

Exhibit 3

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

ANWAR, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FAIRFIELD GREENWICH LIMITED, *et al.*,

Defendants.

This Document Relates To: All Actions

Master File No. 09-cv-118 (VM)

**PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO CONTENTION
INTERROGATORIES OF CITCO FUND SERVICES (EUROPE) B.V.**

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 33, and Rule 33.3 of the Local Rules of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, as modified by the Amended Case Management Plan and Scheduling Order, entered November 2, 2010, the Class Representative Plaintiffs ("Plaintiffs"), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby respond to Citco Fund Services (Europe) B.V.'s Contention Interrogatories to Plaintiffs.

Plaintiffs herein use the term "CFSE" to mean the entity Citco Fund Services (Europe) B.V., and the term "Citco" and "Citco Defendants," and all other capitalized terms not defined herein, to have the meanings set forth in Plaintiffs' Second Set of Interrogatories to CFSE. Plaintiffs contend, and the evidence has shown, that the Citco Defendants' operation was composed of interrelated entities, including CFSE, that shared names, information, management, and goals related to the Funds' investors. Thus, Plaintiffs contend that acts, statements, and omissions made by, and all facts known by, one Citco Defendant were made and/or known by all Citco Defendants, including CFSE, and Plaintiffs incorporate their responses to the contention

interrogatories of each of the Citco Defendants in their answers to CFSE's Contention Interrogatories.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The responses below reflect the current state of Plaintiffs' knowledge, understanding and belief based upon their investigation and discovery to date. Plaintiffs' discovery, investigation and preparation for trial is ongoing as of the date of these responses and Plaintiffs reserve the right: (a) to make subsequent revisions, clarifications or amendments to their responses and objections based upon information, evidence, documents, facts and/or other things that may be discovered, the relevance of which may hereafter be discovered; and (b) to produce, introduce or rely upon additional or subsequently acquired or discovered evidence and information in any proceedings or at any trial held in this litigation. Furthermore, the Citco Defendants have not responded to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, Plaintiffs' Third Set of Requests for Production; nor has Citco provided documents pursuant to Judge Maas' Discovery Order dated July 8, 2013, and Plaintiffs reserve the right to introduce or rely upon any documents or information produced in response to these discovery requests. Plaintiffs further reserve the right to object on any ground and at any time to a demand for further answers to the Interrogatories.

In addition, Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all expert reports they have served on Defendants, and forthcoming rebuttal reports, into each of the answers below.

Further, any response by Plaintiffs to a particular interrogatory, or any part thereof, is not intended, and shall not be construed, as an admission of any fact, assertion, or other matter expressed or implied by the interrogatory, including, without limitation, the existence of any information described or assumed.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. The following general objections (“General Objections”) are incorporated in Plaintiffs’ responses to each and every request contained in the Interrogatories. No response to any interrogatory is, or shall be deemed to be, a waiver of Plaintiffs’ General Objections, and Plaintiffs make such responses without committing to treat future interrogatories in a similar manner.

2. To the extent that an Interrogatory seeks “each,” “every,” or “all” facts, pieces of evidence, witnesses, or application of law to fact, Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome. *See Ritchie Risk-Linked Strategies Trading (Ireland), Ltd. v. Coventry First LLC*, 273 F.R.D. 367, 369 (S.D.N.Y. 2010) (Marrero, J.) (“Defendants’ requests, insofar as they seek every fact, every piece of evidence, every witness, and every application of law to fact—rather than, for example, certain principal or material facts, pieces of evidence, witnesses and legal applications—supporting the identified allegations, are overly broad and unduly burdensome.”); *Linde v. Arab Bank, PLC*, 2012 WL 957970 (E.D.N.Y. 2012) (“Courts generally resist efforts to use contention interrogatories as a vehicle to obtain every fact and piece of evidence a party may wish to offer concerning a given issue at trial. Thus courts do not typically compel responses to interrogatories that seek a catalog of all facts or all evidence that support a party's contentions.”). Where such a response is called for, Plaintiffs will provide the principal or material facts and evidence supporting their contention.

3. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they purport to seek discovery from individual class members or named plaintiffs who are not subject to discovery, pursuant to the prior orders of the Court.

4. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent the information sought is protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, or other applicable privileges or doctrines. Plaintiffs hereby claim such privileges and protections to the extent implicated by each interrogatory, and exclude privileged and protected information from their responses to the Interrogatories. Any disclosure of such protected or privileged information is inadvertent, and is not intended to waive those privileges or protections.

5. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent that the “Instructions” incorporated therein attempt to impose obligations on Plaintiffs beyond those imposed or authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Civil Rules of the Southern District of New York, the Orders of the Court, or other applicable law.

6. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek information that is unavailable to Plaintiffs or outside of their possession, custody or control, or seek information in the possession, custody or control of third parties.

7. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek disclosure of information that is already in the possession, custody or control of Defendants, or seek information that could more readily, conveniently and in a less burdensome fashion be obtained from others or by other means, including deposition discovery or reviewing the documents produced in response to Defendants’ Joint First Request for Production of Documents.

8. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they are overbroad, duplicative, and to the extent they seek information or materials that are irrelevant or immaterial to the issues in this action and/or are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In addition, Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent that

responding to the Interrogatories would be unduly burdensome and would cause undue time and expense to Plaintiffs that is not commensurate with Defendants' legitimate discovery needs.

9. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories insofar as they seek to impose upon Plaintiffs an obligation to provide information that Plaintiffs are not able to ascertain after a reasonably diligent investigation.

10. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they are vague, ambiguous or would require Plaintiffs to speculate regarding the information sought.

11. Plaintiffs' responses to the Interrogatories are made without waiving any objections as to relevancy, admissibility, competency, materiality, or privilege.

OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS

1. Plaintiffs object to Definition No. 2 as overbroad and unduly burdensome to the extent it purports to require the disclosure of information from individuals or entities who are not required to furnish such information under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, prior orders of the Court, or other applicable law.

OBJECTIONS TO INSTRUCTIONS

1. Plaintiffs object to Instruction No. 7 as unduly burdensome, and to the extent that it seeks to impose obligations on Plaintiffs beyond those imposed or authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, prior orders of the Court, or other applicable law.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES

1. Identify every "red flag" that You contend existed relating to Bernard L. Madoff or BLMIS prior to Bernard L. Madoff's arrest on December 11, 2008.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this Interrogatory is vague, overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objection and General Objections, Plaintiffs respond by providing the information set forth in Appendix A.

2. For each red flag identified in response to Interrogatory No.1, state: (i) the source of such red flag; (ii) whether You contend that CFSE was aware of such red flag and, if so, the basis of Your contention; (iii) the person(s), if any, at CFSE You contend were aware of such red flag; (iv) the date on which such person became aware of such red flag; (v) whether You were aware of such red flag; (vi) the date on which You became aware of such red flag, if applicable; and (vii) how You became aware of such red flag.

RESPONSE: Without waiving the General Objections, Plaintiffs incorporate herein their response to Interrogatory No.1, and further respond as follows:

(i): The term “source of such red flag” is vague and ambiguous and Plaintiffs cannot answer this subpart of the interrogatory.

(ii)-(iv): *See* Appendix A. Plaintiffs contend that CFSE had actual knowledge of the matters in Appendix A from at least the inception of CFSE’s relationship with the Funds, except for parts D, E, F and K of Appendix A, which arose during the course of the relationship (including as reflected in documents shown in Appendix A). [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Documents and testimony in Appendix A contain examples of individuals at CFSE who had knowledge of such matters and dates on which they had such knowledge.

(v)-(vii): Plaintiffs object to subparts (v) through (vii) as outside of the scope of a contention interrogatory in that they do not seek information regarding Plaintiffs’ contentions, and they are overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objections and the General Objections, Plaintiffs state that, apart from disclosures about Madoff’s role and the Funds’ returns set forth in the Funds’ offering memoranda and elsewhere, and except as

otherwise stated in Plaintiffs' depositions, they were not aware of any matters in Appendix A, including the serious concerns CFSE had identified and harbored about the Funds or of CFSE's failed and substandard efforts to address those concerns, including as shown in Appendix A.

