Christopher Graver (#013235) STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP 2 1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4584 3 Tel: (602) 279-1600 Fax: (602) 240-6925 4 cgraver@stinson.com 5 Attorneys for ML Liquidating Trust as Plaintiff in certain Superior Court Litigation 6 7 IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 8 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 9 In re Chapter 11 10 MORTGAGES, LTD., Case No. 2:08-bk-07465-RJH 11 MOTION OF ML LIQUIDATING TRUSTEE FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING LIMITED AND 12 CONFIDENTIAL DISCLOSURE AND USE IN 13 SUPERIOR COURT LITIGATION OF **DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY HEBETS &** 14 MAGUIRE AND SHELLEY HARTSUIKER UNDER PROTECTIVE ORDER ENTERED 15 **JANUARY 27, 2010** 16 Debtor. 17 18 Matt Hartley, as successor Liquidating Trustee of the ML Liquidating Trust 19 ("Liquidating Trustee"), through undersigned counsel, moves the Court, pursuant to 11 20 U.S.C. §107(b)(2) and (c)(1), Fed. R. Bank. P. 9018, and the "Protective Order Re: Production 21 of Documents by Hebets & Maguire, LLC and Shelley Hartsuiker Pursuant to Court Order" 22 entered herein on January 27, 2010 (the "ML Protective Order," DE #2617), for an order 23 authorizing the Liquidating Trustee to use and disclose to defendants in litigation pending in 24 Maricopa County Superior Court, captioned ML Servicing Co., et al., v. Francine Coles, et al., 25 cause nos. CV2011-011666 and CV2011-005890 (Consolidated) (the "Superior Court 26 Case"), subject to a protective order maintaining their confidentiality, documents produced to 27

Filed 04/13/12

Page 1 of 28

Main Document

Entered 04/13/12 13:57:36

Desc

28

Case 2:08-bk-07465-RJH

the Liquidating Trustee pursuant to the ML Protective Order. The parties to the Superior Court Case are concurrently submitting a stipulated protective order to the Superior Court which fully protects the confidentiality of confidential information. This motion is supported by the following memorandum and the attachments hereto.

# **MEMORANDUM**

# I. <u>Background.</u>

- 1. The order for relief was entered in this case on June 24, 2008 (DE #36).
- 2. The Official Committee of Investors' First Amended Plan of Reorganization Dated March 12, 2009 ("Plan," DE #1532) was confirmed by this Court's Order entered May 20, 2009 (DE #1755).
- 3. The Liquidating Trust was created, and the Liquidating Trustee was appointed, pursuant to the Plan, and is authorized thereunder, among other things, to pursue collection of assets of the bankruptcy estate. In that capacity the Liquidating Trust (along with the reorganized debtor, ML Servicing Co., Inc.), retained the law firm of Stinson Morrison Hecker LLP as counsel and filed the Superior Court Case, which seeks to avoid certain transfers to, and recover certain assets from, members of the family of Scott Coles (the deceased principal of Debtor Mortgages Ltd.), and certain trusts for the benefit of family members (the "**Defendants**").<sup>1</sup>

# II. The ML Protective Order

4. On November 10, 2009, in proceedings unrelated to the Superior Court Case, the Court granted the Liquidating Trustee's Rule 2004 applications for production of documents

The named Defendants in the consolidated proceedings are Francine Coles, Individually, and as Co-Trustee for the Coles Children's Irrevocable Trust and as Conservator for Z.A. Coles and S.B. Coles, Minors; Haley Brooke Coles, an Individual; Bankers Trust Company of South Dakota, as Co-Trustee for the Coles Children's Irrevocable Trust; Thomas Hirsch, as Trustee for Francine Coles Irrevocable Trust; and Ashley Coles, Individually and in her capacity as Trustee of the Ashley M. Coles Family Trust.

11 12

13

1415

16

17

Id. at ¶5.

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

2627

28

from Hebets & Maguire, LLC, and Shelley Hartsuiker (collectively, "**H&M**") (DE ## 2392 and 2393).

