 83:8
199:19	sure 5:23 7:12,15		telephone 189:19
stress 114:3,20	23:24 43:8 52:2,5	<u>T</u>	tell 30:19 50:2 60:20
stretch 158:17	70:8 76:21 84:23	T 3:1,1,7,7 4:1,1	76:20 80:14 81:1
stretched 23:22	85:8,11,23 95:18	204:1,1 205:1,1,1	82:22,25 83:5 95:2
strict 200:3	107:16 112:6	take 4:15 7:23 14:3	110:17 114:6
strike 4:17	113:23 118:10	22:9 29:19 30:18	123:21 144:1
strongly 43:9	119:13 151:5	35:2,4,20 36:1	165:15 167:11
structure 51:14	182:6 186:9	45:17 46:22 51:2	170:20 176:22
struggled 25:22	192:22 199:12	51:25 52:3 53:7,17	192:1 199:21
Stucki 187:20	surface 130:17	54:4 55:13 74:11	200:7 201:11
study 114:21	survive 109:23	81:20 85:18,23	telling 83:14 172:9
stuff 44:22 137:24	114:2	88:10 89:3 95:24	192:3,6
144:11 180:19	suspicious 142:18	95:25 96:23 98:23	tells 83:16
stupid 112:2	147:4 151:22	99:2 103:16 115:2	temperature 75:20
subject 6:8,10 12:4	sweep 138:6,8,10	133:5,23 147:24	temporarily 185:22
subscribe 203:6	sweeps 139:7	150:17 158:14,15	temporary 60:3
SUBSCRIBED	sweetest 113:19	168:20 174:9 184:6,10 185:2,18	103:14 113:6
203:12	swimming 110:22	taken 1:15 2:18 4:2	ten 9:19 60:7 76:6
subsequent 141:7	Swiss 33:10 39:14	4:8 57:18 132:24	term 85:5,6 109:3
171:23	55:9 65:6 84:17	159:10 180:15	113:12,13 154:19
subsequently	132:20 142:11,16	184:18 206:9	194:7
144:13	143:15 145:4	104.10 400.9	terms 9:11 65:11
<u> </u>			

	1	ı	1
135:21 175:23	114:21,22 126:13	93:21 108:12	totally 24:9 62:11
testified 5:5 55:24	135:20 139:2	109:20 110:18	70:14 102:25
testimony 4:2	141:13,22 147:1	111:14 113:9	touch 83:25 176:21
206:11	172:20 175:18	121:25 124:5	track 72:7,19
thank 176:25	178:15 179:9,21	125:24 137:10	tracks 104:7
201:21 202:9	190:5 193:7	138:3 139:15	trade 22:1 42:7 53:8
thanked 173:4	third 160:6,8 189:23	140:6,16 148:1	56:9 58:3 69:4
Thanksgiving 178:4	third-party 6:25	152:25 154:10	86:8 91:25 120:21
178:25 179:14	90:1	156:18 157:20	120:23,24 121:2,4
181:17 184:1	thorough 153:20	159:13,18 168:7	123:7,17 124:24
Thema 65:6 95:17	thought 49:22,23	168:23,24 169:12	195:10
127:5 145:7	75:8 106:10 112:2	171:5 172:3,6,11	traded 10:2 33:23
157:11	113:6 126:13	172:25 176:9	trader 7:8,8
theoretically 49:8	127:13 138:14	180:12 181:19	traders 139:18
63:7 120:5 123:7	147:16 161:9	183:6,24 184:4,7	140:22 199:24
theory 142:21	165:8,9 177:14	184:19 188:2,4	trades 13:25 20:25
164:19,20	179:6 181:4,7	189:23 198:1	24:2,22 26:14,15
thereof 4:17	186:12,18 188:3	201:19,22 202:9	28:1 46:18 87:24
thereon 4:18	thousands 24:4	timeframe 168:23	89:6 121:10 123:8
they'd 130:19	125:11	183:19	123:14 128:3,5,10
135:17	threat 25:20 122:10	times 10:5 74:21	128:14 129:1