3. For each red flag identified in response to Interrogatory No.1, state: (i) whether You contend that Fairfield was aware of such red flag and, if so, the basis of Your contention; (ii) the person(s), if any, at Fairfield You contend were aware of such red flag; and (iii) the date on which such person became aware of such red flag.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as outside of the scope of a proper contention interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information that is not relevant to any of the remaining claims in the action, and limit their answer to contentions that CFSE aided and abetted Fairfield's improper or actionable conduct. Plaintiffs further object on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objections or the General Objections, Plaintiffs refer to and incorporate herein their Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 9-13.

4. Identify and set forth each statement made by CFSE which You contend contained a false statement of material fact and/or omitted to state material facts necessary to make the statement therein not misleading, and identify and set forth, with particularity, the manner in which You contend each such statement was materially false or misleading.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objections and General Objections, below are the types of false statements of material fact and/or omissions of material fact that Plaintiffs contend were made by CFSE, and examples of principal or material facts and evidence supporting Plaintiffs' contentions. The below statements are false and misleading because they fail to disclose that CFSE was aware of and had serious concerns about the matters in Appendix A; that CFSE was failing to take reasonable steps (including in accordance with industry

standards and its own policies) to fulfill its duties as administrator; and for the reasons set forth below:

- Misleading NAVs: CFSE's representations concerning the Funds' NAVs were materially false because they represented that shares in the Funds had substantial positive value when in fact they were nearly worthless. *See, e.g.,* [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- Omissions: CFSE failed to disclose to investors material information of which it was aware that was necessary, among other things, to make CFSE's representations concerning the Funds' NAVs not misleading, including the following:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- Citco was not following its own, or industry-standard, procedures in failing to verify the Funds' assets and transactions with any independent party;
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

See Appendix A.

- Omissions relating to the Funds' Offering Memoranda and PPMs: CFSE reviewed, revised, and approved the Funds' offering memoranda, which CFSE knew contained false and misleading information and omissions concerning the Funds, including the following:

- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] CFSE knew that it was not independently reconciling the cash, other balances, or portfolio holdings of the fund. *See, e.g.*, Appendix A at ¶¶ A, E, G, and K. CFSE failed to disclose these misrepresentations and omissions to investors.

- The offering memoranda represented that Citco was serving as the Funds' custodian, and that Citco would, among other things, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The offering memoranda falsely gave the impression that Citco was independently verifying the assets and reconciling the trades and not depending solely on information received from Madoff.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] *See, e.g.*, Appendix A at ¶¶ A, C, E. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] CFSE failed to disclose these misrepresentations and omissions to investors.

- Misrepresentations about the Irish Stock Exchange (“ISE”): CFSE knew that Fairfield Sentry’s listing on the ISE was based on false information that Citco assisted in providing concerning the scope of Citco’s role as custodian, and the scope of Madoff’s discretion over the Funds’ transactions. Moreover, CFSE knew that investors relied on Fairfield Sentry’s listing on the ISE when deciding to invest in or hold their investments in the Funds. *See, e.g.*, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Appendix A at ¶ D.

5. Identify any statements by CFSE upon which You contend You relied in deciding to invest or subsequently invest in any of the Funds. For each such statement, state: (i) the speaker of the statement; (ii) the content of the statement; (iii) the date on which such statement was made; (iv) the document in which such statement is contained, if any; (v) the person(s) to whom such statement was made; (vi) the person(s) at Plaintiff who was aware of the contents of the statement; and (vii) how such person became aware of the statement.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad and unduly burdensome, and because it is duplicative of Defendants’ prior interrogatories to the class representatives. Without waiving the foregoing objections and the General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Generally, Plaintiffs contend they relied on the statements set forth in Response to Interrogatory No. 4 when deciding to invest initially or subsequently in the Funds, and relied on there being no material omissions, and Plaintiffs incorporate here their answer to Interrogatory No. 4. These statements and omissions were made each time CFSE represented the NAV, issued Plaintiffs subscription confirmations and related correspondence, and issued NAV

statements, and continued for the duration of time that Plaintiffs were investors in the Funds. Examples of the principal or material facts and evidence supporting these contentions are set forth in Response to Interrogatories Nos. 1 and 4 and in Appendix A.

