

Speaker 0: Yes, thank you all. Mr. Hillary, if you could come back up and resume your seat at the witness. We're back on the record in Docket. F.B.03, 1946-22, Lisa F. Flax vs. Glenn H. Hahn. Mr. Hillary, you're still under oath, and Ms. Berger, you were conducting a cross-examination, you may continue. Thank you, Jim.

Speaker 1: (inaudible) The display is March 30th at 406. (inaudible) A video or a picture?

Speaker 0: Oh, sorry, a video. This is a video, I apologize. This video's date and time is March 30th at 406.

Speaker 1: And that shows how, now, fat cancer of a flax cow, correct? Yes. So it shows green paint on the wall. So again, this is just a portion of the larger video. So far I've showed you, again, the same how, now, fat cancer of a flax cow. Yes. You see the painting on the wall, brother and sister, hair of, by date, of June 6th. Is it the same bit of the March 30th video? It looks to be the same. (inaudible) Again, it says March 30th. Now, on the phone, if you take a photo, it also dates and timestamps it as well, correct? Yes.

Speaker 0: What's the date and time on that one?

Speaker 1: Date and time displayed is March 30th, 1.59 p.m What's depicted in that video?

Speaker 0: Yes.

Speaker 1: What is the date and time on that one? March 30th, 2.07 p.m. And I'm showing you the iPhone mount, so that's paint on the back of the bathroom cabinet. What is the date and time on that? March 30th, 2.05 p.m Okay, so I'm showing you the actual iPhone. It says Mount Laurel, March 30th, 2.05 p.m., correct? Correct. And that's green paint in the sink or the back? Yes.

Speaker 0: Yes, it looks like the printouts are just screenshots.

Speaker 1: Yes. So, in theory, if that date is incorrect, whatever is on that screenshot is going to be printed. So, that's the actual photo, correct? It looks like it, yes. Okay, so that's not a screenshot. That reads, can you tell me what?

Speaker 0: 59, the date and time on that one?

Speaker 1: This is March 30th, 2.05 p.m. And I'm showing you the actual iPhone. What's the date and time on number 60? March 30th, 2.05 p.m Okay, and can you read the date and time on that one? It says March 30th, 2.05 p.m Okay, I'm showing you the actual. Sir, did Mr. Hahn pay you through your appearance here today in court?

Speaker 0: He provided us a retainer.

Speaker 1: How much was the retainer? I object, does that really matter?

Speaker 0: Yes, your objection is sustained. You may answer if you can, sir. I'm sorry, that objection was overruled for the record. How much was it, sir?

Speaker 1: And how much did he actually deposit? That was the check that he... Oh, that was the check. And what is the total amount to be billed? So, he'll still owe you at least another \$900. Approximately. Okay, nothing further, Judge.

Speaker 0: Mr. Hahn, do you have any redirect for your expert? Go ahead, sir.

Speaker 2: So, I didn't get a chance to see them, but you were showing a series of photos and you were showing a series of videos.

Speaker 1: And you were looking at a stamp that Apple added to the file?

Speaker 0: Yes.

Speaker 2: Okay, but it does not... But what you were doing was you were looking inside the file to see what the actual creation date is, or what you referred to as the metadata.

Speaker 0: Yes, so for these additional pictures it would be the same process.

Speaker 2: You had the opportunity to have the same data forensics on the first file, completed, with all the other video snippets of all the other files that were presented. Counselor, you want to...

Speaker 0: Judge. Your position will make my ruling.

Speaker 1: Judge, I'm going to object. First of all, Mr. Hahn has sprung on everyone with his expert. The only way to really do it is to do some forensic analysis, and the only way to really change it is to actually do some kind of time stamp that Mr. Hillary, and no offense to Mr. Hillary, couldn't even testify to. He's a forensic expert. I have a special education teacher. She's not a data analyst or some kind of person who plays with phones or what have you. To display or change the date and the time, that's a credibility determination. Your honor gets to determine the credibility here. But Mr. Hahn wanted to spring upon an expert. I'm allowed to ask what I want on cross-examination. I presented my cross-examination. It's now up to your honor as to whether or not your honor believes what Ms. Flax is saying, or whether or not the court believes what Mr. Hahn is saying. This case has now gone on for four days. Unnecessarily, in my perspective, however, we have given full opportunity for Mr. Hahn to call witnesses, spring an expert on us, and I, while made the objection on the record, your honor overruled that, allowed his expert to testify. This matter needs to conclude.

Speaker 0: Okay, so, sir, let me make my ruling on this. When you were permitted to bring an expert in, you had the ability to subpoena any other devices that you wanted to have included. You went on a disk that was provided to you that was moved into evidence, and this is what

happens during cross-examination. Ms. Berger has brought other evidence in to rebut what you had tried to prove, that the video was created on a later date. These are summary cases. Experts usually don't testify in these type of cases. I'm not going to allow any further adjournments to have. Justice, I will make that determination whether or not I believe that that video was shot on March 30th, the original one, or was it when the compilation was done, was it the next day, as your expert testified. So, I'm not going to grant your request, sir. Okay. Do you have any other questions?

Speaker 1: No, not at this time, no. Okay. It's fine. All right.

Speaker 0: So, Mr. Hillary, just

Speaker 1: to

Speaker 0: wrap things up, and I just want to

Speaker 1: make sure that

Speaker 0: the record's complete, but is it your testimony that with a reasonable degree of professional certainty, based on the evidence that you used in your report, that the DVD that you were provided was created on an Apple iPhone XR on March 31st, 2022 at 8.31 a.m.? ? Yes. Thank you, sir. No more further questions, you're excused. Thanks for your testimony, sir. Thanks for your patience. Mr. Hahn, anything else? Anybody else that you have waiting out there? No other witnesses, but I have wrap-ups and so forth.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Speaker 0: So, this is the point of the trial where you get to give summations. Mr.

Speaker 1: Hahn, you can go first.

Speaker 2: Stand for a little bit, if you don't mind. Thank you. So, you know, here we are once again, you know, back in court over another one of Mrs. Black's things, or little things that she likes to hold up against. Max wants to stay over for the weekend? Well, I can't handle that. I guess I'm going to request a TRO. I left the house early in March. The only one that was in the house was the people that were moving some items out, as well as the guy who was taking care of the cat.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Speaker 2: Now, I, you know, all of a sudden now I'm, you know, with this whole issue, and in her own words, Mrs. Black keeps saying that she's so happy she did this because of Max. And once again, it seems like Max is at the center of this thing, and I know you can't call the municipal witness or anything else, I understand that. But it seems like, you know, Mrs. Black seems to have a hard time that throughout this entire ordeal, I've always maintained a good relationship with my son. If I were to park at the 20th mile marker to Great Adventure, instead of

parking towards the entrance, then technically speaking, I would have been over the two-tenths of a mile, and I wouldn't have ended up in Fatherhood Connection.

