COURT OF CHANCERY OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

WILLIAM B. CHANDLER III
CHANCELLOR

COURT OF CHANCERY COURTHOUSE 34 THE CIRCLE GEORGETOWN, DELAWARE 19947

Submitted: August 11, 2005 Decided: August 12, 2005

Albert H. Manwaring, IV Pepper Hamilton LLP P.O. Box 1709 Wilmington, DE 19899-1709

Vernon R. Proctor The Bayard Firm P.O. Box 25130 Wilmington, DE 19899

Re: FMAC Loan Receivable Trust 1997-C, et al. v. William Ostrie, et al.

Civil Action No. 20222

Dear Counsel:

Plaintiffs in this action have moved for a protective order that one of their agents, Mr. Rosselot, not be required to appear for a deposition noticed for September 8, 2005, in New York, New York. Mr. Rosselot resides in Denver, Colorado. Plaintiffs object to having Mr. Rosselot's deposition in New York, instead preferring Wilmington, Delaware as the location for the deposition, with Denver, Colorado as an alternate but much less desirable location. Plaintiffs do not object either to the deposition of Mr. Rosselot itself, nor the date thereof.

To receive a protective order pursuant to Court of Chancery Rule 26(c), the moving party must show "good cause" that the order is necessary to "protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense." Plaintiffs' motion for a protective order concedes that the protection contemplated by Rule 26(c) is not for the proposed deponent, Mr. Rosselot, but instead for counsel, who would be required to travel to New York. Plaintiffs' argument is essentially that it

would be unfair to have Mr. Rosselot's deposition in New York because that arrangement is more convenient for defense counsel and less convenient for plaintiffs' counsel. Unfortunately, inconvenience for counsel and expenses are part of the decision to litigate.

Therefore, unless the parties earlier come to an amicable agreement regarding the location for Mr. Rosselot's deposition and/or the apportionment of the expenses thereof, it is hereby ORDERED that the deposition of Mr. Rosselot noticed in this action for September 8, 2005, will be held in Denver, Colorado. This is the most convenient scenario for Mr. Rosselot. All attorneys will be inconvenienced equally and all will be forced to incur travel expenses, such that neither party will obtain an unfair advantage as a result of Mr. Rosselot's deposition.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Very truly yours,

William B. Chandler III

William B. Chandler III

WBCIII:amf