6. Identify any statements by CFSE upon which You contend You relied in deciding to retain Your investment in any of the Funds. For each such statement, state: (i) the speaker of the statement; (ii) the content of the statement; (iii) the date on which such statement was made; (iv) the document in which such statement is contained, if any; (v) the person(s) to whom such statement was made; (vi) the person(s) at Plaintiff who was aware of the contents of the statement; (vii) how such person became aware of the statement; (viii) when You would have redeemed if not for this statement; and (ix) the amount You contend that You would have redeemed if not for this statement.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad and unduly burdensome, and because it is duplicative of Defendants' prior interrogatories to the class representatives. Without waiving the foregoing objections and the General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Generally, Plaintiffs contend they relied on the statements set forth in Response to Interrogatory No. 4 when deciding to retain their investments in the Funds, and relied on there being no material omissions, and Plaintiffs incorporate here their answer to Interrogatory No. 4. These statements and omissions were made each time CFSE represented the NAV, issued Plaintiffs subscription confirmations and related correspondence, and issued NAV statements, and continued for the duration of time that Plaintiffs were investors in the Funds. Examples of the principal or material facts and evidence supporting these contentions are set forth in Response to Interrogatories Nos. 1 and 4 and in Appendix A.

7. State whether You contend CFSE owed a fiduciary duty to You and, if so, the basis for the duty and all facts that You contend establish such duty.

RESPONSE: Without waiving the foregoing General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Plaintiffs contend that CFSE owed Plaintiffs a fiduciary duty. Examples of the principal

or material facts and evidence supporting that contention are as follows: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CFSE was aware that potential and current investors knew that CFSE was providing services to the Funds, that CFSE had superior expertise or knowledge concerning the Funds, and that investors were reposing trust and confidence in CFSE in making their investment decisions.

CFSE was further aware that the primary purpose of its representations concerning the Funds' NAVs was to enable investors to evaluate their investments or potential investments in the Funds. *See, e.g.*, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 5 and 6.

8. Identify every instance where (i) You contend CFSE breached a fiduciary duty owed to You; (ii) the date of such breach; (iii) the person(s) at CFSE who were aware of such breach; and (iv) all facts that You contend establish such breach.

RESPONSE: Without waiving the General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Plaintiffs contend that CFSE breached fiduciary duties to Plaintiffs by making the false and misleading statements and omissions in Plaintiffs' Response to Interrogatory No. 4, which response is incorporated here; by failing to obtain independent confirmation of the Funds' purported trades and that the Funds' assets existed, thereby falsely stating that Funds had substantial, positive NAV values; failing to reconcile from sources independent of Madoff the Funds' purported cash balances; failing to reconcile from sources independent of Madoff the Funds' portfolio holdings; failing to confirm the existence of the assets from sources independent of Madoff; failing to insist on an audit by a qualified accounting firm; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] failing to correct material misstatements as set forth in Plaintiffs' Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, and Appendix A; failing to monitor BLMIS/Madoff in any meaningful way; collaborating in misleading the Irish Stock Exchange concerning Madoff's role regarding the Funds; and failing to disclose any of its concerns and deficiencies in such matters to Plaintiffs. These breaches of duty occurred from the inception of CFSE's involvement with the Funds and continued for the duration of the relationship. Examples of principal or material facts and evidence supporting these contentions, including individuals at CFSE who had knowledge and dates on which they had knowledge, are set forth in Plaintiffs' Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and Appendices A and B.

9. State whether You contend Fairfield owed a fiduciary duty to You and, if so, the basis for the duty and all facts that You contend establish such duty.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objections and General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Plaintiffs contend that Fairfield owed fiduciary duties to Plaintiffs, which Fairfield breached. Fairfield represented that it had superior expertise or knowledge concerning the Funds, and was aware that potential and current investors were reposing trust and confidence in Fairfield in making investment decisions. As examples, Fairfield held itself out as having special knowledge and expertise about Madoff's operations, including representing that Fairfield had full transparency to Madoff's accounts, which Fairfield claimed it was monitoring on a daily basis. Fairfield represented to Plaintiffs that the Funds' assets actually existed, were being invested using a split-strike conversion strategy, and that assets in the Funds were earning substantial, consistent returns. *See, e.g.,* [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

10. Identify every instance where (i) You contend Fairfield breached a fiduciary duty owed to You; (ii) the date of such breach; (iii) the person(s) at Fairfield who were aware of such breach; and (iv) all facts that You contend establish such breach.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as outside of the scope of a contention interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information that is not relevant to any of the remaining claims in the action, and limit their answer to those breaches of fiduciary duties as to which Plaintiffs contend CFSE was aware and aided and abetted. Plaintiffs further object on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objections and General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Plaintiffs contend that Fairfield, with substantial assistance from Citco, breached fiduciary duties to Plaintiffs because of the misrepresentations and omissions it made to investors, including those statements set forth in the Funds' offering materials, and set forth in response to Interrogatory No. 11. Fairfield breached its fiduciary duties to Plaintiffs, again with substantial assistance from Citco, by not performing the obligations it represented it would, including monitoring and safeguarding the Plaintiffs' investments, and by failing to inform Plaintiffs of its failure to perform. Fairfield further breached its fiduciary duty, with substantial assistance from Citco, by making knowing misrepresentations to the Irish Stock Exchange concerning the scope of Madoff's discretion over the Funds' transactions, and Citco's role as custodian. Examples of principal or material facts and evidence supporting Plaintiffs' contentions are set forth in Appendix C.

11. For every breach of fiduciary duty identified in response to Interrogatory No.10, state (i) whether You contend CFSE was aware of such breach; (ii) the person(s) at CFSE who You contend were aware of such breach; (iii) the date on which such person became aware; (iv) all facts You contend establish such awareness; and (v) how CFSE participated or induced the breach.

RESPONSE: Without waiving the General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Plaintiffs contend that CFSE was aware of Fairfield’s breaches of its fiduciary duties including as set forth in Response No. 10. With awareness of Fairfield’s breaches, CFSE substantially assisted Fairfield, participated in, or induced Fairfield’s breaches by continuing to serve as administrator, including processing subscriptions and redemptions, calculating the NAV, publishing NAV statements, and processing the transfer of funds from Plaintiffs to Fairfield and Madoff, and from Fairfield and Madoff to Plaintiffs. Without these services, Fairfield’s breaches of duty could not have continued. Examples of principal or material facts and evidence supporting Plaintiffs’ contentions are:

- CFSE reviewed and approved the Funds’ offering memoranda knowing that they contained materially false and misleading statements and omissions, including as set forth in Plaintiffs’ Response to Interrogatory No. 4, *see, e.g.*, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] CFSE did nothing to correct these misrepresentations and omissions, instead participating in them. *See, e.g.*,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Appendix A at ¶¶ A, B, D.

- CFSE was aware of, and participated in, Fairfield’s misrepresentations to the Irish Stock Exchange as set forth in Plaintiffs’ Response to Interrogatory No. 4. *See* Appendix A at ¶ D.
- CFSE knew that Fairfield continued to make misstatements and omissions concerning its knowledge of Madoff’s operations, and the extent to which it was monitoring Madoff’s operations. *See, e.g.*, Appendix A at ¶¶ A, C, I, J, K, G.

Examples of individuals at CFSE who had knowledge, and dates on which they had knowledge, are reflected in the documents and testimony set forth above.

12. State whether You contend that Fairfield committed a fraud, and, if so, identify all facts and circumstances supporting Your contention.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as outside of the scope of a contention interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information that is not relevant to any of the remaining claims in the action, and limit their answer to fraud by Fairfield that Plaintiffs contend CFSE aided and abetted. Plaintiffs further object on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objections and General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Plaintiffs contend that Fairfield committed fraud. As examples, Fairfield made inaccurate and misleading representations and omissions to investors, including representing that Fairfield had full transparency to Madoff’s accounts, which Fairfield claimed it was monitoring on a daily basis, and which investors relied on, and misrepresentations and omissions set forth in response to Interrogatory Nos. 9-11. *See, e.g.*, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. Fairfield further made knowing misrepresentations

to the Irish Stock Exchange concerning the scope of Madoff's discretion over the Funds' transactions, and Citco's role as custodian. Examples of principal or material facts and evidence supporting Plaintiffs' contentions are set forth in Appendix C.

13. State whether You contend that CFSE aided and abetted Fairfield's alleged fraud, and, if so, identify all facts and circumstances supporting Your contention, including any facts that establish CFSE's awareness of Fairfield's alleged fraud.

RESPONSE: Without waiving the General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Plaintiffs contend that CFSE aided and abetted Fairfield's fraud. With awareness of Fairfield's misstatements and omissions, CFSE substantially assisted Fairfield in its fraud by continuing to serve as administrator, including processing subscriptions and redemptions, calculating the NAV, and publishing NAV statements, without which Fairfield's fraud could not have continued. CFSE further knowingly assisted Fairfield in making false representations to the Irish Stock Exchange concerning the scope of Madoff's discretion over the Funds' transactions and Citco's role as custodian. Examples of principal or material facts and evidence supporting Plaintiffs' contention include those set out in Plaintiffs' Response to Interrogatory Nos. 4, 11, [REDACTED], and Appendix A.

14. State whether You contend that CFSE had a special relationship with You, and, if so, identify the basis of that special relationship and all facts You contend establish the special relationship.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory on the grounds that the term "special relationship" is vague and ambiguous. Without waiving the foregoing objections and the General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Plaintiffs contend that CFSE had a special relationship with Plaintiffs, and incorporate Plaintiffs' Response to Interrogatory No. 7.

15. Identify any statements You contend were negligently made by CFSE. For each such statement, state: (i) the speaker of such statement; (ii) the content of such statement; (iii) the date on which such statement was made; (iv) the document in which such statement is included, if any; (v) the reason You contend such statement was negligent; (vi) the person(s) at Plaintiff who were aware of the contents of such statement; and (vii) the date when Plaintiff became aware of such statement.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad.

Without waiving the foregoing objection and the General Objections, Plaintiffs incorporate their Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 4, 6, and 8, and Plaintiffs' expert reports, as setting forth types of negligent misstatements CFSE made and examples of individuals who made such statements.

16. Identify every instance in which You contend that CFSE was negligent and all facts You contend support such negligence.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objection or the General Objections, Plaintiffs incorporate their Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, and 13, and Plaintiffs' expert reports, as setting forth types of negligent acts that CFSE committed and examples of facts showing CFSE's negligence.

17. Identify with specificity all acts taken by CFSE that You contend proximately caused harm to You, including (i) the date of each act; (ii) the individuals whose conduct constituted each act; and (iii) the harm that was caused by each act.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objection and the General Objections, Plaintiffs incorporate their Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, and 13, and Plaintiffs' expert reports, as setting forth types of acts that CFSE committed that harmed Plaintiffs.

18. State whether You contend that CFSE caused Your alleged loss independent of BLMIS's alleged fraud. If yes, identify the basis for Your contention.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous and to its use of the word "alleged". Without waiving the foregoing objections and the General Objections, Plaintiffs respond as follows: Plaintiffs contend that CFSE caused their losses independent of BLMIS's fraud. Had CFSE properly performed its duties and provided accurate information, Plaintiffs would not have initially invested in the Funds, would not have re-invested in the Funds, and would not have maintained their investments in the Funds, and could have recovered their investments. Examples of principal or material facts and evidence supporting Plaintiffs' contentions are included in Plaintiffs' Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, and Plaintiffs' expert reports, which are incorporated here.

19. Identify every instance in which You contend that CFSE was grossly negligent and any facts You contend support such gross negligence.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objection and the General Objections, Plaintiffs incorporate their Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, and 13, and Plaintiffs' expert reports, as setting forth types of grossly negligent acts that CFSE committed and examples of facts showing CFSE's gross negligence.

20. Identify what actions, if any, by CFSE that You contend were reckless. For each such action, state: (i) the date of such action; (ii) what person(s) at CFSE was involved in such action; and (iii) the basis of Your contention that each such action was reckless.

RESPONSE: Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving the foregoing objection and the General Objections, Plaintiffs incorporate their Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, and 13, and