- 5. H&M asserted that the responsive documents were confidential information of H&M and included confidential information about Scott Coles. To address this concern, on January 6, 2010, the Liquidating Trustee and H&M entered into a Stipulated Motion for Protective Order re: Production of Documents by Hebets & Maguire, LLC and Shelley Hartsuiker Pursuant to Court Order (DE #2569), and the Court thereupon entered the ML Protective Order. H&M proceeded to produce to the Liquidating Trustee documents subject to the ML Protective Order, and the Liquidating Trustee is currently in possession of those documents (the "Confidential Information").
- 6. The ML Protective Order provides that the Confidential Information will be used "solely for purposes of these proceedings, including any adversary proceedings that may be filed in the future...," but also provides that

...nothing contained herein to the contrary shall limit or waive the Liquidating Trustee's right to request the Court's authorization to allow the disclosure and/or use of any information or documentation produced in accordance with the 2004 Examination Orders for the purposes of any existing or future judicial proceedings.

III. Discovery of Confidential Information in the State Court Case

- 7. Defendants in the State Court Case have requested production of, among other things, confidential material including the Confidential Information produced by H&M to the Liquidating Trustee under the ML Protective Order.
- 8. The parties in the State Court Case intend to exchange certain confidential information, and pursuant to Rule 26(c) of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs and Defendants have filed a Joint Motion and Stipulation for Entry of Protective Order and have lodged an agreed form of order granting the motion, copies of which are attached hereto as **Exhibits 1 and 2**, respectively, which are here incorporated by this reference (collectively, the

"Joint Motion"). The protections provided under the parties' agreement are consistent with the protections in the ML Protective Order, and include maintaining the confidentiality of information, restricting its use to parties expressly covered by the agreement, requiring new parties or expert witnesses to agree to be bound by the agreement before they have access to confidential information, and requiring the return or destruction of confidential information to the disclosing party when the case is finally concluded. *See* Exhibit 2.

- 9. Notwithstanding the parties' agreement as embodied in the Joint Motion, the Liquidating Trustee believes that the ML Protective Order by its terms requires a separate order of this Court, after notice to H&M and opportunity for a hearing, before the Liquidating Trust will be authorized to disclose or use the Confidential Information in the State Court Case.
- 10. The Liquidating Trustee has no objection to producing the Confidential Information for use in the State Court Case, subject to the terms of the Joint Motion.
- 11. Counsel for the Liquidating Trustee has contacted counsel for H&M to request its consent to the use of Confidential Information. For timing reasons, this motion is being filed prior to a response from H&M counsel.

## IV. Argument

The Court is authorized under 11 U.S.C. §107(b)(2) and (c)(1), and Fed. R. Bank. P. 9018, to make any order which justice requires to protect any entity against disclosure of "scandalous or defamatory" matter, and to protect any individual against disclosure of personally identifiable information. The Court has already ordered in the ML Protective Order that the Confidential Information be protected, and the Liquidating Trust has complied and will continue to comply with that order.

This motion does not seek a modification of the ML Protective Order, but requests that the Confidential Information previously disclosed by H&M, including confidential information about Scott Coles, be used and disclosed by the Liquidating Trustee in the State

17

Court Case to Mr. Coles' family members, the trustees of their trusts, and identified other persons, all of whom will be bound by a separate and extensive protective order.

The Confidential Information appears to the Liquidating Trustee to be discoverable, and likely remains independently available to the Defendants by means of subpoena to H&M. However, to avoid cumbersome and unnecessary additional discovery, and the necessity for yet another protective order covering a second production of the same material, the Liquidating Trustee believes it would be in the interests of justice, and in the best interests of all parties, for this Court to authorize him to use and disclose the Confidential Information subject to the parties' agreement in the Joint Motion.

This Motion is being served on counsel for H&M and counsel for parties in the State Court Case. The Liquidating Trustee believes that there are no other parties interested in the subject matter of this Motion, and requests that the Court find that notice is sufficient under Fed. R. Bank. P. 9007.

# **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Liquidating Trustee requests that the Court enter its order authorizing the Liquidating Trustee to use and disclose the Confidential Information in the Superior Court Case, subject to entry of a protective order in the Superior Court Case granting the Joint Motion, and for such other and further relief to which he may be entitled.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 13<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012.

#### STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP

By: /s/ Christopher Graver Christopher Graver 1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4584 Attorneys for ML Liquidating Trust as Plaintiff in the Superior Court Case

1	COPY of the foregoing sent this 13th day
2	of April, 2012, to:
3	E. Scott Dosek Jennifer R. Friedman
4	HINSHAW & CULBERTSON LLP 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 800
5	Phoenix, Arizona 85012
6	Jerome K Elwell J. Brent Welker
7	WARNER ANGLE HALLAM
8	JACKSON & FORMANEK 2555 E. Camelback Road, Suite 800
9	Phoenix, Arizona 85016
10	Todd Feltus Christopher M. Goodman
11	Jenessa G.B. Cocarro KERCSMAR & FELTUS PLLC
12	6263 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 320 Scottsdale, AZ 85250
13	Greg S. Como
14	Kristen DeWitt-Lopez LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD &
15	SMITH, LLP 2929 N. Central Ave., Suite 1700
16	Phoenix, AZ 85012-2761 como@lbbslaw.com
17	dewitt-lopez@lbbslaw.com Attorneys for Hebets & Maguire, LLC
18	
19	/s/ Anne Finch
20	/s/ Anne Finch
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

# **EXHIBIT 1**

1	Michael C. Manning (#016255) James M. Torre (#017523)	
2	M. Elizabeth Nillen (#023862) Alison Pulaski Carter (#025699)	
3	STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP 1850 North Central Avenue, Suite 2100	
4	Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4584	
5	Tel: (602) 279-1600 Fax: (602) 240-6925	
6	Email: mmanning@stinson.com jtorre@stinson.com	
7	mnillen@stinson.com acarter@stinson.com	
	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
8	SUPERIOR COUR	T OF ARIZONA
9	MARICOPA	COUNTY
10	ML SERVICING CO., INC., an Arizona	No. CV2011-011666 (Consolidated)
11	corporation; and ML LIQUIDATING TRUST,	CV2011-005890
12	Plaintiffs,	
13	v.	JOINT MOTION AND STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF PROTECTIVE ORDER
14	FRANCINE COLES, individually, and as Co- Trustee for THE COLES CHILDREN'S	(Assigned to the Honorable Arthur
15	IRREVOCABLE TRUST and as conservator	Anderson)
16	for Z.A. COLES and S.B. COLES, minors; HALEY BROOKE COLES, an individual;	
17	BANKERS TRUST COMPANY OF SOUTH DAKOTA, as Co-Trustee for THE COLES	
18	CHILDREN'S IRREVOCABLE TRUST; THOMAS HIRSCH, as Trustee for	
	FRANCINE COLES IRREVOCABLE	
19	TRUST; JOHN AND JANE DOES 1-30; BLACK CORPORATIONS 1-30; WHITE	
20	PARTNERSHIPS 1-30; and GRAY TRUSTS 1-30,	
21	Defendants.	
22	Determine.	
23		
24		

Doc 3497 Filed 04/13/12 Entered 04/13/12 13:57:36 Desc Main Document Page 8 of 28

Case 2:08-bk-07465-RJH DB04/808783.0002/5736450.4

ML SERVICING Co., INC. and ML LIQUIDATING TRUST,

Plaintiffs.

V.

ASHLEY COLES, individually and in her capacity as Trustee of the Ashley M. Coles Family Trust, *et al*.

Defendants.

Pursuant to Rule 26(c) of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs ML Servicing Co., Inc. and ML Liquidating Trust (collectively "ML") and Francine Coles, Haley Brooke Coles, Bankers Trust Company of South Dakota, Thomas Hirsch, and Ashley Coles (collectively, the "Parties") request that the Court enter the proposed Protective Order filed concurrently with this Joint Motion ("Proposed Protective Order"). The Parties believe that discovery in the above-captioned action involves the disclosure of confidential information ("Confidential Information").

Some of the Confidential Information involved in this matter is subject to a protective order in a separate action. There is an ongoing bankruptcy proceeding, captioned *In re Mortgages, Ltd.*, United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Arizona, Case No. 2:08-bk-07465, related to the current matter. On January 27, 2010, the Bankruptcy Court entered a "Protective Order Re: Production of Documents by Hebets & Maguire, LLC and Shelley Hartsuiker Pursuant to Court Orders" (Dkt. 2617) (the "Bankruptcy Protective Order"). A copy of the Bankruptcy Protective Order is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. The parties that produced documents under the Bankruptcy Protective Order are not parties to this action or to this Joint Motion and Stipulation. Based on the terms of the Bankruptcy Protective Order, the Parties believe that the Bankruptcy Court must approve disclosure under the Parties' Proposed Protective Order of any documents now in the possession of any Party that were originally produced subject to the Bankruptcy Protective Order. Therefore, the Parties concurrently are

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

requesting the Bankruptcy Court's approval of disclosure of such documents under the Proposed Protective Order, and no documents originally produced under the Bankruptcy Protective Order will be produced under the Proposed Protective Order until Bankruptcy Court approval has been obtained. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Parties do not waive their rights to seek production of such documents directly from the third parties who produced them under the Bankruptcy Protective Order.

The Parties desire to keep the Confidential Information out of the public domain and out of the hands of third persons not parties to this Lawsuit. Given the Parties' desire to have the Confidential Information remain confidential, the Parties stipulate and agree that the proposed Protective Order should be entered by this Court for the mutual protection of the Parties. The Parties acknowledge the need for a Protective Order, which will: (i) enable the Parties to have access to documents that they request in preparation of their case; and (ii) protect Confidential Information from disclosure except as is necessary for the prosecution and defense of the claims in this case.

Accordingly, the Parties request that the court enter the proposed Protective Order filed concurrently with this Joint Motion.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 13<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012.

#### STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP

/s/Alison Pulaski Carter By:

Michael C. Manning James M. Torre M. Elizabeth Nillen Alison Pulaski Carter 1850 North Central Avenue, Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4584 Attorneys for Plaintiffs (CV2011-005890)

23

24

25

26

Case 2:08-bk-07465-RJH DB04/808783.0002/5736450.4

Filed 04/13/12 Main Document

Entered 04/13/12 13:57:36 Page 10 of 28

1		HINSHAW & CULBERTSON LLP
2		
3	By:	/s/ Alison Pulaski Carter on behalf of E. Scott Dosek
4		E. Scott Dosek Jennifer R. Friedman
5		3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85012
6		Attorneys for Plaintiffs (CV2011-011666)
7		WARNER ANGLE HALLAM JACKSON & FORMANEK
9		/s/Alison Pulaski Carter on behalf of Jerome
10	Ву:	K. Elwell
11		Jerome K Elwell J. Brent Welker
12		2555 E. Camelback Road, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85016
13		Attorneys for Defendants (CV2011-005890)
14		KERCSMAR & FELTUS PLLC
15		
16	By:	/s/Alison Pulaski Carter on behalf of Todd Feltus
17		Todd Feltus Christopher M. Goodman
18		Jenessa G.B. Cocarro 6263 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 320
19		Scottsdale, AZ 85250 Attorneys for Defendants (CV2011-011666)
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	4	

Case 2:08-bk-07465-RJH Doc 3497 Filed 04/13/12 Entered 04/13/12 13:57:36 Desc DB04/808783.0002/5736450.4 Main Document Page 11 of 28

1	ORIGINAL e-filed this 13th day of April, 2012:	
2	Clerk of the Court Maricopa County Superior Court	
3	201 West Jefferson Phoenix, Arizona 85003	
4	COPY delivered via e-filing system this 13th day	
5 6	of April, 2012 to: The Honorable Arthur Anderson	
7	Maricopa County Superior Court East Court Building – 511	
8	101 West Jefferson Phoenix, AZ 85003	
9	COPIES of the foregoing mailed this 13 <sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012, to:	
10		
11	Jerome K. Elwell J. Brent Welker	
12	Warner Angle Hallam Jackson & Formanek 2555 E. Camelback Road, Suite 800	
13	Phoenix, AZ 85016 Attorneys for Defendants (CV2011-005890)	
14		
15	E. Scott Dosek Jennifer R. Friedman Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP	
16	3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 800 Phoenix, AZ 85012	
17	Attorneys for Plaintiffs (CV2011-011666)	
18	Todd Feltus Christopher M. Goodman	
19	Jenessa G.B. Coccaro Kercsmar & Feltus PLLC	
20	6263 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 320 Scottsdale, AZ 85250	
21	Attorneys for Defendants (CV2011-011666)	
22	/s/Lisa Hamilton	
23	/s/Lisa Hallilitoli	
24   25		
	5	
26 C	5 ase 2:08-bk-07465-RJH Doc 3497 Filed 04/13/12 Entered 04/13/12 13:57:36 DB04/808783.0002/5736450.4 Main Document Page 12 of 28	Desc

# **EXHIBIT A**

#### IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED and DECREED this is SO ORDERED.

The party obtaining this order is responsible for noticing it pursuant to Local Rule 9022-1.

Dated: January 27, 2010

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Pursuant to Rules 2004 and 9018 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure and

Rules 26(c) and 45(d)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and based upon the

Stipulated Motion of Kevin T. Halloran, as Liquidating Trustee of the ML Liquidating

Trust (the "Liquidating Trustee"). and Hebets & Maguire, LLC and Shelley Hartsuiker

(hereinafter collectively referred to as "H&M") for Protective Order Re: Production of

Documents by Hebets & Maguire, LLC and Shelley Hartsuiker Pursuant to Court Order



U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

In Proceedings Under Chapter 11

Case No. 2:08-bk-07465-RJH

PROTECTIVE ORDER RE:

TO COURT ORDER

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

BY HEBETS & MAGUIRE, LLC AND SHELLEY HARTSUIKER PURSUANT

2 3

1

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

In re:

Debtor.

MORTGAGES, LTD.,

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Case 2:08-bk-07465-RJH

("Motion").

Main Document

Page 14 of 28

Filed 01/27/10 Entered 01/28/10 09:22:16 Desc Doc 3497 Doc 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 13:57:36

Doc 2617

4 5

6 7

1.

9 10

8

11 12

14 15

13

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

Case 2:08-6k-07465-RJH

Case 2:08-bk-07465-RJH

transcript thereof.

2.

Doc 2617

Filed 01/27/10

Entered 01/28/10 09:22:16

Main Document

Page 15 of 28

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED granting the Stipulated Motion and entering the

following Protective Order to govern confidential information produced by H&M, or either

of them, in response to the 2004 Examination Orders (as defined in the Motion) that the

PROTECTIVE ORDER

mean proprietary, private, sensitive, or competitive information that could cause Hebets &

Maguire, or the family of Scott Coles competitive disadvantage, public embarrassment, or

other significant inconvenience if disclosed. It shall also include information protected by

applicable state and federal privacy laws, including, but not limited to, Health Insurance

Portability and Accountability Act (Pub. Law No. 104-191 §§ 262, 264: 45 C.F.R. §§ 160-

Information may consist of documents or other information in tangible or electronic form.

In the event any person is deposed or gives testimony in this case concerning the

Confidential Information, the provisions of this Protective Order shall apply to the

H&M will produce the records requested, so long as any personally identifiable

information (other than name), including addresses, telephone numbers, dates of birth and

social security numbers, is redacted if further disseminated by or at the direction of the

Liquidating Trustee. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Liquidating Trustee shall have

the right to disseminate such information in its original form without redaction to its

Production of Confidential Information: The parties agree that non-party

164) and the Graham-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 6801 et seq.).

The phrase "confidential information" shall

Confidential

Liquidating Trustee has served upon non-party H&M.

Confidential Information:

28

S 28

attorneys and advisors, so long as such attorneys and advisors are provided with a copy of the Protective Order and agree to be bound by its provisions to keep such information confidential.

- 3. Non-Production of Certain Information and Preservation of Right to Challenge: H&M believes certain documents set forth on the Privilege Log attached hereto as Exhibit 3, and incorporated herein by this reference, are protected from production by Arizona Rule of Evidence 408 and A.R.S. § 12-2238. The parties agree that H&M's current non-production of the documents listed on Exhibit 3 shall not constitute a violation of the 2004 Examination Orders. The parties further agree that nothing contained herein shall limit or waive the Liquidating Trustee's right to challenge the privilege asserted as to any document(s) listed on Exhibit 3 and move the Court for an order requiring the production of such document(s) at a later date.
- 4. <u>Designation of Confidential Information</u>: At the time H&M produces documents pursuant to the 2004 Examination Orders, H&M shall designate all information it deems to be confidential as "Confidential" by (1) placing such designation conspicuously on the information, in the case of a document; and (2) stating the designation on the deposition or hearing/trial record, in the case of testimony from a representative, agent, or employee of H&M.
- 5. <u>Use of Confidential Information</u>: The parties stipulate and agree that they will use the Confidential Information solely for purposes of these proceedings, including any adversary proceedings that may be filed in the future. In so stipulating, no party waives his/her/their rights to request that particularly sensitive documents be sealed and

1

10 11

8

17 18 19

20

21

16

22 23

24

25 26

27

not be made a part of the public record. Further, no party waives his/her/their rights to claim privilege pursuant to Rules 26(b)(5) and 45(d)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In addition, nothing contained herein to the contrary shall limit or waive the Liquidating Trustee's right to request the Court's authorization to allow the disclosure and/or use of any information or documentation produced in accordance with the 2004 Examination Orders for the purposes of any existing or future judicial proceedings.

