UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

)
LAWRENCE E. JAFFE PENSION PLAN, ON BEHALF OF ITSELF AND ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,, Plaintiff,))) Lead Case. No. 02-C5893) (Consolidated)) CLASS ACTION
- against -)
o .) Judge Ronald A. Guzman
HOUSEHOLD INTERNATIONAL, INC., ET. AL.,)
Defendants.)))

DECLARATION OF JOSHUA NEWVILLE IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 2

STATE OF NEW YORK)
	: ss.:
COUNTY OF NEW YORK)

JOSHUA NEWVILLE, declares as follows:

- 1. I am a member of the bar of the State of New York and an associate of the firm Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP, attorneys for defendants Household International, Inc., William F. Aldinger, David A. Schoenholz, and Gary Gilmer, Defendants in this action. I have been admitted to appear before this Court *pro hac vice*. I submit this declaration to place before the Court certain information and documents referenced in Defendants' Partial Opposition to Plaintiffs' Miscellaneous Motions *In Limine*. I make this declaration based on my personal knowledge as well as my review of relevant documents.
- 2. Attached hereto as <u>Exhibit 1</u> is a true and correct copy of my February 4, 2009 letter to Luke Brooks.

- 3. On February 5, 2009, I, along with my colleagues Janet Beer and Andrew Roop, held a telephonic meet-and-confer with Plaintiffs' counsel, including Michael Dowd, Spencer Burkholz and Daniel Drosman, concerning the parties' proposed joint jury instructions and other topics.
- 4. During the February 5, 2009 meet and confer, I requested clarification of Plaintiffs' position set forth in their Miscellaneous Motion *In Limine*, Part C, that purports to seek a blanket ruling under Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) that all witnesses should be barred from testifying live on Defendants' case unless Defendants produce them to testify live on Plaintiffs' case-in-chief. Plaintiffs' counsel specified that this request applied only to Ned Hennigan, Robert O'Han and Kenneth Walker.
- 5. During the February 5, 2009 meet and confer, I requested clarification of Plaintiffs' position set forth in their Miscellaneous Motion *In Limine*, Part C, that purports to seek a ruling precluding Defendants from offering into evidence deposition testimony of witnesses "under defendants' control." Plaintiffs' counsel specified that this request applied only to Louis Levy, a former member of the Household Board of Directors who is on both parties' deposition designation lists.
- 6. Attached hereto as <u>Exhibit 2</u> is a true and correct copy of relevant excerpts of the deposition of Louis Levy, taken by Plaintiffs in this action on August 25, 2006.
- 7. Attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of relevant excerpts of the 30(b)(6) deposition of Plaintiff PACE Industry Union-Management Pension Fund by Maria Wieck, taken by Defendants in this action on September 24, 2004.
- 8. Attached hereto as <u>Exhibit 4</u> is a true and correct copy of the Plea Agreement for Defendant William S. Lerach, *United States v. William S. Lerach*, 2:07-cr-00964, (C.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2007).

Executed this 10th day of February, 2009, in New York, New York.

Joshua Newville

Case: 1:02-cv-05893 Document #: 1400 Filed: 02/10/09 Page 3 of 39 PageID #:36081

Exhibit 1

CAHILL GORDON & REINDEL LLP

EIGHTY PINE STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10005-1702

FLOYD ABRAMS
L HOWARD ADAMS
ROBERT A. ALESSI
HELENE R. BANKS
LANDIS C. BEST
GARY A. BROOKS
SUSAN BUCKLEY
KEVIN J. BURKE
JAMES J. CLARK
BENJAMIN J. COHEN
CHRISTOPHER T. COX
W. LESLIE DUFFY
ADAM M. DWORKIN
RICHARD E. FARLEY
PATRICIA FARREN
JOAN MURTAGH FRANKEL
BART FRIEDMAN
CIRO A. GAMBONI
WILLIAM B. GANNETT
CHARLES A. GILMAN
STEPHEN A. GREENE

ROBERT M. HALLMAN WILLIAM M. HARTNETT CRAIG M. HOROWITZ DOUGLAS S. HOROWITZ DAVID G. JANUSZEWSKI ELAI KATZ THOMAS J. KAVALER DAVID N. KELLEY CHÉRIE R. KISER* EDWARD P. KRUGMAN JOEL KURTZBERG ALIZA R. LEVINE JOEL H. LEVITIN GEOFFREY E. LIEBMANN MICHAEL MACRIS ANN S. MAKICH JONATHAN I. MARK GERARD M. MEISTRELL MICHAEL E. MICHETTI WILLIAM J. MILLER ATHY A. MOBILIA NOAH B. NEWITZ

TELEPHONE: (212) 701-3000 FACSIMILE: (212) 269-5420

1990 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1181
(202) 862-8900
FAX: (202) 862-8958

AUGUSTINE HOUSE 6A AUSTIN FRIARS LONDON, ENGLAND EC2N 2HA (011) 44.20.7920.9800 FAX: (011) 44.20.7920.9825

WRITER'S DIRECT NUMBER

(212) 701-3150

MICHAEL J. OHLER
KENNETH W. ORCE
DAVID R. OWEN
JOHN PAPACHRISTOS
LUIS R. PENALVER
ROY L. REGOZIN
DEAN RINGEL
JAMES ROBINSON
THORN ROSENTHAL
JONATHAN A. SCHAFFZIN
JOHN SCHUSTER
MICHAEL A. SHERMAN
DARREN SILVER
HOWARD G. SLOANE
LAURENCE T. SORKIN
SUSANNA M. SUH
GERALD S. TANENBAUM
JONATHAN D. THIER
JOHN A. TRIPODORO
ROBERT USADI
GEORGE WAILAND
GLENN J. WALDDRIP, JR.