thing 8:5 37:3 51:9	185:19	94:7 158:23	136:12 138:23,25
51:17 57:16 79:21	threatened 96:23	159:25 160:1	140:15 142:5
103:3 108:5,6,14	threatening 51:17	179:16 188:7	144:16 149:2
109:7 113:10	three 15:14 17:4	189:22 201:12	trading 8:23 9:11,20
116:7 118:23	18:11 19:5 75:6	tips 151:22	11:10 17:5,13,14
130:20 145:4,5	136:22 147:14,23	today 24:9 28:9,15	17:16,18 19:7,12
151:17 153:23	148:18,23 155:3	100:25 103:4	19:21 37:6 52:14
154:14 164:11	170:12 179:10	106:5 122:24	53:10,15 56:21
166:10 173:14	183:25 201:12	133:16 190:6	58:12,13 67:2 76:7
192:21,22 199:19	three-day 27:24	token 164:2	77:8,22 79:11 92:8
things 34:19 35:7	thrilled 78:16	told 48:13 50:15	106:16 121:13,22
47:24 85:14	tickets 129:16	68:15 90:21	125:15 140:3,9,16
101:12,20 105:9	time 4:4,20 7:25	111:17 138:21	140:24,25 193:19
108:22 113:12	13:1,14 14:5,8	153:15 168:11,14	193:24 197:12
130:5,14,17 134:5	15:2 16:14 19:9	184:5	198:5
141:14 143:2	23:11,18 24:1	ton 130:18	trans 140:2,3
160:25 187:16	25:11,23 28:21	top 102:19 160:7	transacted 9:18
think 6:5 21:8,11	32:24 33:4 34:12	topic 128:2	transaction 11:15
25:5,6 47:6,10	36:8 43:1,9,15	topics 200:10	12:22 15:4 21:24
61:6,8 65:19 81:5	44:19 51:18 52:12	torn 196:25	23:2 26:10 27:21
92:19 93:1 97:21	53:6 56:1 65:18	total 24:7 102:2	28:8 36:16 37:2,12
98:10 101:12	68:13 76:5,9 82:16	112:25 130:15	41:25 45:23 46:20
104:4 113:22	83:23 84:22,23	198:6	51:13 60:7,11,12
<u> </u>			

60.12 14 61.14	t	66.25 67.6 14	
60:13,14 61:14	trust 27:2,11 47:14	66:25 67:6,14	uncommon 23:20
62:1,9,11,24 64:20	48:4,16 89:13	68:19 69:3,5,16	195:1
66:25 69:7,10	105:25 133:8	70:25 72:22,24	uncovered 51:9
83:14 86:3 91:17	trusted 129:12,12	75:9,11 79:3 80:10	101:14 103:4
93:15,22,23	trustee 48:20	102:21 140:24	underlying 66:2
118:20 125:2	trusts 49:1	182:1 183:25	67:8,9,11
transactions 9:18	truth 131:14 192:1	195:17	undersigned 4:14
11:16,18 26:21	192:4,6	types 10:19 19:10	understand 7:18 8:8
31:6 32:7,17 37:10	truthful 193:1	20:5,6 42:22 68:16	11:23 30:8 39:17
40:18 41:3,22 42:5	try 24:21 34:24	132:1,4 134:24	39:19,23 41:17
42:6 43:21,22	37:18 41:16 56:7	typewriting 206:10	44:11 47:14 49:13
63:13,15 74:3 79:8	76:24 77:9 103:25	typical 17:23 44:1	49:14 60:15,19
85:16,18,23 86:14	139:8 184:2	67:5 68:5 69:5	71:21,25 73:8
95:14 124:23	trying 43:4,13 105:6	70:19 81:8,12	74:12 83:19 96:16
125:12	147:12	96:16 125:1 135:9	104:23 105:5
transcribe 7:14	Tudor 71:1 72:12	183:18 200:20	106:12 108:10
transcript 6:7 203:3	80:25 81:11	typically 23:4 29:10	132:18 139:8
203:6 206:4,11	tug 144:9	29:15 42:6 54:14	141:23 142:16
transparency 81:10	turf 25:25	58:17 67:13,23	146:14 164:21,22