Speaker 1: But throughout the entire time, what happened?

Speaker 2: Max wanted to see me, because Max knows. I have been dealing with severe maliciousness, not just from Mrs.

Speaker 1: Black, but from her entire family. Her brother damages the car.

Speaker 2: Her brother-in-law threatened me numerous times with bodily injury over the time I went to pick Max and Morgan up to go to the mall. Her sister openly disparages me to Morgan, saying that your father's a liar, and your father does this, your father does that, and so forth. All this stuff I've been dealing with.

Speaker 1: I got Mrs.

Speaker 2: Black, who loves to call up the police on me, okay?

Speaker 0: Sir, what are you doing?

Speaker 2: I'm playing an example of. she says that I'm screaming and yelling at Morgan.

Speaker 1: Hold on, hold on.

Speaker 0: This isn't the time for entry. Okay, okay, fine. This is the summations.

Speaker 1: Okay, fine. That's fine.

Speaker 2: In regards to the real estate agent that came into the house, Mr. Kofsky, I told him, yes, you can put a sign out in front of the house. There was no problem with that. I warned him about the induction charges, which the court didn't want to hear me about, and that whole thing.

Speaker 1: I even said to him in the beginning, "Listen, over that door, if I would replace the door, I'd get a \$650 door at Home Depot.". And he said there was no problem with that.

Speaker 2: He can do that as an exclusion. And what happened? They turned around and they twisted in a way that I was taking the door and never replacing the door, and that's the way it got introduced in court. These are the things that I have been dealing with from day one.

Speaker 1: I have been spied upon through Preda Karma. She has been accessing my emails and so forth through that iPad that I was desperately trying to get back all this time. When I turned on that iPad for the first time in the lawyer's office, it had access and showed access to all my emails.

Speaker 2: And she was able to send and receive emails through that account on the G H H A N N account case.net account. She had time and she had the motivation to do it. Half these emails that I don't recognize, I'm telling you, are ones that she sent through that particular device.

Speaker 1: When I eventually found out about it in March, because I wasn't aware of any of this that's going on, I turned off through AT&T the iPad.

Speaker 2: And do you know what happened in March? AT&T got a call from someone pretending to be Miss Flex who was trying to turn the iPad back on.

Speaker 1: I have that here as well, but I don't know, it's hearsay at the moment.

Speaker 2: So I have been dealing with nothing, with everything, and the only thing that I have been trying to do is straighten out the childcare issue because she's been getting three times the amount of money that she's supposed to be getting per month.

Speaker 1: That's coming out as direct payments out of my benefits from Social Security.

Speaker 2: That's all I've been trying to do is to get that fixed, and I can never get that fixed. Spend more time with my son. Right?

Speaker 1: I can't do that. Take him on a vacation to Disney World.

Speaker 2: I can't do that. That's all I've been trying to do this whole time is to get some reasonableness back into this divorce. Okay, I'm used to the term "scorched earth". I'm sorry that it offends anyone.

Speaker 1: I really truly am. If I would have known that it was a big issue, I would not use it, but it's just natural based on what I used to do.

Speaker 2: It's a term that's a natural expression to me for what I used to do.

Speaker 1: Now, and once again, I'm sorry about all that, but this is what I feel that's really been happening to me throughout this entire case.

Speaker 2: Max wants to stay with me. TRO. Max wants to spend some time with me. No, that can't happen. I get stuck in a snowstorm. I can't take him back right away.

Speaker 1: She's texting Max going, "He's got to bring you home right now."

Speaker 2: Driving in the snow?

Speaker 0: You didn't want me to drive 20 miles and now it's okay to drive in the snow?

Speaker 2: I have been dealing with all these particular issues. And once again, you know, she said, direct the correspondence, direct, asking her, "What's going on with the attic?". She said, "No, nothing, nothing, nothing.". Well, that day on March 30th, they emptied out the attic.

Speaker 1: She couldn't say that at the time, but she kept saying at the time that the first time she was in the house was March 31st, not March 30th.

Speaker 2: March 30th never came up until after, well, she kept saying that. March 31st came up with the video.

Speaker 1: But she kept saying, "Oh no, she knew nothing about the attic or this or that.".

Speaker 2: Where I got messages saying, "Hey, guess what? I found my Skylanders."

Speaker 1: They were in the attic on March 30th."

Speaker 2: On March 30th, I'm getting messages that I didn't even prompt. Out of the blue, I'm getting a message saying, "Mom's making us clean out the old house tonight." Meaning, March 30th.

Speaker 1: According to her, she wasn't in the house March 30th, but now she was. Under cross-examination, I asked her, "What happened to the cameras?".

Speaker 2: Do you remember me asking her that, Your Honor? I asked her, "What happened to the cameras?" And she said, "Well, her family's been in the house earlier that day removing the cameras and so forth.".

Speaker 1: Well, fine. Right? So they had ample opportunity to do this.

Speaker 2: This is not all of a sudden, I'm saying to you, "Oh, you know, her family hates me, blah, blah, blah.".

Speaker 1: This is true.

Speaker 2: Hate on their part.

Speaker 1: This has been going on years and years of the marriage. That's why I never really liked going over to their house.

Speaker 2: I would stay back. I'm not stopping her taking the kids

Speaker 1: to go there, but I wouldn't go there

Speaker 2: because

Speaker 0: of the relationship.

Speaker 2: My 50th birthday party, I was called all sorts of names that night on my 50th birthday party. I actually, you know, I just went in the other room and just secluded myself.

Speaker 1: That's how sad it was.

Speaker 2: And you know something? The kids joined me because they realized how sad it was, too, of the insults that were being flown back and forth by her family against me. And at some point, Your Honor, when Max is 18, he'll be able to testify on all this, and he's going to come back in a year and a half, and that's her biggest concern. You know something? Her biggest concern is she's afraid that she's losing her relationship with her son.

Speaker 1: And she is.