- 6. Destruction of Confidential Information: At such time as all of the matters in the above-captioned pleadings have been concluded, all information produced by H&M will be either destroyed or returned to H&M. The word "destroyed" means the destruction of paper documents and any electronic means of storing protected health information regarding Scott Coles. The parties may retain logs of the information that was received and destroyed, including any Bates numbers, for purposes of their law firm's document retention.
- 7. Challenge to Designation: If any party disputes the designation of any information hereunder, counsel for that party shall first attempt to resolve the dispute as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. If, after good faith efforts to resolve the dispute have failed, the party challenging the designation may move the Court for a determination of the propriety of the designation.
- 8. Expert Witnesses: Any expert witnesses or consultants retained by any party to these proceedings are to be provided with a copy of this Protective Order and are bound by its provisions, including but not limited to the requirement that any designated

1	Confidential Information produced by H&M be destroyed at such time as all of the matters			
2	in the above-captioned proceedings have been concluded.			
3				
4				
5	DATED this day of,			
6				
7				
8	Honorable Randolph J. Haines Bankruptcy Judge			
9	Saint up to y trange			
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19 20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	JX11-6671-6933 1			

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD

8.5MIHUP Case 2:08-bk-07465-RJH Doc 2617 Filed 01/27 10 Entered 01/28/10 09:22:16 Desc

Case 2:08-bk-07465-RJH Doc 1/28/10 09:22:16 Desc

Main Document Page 18 of 28

# **EXHIBIT 2**

1 Michael C. Manning (#016255) James M. Torre (#017523) M. Elizabeth Nillen (#023862) Alison Pulaski Carter (#025699) STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP 3 1850 North Central Avenue, Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4584 4 Tel: (602) 279-1600 5 Fax: (602) 240-6925 Email: mmanning@stinson.com itorre@stinson.com 6 mnillen@stinson.com acarter@stinson.com 7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 8 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA 10 MARICOPA COUNTY 11 ML SERVICING CO., INC., an Arizona No. CV2011-011666 (Consolidated) 12 corporation; and ML LIQUIDATING TRUST, CV2011-005890 Plaintiffs, 13 14 [PROPOSED] PROTECTIVE ORDER 15 FRANCINE COLES, individually, and as Co-Trustee for THE COLES CHILDREN'S (Assigned to the Honorable Arthur IRREVOCABLE TRUST and as conservator Anderson) 16 for Z.A. COLES and S.B. COLES, minors; HALEY BROOKE COLES, an individual: 17 BANKERS TRUST COMPANY OF SOUTH DAKOTA, as Co-Trustee for THE COLES 18 CHILDREN'S IRREVOCABLE TRUST; THOMAS HIRSCH, as Trustee for 19 FRANCINE COLES IRREVOCABLE TRUST; JOHN AND JANE DOES 1-30; 20 BLACK CORPORATIONS 1-30; WHITE PARTNERSHIPS 1-30; and GRAY TRUSTS 21 1-30, 22 Defendants. 23 24

Case 2:08-bk-07465-RJH Doc 3497 Filed 04/13/12 Entered 04/13/12 13:57:36 Desc

ML SERVICING Co., INC. and ML LIQUIDATING TRUST,

Plaintiffs,

v

ASHLEY COLES, individually and in her capacity as Trustee of the Ashley M. Coles Family Trust, *et al.* 

Defendants.

Having considered the Parties' Joint Motion and Stipulation for Entry of Protective Order, and for good cause appearing,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the following Protective Order shall govern the proceedings in this matter:

### PROTECTIVE ORDER

## 1. <u>Confidential Information</u>:

a. In the course of this proceeding, the parties are likely to exchange documents and information that they deem to be proprietary or confidential ("Confidential Information"). The Confidential Information may include documents originally from third parties that are already subject to a protective order, entitled "Protective Order Re: Production of Documents by Hebets & Maguire, LLC and Shelley Hartsuiker Pursuant to Court Orders" and dated January 27, 2010, entered in a related bankruptcy proceeding, captioned *In re Mortgages, Ltd.*, United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Arizona, Case No. 2:08-bk-07465 (the "Bankruptcy Protective Order"); provided, however, that no documents produced in the bankruptcy proceeding under the Bankruptcy Protective Order shall be disclosed under this Order absent the Bankruptcy Court's prior approval of such disclosure. Notwithstanding the foregoing, nothing in this Order shall prevent any party from seeking production of such documents directly from the third parties who produced them under the Bankruptcy Protective Order.

- b. Any party disclosing information (the "<u>Disclosing Party</u>") to another party in this action (the "<u>Receiving Party</u>") by any means, including Ariz.R.Civ P. 26.1 disclosures, deposition testimony, deposition exhibits, responses to interrogatories, responses to requests for admission, responses to requests for production of documents or things, or informally, may designate the information as Confidential in accordance with Paragraph 2 below.
- c. The sum, substance, or contents of Confidential Information, as well as all notes, abstracts, summaries, and memoranda containing or incorporating Confidential Information shall be treated as Confidential Information and shall not be disclosed or made accessible to anyone other than those persons who qualify to receive such information under this Order.
- d. Confidential Information shall cease to be Confidential for purposes of this Order if it is or becomes generally available to the public from a source that is not prohibited from disclosing such information by a legal, contractual or fiduciary obligation.
- 2. <u>Designation of Confidential Information</u>. Any party or third party disclosing Confidential Information shall designate the information as Confidential Information in the following manner:
- a. All documents and items produced that contain any Confidential Information shall be labeled "Confidential". This label shall be placed on every page of each document so designated.
- 3. Testimony taken at depositions, conferences, hearings or trial and exhibits (not previously designated as "Confidential") used in depositions, conferences, hearings or trial may be designated as "Confidential" by making a statement to that effect on the record during the course of the deposition or other proceeding. Whenever such a designation is made during a deposition or other proceeding, the transcripts and designated exhibits shall be deemed Confidential Information. Arrangements shall be made with the court reporter taking and transcribing the proceedings to separately bind such portions of the transcript containing information designated as "Confidential" and to label such portions appropriately.

4. <u>Experts</u>. "Expert" means any person retained or specifically employed by any party in anticipation of this litigation or preparation for trial, whether or not the person is expected to be called as a witness at trial.

### 5. Restrictions on Disclosure of Confidential Information.

- a. Confidential Information disclosed by a Disclosing Party and designated "Confidential" may be disclosed by the Receiving Party only to the following persons (the "Qualified Person[s]"):
- i. Outside counsel of record for any party to this matter, including all attorneys of the counsel's law firm and all paralegal assistants, stenographic and clerical employees operating under the direct supervision of such attorneys;
- ii. Court personnel, including stenographic reporters and certified videotape operators, engaged in those proceedings that are a necessary incident to the trial or preparation of this action for trial;
- iii. Experts whom the attorneys deem necessary to review the Confidential Information for the prosecution or defense of this lawsuit may be shown documents designated "Confidential" provided that Expert executes a copy of the accompanying statement (**Exhibit A**) stating that such person has read this Order, agrees to be bound by all of its terms and conditions, and agrees to be subject to this Court's jurisdiction;
- iv. A deponent at a deposition and a witness at a hearing may be shown documents designated "Confidential" provided that the document indicates that the deponent or witness previously had access to the document;
- v. Parties to this lawsuit may be shown documents designated "Confidential" for purposes of this litigation provided that the documents designated as "Confidential" (1) may not be copied or reproduced in any manner except as necessary for the prosecution or defense of this lawsuit, and (2) may not be removed from the attorney's office except as necessary for the prosecution or defense of this lawsuit. Parties shall not further disclose such Confidential Information except as authorized by this Order.

Desc

- 6. Restrictions on Use of Confidential Information. All Confidential Information produced during discovery may be used solely for purposes of this litigation. Confidential information may also be used by a Receiving Party to comply with legal obligations, but if such compliance requires the disclosure of Confidential Information to a third party who is not a Qualified Person, the party who seeks to disclose such information shall provide reasonable advance notice of such intended disclosure to the party who designated the information as Confidential Information. If the Disclosing Party provides written objection to such disclosure of Confidential Information, the Receiving Party shall not disclose the Confidential Information absent Court approval. Confidential Information produced during discovery shall not otherwise be disclosed to or made accessible to any person who is not a Qualified Person without a Court order or the prior written consent of the party or other person originally designating the material as Confidential Information.
- 7. <u>Filing</u>. In filing material with the Court, in pretrial proceedings, counsel will file under seal only those specific documents designated "Confidential." If responses to discovery requests are filed with the Court and have been designated as Confidential Information, counsel will file the responses under seal.
- 8. Objection to Designation of Confidential Information. If any party believes that a document designated or sought to be designated "Confidential" by the Disclosing Party does not warrant that designation, it will first make a good faith effort to resolve such dispute with opposing counsel. In the event that the dispute cannot be resolved within ten (10) business days (unless the parties stipulate to further extension), the party opposing the confidentiality designation may apply to the Court for an order declaring that the document is not confidential. Until such order is entered, the document will be treated as designated by the Disclosing Party.
- 9. <u>No Waiver of Applicable Privileges</u>. This Protective Order does not waive any applicable any common law or statutory attorney-client privilege, work-product immunity, or any other privilege or immunity that would otherwise attach to such information or objections

unrelated to the purported confidential nature of a document that might otherwise be interposed during the course of discovery. Upon the assertion of a claim of privilege or immunity as to information that has already been produced, the party who has received the information shall promptly return it without a further showing from the party asserting the inadvertent production. In appropriate circumstances, however, the inadvertently-producing party will need to describe the materials on a privilege log.

- 10. <u>No Loss of Confidential Designation</u>. No document marked "Confidential" will lose such status under this Order as the result of the use of such document in any hearing, trial, or other Court proceeding in this action, provided that such use is consistent with the terms of this Order.
- 11. <u>Inadvertent Non-Designation</u>. The failure of a party to designate information produced in discovery as Confidential Information at the time of its production shall not preclude that party from later designating the information as Confidential by promptly notifying counsel of record of that designation, provided, however, that the disclosure of such document by any other party prior to such later designation shall not be deemed a violation of this Order. The failure of any party to challenge the designation of information as Confidential Information at the time of its disclosure shall not be deemed a waiver of the right to challenge the propriety of such designation at a later time.
- 12. <u>No Limit on Rendering Legal Advice</u>. Nothing in this Order will prevent or otherwise restrict counsel from rendering advice to their clients and relying generally on examination of stamped Confidential documents; provided, however, that in rendering such advice, counsel will not make specific disclosure of any document designated as "Confidential" except pursuant to the procedures set forth in this Order.
- 13. <u>New Parties</u>. In the event additional individuals or entities become parties to this litigation, they shall not have access to, nor shall any existing party produce to them, any confidential documents until the newly added parties, by counsel, have signed and filed a

9

6

7

11

12

10

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26 ase 2:08-bk-07465-RJH DB04/808783.0002/5735948.4

Filed 04/13/12 Main Document

Entered 04/13/12 13:57:36 Page 26 of 28

Desc

stipulation agreeing to be bound by this Order or until a further order is entered permitting them to have access to such documents.

- 14. Scope of Order. Any non-party to this action who shall be called upon to make discovery or to provide depositions or other testimony shall be entitled to avail itself of the provisions and protections of this Order only with the written consent of the party seeking such discovery and the signing of an agreement to be bound to this Order, and, by doing so, assumes the duties and obligations imposed by this Order.
- 15. Termination of Action. Upon the final determination of this action, whether by trial, appeal, settlement or other disposition as to which all appeals have been exhausted and no further appeals are possible, counsel of record for each party who has received any Confidential Information produced in discovery in this action shall assemble and return to the Disclosing Party such confidential materials, including copies that are in the possession of any Qualified Persons and all copies retained on computer takes, diskettes or other electronic media, within thirty (30) days of the final determination. At the option of the counsel of record for each party that received Confidential Information, the material and information may be destroyed in lieu of returning them to the Disclosing Party as long as counsel of record certify in writing that all such materials and information have been destroyed. In the event that the Receiving Party elects to return confidential material that is subject to the Bankruptcy Protection Order, the Disclosing Party shall destroy the material or information pursuant to the terms of the Bankruptcy Protection Order. The word "destroyed" means the destruction of paper documents and any electronic means of storing such information or material. The parties may retain logs of information that was received and destroyed, including any Bates numbers, for purposes of their law firm's document retention. Notwithstanding the foregoing, (a) materials constituting the work product of counsel of record that contain Confidential Information obtained from any other party, (b) copies of documents filed with the Court under seal, and (c) deposition transcripts and exhibits may be retained by counsel of record so long as the Confidential Information is kept confidential.

1	16. <u>Survival o</u>	of Order. This	Order sha	all survive the final determination of this action
2	and shall remain in full	I force and effe	ct after th	ne conclusion of all proceedings to provide the
3	Court with ancillary jur	isdiction to enf	orce and	to ensure compliance with its terms.
4	DATED this	day of	, 20	12.
5				
6			Ву	/s/
7			:	Honorable Arthur Anderson
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26			8	

Case 2:08-bk-07465-RJH Doc 3497 Filed 04/13/12 Entered 04/13/12 13:57:36 Desc DB04/808783.0002/5735948.4 Main Document Page 27 of 28

Main Document

Page 28 of 28

DB04/808783.0002/5735948.4