132:3 134:12	turmoil 34:19	68:6 86:8 87:21	165:3,4,7,9
trapped 103:12	181:20,25	90:4,5 92:14 93:8	understanding 40:9
traveled 35:3	turn 54:12 69:18	94:17 97:21 118:9	40:12,17 46:17
treasurer 156:3	148:17	118:14 119:25	54:21,23 66:1,4
treasuries 20:7 29:8	turned 88:3 112:24	121:4 123:18	67:10 70:17 72:25
58:20,22 59:6 62:3	130:15 197:2	137:1 151:15	77:14 78:10 80:5
62:5 89:17 163:6	turns 114:1	170:15 176:20	85:21 93:11 97:14
163:19	twice 156:17 168:6	190:1 195:7,9	100:15 153:12
treasury 28:25	169:2 201:12	196:24	178:23 180:25
29:16 58:9 59:2,11	two 15:14,14 53:21		187:6
106:2	59:17 60:4 75:5	U	understood 66:22
treating 196:18	76:16 82:3 110:24	U 4:1 205:1	69:3,17 73:3 75:12
treatment 51:3 53:1	110:25 136:20,23	UBS 133:17	78:7 113:25
tremendous 34:24	141:4,13 147:14	Uh-huh 7:22 8:13	125:13 201:1
122:3	147:23 148:17,23	51:23 55:8 63:9,19	undoing 197:3
Tremont 65:7 68:1	156:18 157:16	64:24 66:24 74:17	unfortunately 49:25
trial 4:19	162:15 174:5	79:9 80:1 115:11	unidentified 160:12
tried 173:10 185:10	186:5,6 190:1	117:25 161:19	160:18
199:23	two-hour 160:8	166:3 167:1 168:9	unique 23:14 73:16
tries 164:25	two-sided 56:13	178:7 193:18	83:20
trouble 38:22,24	type 11:18 14:16	200:14 202:3	United 1:2 5:18
41:6 54:3	15:3 19:15,24	umbrella 9:8 12:13	143:12
true 44:16 143:11	23:13 27:21 41:15	unclear 70:14	unpunished 106:1
155:14 172:11	42:23 50:6 53:14	uncomfortable	unsuitable 101:1
206:11	54:25 55:3 57:10	150:4	unusual 116:21
	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

			I
125:15 130:3	141:15	124:14 128:9	weeks 156:18
155:15 163:22,24	volumes 24:18	135:5 139:13	157:17
164:12 171:10,22	137:14	141:3 142:2	Weil 148:16
179:13	vote 180:10	147:22 149:10	welcome 202:10
unwind 46:19	Vuitton 55:6	151:16 169:6	well-known 76:4
upmarket 57:25		173:14 176:10	125:8
58:1	W	180:23 184:11	went 13:16,24 33:25
upwards 29:15	wait 147:7 195:7	187:17,18 189:10	36:16 43:1 49:6,7
use 4:8,24 79:22	waiting 59:2	189:13 197:7,8	50:12 57:19 135:9
81:4 113:13 123:5	waived 4:5,11,21	wanting 13:18	137:24 141:3
123:8 130:4	walkthrough	wants 101:3	143:20 153:4
138:25 159:4	120:20,23,24	war 57:22 114:1	163:6 176:22
174:15 191:10	121:2 123:17	133:1 144:9	182:25 186:12
195:25 196:2	124:16,25	warned 129:20	187:20
198:24	wall 18:6 33:23 53:9	warning 101:13	weren't 12:20,22
usual 5:13	105:8 106:20	wars 25:25	14:23 22:16 35:2
usually 163:8 173:1	122:6 125:10	Washington 138:4	49:15 60:11 67:16
174:9 176:25	141:17 145:20	140:2	75:16 94:12
183:18	156:15 157:6	wasn't 31:25 47:17	119:24 128:25
utilizing 34:14	197:11 199:19	60:12 120:9 130:3	140:13,14 148:22
U.S 1:6 9:20 35:15	walls 18:8	140:11 143:11,12	156:9 187:19