Speaker 2: She really, really is. He gets dropped off. He gets interrogated. Once again, on all these actions and the silliness. Listen, I'm sorry that this was done and this happened to her. I truly am. I'm truly sorry that they would do all this, despite me, in this process. And that's basically what they're doing. They're trying to break down the relationship I had with my children, and more importantly, the relationship that I had with my son, Max.

Speaker 1: And this is what they like.

Speaker 2: I didn't do any of this stuff.

Speaker 1: Like I said, I can't walk up steps.

Speaker 2: I haven't been able to walk up steps in months. And yes, Miss Berger, I basically put my head over a laundry sink in order to wash my hair occasionally. And that's about it. I can't take showers. I can't go up steps. I can't move these things. I can't spray down this bottle. My body just can't do this anymore.

Speaker 1: And it's not something that happened over three, three and a half years ago, but gradually, over time, these things happen.

Speaker 2: My medication has changed because of all this. You think I like living this? Why, I don't. It saddens me that I really can't walk anymore. I can barely walk. And, you know, a lot of it's because I was induced in hypothermia. Well, you know, believe it or not, Your Honor, but that's just, you know, the way it is. And, you know, that's what I've been dealing with. You know something? If I've been, like I said, spinal credit karma, she's been accessing all my data through the iCloud, she was reading my personal confidential emails and sending emails through my iPad, all this stuff she's been doing. All this stuff. And you might hear, she is not telling the truth on a predicate video. Can I have a restraining order against that? I wasn't even thinking about even asking for that. I just want to move on with my life.

Speaker 1: That's all. You know?

Speaker 2: But there are times where I can say, well, she committed perjury during this trial.

Speaker 1: Am I going to the court saying, hey, I want her confined for perjury?

Speaker 2: No. Do you know something?

Speaker 1: I don't.

Speaker 2: I'm not looking for any of that. I'm not looking for the vendetta recourse that she's looking for against me. I just want to have my life go on. I want to have my relationship with my son. I want to be able to see my son. And I would love to get the child thing straightened out, which I'm going back to court, I guess it's Friday. So when she read the thing about the court saying, yeah, we're getting a new judge. Yeah, I knew we were getting a new judge. I wasn't taunting or anything else like that. I knew that we were getting assigned to Judge Hoffman for that. And yes, I did report you to state and federal. And that's still an open debate. And you know how I feel about that. I really didn't like the fact that you said that you believe 100% of what she says. So I feel, what's the effort here for me at this point? I don't.

Speaker 1: I have no effort here.

Speaker 2: I have no vendetta here against her.

Speaker 1: Not at all. I was surprised about this more than anyone else. I really thought that when I saw this thing, I really thought, you know, was it someone who took a TV set from the house or something like that?

Speaker 2: I didn't know until I started getting more and more deep into what was actually said. And I saw the file and things like that. I had no clue until I actually saw the stuff to what was going on. And then the thing started piecing together. The video started piecing together. The thing that she had the iPad started piecing together with these emails I have no recollection of. You know, listen, I'm under oath to tell the truth. If I lied here, I'd ruin whatever future security clearances I have.

Speaker 1: Okay?

Speaker 2: For anything. And that, you know, I would never put it into risk. I have more and more data, but like you said, it's hearsay.

Speaker 1: It's absolutely hearsay.

Speaker 2: But, you know, they rely on this.

Speaker 1: Do you know what parental alienation is?

Speaker 2: How one parent plots and schemes to keep their children away from another parent?

Speaker 1: Or malicious mother syndrome?

Speaker 2: I mean, I forward you guys to use articles and so forth where they take one little piece of thing and they turn it around and they twist it and they bend it to make it look like I'm the worst creature imaginable on the face of the planet. Well, I apologize on the term scorcher.

Speaker 1: I own that.

Speaker 2: I'm sorry about that. I'll never use that again. I'll never use that term ever again. Okay?

Speaker 1: In anything. You know?

Speaker 2: But, listen, you know, the sad thing is sometimes I feel that she's actually doing more harm than good. Because Max turns 18 in a year and a half from now. He leaves her house. He comes with me. And quite frankly, he's at a point now where he doesn't want to have anything to do with her. And you want to know something that's sad. That is really, really, really, really sad. Because I know what it's like to have one parent turn their kids away from another parent. And I wouldn't wish that against anyone. So this is why I keep pushing, is Max going back into therapy? What are we doing about Max and his therapy? I don't want to see that relationship break with a child against a mother. As what she's doing to me and what she did do to me with the kids. I don't want that. You know, a mother and a father should have time with their kids. And so forth. You know, she blames me for every ill-win that she's been experiencing in her life.

Speaker 1: And it's simply not the case.

Speaker 2: It really is simply not the case.

Speaker 1: So fine, I know you. You're going to want to sign that order. You're going to want to enforce this thing.

Speaker 2: And you know at the end of the day, you know what's going to happen? Max comes with me when he's 18.

Speaker 1: Right?

Speaker 2: You know when Max gets married?

Speaker 1: Right?

Speaker 2: He's not going to have a relationship with his mother. His mother won't even be allowed to come to the wedding because this order is in place. So any short-term thing, and quite frankly, I have really nothing further to say in regards to any of this stuff.

Speaker 1: Like I said, I just really want to get my childcare expenses things straightened out.

Speaker 2: Because that is a direct cash that's reduced out of my monthly Social Security disability model.

Speaker 1: Right?

Speaker 2: And you know, I live with my dad. I've been living with my dad for months over in Richboro and so forth. But like I said, I'm truly sorry that we're all going through this whole mess. It shouldn't be. Right? It shouldn't be. Parents get divorced.

Speaker 0: They split time with their kids.

Speaker 2: People move on with their lives. This shouldn't be the way this is.

Speaker 0: It's too damn competitive. Right?

Speaker 1: Every time I turn around, she's accusing me of something else. But, you know, it's just ridiculous.

Speaker 2: Like I said, the only thing that I've been looking for from day one, and you know this, is I'm looking for a fix on the childcare.

Speaker 1: I'm looking for more time with my son Max.

Speaker 2: You know, my son Max, last night, wished me luck today. Because he knows that if I prevail, it means I get to spend more time with him.

Speaker 1: That's all he wants.

Speaker 2: And she's very happy to separate that and break that bond between me and Max because it irritates her. It irritates her that I have a relationship with my son, which quite frankly, she's losing every single day. And like I said, I'm sorry. And like I said in the beginning, I don't have that much money. But if there was cost associated with this thing, in regards to the damages that were done to the house, I would pay for them. My dad would give me the money to pay for these damages and so forth.