MICHAEL B. WEISS S. PENNY WINDLE COREY WRIGHT DANIEL J. ZUBKOFF ADAM ZUROFSKY

SENIOR COUNSEL LAWRENCE A. KOBRIN IMMANUEL KOHN

COUNSEL
ANASTASIA EFIMOVA
JAY GEIGER
SAMUEL LICHTMAN
RAND McQUINN**

*ADMITTED IN DC ONLY **ADMITTED IN

February 4, 2009

Re: Lawrence E. Jaffe Pension Plan v. Household International, Inc., et al.

Case No. 02-CV-5893 (N.D. Ill.)

Dear Luke:

Regarding Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine #2, Part C, Plaintiffs appear to be asking the Court to preclude Defendants from calling live on Defendants' case any witness outside the Court's subpoena range. We suspect that was not your intent. You have our witness lists. Please let us know what witnesses specifically you are concerned about so that we can respond to your motion in a meaningful way.

In a similar vein, the same section of your brief seeks an order barring Defendants from offering into evidence deposition testimony of witnesses under Defendants' "control". Again, you have all of our PTO submissions, including our deposition designations and counterdesignations. Please specify what deposition testimony you are referring to so that we can respond appropriately.

Sincerely,

Joshua M. Newville

Luke O. Brooks, Esq. Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP 100 Pine Street, Suite 2600 San Francisco, CA 94111

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND U.S. MAIL

CAHILL GORDON & REINDEL LLP

-2-

cc: D. Cameron Baker, Esq. (via electronic mail)
Azra Z. Mehdi, Esq. (via electronic mail)
Spencer A. Burkholz, Esq. (via electronic mail)
Lori Fanning, Esq. (via electronic mail)
Adam Deutsch, Esq. (via electronic mail)
Landis C. Best, Esq.

Case: 1:02-cv-05893 Document #: 1400 Filed: 02/10/09 Page 6 of 39 PageID #:36084

EXHIBIT 2

Restricted Document Pursuant To L.R. 26.2 Filed Under Seal Pursuant To The Protective Order Dated November 5, 2004 And The Minute Order Dated October 10, 2006

EXHIBIT 3

Restricted Document Pursuant To L.R. 26.2 Filed Under Seal Pursuant To The Protective Order Dated November 5, 2004 And The Minute Order Dated October 10, 2006 Case: 1:02-cv-05893 Document #: 1400 Filed: 02/10/09 Page 8 of 39 PageID #:36086

Exhibit 4

```
Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 1 of 31
   GEORGE S. CARDONA
1
   United States Attorney
   THOMAS P. O'BRIEN
   Assistant United States Attorney
   Chief, Criminal Division
   DOUGLAS A. AXEL (Cal. Bar #173814)
   Deputy Chief, Major Frauds Section
4
   RICHARD E. ROBINSON (Cal. Bar #090840)
5
   ROBERT J. MCGAHAN (Cal. Bar #196568)
   Assistant United States Attorneys
   Majer Frauds Section
6
        1100 United States Courthouse
        312 North Spring Street
7
        Los Angeles, California 90012
                        (213) 894-0713
8
        Telephone:
                        (213) 894-6269
        Facsimile:
                   Richard.Robinson@usdoj.gov
9
        E-mail:
                   Doug.Axel@usdoj.gov
                   Robert.McGahan@usdcj.gov
10
   Attorneys for Plaintiff
11
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
12
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13
                 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
                                      No. CR 07- 07-00964
14
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                      PLEA AGREEMENT FOR DEFENDANT
                   Plaint ff.
16
                                      WILLIAM S. LERACH PURSUANT TO
                                      FEDERAL RULE OF CRIMINAL
17
                                      PROCEDURE 11 (c) (1) (C)
   WILLIAM S. LERACH,
18
19
                   Defendant.
20
             This constitutes the binding plea agreement between
21
   WILLIAM S. LERACH ("defendant"), on the one hand, and the United
22
   States Attorney's Office for the Central District of California,
23
   on the other hand (the "USAC"). Except as provided in paragraphs
24
   22(a) and (b) below, this agreement is limited to the USAO and
25
    cannot bind any other federal, state, or local prosecuting,
26
    administrative or regulatory authorities.
28
    111
```

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 2 of 31

•

1

2

3

6

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

2. Defendant gives up the right to indictment by a grand jury, waives any applicable statute of limitations, and agrees to plead guilty to a one-count information in the form attached to this agreement or a substantially similar form.