36:6 37:7,10 65:7	want 6:7 35:18 44:3	149:2 151:13	we'll 47:8,13 52:2,3
204:2 205:2	44:8 48:11,21,21	163:3 176:10	127:8 149:16
	48:22 49:20 54:8,9	183:13,21 184:6,8	150:16,17,18
V	54:13 60:21 61:16	197:4 198:14	we're 16:21 26:13
value 191:19	68:23 75:10 78:2,4	watch 172:23,23	36:10 56:10 59:10
varied 74:23	78:8 79:4,13,19	watched 106:22	129:2,8 139:6,7
various 13:14 17:24	80:6,7,7,24 83:7	way 7:16 35:8 36:3	157:10 172:21
41:13 125:5 162:5	93:4 109:17	42:7 43:2 47:18	201:25
vault 22:14 28:22	115:19 118:10	49:23 52:24 61:4,7	we've 16:19 44:14
152:19	129:9,11 134:7	63:4 87:15,16 89:5	91:10 141:13
vaults 22:13,13	135:13,17 136:16	98:20 101:11,23	189:2 190:4,5
verbal 7:13	139:8 148:10,12	107:6 110:2	whistle 137:22
verify 89:5	150:7,24 164:16	112:20 117:3	wholesale 9:13
videographer 5:13	165:8,23 166:13	123:8 131:23	194:10
view 117:16 119:8	173:3,4,9,18	154:18 161:5,11	wholesaler 78:14
violate 105:25,25	190:24 193:3	163:11,14 167:13	79:5
violated 60:1 108:20	194:4,8,8,12 195:7	176:7,7 187:7,23	wife 49:13,17 112:5
violating 106:24	199:11,23	188:11 191:17	114:16 150:24
violations 141:13	wanted 11:14 13:10	192:19 200:1	200:7
virtually 28:14	35:19 44:9 61:25	ways 161:25	willful 162:6 164:15
vision 11:19	79:21 81:18 84:22	wealth 104:25	165:11
visits 113:20	84:24 96:25	wealthy 11:6 44:2	Williams 2:10 6:1,4
volume 140:8	104:10 107:1	104:18	willing 36:12 189:14
		I	I

192:13,15	100:10 191:6	T 7	179:17
wills 48:4	201:11	<u>Y</u>	young 155:1 178:17
Wilmer 14:6,15,22	work 14:10 57:24	yard 113:17	younger 178:11
15:15 16:1,14	58:16 59:9 103:14	yeah 7:3,19 8:20	younger 1/6.11
wind 109:3	103:17 105:6	20:1 23:9,9 39:15	<u> </u>
wind 109.3 window 22:5	107:23 115:22	40:25 50:14 55:15	\$100,000 66:16
wiped 50:20 111:17	116:3	66:14 67:13 70:5	\$250,000 66:15,16
wiring 26:20	worked 21:17 97:14	73:6 75:2 76:13	\$30,000 129:23
wish 105:15,15	114:11 171:13	87:19 88:21,24	\$500 23:15,21
165:15	working 24:21	89:23 110:20	141:15
withdraw 95:4	116:6,8	113:15 120:25	
182:4,14 183:1,14	works 105:20	128:8 131:8	#
183:20,23,23	190:10	145:24 146:6	#19952760001
185:24	world 24:12 199:8	152:4 154:12,21	206:24
withdrawals 182:8	worried 34:22 54:17	155:6,10 157:16 158:13,15,17	
183:7,13 184:9	54:19 135:23,24	158:13,15,17	0
withdrawing 183:10	135:24	160:5,10 161:17	05 13:23
withdrawn 182:16	worry 51:1,19 89:1	162:10 165:19	1
182:17,24	96:4,6 133:1	166:1 167:4,23	1 3:10,10 4:4 166:17
withdrew 98:3	worth 23:15 29:7,16	168:19 169:22,25	166:18,21 177:3
129:5 184:5	36:3 43:16 66:10	172:8 173:24	*
witness 3:3 4:22	66:12,17 67:12	174:4 182:5	10-cv-4095(SAS) 1:6