Speaker 1: You know?

Speaker 2: And like I said, I'm not bitter. You may think I'm bitter.

Speaker 1: I'm really not. I just want to move on with my life. That's all.

Speaker 2: That's all I really want to do. Just move on with my life and have some sort of relationship with my son. He's dying for me to take him to Disney World and I can't. And like I said, these are just the games that she's been playing. Like I said, ever since Max called me up

and said he would like to spend the weekend with me. And I sent her an email at the time and I said, "Listen, Max wants to spend the weekend with me. I already have his food, gluten-free, converted the whole kitchen over for gluten...".

Speaker 1: I gotta sit down.

Speaker 2: I only converted over the whole kitchen to gluten-free. Mr.

Speaker 0: Don, I understand all about you wanting a relationship with Max. That's not for this court. That's for the court you're going to be in on Friday, the FM docket. I understand that that's what you want to relay, but it's not relevant to this matter before me. This is domestic violence that has been alleged against you by Ms. Flax. And your defense is she's doing this over your affection for Max.

Speaker 1: And I physically cannot do the stuff that she's claiming.

Speaker 0: I have all that, sir, and I let you go on for quite a while and you repeated yourself. I understand, but I just want to tell you this is not the court regarding parenting time, custody, and child support. That will be decided under the court that you're going to on Friday with Judge Hoffman. This is the domestic violence.

Speaker 2: And like I said, just to finalize it, these are stuff that I did not do, and this is stuff I physically cannot do.

Speaker 0: Okay. Is that all, sir? Yeah, that's it.

Speaker 2: I mean, what else can I say? Just find me guilty and we'll get on with this.

Speaker 0: Alright, Ms. Berger.

Speaker 1: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, we're required under the Domestic Violence Act to prove, one, that we have a domestic violence relationship that's easily fit here. The parties were married. Then we have number two prong. What is the predicate act of domestic violence? Well, Judge, I mean, there is a whole act of domestic violence that went on here. And I really -- we have the predicate act of harassment. I don't understand how much more harassment you could possibly give. And I've painstakingly -- and we're going to get into the second prong of silver, which is the prior history. I have painstakingly gone through it because the level of domestic violence in this case is just inescapable. There is a relationship that went on prior to 2018 that Ms. Flex testified to, Your Honor. I have presented from 2018 getting a restraining order, all of the evidence that had gone on, his e-mails, his text messages, all relating to the same topics, which he wouldn't testify -- he wouldn't say he said, but then kind of said, but then didn't say. He was not sure if he said, maybe he said, "Where am I going with it?". They're all the same topics -- children, DCP, threats to her, you know, "I'm going to do this to you. I'm going to do that to you.". All through 2018, she gets a restraining order. She had been with him for years. It took a lot of strength for her to even make that first move.

They ultimately resolve into an order for civil restraint. It puts certain restrictions in there. He has repeatedly, repeatedly violated it. And I have to say, I painstakingly did that history because Your Honor needs to understand the level -- we have now just escalated into the most recent act. Through 2019, threats, comments -- Ms. Flax does not immediately go and file a TRO. Repetitive violations of the order for civil restraint was told in July of 2019. He had violated the restraining order -- or the order for civil restraint. He didn't care. He just kept on going. 2020, more threats, more comments on Our Family Wizard. "Oh, they weren't me. Who was it?". Apparently, somebody is impersonating Mr. Hahn on every level, in every way possible. "Maybe it was me. Maybe it wasn't me. Maybe I couldn't type that, so I dictated it to them.". "They're your words.". "Well, that wasn't my intent.". "Well, you wrote them.". "So, whatever your intent was, sir, you're the one who wrote them.". Throughout 2020, I read you literally trying to extort her. "Give me a check for \$10,000. I'm going to call the prosecutor's office. You're going to prison.". Again, 2020, did not run to the police and file another restraining order. When absolutely hands down, not only is that an order for civil restraint violation, but repetitive harassment. 2021, it still doesn't stop. In the summer of 2021, she finds out about her cancer. And what is his response? "Glad to hear it. Fantastic news.". We then move into November. "Well, maybe you're not even going to make it to January 7th.". Repetitive threats and comments, just endless harassment of Ms. Flax. And then we move to the height of where we came to this predicate act. Your Honor rules in January that this house needs to be sold. He's admitted he doesn't like Ms. Flax, then he tried to say that he didn't. Well, maybe he does like her, he doesn't hate her, but then he does hate her. Whatever one it is. We know he wasn't happy because he sent her our family wizard messages. "Well, maybe I'll file an appeal. I called the Ombudsman. He told me I can do this.". "Whatever. You're right. Do whatever you want.". He wasn't happy about it. He files his motion for reconsideration. It's denied. We know he's angry about it. He claims he didn't know about the contract for sale, but then admits he did know about it when we're talking about the emails for March 24th. And then let's look at what the content of the emails are for March 24th. Which is when the house was supposed to be inspected to get this house sold. A house that should have been gone away with years ago. He says, and I can quote some of them, "Scorch Earth,", that's before 25pm email, in fact in that particular one, he also says there's nothing in the law that prevents him from saying he's glad she's going to be dying of cancer. What other intent do you have than to say to some woman who has a reoccurrence of cancer, and you know who's undergoing chemotherapy, surgery, to simply be here to care for three children who desperately need her? How much sicker do you need to be? He just keeps talking about her death. He's talking about her death. He just won't let it go. I don't know what other conclusion we're getting to other than he wants her to die. It's not that hard. He's saying it in his own emails. He admits he sent those emails. Interestingly, they come from the same email address, ghhan@comcast.net, which is the same one from 2018. Well maybe he did those emails, maybe he didn't do those emails, again when he was threatening her back then. They're the same exact email address. He knows the only way to access the house is through the Internet that he has control over. He put the locks on the Internet. She couldn't get

