EXHIBIT I

1 CONFIDENTIAL 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3 11-CV-03605(JSR)(HBP) 4 5 -----x 6 IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee for the Liquidation of Bernard L. 7 Madoff Investment Securities LLC, Videotaped Deposition of: Plaintiff, 8 FRED WILPON v. 9 SAUL B. KATZ, et al., 10 Defendants. 11 -----x 12 13 14 15 TRANSCRIPT of testimony as taken by and before 16 NANCY C. BENDISH, Certified Court Reporter, RMR, CRR 17 and Notary Public of the States of New York and New 18 Jersey, at the offices of Baker & Hostetler, 45 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, New York on Tuesday, 19 January 10, 2012, commencing at 9:28 a.m. 20 21 22 23 24 25

1

CONFIDENTIAL

52

starting up Sterling Stamos? 1 2 I don't recall. Α. 3 Do you remember having any Ο. conversations, prior to the actual formation of 4 5 Sterling Stamos, with Mr. Madoff about starting 6 Sterling Stamos? 7 Α. Before or? 8 Yeah, let me break that down. Before Ο. 9 Sterling Stamos started, you know, you're talking to Mr. Peter Stamos about it, as you described --10 11 Α. Right. -- did you prior to that sit down 12 0. 13 with Mr. Madoff and tell him that you were thinking of putting together the Sterling Stamos fund? 14 15 Α. Yes. 16 0. Do you have any idea when that was? 17 Α. No. Other than it was obviously before 18 Ο. 19 the formation. 20 Α. Right. No. What do you remember about that 21 Q. conversation with Mr. Madoff about that? 22 23 It occurred subsequent to another Α. 24 conversation which initiated that. 25 Q. Okay.

PICARD v. KATZ, et al. CONFIDENTIAL **FRED WILPON 1/10/12** 53 With Mr. Madoff, when the question 1 Α. 2 was asked of Mr. Madoff was he going to retire. 3 Um-hum. Ο. And he said he didn't have any 4 Α. 5 plans to -- my recollection is he said he didn't 6 have any plans to retire, but if he did, he would 7 send us the money back. And he said you can invest it in, I think he said U.S. Trust or Treasury, I 8 9 forget. Saul and I were a little taken back 10 by that, and we had a meeting going down the 11 elevator from his office. I looked at him and he 12 looked at me, and we said, we better have other 13 alternatives. 14 15 Um-hum. 0. 16 Α. And that was the initiation of, say, 17 starting a family office or starting Sterling 18 Stamos. Which was not to be as it turned out to be. It was really to -- to invest just the Stamos family 19 20 money and our money. You indicated that conversation that 21 Q. you just described for us took place first and then 22 there was a subsequent conversation, I believe was 23 24 your testimony, with Mr. Madoff about Sterling 25 Stamos. Could you tell us now about that subsequent

	PICARD v. KATZ, et al. CONFIDENTIAL FRED WILPON 1/10/12
	66
1	strategy, then Sterling Stamos might decide to, to
2	stop doing business with that particular investment
3	vehicle.
4	Q. Was it your understanding that
5	that the Stamos investment side had concerns about
6	the transparency of Mr. Madoff?
7	A. He was a he was a proprietary
8	investor, didn't want people to understand what
9	his how he came to his investments, and therefore
10	that wouldn't be transparent.
11	For example, one of the great
12	investors of the past 40 years is Renaissance,
13	Mr. Simons and his group. They're not transparent.
14	It's proprietary investing, and if you choose to
15	invest with him, if you're fortunate to do that, you
16	don't know what he's investing in or how he's
17	investing or how he's determining those investments.
18	Q. Other than transparency, were you
19	aware of any other concerns that Stamos don't
20	care if I use that is your understanding based on
21	what, your current let me rephrase the whole
22	thing. Not doing very well there.
23	The transparency issue that we've
24	been discussing, do you know what the source of that
25	was, the concern about transparency?

	PICARD v. KATZ, et al. CONFIDENTIAL FRED WILPON 1	/10/12	
		67	
1	A. I		
2	Q. Let me rephrase it.		
3	Was it the company policy of Sterling		
4	Stamos that you would not invest in a fund that was		
5	not transparent?		
6	A. That's my understanding.		
7	Q. Okay. And other than transparency,		
8	were you aware of any other issues that prevented		
9	Sterling Stamos from investing in Mr. Madoff?		
10	A. No, not at all. Because as far as I		
11	know, Mr. Madoff had a great reputation in the		
12	general field. And Peter Stamos had a very high		
13	regard for Bernie, Bernie Madoff and his his		
14	abilities as an investor. So I don't think that was		
15	the case. He and his family, with more limited		
16	funds from the sale of one of his companies, or a		
17	company that he had, more limited than Sterling's		
18	funds, was an investor for many years in Bernie		
19	Madoff.		
20	Q. Do you know if Mr		
21	A. Before Sterling Stamos.		
22	Q. I understand.		
23	Do you know whether or not the Stamos		
24	family redeemed its money out of Madoff at some		

point in time? 25

PICARD v. KATZ, et al. CONFIDENTIAL **FRED WILPON 1/10/12** 72 their exposure. I think it referred -- the words 1 2 don't say it, but I think it referred to the 3 doubling-up concept. Okay. Just for the record, could you 4 Q. 5 tell us what the doubling-up concept is. 6 Α. Where a bank would loan money to an 7 individual to buy -- to invest in Madoff, and the interest rate of that loan would be less than the 8 9 return that Madoff was returning on a yearly basis. 10 Q. Um-hum. And that they would -- so they would 11 Α. owe the bank that money. The collateral was the 12 Madoff account, and they would make the 13 differential, what they call a spread or 14 15 differential. 16 Ο. Right. Pardon me? 17 Α. Right, I said. Yeah, I understand. 18 Q. And -- better than I do. 19 Α. 20 And I think that that's what people were doing, and so someone must have said, well, 21 22 check your individual accounts. We were already --I assume at this time we were already investing in 23 24 Sterling Stamos. Oh, yeah, sure. We were investing 25 in Sterling Stamos. A lot of the new funds that

CONFIDENTIAL

FRED WILPON 1/10/12

73

were coming in, new liquidity was being invested in 1 2 Sterling Stamos, as well as -- as well as Madoff, 3 but we were trying to balance. When you say individuals would borrow 4 Q. 5 money from a bank and put it into Mr. Madoff, would 6 the individual deal directly with Mr. Madoff? 7 No. I think they probably would deal Α. through Arthur Friedman. 8 9 Ο. And would all the Sterling equity partners participate in the double-ups? 10 11 Α. No. How was it determined who would 12 Ο. participate? 13 The individual partner would decide. 14 Α. 15 Okay. And did all the individual Ο. 16 partners then deal through Mr. Friedman with Mr. Madoff? 17 I believe so. 18 Α. All right. And when those numbers 19 Ο. were reported, double-up numbers, were they reported 20 in the aggregate or by individual? 21 22 I don't recall. Α. Okay. When -- the phrase "exposure 23 0. 24 with Mr. Madoff, " does that suggest to you that 25 there's any risk involved?

CONFIDENTIAL

FRED WILPON 1/10/12

74

1 Α. We never -- we never felt exposure. 2 We always felt that Bernie Madoff was a low-risk 3 type of investment that we had been investing with 4 for 25 years. 5 Ο. So, how -- how would each partner go 6 about -- your understanding -- analyzing their 7 exposure to Mr. Madoff? Well, they were -- they were 8 Α. 9 borrowing money from a bank. 10 Q. Right. 11 Α. The bank allowed that to happen 12 because the bank did their investigation of Madoff and allowed that to be used as collateral. 13 14 Um-hum. Ο. 15 And there were several banks that Α. 16 allowed that. And so they were borrowing money. What -- what would happen if Bernie Madoff's returns 17 18 in a year didn't match interest rate? You'd have a -- you'd have a reverse situation. So, they were 19 20 saying, we'll look at that. Not that -- not that 21 there was an exposure to Bernie, in terms of 22 Bernie -- but there was certainly a -- Bernie did not always produce the same returns. He might 23 24 produce X one year and X minus five the next year. 25 Q. Do you recall anything specific that

CONFIDENTIAL

FRED WILPON 1/10/12

76

with regard to Mr. Madoff and how his business 1 2 operated that would have spawned this comment? 3 Α. None. None that I know of. Okay. Was there, at or about this 4 Ο. 5 time, we're going to talk more about this later, but 6 do you recall any conversations about Mr. Madoff 7 registering as an investment adviser? I believe he told us he was 8 Α. 9 registering as an investment adviser when the -- I think the law changed? 10 11 0. Um-hum. Or a new law came in? 12 Α. 13 0. Right. And I think he told us he was -- he 14 Α. 15 was, in addition to being a broker-dealer, whatever, 16 NASDAQ and whatever you have to be as a broker-dealer, he was -- he was registered as an 17 18 investment adviser. 19 Ο. Okay. I want to take a look at D. 20 Do you see this? It says, "Net Madoff balances." Do you see that? 21 22 Α. Yes. Okay. What does anything -- if 23 Ο. 24 anything, does that mean to you, that entry in the 25 minutes?

	PICARD v. KATZ, et al.	CONFIDENTIAL	FRED WILPON 1/10/12
			98
1	registration. An	nd I remember that we d	contacted
2	counsel, Davis Po	olk, to tell us what th	ne rulings
3	were.")		
4	Q. Fo	ocusing on just this po	ortion of your
5	answer, and that	is, is where you test	fied that
6	Sterling Equities	s did not need to be pa	art of that
7	registration or s	should not be part of i	t. Do you
8	recall that?		
9	A. (1	Nitness nods.)	
10	Q. 01	kay. What did you mear	n by that?
11	A. We	e were not, as I've tes	stified to
12	you, we at Sterl:	ing Equities were not i	nvolved in
13	the in the inv	vestment process at Ste	erling Stamos.
14	We were involved	only in the management	of the
15	company, that the	ey were going to take s	space at 450
16	Park Avenue or 2'	70 Lex or things of tha	at nature.
17	Ai	nd, therefore, we are a	a private
18	company, a privat	te family company, and	it wasn't
19	required that all	l of our businesses be	registered on
20	whatever that, wh	natever they had to reg	gister under.
21	Q. Do	o you have any understa	anding of what
22	the implications	of registration might	be for
23	Sterling Equities	s as a let me just s	stop there.
24	A. We	ell, it was a lot of pa	aperwork, a
25	lot of reporting	. As I understood it,	it's

CONFIDENTIAL

FRED WILPON 1/10/12

99

tantamount to being a publicly held company, which 1 2 is something we did not want to be. 3 Did -- did Sterling Equities' Ο. investments in Madoff have any influence or any 4 5 impact on your concerns about registering as part of 6 the Sterling Stamos investment advisory 7 registration? I don't recall that being part of 8 Α. 9 that. Did you have any conversations --10 Q. just you, personally, have any conversations with 11 Bernie Madoff about the fact that Sterling Stamos 12 was considering registering as an investment 13 adviser? 14 15 Only what I testified to in that --Α. that meeting that we had with Bernie Madoff. I 16 17 don't remember at that time whether he was already an investment adviser --18 19 Ο. Who, Mr. Madoff? Mr. Madoff. 20 Α. 21 Okay. Q. 22 Α. -- or he was saying -- or it was at a time when they both were going to become investment 23 24 advisers, that Sterling Stamos was going to become 25 an investment adviser, under the law or new law or

CONFIDENTIAL

100

1 requirement. 2 And as I testified, he said something 3 about, I don't think you guys want to be investment advisers for your real estate, your media business, 4 5 your oil business, whatever businesses you're in. 6 Um-hum. Q. 7 That's the -- I have a vague Α. recollection of that conversation. 8 9 (Comments off the record.) (Exhibit Trustee 331, Meeting Notice, 10 Bates SE T673935, marked for identification.) 11 I'm showing you what has been marked 12 Ο. as Exhibit 331 for identification, and it appears to 13 be another one of those meeting notices, whatever. 14 Do you see that? 15 16 Α. Yes. 17 Have you seen this prior to today? Ο. 18 Α. No. 19 Ο. Okay. I note for the record that the date of this is July 15th, 2004. Do you see that? 20 21 Α. Yes. 22 Ο. And I would also note that the prior exhibit that we were looking at was 330, was dated 23 24 July 14, 2004. Do you see that? The one just 25 before.

	PICARD v. KATZ, et al.	CONFIDENTIAL	FRED WILPON 1/10/12
			143
1	А.	No.	
2	Q.	And the personal friends	s who had
3	invested with	Mr. Madoff that you've sp	ooken of but
4	haven't named,	but I'm not asking you f	for their
5	names, would you consider any of them to be		
6	investment advisers?		
7	А.	No. Not not personal	friends that
8	I can recall.		
9	Q.	Did Mr. Levitt actually	invest with
10	Mr. Madoff?		
11	Α.	I don't know.	
12	Q.	Okay. Did you know whet	her
13	Mr. Levitt eve	r you know, I know you	ı've spoken of
14	his high opini	on of Mr. Madoff, but do	you know if
15	he ever did an	analysis of Mr. Madoff's	s investment
16	strategy?		
17	Α.	No, I couldn't tell you	that.
18	Q.	Okay. Other than what y	vou've just
19	described for	us, Howard Squadron, Arth	nur Levitt and
20	your friends,	was there any other due d	liligence that
21	you did with r	egard to investing in Mr.	Madoff?
22	А.	Well, it wasn't somethin	ng that was
23	static.		
24	Q.	Right.	
25	А.	It started, I'd say '75,	heard a lot

CONFIDENTIAL

FRED WILPON 1/10/12

144

1	about it. In '85 we decided to make some		
2	investments with the individuals, partners made some		
3	investments with Madoff. And as time went on it was		
4	a constant kind of thing, that we were constantly		
5	hearing, thinking, you know, observing how Bernie		
6	Madoff performed, how others performed, and so it		
7	was it was a sort of, if I may use, it was a		
8	motion picture, you know, in terms of a learning		
9	process.		
10	Q. Right.		
11	A. And there was a time when, I don't		
12	know the year, but the stock market went down		
13	significantly. And it was, Bernie Madoff was his		
14	investments came through that. There was a time		
15	when some Florida investors were sanctioned or		
16	something by the SEC. Ike Sorkin was one of the		
17	lawyers at Squadron at the time, he was the		
18	former I think he was the former head of the SEC		
19	in New York. Something someone we knew.		
20	And I remember being at their offices		
21	that day and describing what happened, that the SEC		
22	came and and did an analysis of that particular		
23	situation. I don't know how far they went, but that		
24	particular situation. And they sanctioned the two		
25	people in Florida, and they said that the Madoff		

PICARD v. KATZ, et al. CONFIDENTIAL **FRED WILPON 1/10/12** 145 operation was perfectly fine. 1 2 Ο. Okay. 3 Α. I don't know whether those were the words. 4 5 Ο. No, I understand. I assume that's 6 your understanding of it? 7 That's my... Α. Yeah, exactly. The -- just a moment 8 Ο. 9 here, I lost my train of thought. I was listening to you there and I lost it, you know. 10 Join the club. 11 Α. First one to admit that. 12 Q. Join the club. 13 Α. But -- exactly. 14 0. 15 That's why when you're asking me Α. 16 things like years, I say --I understand completely. 17 0. What did I have for lunch yesterday? 18 Α. I've had that experience as well. 19 Ο. 20 MR. WISE: Those senior moments. MR. SHEEHAN: 21 Indeed. 22 The -- but let me try to get back Ο. 23 into the context of it. The -- let me jump-start it 24 in a different direction. This might get me back to 25 where I want to go.