6:24,25 7:1,2,6	104:6	185:17 187:2,10	10:17 115:4
30:12,14,23 52:6,9	worths 67:6,22	187:25 189:6	10:1 7 113.4 10:48 115:4
65:16 73:6 86:1,18	wouldn't 16:9 78:4	191:5 196:4 201:8	10.48 113.4 100 21:21 31:7
88:6 91:12 92:19	81:7 86:18 88:25	year 40:13,15 98:7	76:21 98:7
92:25 93:3 94:4	90:15 94:21 99:1	110:11 128:18	10005 2:5
96:15 98:19 99:23	100:4,5,13 101:22	129:23 136:20	10166 2:11
100:19 102:14	130:4 133:25	139:5,12 141:4	11 60:7
106:14 117:7	134:2 137:19	years 6:21 13:6,7,17	11:41 158:19
118:9 119:11	157:2 170:24,24	32:11 33:20 44:5	11:55 158:19
126:4 127:23	201:17	51:10 73:18 74:21	12 58:22 60:6
131:8 136:3	wound 122:20	101:13,24 104:24	12:36 193:9
159:19 167:19	writer 159:24	106:13 109:21	12:44 193:9
175:12 179:8	written 80:15	112:18 131:25	12:55 202:13
181:7 200:20	wrong 42:8 49:6	137:2 141:12	13 58:22 60:6
202:3,7,10 206:12	64:19 105:18	146:16 150:14	13-F 162:24,25,25
woke 146:11	114:7 145:11	156:18 200:11	140 2:4
woman 55:7 167:3	161:15 165:23	York 1:3 2:5,5,11	15 24:7 31:3 73:22
words 12:20 20:17	wrote 159:14,25	2:11 6:5 9:17 29:9	120:5 159:7
21:20 37:21 53:25		121:23 122:10,11	16 126:8,9,18,19
56:10 77:1 79:20	X X 1 5 0 2 7 7 26 10	158:23 159:24	127:9
80:11,19 83:13	X 1:5,8 3:7,7 26:19	170:17 176:9	166 3:10,10
86:23 87:13 93:19	81:14 91:3		ĺ
	•	•	•

17th 170:1	25 146:24	8:53 55:17	
19 21:8 27:7	25 146:24 250 66:12,14 112:12	80 38:25	
	*		
19th 170:1,3,4	182:22 184:15	80s 31:10 32:8 48:10	
1960 8:24 21:11	3	73:21	
1960s 23:7		800 198:11	
1980 33:4,16,25	34:10	83 21:9 27:8	
34:18 42:15,17	30 185:25	84 21:9	
133:10	30-day 183:17	87 32:15 42:9	
1987 27:8 42:15	300 10:21	9	
43:15	309-1046 2:11		
1992 62:6	35 104:24 112:18	9th 206:17	
1995 65:24	123:22	9:01 55:17	
	36 104:24 146:17	90 109:21	
2		90s 31:21,22 34:1	
2 4:8	4	50:16 52:11 57:19	
20 97:25 120:4	44:14 27:8	69:22 74:15 137:9	
146:23 203:13	40 13:7	90-day 163:8	
20's 126:21	400,000 9:18	907-0887 2:5	
200 2:10 10:3	48 195:15	92 55:24 140:23	
114:10 182:23		95 65:19 73:25	
2000 137:17 141:10	5	98 50:12	
2000's 13:8 95:7	5 3:4 4:16		
122:8 128:19	50 13:6 31:4 101:23		
2002 138:2 140:16	106:12 121:20		
147:2	123:22 140:3		
2004 13:23	141:12 182:23		
2006 9:5 15:12,13	50s 24:7		
15:21,25 126:6	500 10:2 31:5 65:20		
141:10 151:20	112:13		
2007 171:19			
2007 171.17 2008 126:1 160:4	6		
168:5 171:15	6 4:22		
174:23,25 178:4	60 126:13 127:19,19		
181:17 183:2			
184:1	7		
2011 159:8 166:23	7 1:17 4:23 204:3		
	205:3		
2012 1:17 2:22	7th 2:21		
204:3 205:3	7:51 1:18 2:22		
206:17	70 150:14		
2015 206:24	70s 23:7 24:17		
21 113:19 126:12	75 2:20		
166:23			
212 2:5,11	8		
24 24:21 195:10	8 206:24		
	I	1	<u> </u>