into the house to get them in there to inspect it under your honor's order to get this house sold. We then move to some of the other emails he continues to send, telling me to F myself, miss flax to F herself, the scorched earth. That is a threat judge. What other person is using that, unless you're, basically what that means is, and this is what miss flax has testified to your honor, there's nothing left. I'm just going to continue to do what I need to do to get to what I need to do here. That is a threat. There's no bounds, nothing he needs to listen to. I'm sure he is sorry now because it all goes back into the same argument. He did it. They're his words. No one else is using scorched earth around here other than Mr. Hahn. And he seems to have dug himself in a hole, quite literally with the August, or the April 6th time capsule, but by using that language. Because it's the same language that appears on the wall. Who else is using that? He then is telling me it's not his issue, he has no inclination to help, because he knows he's the only one that can help get us into the house to get the house sold. Looming, dangling, carrying. Then he tells me he's coming to the house that Saturday. So he puts himself in the house. So that would have been, so that's exhibit 8. Friday the 25th, he says I'm coming to the house at 1243 AM. Okay, he's going to the house, so we know he was in the house. He can keep claiming he's not in the house, but he was. Through that weekend, he's sending threatening messages to Ms. Flax again through our family wizard, talking about her dying again, no one's going to put stones on her marker, which is in the Jewish religion, a big deal. That is a reflection of him constantly talking about her death. He wants her dead. What other interpretation are we taking from that? How many more times does he need to threaten her? We then get to the 30th. Ms. Flax testified that there were multiple videos. She took then one whole video because it was multiple videos. We had the expert come in here, let's look at what the internal data says, and then the first, what does he call it, the first step data, whatever, file system data. So the internal data is what's on the actual phone, internally on the phone, and then the file system data is what would be on the DVD when you're looking at the properties to see when it was made. Well, I'm giving you both, here's both iPhones, here's the iPhone. Here's the actual iPhone with little snippets of videos from the 30th. It wasn't the full video, like Ms. Flax said, it was pieces of the video, but matched the same things. There is grey paint in the laundry room downstairs, all over the door, all over the cabinets, scorched earth. Mr. Hund has now told us, I mean, Judge, I bring, he testified to your honor, just last time we were in the court, here's the can that was used, but apparently now that's not the can. He testified, here's the can that was used, but I can't open it. It's literally like the bank robber bringing the gun to court and saying, "I couldn't pull the trigger." He literally brought it to court and said, "I can't open it." And he has his hand on it like this, "I can't open it." Except the funny thing is, he was doing even during his closing, opening his Pepsi bottles like nobody's business. Opening up the water bottle like nobody's business. So you're telling me you couldn't pop off a cap. I couldn't pop off a cap, but I can certainly turn that cap to get my soda, we watched him open medication bottles, none of it makes any sense. Why doesn't it make any sense? Because he's lying. The same language he used in the email is on the wall, scorched earth. We then move into the damage upstairs. I had the expert go through that, here's the iPhones again, here's the videos,

here's the property showing again. March 30th, there's snippets, again Ms. Flack said I did one whole video which would have been on the 31st. March 30th, I took all snippets so it wasn't one whole video of all the damage. Again, green paint, there is green paint all upstairs. Mr. Hahn admits the green paint was his, he bought it for a project a year ago. Wasn't him, Tom did it. Tom, whom he doesn't know the last name, he's not sure who he is, didn't bring him here today. But Tom did it. Because he couldn't get upstairs. Judge, that literally makes no sense. He has lived in this house for three and a half years. So to suggest he hasn't taken a shower in all that time, literally makes no sense. And what are the comments that are on there? So you mean to tell me Tom has a major vendetta against Ms. Flacks because the comments upstairs were how now fat, flax, cancer, cow. So Tom really has it in for Ms. Flacks and apparently Tom has it in for her sister and brother as well. There are a pair of F's in something but we can't even, it's indecipherable at the bottom. So this Tom guy really has it in for people he doesn't even know. He didn't say they have any relationship to Ms. Flacks or to the brother and sister. Except what we do know is Mr. Hahn not only admits it that he does not like Ms. Flacks or her brother or her sister or her entire family. But going back to 2018, tying all this in, there are emails, there are texts, all saying talking about the family, don't like the family, don't want them around your family. Going back in his own words. Again, who has the motive here judge? He's angry, he doesn't like Ms. Flacks, he's constantly talking about her dying, in fact happy about her dying. It makes literally no sense that he did not do this damage to the house. Ms. Flacks, to let her know, I'm going to let you know Ms. Flacks exactly where we're going with this. This is my scorched earth, I have nothing left to lose now, do I? Nothing left to lose. Pain on the doors, his own pain, pain he admits. I forgot the one part which was downstairs, apparently the movers are the one who did the grey paint downstairs. Apparently the movers must have seen his divorce paperwork. He actually showed them the divorce paperwork and they somehow used the word scorched earth. Except the scorched earth was in his emails to me so they must have also looked in his computer from March 24th. That's how unbelievable that story is. We then move forward. And what even gets more disturbing to me is we're in court on April 6th of this year before Judge Morley. No one knew anything about where her photo albums have been, where her photos have been. We know that he left a bag of her jewelry sitting in feces on a table, which he now claims was his mother's. Although I'm not sure why he would put his mother's jewelry in dirt. But he claims that it was his mother's jewelry, he didn't leave it there from his home except he admits on April 6th on the audio that we heard ourselves. I left it there for her. He admits on April 6th, "Judge, I need to get back in. I got a time capsule. I got a time capsule there.". Well, Judge, when we say time capsule, the entire point of a time capsule, which he admits, is to be able to look at those memories at some point in the future. So you want to make sure they're in some kind of secure, boxed, protected items so that you can actually look at them in the future. That's the entire point of it. Except he admits it was in a plastic bin just like he has sitting next to him. Exactly what we saw in the video. The only way that Ms. Flax even knew it was there, and he admits it on the April 6th, 2022 tape that this court heard, is that he says he has a time capsule in the backyard. He claims that's where the jewelry was, he still has it there, and there's

still stuff in it. So he wants to be able to go there to go get it. So then we see Scott Kurtz came in here and testified. There was a video of it. He went back there to find what was in this backyard, and we saw the date of the video is April 6th. So after court, he goes to dig it up because Ms. Flax is not in the condition to be able to do that. And what do we find? Just a mix of just destroyed photographs that Ms. Flax can identify as being Bailie's baby book, her grandparents' old photos, and some of them you can't even see. Photos that she's been waiting to get back for years. He's going to let her know, "I'm going to bury you." "What other symbolization do you need than to see him bury her in the backyard in a home that was dug out perfectly?". And he admits he did it. No one would have even known he had done this had he not said it in court. Why would anybody even think of this? Mr. Hahn would. He's going to let her know exactly what he's going to do to her. Judge, to suggest that Ms. Flax does not need a restraining order from Mr. Hahn for a last prong of silver, he is a danger. He is a loose cannon who takes no responsibility for anything he has done. He has been all over the place in terms of his testimony. Nothing he says is the least bit credible. And yet, I have a woman who has been harassed and threatened repetitively. And now we're down to "I want you to die." And let me show you the buried pictures in the backyard. What other symbolization is that? Your Honor, in this case, we have a lot of cases that come into this court. I'm not sure how we don't have an absolute unbelievable history as well as a predicate act that requires and desperately needs protection from Ms. Flax. And I'm going to ask that you enter that final restraining order. And if Your Honor is to grain it, I'm going to ask for some other conditions upon it as well.

