

# EXHIBIT 1

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT  
BRIDGEPORT DIVISION

-----X

In re:

Chapter 11

BRITESTARR HOMES, INC.,

Case No. 02-5081 (AHWS)

Debtor.

Adversary Proceeding

BRITESTARR HOMES, INC.,

No. 03-05072

Plaintiff,

v.

**CERTIFIED COPY**

PIPER RUDNICK, LLP

Defendant.

-----X

DEPOSITION OF

MATTHEW BEATMAN

NEW YORK, NEW YORK

April 27, 2004

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.

COURT REPORTERS

330 North Brand Boulevard, Suite 250

Glendale, California 91203

(818) 551-7300

REPORTED BY: ANTHONY ARMSTRONG

FILE NO.: 9E037DA

MATTHEW BEATMAN

180

1  
2 anyone else at the Piper law firm during the month of  
3 March, 2001 concerning the payments that were being  
4 authorized by Piper Rudnick to Mr. Norkin out of the  
5 Britestarr bank account, would that have been reflected  
6 first on your time records and then in this fee  
7 application?

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. Does it surprise you to learn, by the way, that  
10 Mr. Langlois doesn't reflect on his time records any  
11 conversation with you in March of 2001 either?

12 A. Doesn't surprise me because I think that's  
13 consistent with my belief that I don't recall it and I am  
14 not sure that it happened.

15 Q. Alright, sir. In fact, the lawyers at Piper  
16 Rudnick don't reflect a conversation with you, Mr.  
17 Beatman, until December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2001, which would have been  
18 shortly after the filing of the complaint, the adversary  
19 proceeding in Mr. Norkin's bankruptcy?

20 A. That's my recollection of when we first have  
21 contact.

22 Q. Alright, sir. Now, do you recall in March 2002 a  
23 settlement meeting at the lawyer -- at the offices of  
24 Zeichner Ellman, attended by yourself, Mr. Langlois, Mr.  
25 Colucci, Mr. Hanchet, who is here in the room today, and

MATTHEW BEATMAN

181

1

8:14:53 2 Mr. Hanchet's partner Mr. Krause?

18:14:56 3 A. Yes.

18:14:57 4 Q. Do you recall who called that meeting or asked  
18:15:00 5 for that meeting?

18:15:06 6 A. I think it may have been a combination of Mr.  
18:15:10 7 Hanchet, Mr. Miltenberger and myself where we talked  
18:15:15 8 about whether or not there was a prospect of settlement,  
18:15:17 9 and while it would be difficult, that it probably made  
18:15:21 10 some sense to do it just among the lawyers. And I  
18:15:25 11 believe I would have said that I think in order to do  
18:15:27 12 that if I was Britestarr, you would need to have  
18:15:30 13 Britestarr's attorneys because I would say I couldn't  
18:15:32 14 speak on behalf of Britestarr or settle anything on  
18:15:34 15 behalf of Britestarr, so they need no participate.

18:15:37 16 Q. In that meeting?

18:15:40 17 A. And I might also add. I think it was Mr. Hanchet  
18:15:43 18 who suggested that was a good idea and suggested we use  
18:15:46 19 his office to initiate that.

18:15:50 20 Q. In that meeting, how would you characterize the  
18:15:58 21 positions taken by the lawyers for Britestarr Homes, Mr.  
18:16:01 22 Langlois, and Mr. Colucci?

18:16:04 23 A. I am not sure what you mean by that.

18:16:06 24 Q. Were they receptive to trying to discuss  
18:16:10 25 settlement, were they more aggressive, were they opposed

1

MATTHEW BEATMAN

182

8:16:15 2 to settlement, were they combative? You characterize it  
18:16:19 3 based on your recollection.

18:16:21 4 A. I mean I think we were all there to try to  
18:16:24 5 settle, so I don't know that they ever -- I would  
18:16:26 6 characterize it as being resistive. I think we were all  
18:16:29 7 interested in trying to settle. I think they were  
18:16:32 8 perhaps a little pessimistic, but I think we were all  
18:16:37 9 there to try to settle the case. I am not sure I  
18:16:39 10 interpret their being there as that they didn't want to  
18:16:42 11 try to resolve it, but I think they were reserved about  
18:16:45 12 whether or not we would could reach a settlement that was  
18:16:48 13 sufficient enough given the magnitude of what was  
18:16:50 14 involved to justify their approval.

18:16:54 15 Q. Isn't it true that in that meeting, though, there  
18:16:57 16 was in fact -- it was clear that ABB directly and through  
18:17:05 17 Oak Point was still willing to disclose an extension --  
18:17:10 18 renewal and extension of the option agreement with  
18:17:13 19 Britestarr Homes?

18:17:14 20 A. I think that's correct.

18:17:16 21 ~~Q. Now, we won't characterize how much of Mr.~~  
18:17:20 22 ~~Arthur's examination dealt with Mr. Buss, whether it was~~  
18:17:24 23 ~~most of it or a lot of it. But he did ask a lot of~~  
18:17:27 24 ~~questions about Mr. Buss and your assessment of Mr.~~  
18:17:30 25 ~~Buss's involvement on various issues, correct?~~

MATTHEW BEATMAN

183

1

8:17:33 2

A. Yes, sir.

18:17:34 3

Q. Do you have any indication that Mr. Buss ever

18:17:38 4

approved or authorized a single payment out of the escrow

18:17:46 5

account that was maintained at Piper Rudnick for the

18:17:49 6

benefit of Britestarr Homes?

18:17:51 7

A. I don't know that I have any factual basis to

18:17:55 8

answer that question, so I don't think I ever discussed

18:17:57 9

anything about it.

18:18:00 10

Q. Have you ever had -- have you ever had any

18:18:01 11

indication that Mr. Buss ever made a recommendation to

18:18:06 12

anyone that Britestarr Homes Inc. file bankruptcy?

18:18:12 13

A. Again, to the best of my knowledge, he never

18:18:14 14

mentioned it to me. I can't tell you whether or not he

18:18:17 15

mentioned it to anyone else.

18:18:18 16

Q. Alright, sir. In fact, I show you what was

18:18:24 17

marked in a prior deposition as Exhibit 90. You can take

18:18:32 18

a minute to look at that.

18:18:35 19

A. (Perusing.)

18:20:55 20

Okay.

18:20:55 21

Q. Mr. Beatman, this is a September 2000 letter from

18:21:02 22

Mr. Buss to you concerning the David Norkin bankruptcy

18:21:12 23

and the Britestarr Homes issues vis-a-vis the development

18:21:19 24

of the Oak Point Property, correct?

18:21:22 25

A. Yes, sir.