

EXHIBIT 8

4. "Aufmann" and/or "AWA" shall mean Plaintiff's attorney Arthur W. Aufmann.
5. "MacDougall" and/or "JLM" shall mean Plaintiff's attorney Jennifer L. MacDougall.
6. "Joyce" shall mean Plaintiff's attorney Edward T. Joyce.
7. "Spehar" and/or "GS" shall mean Gerry Spehar and Spehar Capital, LLC.
8. "Todhunter" and/or "JT" shall mean Spehar's attorney Jud Todhunter.
9. "SC" shall mean Sean Crotty, Esq. Mr. Crotty is a lawyer with whom Spehar apparently consulted regarding claims that Spehar believes his company may have against Defendants.
10. "Spellmire" shall mean George Spellmire, Esq. Mr. Spellmire is an attorney who was initially contacted/interviewed regarding representing Plaintiff in this matter.
11. "JF" shall mean John Foley, Esq. Mr. Foley is an attorney who works with/for Mr. Spellmire.
12. "Defendants" shall mean Defendants Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw LLP and Ronald B. Given.
13. The "Unclean Hands Issue" shall mean the issue as articulated by Judge Kendall on October 30, 2007 when she stated "...there is a question lurking about why this was handled the way it was and issues as to the trustee's position in coming forward and being paid by this entity, issues regarding why the trustee didn't go in and move to vacate the dismissal, and I think what we need to do is we need to do discovery solely on that, what I would call, unclean hands issue first....," and on December 13, 2007

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
Page 3 of 21

when she stated, “[the unclean hands issue is] really getting to the issue as to what was the motivation for the filing of the lawsuit...”

14. “WP” shall mean the work product privilege.

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
1	RDC	GS	Draft response to Defendants' motion to dismiss. This draft was emailed to GS on 1/3/07. The email (Bates number 1062) was produced. This document is privileged because it was prepared by Plaintiff's attorneys for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's attorneys' mental impressions, legal theories and legal strategies for the case.	1/3/07	Draft Response to Motion to Dismiss	WP	Responsive to Request Number 7. Because this document post-dates the filing of Plaintiff's Complaint, it is not relevant to the Unclean Hands Issue.	1063-1088
2	GS	RDC, Joyce (ETJ)	In this email, Spehar discusses Plaintiff's legal theories and strategies that are contained in Plaintiff's draft response to Defendants' motion to dismiss (1062-1088; Log #1.) Spehar gives his thoughts regarding Plaintiff's response to Defendants' argument that Plaintiff's complaint failed to sufficiently allege damages with	1/6/07	Email	WP	Responsive to Request Number 7. Because this email post-dates the filing of Plaintiff's Complaint, it is not relevant to the Unclean Hands Issue.	1089-1091

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 4 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
			respect to Count II. Spehar's thoughts/suggestions are based, at least in part, on (a) his review of Plaintiff's draft response to Defendants' motion to dismiss and (b) his conversations with Plaintiff's attorneys. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff's attorneys in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's attorneys' mental impressions, legal theories and legal strategies for the case.					
3	GS	RDC/ETJ	In this email, Spehar discusses Plaintiff's legal theories and strategies that are contained in Plaintiff's response to Defendants' motion to dismiss. Spehar gives his thoughts/suggestions regarding Plaintiff's response to Defendants' motion to dismiss. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff's attorneys in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals legal theories and strategies considered by Plaintiff.	1/15/07	Email	WP	Responsive to Request Number 7. Because this email post-dates the filing of Plaintiff's Complaint, it is not relevant to the Unclean Hands Issue.	1123-24
4	GS	RDC/ETJ	In this email, Spehar discusses	3/7/07	Email	WP	Responsive to	1149-50

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 5 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
			arguments made by Defendants in their reply in support of their motion to dismiss. Spehar gives his thoughts/suggestions regarding how to respond to arguments made by Defendants in their reply brief. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff's attorneys in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals legal theories and strategies considered by Plaintiff.				Request Number 7. Because this email post-dates the filing of Plaintiff's Complaint, it is not relevant to the Unclean Hands Issue.	
5	GS	RDC/ETJ	In this email, Spehar discusses an Illinois case regarding lost profit damages. Prior to sending this email, Spehar had discussions with ETJ in which ETJ discussed its legal theory/strategy for responding to damage related arguments. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff's attorneys in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's attorneys' legal theories/strategies regarding this case.	9/24/07	Email	WP	Responsive to Request Number 7. Because this email post-dates the filing of Plaintiff's Complaint, it is not relevant to the Unclean Hands Issue.	1526-27
6	GS	DG, RDC, AWA, Joyce and JT	In this email, Spehar discusses his views regarding what amount Plaintiff should be willing to accept	8/15/07	Email	WP	Responsive to Request Number 7. Because this	1586-1607