Speaker 0: Thank you, Ms. Bergeron.

Speaker 1: Just some housekeeping. The exhibits that you might mark, are we introducing these or are we not just marking them? Judge, I'm going to introduce the videos. I'm not going to be able to. I would suggest I'm going to enter in 56 through 61 and also exhibit. 56 through 61 is fine, Judge.

Speaker 0: Mr. Hahn, any objection to 56 through 61?

Speaker 1: Well, if the objection is high, you may not get a chance to see or examine them, Your Honor. Your Honor, I have provided a copy to both Your Honor as well as Mr.

Speaker 0: Bergeron. Thank you, Judge. Mr. Hahn, what about your report?

Speaker 2: I would like to have that moved into this.

Speaker 1: No, Your Honor.

Speaker 0: Well, Mark, this is D1. Ms. Bergeron, with regard to criminal mischief, what's the proposed damages that you're seeking?

Speaker 1: Judge, I have to look back at it because I actually just did this as part of the civil part of this to see how much it was. There is the locksmith.

Speaker 0: And you don't have to worry about that at this point.

Speaker 1: Again, there are damages to it because I just attached them to actually her cross motion, which was there's the locksmith, there's paint, and there was something else. I have to look at it, Judge.

Speaker 0: After five days, I was here for four of them, Judge Morley was here for one of them. Five days, these are summary cases that were supposed to be resolved within ten days. Maybe twenty, thirty days. This is too much. We didn't get a full day, one of the days, but this case has been going on so long, and I have given everyone the opportunity to present their evidence and their case, and this is my decision. It's pursuant to Rule of the New Jersey Rules of Evidence, 1 colon 7 dash 4A. The first thing I need to determine is whether or not there is jurisdiction, and under the Prevention of Domestic Violence Act, there is no question that you were married, you have three children, you're divorced, you lived together for many years. Jurisdiction, the threshold issue has been satisfied, so that's not an issue. The next part is pursuant to a case, Silver v. Silver, 387 NJ Super 112, Appellate Division 2006. In the silver case, I must determine if the plaintiff has proved by a preponderance of the credible evidence the predicate acts. In this case, and you don't have to comment, sir, just please, you don't have to say, uh-huh, this is my decision. Pursuant to the temporary restraining order as amended, there are two predicate acts, the first is harassment, New Jersey Statute's annotated, 2C colon 33 dash 4A, provides as follows. A person commits a petty, disorderly person's offense if, with purpose to harass another, he, under subsection A, makes or causes to be made a communication or communications anonymously, or at extremely inconvenient hours, or in offensively coarse language, or in any other manner likely to cause annoyance or alarm. And there's a relevant case on harassment, it's called State v. Hoffman, it's 149 NJ 564, 1997, and in the Hoffman case, the purpose to harass is very important in the harassment statute. And what that means, basically, is if someone annoys you, that means to disturb, irritate, or bother you, and as part of that analysis, I must scrutinize the totality of the circumstances as well. So, in this case, I do find that the plaintiff has proven, by a preponderance of credible evidence, that Mr. Hahn did engage in the act of harassment. And I find this because of credibility findings, predominantly, I do find Ms. Flax to be credible. I observed her for all of these days of trial, and she's been here with her family, she had a good recollection of what transpired, she did not embellish at all, she was believable, and most importantly, I observed you

Speaker 1: testifying,

Speaker 0: I observed your expressions, your body language, that you're a very credible witness, and we believe that when you went into the home, and you saw the damage

Speaker 1: that has been

Speaker 0: moved into evidence,

Speaker 1: and

Speaker 0: that damage started

Speaker 1: on P12,

Speaker 0: which was the bathroom wall, the term scorched earth,

Speaker 1: then there

Speaker 0: was

Speaker 2: P16,

Speaker 0: spray painting to the bathroom cabinets, and this is gray paint. P18, the door on the bathroom, all painted with spray paint, and it is important to note that Mr. Hahn brought in a spray paint can, a gray can, and did tell the court that that was the can that was in the bathroom.

Speaker 1: Excuse me, Your Honor, no, I never said that.

Speaker 0: Sir, do not interrupt me, I heard what I heard, and I wrote it down, and you did say this during the last time you appeared. I purchased that can from Amazon recently, Your Honor, and I'm going to have to show you. I'm going by what you said, sir, okay, and that's what I recorded and wrote, that that was the can that was in the bathroom, and you showed it to the court saying you can't open it up, but it was gray, and that's the paint, don't interrupt me, please, that was the paint that was on

Speaker 1: the bathroom,

Speaker 0: the laundry

Speaker 1: room floor.

Speaker 0: You say scorched earth was written in black, I think it was written in gray. I say that the cabinets were gray, and that's the spray paint can that you brought in, and also the door, gray. So, I do find that with those pictures that you did that, and then also with regard to the second floor, there were paint, green paint on the bathroom door on P-13, then the P-14, how now, fat cancer, flax cow in green. Our brothers and sisters are a pair of, pair of fucking mess something P-15, and testimony was that you had this green paint, you were using it with Max.

Speaker 1: That is correct.