PICARD v. KATZ, et al. CONFIDENTIAL **FRED WILPON 1/10/12** 175 than once, they suggest Saberhagen and Glavine? 1 Do 2 you see that, down the bottom? 3 Α. Yes. All right. Is that accurate? 4 Ο. 5 Α. That we -- that we did defer -- that 6 we invested monies in Bernie and that it was 7 deferred payments --8 Ο. Yes. 9 Α. -- for Saberhagen and Glavine? Ι believe that's correct. 10 Okay, fine. Is -- is the reason you 11 Ο. went with Mr. Madoff is because of the consistency 12 13 of his returns? I think the acceptability of his 14 Α. returns. He had -- he had very good returns over 25 15 years. There were times when it was not meeting --16 17 when Arthur Friedman would report it was not meeting projections. 18 19 0. Right. 20 There was one or two years there was Α. a very big dip. But overall he was -- he was 21 22 out-performing treasuries or investments like that. 23 Okay. I want to go back to Ο. 24 exhibit -- the other exhibit that you have in front 25 of you. It's the financial outlook, capital

PICARD v. KATZ, et al. CONFIDENTIAL **FRED WILPON 1/10/12** 202 this email? 1 I did not. 2 Α. 3 Did you ever have a conversation with Ο. anyone at Sterling Stamos about the contents of this 4 email? 5 T did not. 6 Α. 7 Q. Or anyone else at the bank other than Mr. Kenny? 8 9 Α. This is the first time I've ever seen this email. 10 Okay, all right. 11 Ο. This is a somewhat unrelated 12 13 question, but it's still in the area of banks. Earlier you were talking about double-ups; do you 14 15 remember that? 16 Α. Yes. 17 And you talked about the fact that Ο. the bank itself would do some due diligence; do you 18 19 remember that --20 Α. Yes. -- with regard to that? 21 Q. 22 Could you describe for me what you understand the banks did? 23 24 My understanding is that if -- if Α. 25 Sterling Equities partners or any of the partners

	PICARD v. KATZ, et al.	CONFIDENTIAL	FRED WILPON 1/10/12
			203
1	wanted to borrow	w money against an account	they had
2	at Bernie Madoff		
3	Q. F	Right.	
4	A	using collateral of the	Bernie
5	Madoff account,	the bank would then determ	nine
6	whether they the	ought that was appropriate	
7	collateral.		
8	Q. t	Jm-hum.	
9	A. 7	and so the bank would then	do I'm
10	probably going t	to use wrong words, you kno	ow, as I
11	say an investiga	ation, I don't know what th	ne words
12	are, but		
13	Q. 7	All right. We understand.	
14	A	they would do they wo	ould look
15	into whether Ber	rnie Madoff Securities was	something
16	that the bank co	ould, could keep as collate	eral for
17	a for a borro	ower. And my understanding	g is that
18	the bank did all	that investigation or wor	ck, came
19	back and said th	nat Bernie Madoff is fine,	we we
20	would lend you o	on Bernie Madoff.	
21	Q. I	Do you have any knowledge w	what the
22	bank actually di	d to, to borrow your word,	
23	investigate Mr.	Madoff?	
24	A. 3	have no idea.	
25	Q. I	Did they ever share any of	that
	1		

CONFIDENTIAL

206

said something, he used some words, clean bill of 1 2 health or something like that, with respect to that. 3 And I remember that the newspapers reported and -that they had sent the money back. 4 Okay. 5 Ο. 6 Α. That Bernie Madoff had sent the money 7 back. Using that as a point in time, 8 Ο. 9 whether it's '92 or some other year, using that as a point in time, did there come a time after that when 10 you became aware of any other SEC investigation of 11 12 Mr. Madoff? 13 Now, I'm -- I would answer yes, but Α. I'm going to give you a qualification, that I'm not 14 15 sure I remember when -- when I knew of this versus 16 what I've read afterwards. Because there's so much 17 publicity that's been about this. But I did know 18 that Madoff was, I thought the word "regularly," maybe regularly like everybody else, but regularly 19 was -- was, I'm going to use the word "monitored," I 20 don't know if that's the right word, by the -- by 21 22 certain regulatory bodies, like NASDAO or the SEC or 23 other government agencies. 24 When you said that -- is that an Ο. 25 assumption on your part, that that happened on a