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 6 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
			as a settlement. During that discussion, Spehar refers to legal theories that had been the subject of discussions between ETJ, Plaintiff and Spehar. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals ETJ's mental impressions and legal theories of this case.				email post-dates the filing of Plaintiff's Complaint, it is not relevant to the Unclean Hands Issue.	
7	GS	RDC/ETJ	At ETJ's request, Spehar provided suggestions for the Rule 2004 document subpoenas that were issued to third-parties before the Complaint was filed. In this email, Spehar provides ETJ with those suggestions. This document is privileged because it was prepared for ETJ in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals ETJ's legal strategies regarding Plaintiff's claims against Defendants.	5/8/06	Email	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2144-2146
8	GS	RDC/ETJ and SC	Memorandum entitled "Memo: CMGT v. Mayer Brown." At ETJ's request, Spehar gave ETJ a memo summarizing facts and potential claims. This memo was sent to ETJ	Undated	Memo	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2184-2208

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 7 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
9	JLM	Joyce, AWA, RDC, GS and DG	In this memorandum, JLM summarizes the current status of responses to the Rule 2004 subpoenas for documents that Plaintiff issued in the bankruptcy proceeding as part of his investigative efforts. The memo was emailed as an attachment to Spehar and Grochocinski on August 10, 2006. The email (Bates number 2211) was produced. This document is privileged because it was prepared in confidence by Plaintiff's attorneys for plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's attorneys legal strategies relating to this case. Moreover, although the document was shared with Spehar, it is protected by the	8/10/06	Memo	A/C and W/P	Responsive to Request Numbers 2 and 7.	2212-2214

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 8 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
10	GS	Joyce	attorney-client privilege pursuant to the "common-interest" doctrine. Prior to Spehar writing this email, Joyce met and talked with Wayne Baliga regarding CMGT and the matters that were eventually alleged in Plaintiff's Complaint. Also prior to Spehar writing this email, Joyce talked to Spehar about Joyce's conversation with Baliga. In this email, Spehar addresses questions/issues that Joyce raised based on his conversation with Baliga. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff's attorneys in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's attorneys' mental impressions/legal theories regarding this case.	8/18/06	Email	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2215
11	GS	Joyce/ETJ, DG and JT	Memorandum entitled "CMGT v MB: Damages Summary." Prior to Spehar writing this memo, he and ETJ had discussions in which ETJ raised certain damage related questions/issues. In this memo, Spehar addresses the damage related	Undated	Memo	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2216-2222

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 9 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
12	GS	Joyce/ETJ, DG and JT	Memorandum entitled "MB's Duty to Appear at SC's 2/26/04 Default Judgment Hearing." Prior to Spehar writing this memo, he and ETJ had discussions in which ETJ raised certain damage related questions/issues. In this memo, Spehar discusses the damage related questions/issues that ETJ previously raised. As the title of the memo indicates, the damages theory being discussed involves establishing Defendants' duty to appear at the February 26, 2004 default judgment hearing in the Spehar Lawsuit. This memo was attached to Spehar's August 18, 2006 email to Joyce.	7/30/06	Memo	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2223-2235
			questions/issues that ETJ previously raised. This memo was attached to Spehar's August 18, 2006 email to Joyce. (Bates number 2215; Log # 10.) This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals ETJ's mental impressions, legal theories and legal strategies for the case.					

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 10 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
			(Bates number 2215; Log # 10.) This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals legal strategies being considered by ETJ.					
13	GS	DG, RDC, AWA, Joyce and JT	Same as 1586-1607. (Log # 6.)	8/15/07	Email	WP	Responsive to Request Number 7. Because this email post-dates the filing of Plaintiff's Complaint, it is not relevant to the Unclean Hands Issue.	2338-2375
14	DG	RDC, GS and JT	Email from Grochocinski regarding status of investigation and RDC's thoughts about the case. This document is privileged because it was prepared in confidence by Plaintiff for his attorneys in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's attorney's mental impressions regarding Plaintiff's claims against Defendants. Moreover, although the document	7/25/06	Email	A/C and WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2594

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
Page 11 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
15	GS	Spellmire, JF and DG	was shared with Spehar, it is protected by the attorney-client privilege pursuant to the "common-interest" doctrine. Memorandum entitled "Memo: CMGT v. Mayer Brown." This memo appears to be an earlier version of the memo Bates stamped 2184-2208. This memo was attached to a November 22, 2004 email from Spehar to Spellmire and JF. (Bates number 2604.) The email was not withheld. In this memo, Spehar summarizes facts relating to CMGT and potential claims that CMGT may have against Defendants. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals legal theories considered by Plaintiff's attorneys.	Undated	Memo	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2605-2627
16	GS	Spellmire, JF and DG	Updated version of 2605-2627. This memo was attached to a November 23, 2004 email from GS to Spellmire and JF. (Bates number 2628.) The email was produced.	Undated	Memo	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2629-2652
17	GS	DG and JT	In this email, Spehar discusses his	7/24/06	Email with a	WP	Responsive to	2653-2660

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 12 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
			<p>understandings of what RDC's mental impressions/legal theories were regarding potential claims against Defendants. Spehar's statements, while not an entirely accurate description of RDC's thoughts and/or comments, do reveal RDC's mental impressions/legal theories regarding this case. The subject matter of Spehar's email relates primarily to the damages element of a legal malpractice claim. Prior to Spehar writing the attached memo, he and ETJ had discussions in which ETJ raised damage related questions/issues. In his memo, Spehar addresses the damage related questions/issues previously raised by ETJ. Spehar specifically discusses RDC's interpretation of certain cases. This document (the email and the attached memo) is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals RDC's mental impressions and legal theories regarding Plaintiff's claims in this case.</p>		<p>memo attached</p>		<p>Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.</p>	

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 13 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
18	GS	DG and JT	In this email, Spehar discusses his understandings of what RDC's mental impressions/legal theories were regarding potential claims against Defendants. Spehar's statements, while not an entirely accurate description of RDC's thoughts and/or comments, do reveal RDC's mental impressions/legal theories regarding this case. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals RDC's mental impressions and legal theories regarding Plaintiff's claims in this case.	7/25/06	Email	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2661-2662
19	GS	DG and JT	In this email, Spehar discusses Carroll's thoughts/legal analysis regarding potential claims against Defendants. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's attorneys mental impressions and legal analysis of Plaintiff's claims.	7/25/06	Email	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2663-2664
20	GS	DG and JT	In this memo, Spehar discusses the	7/26/06	Memo	WP	Responsive to	2666-2670

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 14 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
21	GS	ETJ, DG and JT	Memorandum entitled "MB's duty to appear at SC's 2/26/04 Default Judgment Hearing." Prior to Spehar writing this memo, he and ETJ had discussions in which ETJ raised damage related questions/issues. In his memo, Spehar addresses the damage related questions/issues previously raised by ETJ. As the title of the memo indicates, the damages theory being discussed involves establishing Defendants' duty to	7/24/06	Memo	WP	Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2671-2682

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)

Page 15 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
22	GS	DG and JT	<p>appear at the February 26, 2004 default judgment hearing in the Spehar Lawsuit. This memo is an attachment to an email from GS to DG and JT dated 7/26/06. (Bates number 2665.) The email was not withheld. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's attorneys mental impressions and legal theories regarding Plaintiff's claims against Defendants.</p> <p>Prior to Spehar writing this email and memo, he had discussions with ETJ in which ETJ raised questions/issues relating to the damage element of a legal malpractice claim against Defendants. In this email and the attached memo, Spehar discusses cases that Plaintiff (including Plaintiff's attorneys) was reviewing in relation to the damage questions/issues raised by ETJ. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in</p>	7/27/06	Email with memo attached	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2685-2690

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 16 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
23	GS	DG and JT	<p>anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's (including Plaintiff's attorneys') mental impressions and legal theories regarding the case.</p> <p>Prior to writing this email, Spehar had conversations with ETJ in which ETJ raised questions/issues relating to the damage element of a legal malpractice claim. In addition, Spehar had a conversation with Grochocinski regarding potential claims against Defendants and case law regarding the damage related issues that were previously raised by ETJ. In the email, Spehar refers to comments made by Grochocinski regarding his thoughts on potential claims. Spehar also discusses the damage issues previously raised by ETJ and case law relating to those issues. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's (including Plaintiff's attorneys') mental impressions and legal theories</p>	7/27/06	Email	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2691-2692