Speaker 0: So, I do find that your testimony, Ms. Flax, was credible, and I do believe you that this is the condition in the home, that that

video that you shot may have been compiled and followed the next day, but you had videos during that first day when you came into the home. And I also find that the garage door was cut, and there was a bag of what looked like some type of jewelry on the kitchen table. There was this time capsule that was out in the back part of the home, it was a plastic container, and over the hole to where that container was located was a cover, and what Mr. Kirk testified to was that in that hole there were these pictures that were ruined, and that was what was put into evidence as, I believe, P-55? P-55. The other thing I have to assess is your credibility, Mr. Hahn, and I don't find you to be credible, sir. I observed you for all of these days, and I don't find your testimony to be of that someone telling the truth. Your reasoning was unreasonable, you were not logical, your behavior was erratic, and generally your body expression in front of me, as you testified, was somebody that was just not telling the truth. In the context of what had happened in this home, that you couldn't go up to the second floor because you couldn't take a shower over six months, I don't believe it. I believe that you did go up on the second floor, and you're the only one with the knowledge about Ms. Flax's cancer, about her brother and sister. You were angry, you testified to that. All of the things that had been going on with the other litigation, the FM about compelling you to sell that home, the motion that you filed that was not granted, that was P-1, and P-3 was the motion for reconsideration that was denied. You were mad. You were mad that you had to get out of that home, and that anger spilled over to what happened during this day when Ms. Flax came into the home and saw all of these things that happened in the home. So, with regard to harassment, I do find by preponderance of credible evidence that you did prove that Ms.

Speaker 1: Flax.

Speaker 0: The next predicate act is criminal mischief. I do find that the damages that were caused were caused by Mr. Hahn, and I do find that that criminal mischief predicate act has been proven by a preponderance of the credible evidence. And I want to, as we move along here, to get an application for how much it cost to repair that damage for the locksmith, for the garage door, anything that was incurred as a result of these acts which I find Mr. Hahn committed. I don't find it to be credible, Mr. Hahn, that some guy, Tom, rented from you from Craigslist, and that you told Tom about your problems with Ms. Flax, and your former brother-in-law and sister-in-law, Snap Walker, would do this. I don't find that the movers would do this. Why? Why would they do this? It's not reasonable. It doesn't fall in any type of context of logic. And for you to suggest that Ms. Flax, after going through all of these problems with her health, would want to come back and have four days of trial because she made this up against you, that's absolutely unreasonable and not believable. I'm not to the criminal mischief. I find that that has been proven as well by a preponderance of the credible evidence. I find the testimony of Mr. Kurtz to be credible. He testified about the time capsule and what he uncovered when he went into the backyard, and that was as a result of the April 6th court hearing before Judge Morley. I believe that was P-64. Yes, Your Honor. P-64. Thank you. And within that audio, you said you knew who did it, that they were going to pay severely and she would have restitution. That didn't play out to be what happened.

Speaker 2: I thought I actually received an email from Mr. Rose that I could read to you, but it didn't matter. Sir, nobody did this but you.

Speaker 1: I did not do this, Your Honor.

Speaker 0: Sir, you did this, okay? You did this to Ms. Flax because of your anger. There's nobody else that would reasonably have done this, no phantom tom that rented from you, no movers, no catwalkers. There's nobody that was presented as a witness by you that would even suggest that somebody else did this. There's no way you didn't take a shower for three or four months or six months. You were washing your hair. No, sir, it's not reasonable. You went upstairs to the bathroom before you left. You did this. You spray-painted the medicine cabinet. You spray-painted the walls.

Speaker 1: This was all of your own doing.

Speaker 0: I, uh... You don't have to say anything, okay? Okay, I'm just going to appeal this.

Speaker 1: I'm going to appeal this.

Speaker 0: I want you to understand that you have 45 days to appeal me and I want you to think about that, okay? Yes, I will. That's one of the things I must tell you, but I want to make it very clear on this record that I observed you and I observed Ms. Flax. Stories don't line up. And with regard to the prior history, there's no doubt that in the past, in 2018, and that was a TRO that was entered into evidence as P47 under Docket FB 03900-19, and was amended by TRO P48 that there were a lot of allegations of prior domestic violence. And in that TRO as amended, it was resolved by way of a consent order with civil restraints, which was moved into evidence as P49. It's clear in P49 that you're only supposed to communicate on a family wizard regarding the children, but that didn't happen. There was multiple violations by you, and I understand. During your testimony you said, "Well, Ms. Flax did that.". She also spoke about other things, but the material and predominant things that were said by you had nothing to do with the children. And more importantly, there was an email, I believe it was an email, or not an email, our family wizard, about you wanting to get money from Ms. Flax so you can resolve this whole thing. And you wanted a \$10,000 check from Ms. Flax to make it all go away.

Speaker 1: My deferred compensation, which still to this day I haven't received. Certainly.

Speaker 0: It's nothing but pure harassment. That's an incredible history of domestic violence in the past. And, like I said, there's no doubt in my mind, pursuant to the second prong of silver, that a final restraining order is necessary to protect Ms. Flax from immediate harm or further acts of domestic violence. And that is based upon the totality of the past in relation to the future, or the current, I should say, of what happened on March 30th. So let me make sure I covered the rest. I do find your witness to be credible, Mr. Hillary. He was only

given one thing to analyze, and I believe that what he analyzed says it was created on March 31st. That could be true. But what Ms. Berger cross-dissaminated him on. with regard to the compilation of the other videos that were made on the 30th, there's no doubt that those graffiti marks on the walls were there when she entered the home. And also, going back to the past, P45, this GoFundMe page where you're laying in the bed and Ms. Flax is sleeping and this picture is taken, and it's you trying to get money to fund your lifestyle, you're suggesting that Sue did it next door? Sue never came here. I don't believe that. I don't believe it. And what I say in this court is what I determine. I'm the judge, Mr. Hahn, and my findings are what's relevant here. You're saying that's fine? No, this is what I find, and this is what matters. I'm the finder of fact, and these are my conclusions of law. I'm entering an FRO against you, Mr. Hahn. Mr. Hahn, do you have any weapons?

Speaker 2: No.

Speaker 0: The other evidence was P46, a GPS trackerson by Speed Tech. It says GSM Mobile.

Speaker 1: I believe you were tracking, Ms.

Speaker 0: Hahn. You say no, it was never used. It was for an R2D2 robot.

Speaker 1: No evidence about that.

