

EXHIBIT 1

1

1

2

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT
BRIDGEPORT DIVISION

4

X

5

In re: Chapter 11

6

BRTESTARR HOMES, INC., Case No. 02-5081 (AHWS)

7

Debtor.

Adversary Proceeding

8

BRTESTARR HOMES, INC., No. 03-05072

9

Plaintiff,

v.

10

PIPER RUDNICK, LLP

11

Defendant.

12

X

13

14

15

DEPOSITION OF

16

MATTHEW BEATMAN

17

NEW YORK, NEW YORK

18

April 27, 2004

19

20

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.

21

COURT REPORTERS

22

330 North Brand Boulevard, Suite 250

23

Glendale, California 91203

(818) 551-7300

24

REPORTED BY: ANTHONY ARMSTRONG

25

FILE NO.: 9E037DA

CERTIFIED COPY

1

MATTHEW BEATMAN

180

8:13:31 2 anyone else at the Piper law firm during the month of
18:13:34 3 March, 2001 concerning the payments that were being
18:13:37 4 authorized by Piper Rudnick to Mr. Norkin out of the
18:13:41 5 Pointestarr bank account, would that have been reflected
18:13:45 6 first on your time records and then in this fee
18:13:48 7 application?

18:13:48 8 A. Yes, sir.

18:13:50 9 Q. Does it surprise you to learn, by the way, that
18:13:54 10 Mr. Langlois doesn't reflect on his time records any
18:13:58 11 conversation with you in March of 2001 either?

18:14:02 12 A. Doesn't surprise me because I think that's
18:14:04 13 consistent with my belief that I don't recall it and I am
18:14:06 14 not sure that it happened.

18:14:07 15 Q. Alright, sir. In fact, the lawyers at Piper
18:14:10 16 Rudnick don't reflect a conversation with you, Mr.
18:14:14 17 Beatman, until December 18th, 2001, which would have been
18:14:20 18 shortly after the filing of the complaint, the adversary
18:14:24 19 proceeding in Mr. Norkin's bankruptcy?

18:14:25 20 A. That's my recollection of when we first have
18:14:30 21 ~~contact.~~

18:14:30 22 Q. Alright, sir. Now, do you recall in March 2002 a
18:14:38 23 settlement meeting at the lawyer -- at the offices of
18:14:45 24 Zeichner Ellman, attended by yourself, Mr. Langlois, Mr.
18:14:49 25 Colucci, Mr. Hanchet, who is here in the room today, and

1

MATTHEW BEATMAN

181

) 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?

1

MATTHEW BEATMAN

183

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.