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
Page 17 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
24	GS	DG, JT, ETJ and SC	<p>regarding claims against Defendants and others.</p> <p>This memo is an attachment to Spehar's 7/27/06 email to DG and JT (Bates numbers 2691-2692; Log # 23.) The memorandum is entitled "Memo CMGT v. Mayer Brown." Prior to Spehar writing this memo, he and ETJ had discussions in which ETJ raised questions/issues relating to the duty, causation and damage elements of a legal malpractice claim against Defendants. In this memo, Spehar provides a detailed response to the questions/issues previously raised by ETJ. The memo also provides a detailed chronology of facts for Plaintiff to review as part of his investigation. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals ETJ's mental impressions, legal theories and legal strategies for the case.</p>	5/29/06	Memo	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2693-2753
25	GS	DG and JT (ETJ prepared the	<p>In the email (Bates numbers 2766-2768 and 2776), Spehar discusses ETJ's legal theories, legal strategies</p>	7/28/06	Email with a memo and letter	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2	2766-2776

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
Page 18 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
		<p>attached memo and received a copy of the attached letter, but ETJ did not receive the email.)</p>	<p>and mental impressions regarding Plaintiff's claims against Defendants. This document (the email) is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals ETJ's mental impressions, legal theories and legal strategies for this case. The attached memo is a copy of RDC's 12/9/05 memo (See Privilege Log for Trustee's Documents at Log # 12.) This document (the memo) is privileged because it was prepared by Plaintiff's attorneys in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Plaintiff's attorney's mental impressions, legal analysis and legal strategies regarding Plaintiff's claims against Defendants. The attached letter, which is dated 3/06/06, was written by Spehar to Carroll. In the letter, Spehar discusses the merit of potential claims against Defendants and damages related questions/issues that were previously raised by ETJ. This document (the letter) is privileged because it was prepared</p>		<p>attached</p>		<p>and 7.</p>	

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 19 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
26	GS	DG and JT (ETJ prepared the attached memo and received a copy of the attached letter, but ETJ did not receive the email.)	for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals ETJ's mental impressions, legal theories and legal strategies for this case. Same as 2766-2776. (Log # 25.)	7/28/06	Email with a memo and letter attached	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2777-2787
27	GS	ETJ, DG and JT	Memorandum entitled "August 6, 2006 Memo to David Grochocinski and Jud Todhunter Spehar Capital's Response to Rob Carroll's August 1, 2006 Status Update: CMGT v. MB." This memo was attached to an email from GS to DG and JT dated August 7, 2006. (Bates number 2790.) On August 1, 2006, Carroll wrote a memo to Plaintiff regarding Carroll's legal analysis of potential claims	8/6/06	Memo	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2791-2821 and 2824-2826

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 20 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
28	GS	DG and JT	<p>against Defendants (<i>See Privilege Log for Trustee's Documents at Log # 4.</i>) Plaintiff subsequently shared that memo with Spehar. Spehar's 8/06/06 memo is his response to Carroll's 8/01/06 memo. This document is privileged because it was prepared for Plaintiff and Plaintiff's attorneys in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals Carroll's legal analysis. In fact, Spehar quotes portions of Carroll's 8/01/06 memo in his (Spehar's) 8/06/06 memo.</p> <p>This memo is an attachment to an email from GS to DG and JT dated 8/08/06. (The email is Bate stamped 2823 and was not withheld). The memo is entitled "Issues for 4/31/06 conference call with DG, Joyce and Jud." Prior to Spehar writing this memo, he had discussions with ETJ during which ETJ discussed legal strategies and thoughts regarding potential claims against Defendants. In this memo, Spehar summarizes parts of those discussions. This document is privileged because it</p>	Undated	Memo	WP	Responsive to Request Numbers 1, 2 and 7.	2824-2826

PRIVILEGE LOG FOR SPEHAR DOCUMENTS (CONT'D)
 Page 21 of 21

LOG #	AUTHOR	RECIPIENT	DESCRIPTION	DATE	TYPE	PRIV.	PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION	BATES #
			was prepared for Plaintiff in anticipation of litigation/trial and it reveals ETJ's legal strategy and mental impressions regarding this case.					