Speaker 0: Flax about the trackings. And generally, there's no doubt there's a credible history of domestic violence, and the most important thing was these threats about Ms. Hahn dying from cancer. That is totally uncalled for. Offensive harassing, to say that to your ex-wife in light of what has happened to her, the mother of your children, is nothing more than that could be what the purpose to harass. So, I do find also that that's part of the history, what led up to this, your anger, your rage. You just couldn't stand it. You had to lash out, and you did it, and that's what you did. You spray-painted, you graffitied, you ruined this home, and I want to just put into the record what Ms. Flax's testimony was when she entered the home on March 30th. She said that it was like a horror movie. She said that the term scorched earth, which was used in many of our family wizard communications, as she knew it, was a military terroristic term to destroy everything. She said that there was furniture removed, litter boxes, molded dishes, and popcorn. There was a baggie with jewelry in it, and it looked like cat feces in it. Like I said, the garage wires were cut, and she also said that when Mr. Kurtz took those pictures out of the time capsule, which wasn't sealed, that you were afraid and sad, and that you had ruined memories. And that is nothing more than somebody trying to type of time capsule left in mud. They were taken out of the container, thrown into the hole, and of course rain comes and destroys those pictures, so Ms. Flax also credibly testified that she fears for her safety due to what's gone on here. And that she fears that Mr. Hahn may hurt her, and she feels it was alarming, that it was alarming communications about Mr. Hahn referencing her death. And because of all of these findings and conclusions of law, I did find, as I said, that I'm going to enter a

final restraining order. I reserve my right to amplify my findings in the event I need to in the future. So these are the terms of the final restraining order. Mr. Hahn, you are prohibited against future acts of domestic violence, having been satisfied. It is on this 22nd day of June, 2022, ordered as follows. Mr. Hahn, you are prohibited against future acts of domestic violence. You are barred from the following locations, the residents of Ms. Flax, any places of employment that she may have. You are prohibited from any oral, written, personal, electronic, or other form of contact communication with Ms. Flax, and I also believe there are three other parties, Ms. Berger, that were contained in the original TRO. I'll read them into the record. Pamela Perks, plaintiff's sister, Stephen Flax, plaintiff's brother, and Bailey Hahn, the party's adult daughter. Would you like them to be included in the final restraining order? I would, Your Honor. You are prohibited, and if this is a repeat, I apologize. You are prohibited from any oral, written, personal, electronic, or other form of contact communication with Ms. Flax and the protected parties. You are prohibited from stalking, following, or threatening to harm, stalk, or follow Ms. Flax and the protected parties. You are prohibited against possession of weapons, may not possess any and all firearms or other weapons. Ms. Berger, this house is sold, so there is no reason to grant exclusive possession to this home? No, Your Honor, I have been sold. Is there any request for any other relief? as far as a psychiatric substance abuse or batterer's intervention?

Speaker 1: You are actually all right. The psychological is certainly the batterer's intervention as well.

Speaker 0: Psychiatric evaluation comply with all recommendations.

Speaker 1: Substance abuse evaluation comply with all recommendations.

Speaker 0: Participate in a batterer's intervention program and complete it and comply with all of the recommendations.

Speaker 1: And all of this, is that his expense? Is that correct, Your Honor? Absolutely.

Speaker 0: I'm going to assess you with civil penalty, Mr. Hahn, of \$50 to be paid within 30 days. And with regard to the attorney fees that you expended, Ms. Flax, related to this application, as well as the damages to the home as a result of Mr. Hahn's actions, I'll reserve on that and I'll wait Ms. Berger to send in a certification or something like that, but that will also be part of this when it's coming in.

Speaker 1: I'll amend to include that. Thank you, Your Honor. I'll send it in as soon as possible.

Speaker 0: Mr. Hahn, anything else?

Speaker 1: No, Your Honor. Other than the attorney fees and the damages, given what I know about Mr. Hahn, I'm actually quite disturbed. he had the expert to come in here and pay for that expert to come in here,

knowing all of the outstanding orders that we have some mechanism when we do come back to amend to make sure the attorney fees are paid.

Speaker 0: Well, do you have any money in escrow from the sale of the home?

Speaker 1: Judge, there was literally none. She had to actually pay to get the house sold.

Speaker 0: Well, he said on the record that his father would pay, so...

Speaker 1: That's perfect. So we're going to have some kind of enforcing mechanism in there because at some level we have to stop. She does not have the money to be here where we've now been here five days.

Speaker 0: I mean, this is exactly why Mr. Hahn's defense about you making this all up, Ms. Berger and Ms. Flax, just doesn't hold water. It's unreasonable. It's not logical. It's just made up, Mr. Hahn. Ms. Flax is not feeling well. She's had her family here. She's hired Ms. Berger to do this.

Speaker 1: I don't believe that she would ever want to be in this court doing this for all of these days, so as I said before, I don't believe you.

Speaker 0: Also, with regard to any issues for custody, child support, and visitation, they are going to be heard under the other docket with Judge Hoffman. And this is just for the restraints, the compensatory damages as a result of the filing, any damages as a result of the damages to the home, and all of those other issues will have to be heard under the other docket. Okay. So, I think I covered everything. I just want to make sure, Ms. Berger and Mr. Hahn, I really don't want to hold those pictures because they're decomposing in the evidence room. Do you think that you can take them back with you? Judge, I can't... Do you need them? I don't want to hold them if you don't need them.

Speaker 1: I do not. I just don't know if Mr. Hahn determines he wants to appeal.

Speaker 0: Mr. Hahn, I'm going to hold onto them for 45 days. You have every right to appeal. That's your right, but you will also need to be processed. You have to get fingerprinted, photographed. There's a whole processing as part of the Prevention of Domestic Violence Act, and yes, that's new. Is anyone in Lenapee High School that we need to put that prohibition in? Is that something you want, Ms.

Speaker 1: Berger? I do right now. Your Honor, he's aware of it. She hasn't... So, the entire point of one of the issues of selling the house is that every time he wasn't paying, it was taking a hit on her credit, and she lives in a two-bedroom with these three children. She's hoping to rebuild her credit to be able to get out of this two-bedroom apartment. Now, when she eventually gets a new address, he won't know it, but right now. he already knows that. Unfortunately, he's...

Speaker 0: Do you want that address included?

Speaker 1: Yes.

Speaker 0: Daisy Lee? Not Laura? Laura, you have five more? I think that's all.

Speaker 1: So...

Speaker 0: That's all, Your Honor? Yeah. Thank you for your time and patience, and Mr. Hahn, with regard to your comments that somehow you have a problem with my demeanor, you have a problem with me dealing with you, you certainly have every right to take that off with whoever you deem. And I want to put it on the record, I was nothing but courteous to you and all of these litigants. I've been independent and impartial in my decision. I did not make a decision until I heard all of the evidence. So, if you have a problem with that, that's fine. You do take that off with whoever you want, but I disagree with that statement. Thank you very much. That's the conclusion of this hearing.

Speaker 1: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor.