

Adam Greenberg's opening statement to the jury, and his case for defendants, left in the garbage and handed to me by a Court Officer May 13 2004

OPENING

- L + G, Fellow Counsel, Your Honor, one eye in my name is A. G. + I rep. D's MASAC, Fred Anderson, Charles Austin, etc.

1

- As you heard, P claims that my clients intentionally + maliciously subjected her to Emotional Distress!

I believe that once you hear all the evidence, you will come to see that not only did my clients not in any way set out to emotionally injure P, but all of their actions were purely reasonable + designed only to deal fairly with P + her sister, who were involved in a bitter will contest over the late mother's estate!

~~As you will see, the Church did not want to become part of any dispute involving the sisters, it didn't want to be drawn into this bitter will contest involving 2 twin sisters who couldn't agree on anything + needed lawyers to talk to each other.~~

in fact to hurt either sister

You will see that the Church did not want to become part of any dispute involving the sisters, it didn't want to be drawn into this bitter will contest involving 2 twin sisters who couldn't agree on anything + needed lawyers to talk to each other.

Not only were the church's actions not wrong under the law, but they did the right thing.

As jurors, you must determine the facts of the case + then apply those facts to the law given to you by the judge!

(P. 10)

When you hear all the evidence, I believe it will become very clear, very quickly that my client did nothing wrong in how they dealt w/ this difficult situation. Very Citizens System!

(P. 11)

1) They, when you hear the law, there will be no question that my client did nothing wrong + cannot be found liable to TI!

~~Handwritten scribbles in a box~~

2) Please, listen closely to the law regarding T to I of E.O. 14176, even if you think you know what that means, the law sets a certain level of conduct that a TI must prove to recover for eternally existing injuries + TI must prove that conduct rose to that level

I know we have 2 hours in this case... I know he says he...

~~Extensive handwritten scribbles on the right margin~~

How does he know judge will mention malice? (I listen carefully when the court explains...)

Place also list closely ab. the malice what is meant by the term "malice"

Finally, please listen closely ab. the conduct that you must prove to be able to recover TI from my client!

To avoid her, she is say to her to prove she led an injury + you will see to believe it!

o the one fact that she says she's upset or angry by not not

As a result in jury selection the more fact that someone receive emotionally injured by another's actions doesn't automatically mean there is any specific intent to

EVIDENCE

(3) The evidence is going to show that  
 3A) from 1977 to the time of her death in  
 March, 1998, TI's mother, Julie T. worked  
 in the same church office with Assoc  
 Minister Charles Austin. They worked together 6 days/week

The two became very close friends up to the time of her death!

Following her death in 3/98, TI made the decision to have her mother cremated. The evidence will show that TI GAVE these roles to Assoc Minister Austin to hold b/c she was too distressed to be there in her possession. *she didn't make her own sister in this decision*

Minister Austin didn't ASK to hold them + didn't go out of his way to get possession of these roles.

But b/c he is a minister + has friendly w/ Julie for 20 yrs, he held those roles for about

4 1/2 months. (from about 3/23 to 8/1/98)

During this 4 1/2 months, a will contest was debated b/w TI + her only sister who believed she had wrongfully been deprived of a portion of the will!

Both TI + her sister retained lawyers. Both TI + various members of the Church were called by lawyers from both sides to take depositions. *There were 2 sisters*

the Church members did not want to have involved

There was no will contest - this is Wasserman's version of events

*she didn't make her own sister in this decision*  
~~TI~~  
~~Assoc Minister~~  
~~Austin~~  
~~roles~~  
~~TI~~  
~~only~~  
~~sister~~

I'll have keep in mind that both TT + her sister were  
dry, hrs of the deced. ~~to me~~ ~~to me~~

So to the (L) + Feds  
listening to see if Mr. Currier led by  
to those rules & hole those led by  
her sister so that she was  
entitled to them immediately And her  
sister not entitled at all / when is that ok Chris,  
+ listening to see if she will give TT all rights to dispose of the rules to

Adam arranged with  
Judge Williams to keep  
all information  
about my  
being Executive  
out of the  
trial

That is what this case is & Lawd L + G,  
it is angry that her sister was allowed  
to attend the burial <sup>or he invited her</sup> + so she  
is suing the church b/c she  
couldn't have all the rights to the rules

the  
exclusion  
of  
her  
sister,

Absurd  
this was not  
true at all

Immediately! The sister was given a degree of control  
+ this is the emotional distress she suffered.

I was distraught  
because of  
my  
mom's death  
and  
the  
church  
threw me  
out 10 days  
after mom's  
death

(S)

(Drops)

~~which TT~~  
~~she was too distraught to do~~  
~~the rules for L + G~~  
~~to her sister was not fair, she for~~  
~~some reason, all of a sudden, couldn't~~  
~~live with them for even a couple days~~  
~~So saying if so - believe she got the~~  
~~rights to the rules + my client was~~  
~~definitely there + no way to find my~~  
~~client intentionally ended to~~  
~~injure TT + was~~  
~~emotional distress, b/c she didn't~~  
~~take the rules for L + G~~  
~~got the rules for L + G~~

not  
right  
out  
of  
the  
church!

(Drops)

PAGES

3B) On August 1, 1998, Mr. Joe Austin rec'd. a phone message from TT who said she wanted the rules back by 8/7th!

no, I wanted them immediately, July 31 - because Chuck would bury mom with out me after following me out of the state membership

Mr. Austin never spoke to TT directly after setting the message, but he was sure that MENTAL SPIES

1) there was a major lawsuit going on a major lawsuit? b/c the 2 sisters + he didn't know if the rules were a part of it! He would see the rules right!

2) He knew that his friend Julie would be wanted both of her daughters to attend the burial; ~~but~~ But this would say to Lynn b/c Mrs. Conner wouldn't have wanted her own two sisters to the burial not even if I believed this!!

Jill's lawyer told him not to release the rules until he spoke to Jill - so he didn't

So, he called Jill's lawyer who had called his process in the will contest At told him of the situation. This lawyer sat in touch w/ his friend Bill who was in FCA, + then they agreed w/ Mr. Conner's lawyer that both sides would attend the burial!

Once this was the case of the lawyer he returned the rules to TT - by August 7th! The same day she wanted them + 2 who Mr. Austin only told the rules 'any'

4

When you hear the lawyer to release of Ms. Conner had any more rights to the scope of the rules the her sister or whether they BSIT had equal rights to the rules, as the sister, this is the he didn't say the rules to his sister but it should be that way



PAGE 8

2/4/990 must apologize

for her actions +

must be given sessions to

clear up misguided thoughts!

I had to see  
Dr Shoup to  
have my misguided  
thoughts about  
Fred Anderson,  
charged

3/12/990 unless Cansler went

to counseling, she couldn't get

membership back!

unless I  
saw a church  
counselor  
I couldn't  
get my  
membership  
back

4/15/99 = Message re counseling

2/990 must see therapist by key  
member 2/24