PLEA

NATURE OF THE OFFENSE

- 3. In order for defendant to be guilty of count one of the information, which charges a violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371, the following must be true:
- (a) Beginning in or before 1981, and continuing at least into 2002, there was an agreement between two or more persons to commit at least one of the crimes charged in the information, namely:
- (i) to obstruct justice by corruptly influencing, obstructing, and impeding, and endeavoring to influence, obstruct, and impede, the due administration of justice in lawsuits filed and litigated in courts of the United States, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1503; and
- (ii) to make false material declarations under oath in proceedings before and ancillary to courts of the United States, in violation of Title 18. United States Code, Section 1623(a);
- (b) defendant became a member of the conspiracy, that is, he joined in the illegal agreement, knowing of at least one of its objects and intending to help accomplish it; and
- (c) one of the members of the conspiracy performed at least one overt act for the purpose of carrying out the conspiracy.

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 3 of 31

4. Defendant admits that defendant is, in fact, guilty of this offense, as described in count one of the information.

PENALTIES

- 5. The statutory maximum sentence that the Court can impose for a violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371, is five-years imprisonment; a three-year period of supervised release; a fine of \$250,000 or twice the gross gain or gross loss resulting from the offense, whichever is greatest; and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.
- 6. Supervised release is a period of time following imprisonment during which defendant will be subject to various restrictions and requirements. Defendant understands that if defendant violates one or more of the conditions of any supervised release imposed, defendant may be returned to prison for all or part of the term of supervised release, which could result in defendant serving a total term of imprisonment greater than the statutory maximum stated above.
- 7. Defendant also understands that, by pleading guilty, defendant may be giving up valuable government benefits and valuable civic rights, such as the right to vote, the right to possess a firearm, the right to hold office, and the right to serve on a jury.
- 8. Defendant further understands that the conviction in this case may subject defendant to various collateral consequences, including revocation or suspension of his license to practice law. Defendant understands that unanticipated collateral consequences will not serve as grounds to withdraw defendant's plea of guilty.

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 4 of 31

9. The parties agree and stipulate that, in accordance with United States Sentencing Guidelines § 521.1(b)(2), determining complex issues of fact concerning restitution, if any, that should be awarded would complicate or prolong the sentencing process to a degree that the need to provide restitution-to-any victim-is outweighed by the burden on the sentencing process.

FACTUAL BASIS

10. Defendant and the USAO agree and stipulate to the statement of facts set forth in Exhibit A hereto. This statement of facts includes facts sufficient to support a plea of guilty to the charge described in this agreement. It is not meant to be a complete recitation of all facts relevant to the underlying criminal conduct or all facts known to either party that relate to that conduct.

WAIVER OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND OTHER RIGHTS

- 11. By pleading guilty, defendant gives up the following rights:
 - (a) The right to persist in a plea of not guilty.
 - (b) The right to a speedy and public trial by jury.
- (c) The right to the assistance of legal counsel at trial, including the right to have the Court appoint counsel for defendant for the purpose of representation at trial. (In this regard, defendant understands that, despite his plea of guilty, he retains the right to be represented by counsel and, if necessary, to have the Court appoint counsel if defendant cannot afford counsel at every other stage of the proceeding.)
 - (d) The right to be presumed innocent and to have the

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 5 of 31

burden of proof placed on the government to prove defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

- (e) The right to confront and cross-examine witnesses against defendant.
- (f) The right, if defendant wished, to testify on defendant's own behalf and present evidence in opposition to the charges, including the right to call witnesses and to subpoena those witnesses to testify.
- (g) The right not to be compelled to testify, and, if defendant chose not to testify or present evidence, to have that choice not be used against defendant.
- 12. By pleading guilty, defendant gives up any and all rights to pursue any affirmative defenses, Fourth Amendment or Fifth Amendment claims, and other pretrial motions that could be filed on his behalf, including assertion of any defense based on statute of limitations or venue. Further, as a result of defendant's consent to the assistance of a settlement judge in the negotiation of this binding plea agreement, defendant waives any right to pursue any claim that this binding plea agreement was reached in violation of Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c)(1).

SENTENCING FACTORS

- 13. Defendant understands that the Court is required to consider the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1)-(7), including the kinds of sentence and sentencing range established under the United States Sentencing Guidelines ("U.S.S.G." or "Sentencing Guidelines") in determining defendant's sentence.
 - 14. Defendant and the USAO have no agreement concerning

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 6 of 31

the applicable Sentencing Guidelines or Sentencing Guidelines factors.

- 15. As part of this binding plea agreement, defendant and the USAO agree that an appropriate disposition of this case is that the court impose: a sentence of imprisonment within the range of 12-24 months imprisonment, with the court retaining discretion to substitute community confinement or home detention for no more than one-half of the term of imprisonment imposed; a fine of \$250,000; a three-year period of supervised release (with conditions, which may include community confinement or home detention, to be fixed by the Court); and a special assessment of \$100.
- 16. There is no agreement as to defendant's criminal history or criminal history category.
- 17. The Court will determine the facts and calculations relevant to sentencing and decide whether to agree to be bound by this agreement. Both defendant and the USAO are free to: (a) supplement the facts by supplying relevant information to the United States Probation Office and the Court, and (b) correct any and all factual misstatements relating to the calculation of the sentence.
- 18. Defendant understands and agrees that this agreement is entered into pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c)(1)(C). So long as defendant does not breach the agreement, defendant may withdraw from this agreement and render it null and void if the Court refuses to be bound by this agreement. The USAO may also withdraw from this agreement and render it null and void if the Court refuses to be bound by this agreement.

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 7 of 31 DEFENDANT'S OBLIGATIONS 1 19. Defendant agrees that he will: 2 (a) Deliver to the USAO at the time of this Agreement 3 an executed waiver of indictment in substantially the form attached hereto as Exhibit B and an executed waiver of the statute of limitations in substantially the form attached hereto 6 as Exhibit C. (b) Plead guilty as set forth in this agreement. 8 (c) Not knowingly and willfully fail to abide by all sentencing stipulations contained in this agreement. (c) Not knowingly and willfully fail to: (i) appear 11 for all court appearances, (ii) surrender as ordered for service 12 of sentence, (iii) obey all conditions of any bond, and (iv) 13 obey any other ongoing court order in this matter. 14 (e) Not commit any crime; however, offenses which would be excluded for sentencing purposes under U.S.S.G. \$ 4A1.2(c) are not within the scope of this agreement. 17 (f) Not knowingly and willfully fail to be truthful 18 at all times with Pretrial Services, the United States Propation 19 Office, and the Court. 20 (g) Pay the applicable special assessment at or 21 before the time of sentending. 22 (h) Within seven days of sentoncing, pay the fine 23 imposed by the Court, up to a maximum of \$250,000. In this 24 regard, defendant agrees that consideration of the factors set 25 forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(A)-(C), and (a)(3), 26 justifies a fine amount of \$250,000. 27 20. Defendant further agrees to forfeit to the United 28 7

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 8 of 31

- States the amount of \$7,750,000 (the "Forfeitable Currency"), which defendant agrees shall be forfeited through administrative, judicial criminal or judicial civil forfeiture (at the sole election of the United States), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and/or 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(A). Defendant further agrees:
- (a) That the Forfeitable Currency constitutes or is derived from net proceeds of the conspiracy to obstruct justice (18 U.S.C. § 1503) and to make material false statements under oath (13 U.S.C. § 1623) in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371 described in count one of the information;
- (b) That said conspiracy resulted in net proceeds in excess of \$7,750,000;
- (c) That at the sole and absolute discretion of the USAO, the USAO may elect to cause to be entered (i) a money judgment of forfeiture in the amount of the Forfeitable Currency and apply the Forfeitable Currency toward satisfaction of the judgment and/or (ii) a preliminary and final order of forfeiture of the Forfeitable Currency;
- (d) That the Forfeitable Currency shall be paid to the United States in the following manner and by the following means:
- (i) Within seven days of sentencing, defendant shall pay to the United States the amount of \$3,750,000 by electronic funds transfers. Said transfer of the funds shall be made to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 33 Licerty Street, New York, New York, 10045, pursuant to instructions to be provided by the USAO. The government will hold the funds in the

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 9 of 31

Seized Asset Deposit Funds Account until the funds are applied to satisfy any money judgment and/or are forteited pursuant to any final order of forfeiture described in paragraph 20(c) above; and

(ii) Within 180 days of sentencing, defendant shall pay to the United States the amount of \$4,000,000 by electronic funds transfers. Said transfer of the funds shall be made to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 33 Liberty Street, New York, New York, 10045, pursuant to instructions to be provided by the USAO. The government will hold the funds in the Seized Assct Deposit Finds Account until the funds are applied to satisfy any money judgment and/or are forfeited pursuant to any final order of forfeiture described in paragraph 20(c) above.

- (e) That defendant will have clear and sole title to the Forfeitable Currency he promises to deliver to the USAO when it is transferred;
- (f) Not to contest the forfeiture of the Forfeitable Currency in any administrative or judicial proceeding;
- (g) To abandon, relinquish, and warve, and by executing this agreement defendant hereby abandon, relinquish and waive any and all rights in the Forfeitable Currency in favor of the United States;
- (h) To waive, and by executing this agreement defendant does waive, all constitutional and statutory challenges to forfeiture of the Forfeitable Currency on any grounds, including any statutes of limitations and the Excessive Fines Clause;

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 10 of 31

- (i) To take all steps as requested by the USAO that are reasonable to pass to the United States clear title to the Forfeitable Currency, including, without limitation, the execution of a consent decree of forfeiture, the completing of any other legal documents required for the transfer of title to the United States, and causing defendant's spouse to execute a consent to decree of forfeiture, all such documents to be delivered to the United States along with the electronic funds transfers described in paragraph 20(d) above;
- (j) Not to assist any other person in any effort falsely to contest the forfeiture of the Forfeitable Currency;
- (k) That forfeiture of the Forfeitable Currency shall not be counted toward satisfaction of any special assessment, fine, restitution, or any other penalty the Court may impose, nor shall it be counted toward satisfaction of any taxes, penalties, or interest owed to the Internal Revenue Service or any other taxing authority; and
- (1) With respect to any forfeiture of the Forfeitable Currency, to waive and relinquish, and by executing this agreement defendant does waive and relinquish the requirements of: (i) Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 32.2 and 43(a) regarding notice of the forfeiture in the charging instrument, announcement of the forfeiture at the sentencing, and incorporation of the forfeiture in the judgment; and (ii) 21 U.S.C. § 853(p)(1) regarding due diligence, transfer to third party, placement beyond the jurisdiction of the Court, substantial diminution of value and commingling.

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 11 of 31

]

21. Defendant is not required by this agreement to cooperate in any way with the USAO, the United States Attorney's Offices for each of the other 93 judicial districts of the United States ("the other USAOS"), the United States Department of Justice ("DOJ"), the Internal Revenue Service, the Postal Inspection Service, or any other federal law enforcement agency.

THE USAO'S OBLIGATIONS

- 22. If defendant complies fully with all defendant's obligations under this agreement, the USAO agrees:
- (a) Not to further prosecute defendant for violations of federal law occurring prior to the execution of this agreement and arising out of: (i) the conduct charged in the first superseding indictment in United States v. Milberg Weiss Bershad & Schulman LLE, et al., Cr. No. 05-587(A)-JFW and/or described in Exhibit & hereto; (ii) payments to or for the benefit of stockbrokers, non-lawyers, and/or lawyers for serving as plaintiffs and/or for referring other persons and/or entities to serve as plaintiffs; (iii) requests to courts for reimbursement of fees and costs of a damages expert witness and/or his relatives and/or his associated entities based in
- Princeton, New Jersey, and Hilton Head, South Carolina (collectively the "Princeton Export"); (iv) any payments to, or on behalf of, the Princeton Expert; (v) the Princeton Expert's participation as an expert witness or consultant in cases litigated by Milberg Weiss (as defined in Exhibit A hereto) or Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins, LLP, formerly known as
- 27 Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins, LLP ("the Lerach
- 28 Firm"); (vi) the Princeton Expert's financial relationship with

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 12 of:31

PNC Bank; (vii) election, campaign, or other political contributions made using only funds generated by the conduct described in (i) - (v) above; and (viii) defendant's investment in, or relationship with, the Acoun Technology Fund (collectively, "the non-prosecution conduct"). The non-prosecution provisions of this paragraph are binding on the USAO, the other USAOs, and DOJ. Defendant understands and agrees that the USAO, the other USAOs, and DOJ are free to prosecute defendant for any other unlawful past conduct not specifically exempted by this agreement or any illegal conduct that occurs after the date of this agreement.

- (b) Not to prosecute the Lerach Firm for violations of federal law occurring prior to the execution of this agreement and arising out of "the non-prosecution conduct" as defined in paragraph 22(a). The non-prosecution provisions of this paragraph are binding on the USAO, the other USAOs, and DOJ. Defendant understands and agrees that the USAO, the other USAOs, and DOJ are tree to prosecute the Lerach Firm for any other unlawful past conduct not specifically exempted by this agreement or any inlegal conduct that occurs after the date of this agreement.
- (c) Not to prosecute the following current partners in the Lerach Firm, Patrick J. Coughlin and Keith F. Park, for violations of federal law occurring prior to the execution of this agreement and arising out of "the non-prosecution conduct" as defined in paragraph 22(a). The non-prosecution provisions of this paragraph are binding solely on the USAO and do not bind the other USAOs or DOJ. Defendant understands and agrees that

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 13 of 31 the USAO remains free to prosecute Partners Patrick J. Coughlin and Keith F. Park for any other unlawful past conduct not specifically exempted by this agreement or any illegal conduct that occurs after the date of this agreement. (d) Not to pursue any additional civil or criminal forfeiture claims against defendant based on conduct occurring prior to the execution of this agreement and arising out of the non-prosecution conduct. (e) To abide by all sentencing stipulations contained 9 in this agreement. 10 BREACH OF AGREEMENT 23. If defendant, at any time after the execution of this 12 agreement knowingly and willfully violates or fails to perform 13 any of defendant's obligations under this agreement ("a breach"), the USAO may declare this agreement breached. If the USAO declares the agreement breached, and the Court finds such \boldsymbol{a} breach to have occurred, defendant will not be able to withdraw 17 defendant's guilty plea (if, at the time of the breach, he had previously entered his guilty plea), and the USAO will be relieved of all its obligations under this agreement. 20 24. Following a knowing and willful breach of this agreement by defendant, should the USAO elect to pursue any charge that was dismissed or that it would have been obligated 23 to dismiss or that was not filed as a result of this agreement, 24 then: 25 (a) Defendant agrees that any applicable statute of 26 limitations is tolled between the date of defendant's signing of 27 this agreement and the commencement of any such prosecution or 28

8

11

19

21

22

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 14 of 31

action.

(b) Defendant gives up all defenses based on the statute of limitations, any claim of pre-indictment delay, or any speedy trial claim with respect to any such prosecution, except to the extent that such defenses existed as of the date of defendant's signing this agreement.

defendant, under oath, at the guilty plea hearing (if there was such a hearing); (ii) the stipulated factual basis statement in this agreement; and (iii) any evidence derived from such statements, are admissible against defendant in any prosecution of defendant, and defendant shall assert no claim under the United States Constitution, any statute, Rule 410 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 11(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, or any other federal rule, that the statements or evidence derived from any statements should be suppressed or are inadmissible.

LIMITED MUTUAL WAIVER OF APPEAL AND COLLATERAL ATTACK

- 25. Defendant gives up the right to appeal any sentence imposed by the Court and the manner in which the sentence is determined, provided that the sentence is within the range set forth in paragraph 15 and is constitutional. Defendant also gives up any right to bring a post-conviction collateral attack on the conviction or sentence.
- 26. The USAO gives up its right to appeal the sentence, provided that the Court imposes a sentence within the range set forth in paragraph 15.

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 15 of 31 COURT NOT A PARTY 27. The Court is not a party to this agreement and need not accept any of the USAO's sentoncing recommendations or the parties' stipulations. 28. This agreement has no effect on any proceedings against defendant not expressly mentioned herein. NO ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS 29. Except as set forth herein, there are no promises, understandings or agreements between the USAO and defendant or defendant's counsel. Nor may any additional agreement, understanding or condition be entered into unless in a writing signed by all parties or on the record in court. PLEA AGREEMENT PART OF THE GUILTY PLEA HEARING 30. The parties agree and stipulate that this agreement will be considered part of the record of defendant's guilty plea hearing as if this entire agreement had been read into the record of such proceedings.

**	Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 16 of 31
	31. This agreement is effective upon signature by
	defendan:, defendant's attorney, and an Assistant United States
	Attorney.
	4 AGREED AND ACCEPTED
	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (as to paragraphs 22(a) and (b) only)
	5 C b C b
	7 Neon S Cardona 9/17/07
	GEORGES. CARDONA Date United States Attorney
	9
1	0 AGREED AND ACCEPTED
1	UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
1	
1	3 Xeong Sladona 9/17/07
. 1	4 GEORGY S. CARDONA Date United States Attorney
1	5
1	6 2 tecl 9/17/07
1	7 DOUGLAS A. AXEL Date Assistant United States Attorney
1	8 Deputy Chief, Major Frauds Section
1	9 Dels. Noline 9/17/07
2	RICEARS F. ROBINSON Date
2	Assistant United States Attorney Major Frauds Section
	2
	3 4 MMH 9/17/07
	ROBERT J. MOGAHAN Date
	5 Assistant United States Attorney Major Frauds Section
	6
	7
	8
	16

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 17 of 31

I, WILLIAM S. LERACH, have read this agreement and carefully discussed every part of it with my attorney. I understand the terms of this agreement, and I voluntarily agree to those terms. My attorney has advised me of my rights, of possible defenses, of the Sentencing Guideline provisions, and of the consequences of entering into this agreement. No promises or inducements have been made to me other than those contained in this agreement. No one has threatened or forced me in any way to enter into this agreement. Finally, I am satisfied with the representation of my actorney in this matter. WILLIAM S. Defendant I am WILLIAM S. LERACH's attorney. I have carefully discussed every part of this agreement with my client. Further, I have fully advised my client of his rights, of possible defenses, of the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(c), including the relevant Sentencing Guidelines provisions, and of the consequences of entering into this agreement. To my knowledge, my client's decision to enter into this agreement is an informed and voluntary one. 22 23 KEKER & VAN NEST LL? 24 Counsel for Defendant WILLIAM S. LERACH 25

17

ı

2

6

8

9

10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

26 27 28

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 18 of 31 1 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 CR 07-____ 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 11 Flaintiff, INFORMATION [18 U.S.C. § 371: Conspiracy] 12 13 WILLIAM S. LERACH, 14 Defendant. 15 16 The United States Attorney charges: COUNT ONE 17 [18 U.S.C. § 371] 18 [Conspiracy] 19 Beginning on a date unknown but at least as early as in 20 or about 1981, and continuing into at least in or about 2002, within the Contral District of California and elsewhere, 22 defendant WILLIAM S. LERACH, together with the law firm Milberg 23 Weiss Bershad Hynes & Lerach LLP (formerly known as "Milberg 24 Weiss Bershad Spechthrie & Lerach") ("Milberg Weiss"); David J. 25 Bershad ("Bershad"); other partners in Milberg Weiss; and others 26 known and unknown to the United States Attorney, knowingly 27 combined, conspired, and agreed to commit the following offenses DAA:RER:RJM DAY TER NOM

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 19 of 31

against the United States:

- (a) to commit obstruction of justice by corruptly influencing, obstructing, and impeding, and endeavoring to influence, obstruct, and impede, the due administration of justice in lawsuits filed and litigated in federal courts, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1503; and
- (b) to make false material declarations under oath in proceedings before and ancillary to courts of the United States, in connection with lawsuits filed and litigated in federal courts, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1623(a).
- 2. In furtherance of the conspiracy and to accomplish its objects, defendant LERACH and other co-conspirators committed and caused others to commit the following evert acts, among others:
- v. Individual, Inc. et al., 96-CV-12272 (United States District Court, District of Massachusetts), in which Steven Cooperman was a named plaintiff, Cooperman falsely certified, under penalty of perjury, that he would "not accept any payment for serving as a representative party on behalf of a class beyond plaintiff's prorata share of any recovery, except such reasonable costs and expenses (including lost wages) directly relating to the representation of the Class as ordered or approved by the Court."
- (b) On or about December 13, 1999, in <u>Helene Giarputo</u> and <u>Seymour Lazar v. Xerox Corp. et al.</u>, 99-CV-2374 (United States District Court, District of Connecticut), in which Seymour Lazar was a named plaintiff, Lazar falsely certified, under penalty of perjury, that he would "not accept any payment for

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 20 of 31 serving as a representative party on behalf of a class beyond plaintiff's pro rata share of any recovery, except such reasonable costs and expenses (including lost wages) directly relating to the representation of the Class as ordered or approved by the Court." SALLY L. MELOCH Acting United States Attorney THOMAS P. O'BRIEN Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Criminal Division DOUGLAS A. AXEL Assistant United States Attorney Deputy Chief, Major Frauds Section RICHARD E. ROBINSON ROBERT J. McGAHAN Assistant United States Attorneys Major Frauds Section

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 21 of 31

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT OF FACTS IN SUPPORT OF WILLIAM S. LERACH PLEA AGREEMENT AND INFORMATION

Defendant WILLIAM S. LERACH ("LERACH") represents and admits that the following facts are true. Pseudonyms, capitalized terms, and case names herein have the same meanings as are ascribed to them in the first superseding indictment in <u>United States v.</u>

<u>Milberg Weiss Bershad & Schulman LLP</u>, et al., CR 05-587(A)-JFW (the "FSI").

Introduction

- 1. LERACH joined Milberg Weiss in 1976. LERACH worked in Milberg Weiss's office in San Diego, California. LERACH later became a name partner in Milberg Weiss Bershad Hynes & Lerach, LLP, formerly known as "Milberg Weiss Bershad Specthrie & Lerach" (hereinafter "Milberg Weiss").
- 2. Milberg Weiss specialized in serving as plaintiff's counsel in class actions and shareholder derivative actions (collectively "Class Actions") brought in federal and state courts throughout the United States, including in the Central District of California.
- 3. As counsel representing class members or shareholders not before the courts (collectively "absent class members"), Milberg Weiss and its attorneys, including LERACH, had fiduciary duties of loyalty, honesty, and trust to absent class members. Individuals who served as representative plaintiffs on behalf of absent class

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 22 of 31

members (hereinafter "named plaintiffs") likewise had fiduciary duties of loyalty, honesty, and trust to those absent class members.

Overview of Secret Payment Arrangement

- 4. Beginning in or about the 1970s and continuing at least into 2002, in order to facilitate the recruitment and retention of named plaintiffs, certain senior Milberg Weiss partners agreed with various individuals that Milberg Weiss would secretly pay those individuals a portion of the attorneys' fees that Milberg Weiss obtained in Class Actions in which such individuals served, or caused a relative or associate to serve, as a named plaintiff.
- 5. The Milberg Weiss partners who agreed during the relevant times to secretly pay the named plaintiffs included LERACH, David J. Bershad ("Bershad"), and others.
- 6. The individuals who agreed to serve as named plaintiffs in Class Actions pursuant to the secret payment arrangement with Milberg Weiss included Steven G. Cooperman ("Cooperman") and others. Generally, these individuals were promised that they would be paid approximately 10% of the net attorneys' fees that Milberg Weiss obtained in their respective Class Actions. They were also told that the amount would be lower if they were paid in cash or if Milberg Weiss had payment obligations on the same case to others.
- 7. By entering into such payment arrangements, LERACH and other conspiring partners were able to secure a reliable source of

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 23 of 31

individuals who were ready, willing, and able to serve as named plaintiffs in Class Actions that Milberg Weiss wanted to bring. In addition, some of these individuals would investigate and propose to LERACH and other conspiring partners lucrative potential Class Actions for Milberg Weiss to bring. Such payment arrangements generally enabled Milberg Weiss to file more Class Actions and to file them more quickly than would be possible absent such arrangements.

- 8. At all relevant times, LERACH, other conspiring partners, and the paid plaintiffs understood that, to the extent necessary, they would make or cause to be made false and/or misleading statements in documents filed in federal Class Actions (including complaints, motions, and under-oath certifications) and in under-oath testimony and other discovery in such actions in order to conceal the existence of their secret payment arrangements.
- 9. LERACH believed that discovery in a Class Action of the secret payment arrangement with a named plaintiff could have resulted in, among other things: (a) the disqualification of the named plaintiff from serving as a class representative in that action and other Class Actions; and (b) the disqualification of Milberg Weiss, including the conspiring partners, from serving as class counsel in that action and other Class Actions.
- 10. LERACH and other conspiring partners concealed the payments to named plaintiffs. They had the paid plaintiffs select intermediary law firms, lawyers, and other professionals through

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 24 of 31

whom they would be paid their payments. LERACH and other conspiring partners would cause Milberg Weiss checks to be issued to these intermediaries, with the understanding and intent that the money would be distributed to or used for the benefit of the paid plaintiffs. LERACH and other conspiring partners knew that although these payments were variously documented and described as, among other things, "referral fees" and "professional fees" owed by Milberg Weiss to the intermediaries, they were actually disguised payments to the paid plaintiffs.

Secret Payment Arrangements With Steven Cooperman

- 11. LERACH, on behalf of Milberg Weiss, established a secret payment arrangement with Steven Cooperman, pursuant to which Milberg Weiss would pay Cooperman a percentage of the attorneys' fees that Milberg Weiss obtained in Cooperman's cases, as described in paragraph 6 above. LERACH discussed Cooperman's payment arrangement with other conspiring partners.
- 12. Cooperman, Cooperman Plaintiff 1, Cooperman Plaintiff 2, and certain of Cooperman's relatives and associates served as named plaintiffs for Milberg Weiss in numerous other Class Actions. To satisfy Milberg Weiss's payment obligation to Cooperman on these cases, LERACH caused Milberg Weiss checks to be written to intermediary attorneys and their associated law firms selected by Cooperman, namely Richard R. Purtich and James P. Tierney (referred to as Cooperman Intermediary A and Cooperman

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 25 of 31

Intermediary B in the FSI). These payments were documented and disguised as, among other things, "referral fees" and the "share" of attorneys' fees owed by Milherg Weiss to these intermediaries, even though such payments represented monies that Milberg Weiss owed to Cooperman, were made solely to satisfy Milberg Weiss's payment obligation to Cooperman, and would be used for Cooperman's benefit or at his direction.

Overt Act

13. In furtherance of the conspiracy described above, LERACH and other members of the conspiracy committed and caused to be committed the following act, among others:

On or about November 6, 1996, in the <u>Individual</u> class action, brought by Milberg Weiss in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, in which Cooperman was a named plaintiff, Cooperman falsely certified, under penalty of perjury, that he would "not accept any payment for serving as a representative party on behalf of a class beyond plaintiff's pro rata share of any recovery, except such reasonable costs and expenses (including lost wages) directly relating to the representation of the Class as ordered or approved by the Court."

	nt 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 26 of 31
	S DISTRICT COURT ICT OF CALIFORNIA
	CASE NUMBER
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
PLAINTIFF,	CR 07
v.	
WILLIAM S. LERACH,	WAIVER OF INDICTMENT
DEFENDANT.	<u> </u>
prosecution by indictment and consent that the proceed	ings may be by information rather than by indictment
Date:	William S. Lerach Defendant
Date:	William S. Lerach
Date:	William S. Lerach Defendant John Keker Keker & Van Nesi
Before	William S. Lerach Defendant John Keker Keker & Van Nesi
	William S. Lerach Defendant John Keker Keker & Van Nesi

EXHIBIT B

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 27 of 31

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS WAIVER AGREEMENT
BETWEEN WILLIAM S. LERACH AND THE UNITED STATES
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Dated September 17, 2007

Effective as of the Effective Date of the Plea Agreement Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c)(1)(C) in the Matter of <u>United States v. William S. Lerach</u>,

Cr. 07-__-JFW

This Statute of Limitations Waiver Agreement ("Waiver") is entered into between William S. Lerach ("LERACH") and the United States Attorney's Office for the Central District of California ("the USAO"), in connection with a Plea Agreement Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c)(1)(C) in the matter of United States v. William S. Lerach, Cr. No. 07-__-JFW (hereinafter "United States v. Lerach").

RECITALS

WHEREAS, LERACH has entered into a Plea Agreement Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c)(1)(C) ("the Binding Plea Agreement") to resolve a pending criminal investigation in the Central District of California;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Binding Plea Agreement LERACH has agreed to plead guilty to a one-count Information charging him with conspiracy to obstruct justice and to make material false declarations under oath, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371 ("the Information");

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Binding Flea Agreement, LERACH has agreed to waive any affirmative defenses he may have, including

EXHIBIT (

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 28 of 31

any applicable statute of limitations, relating to the conduct charged in the Information;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY AGREED as follows:

LERACH hereby waives any affirmative defense based on the statute of limitations or any claims relating to preindictment delay relating to the conduct charged in the Information;

This Waiver shall be effective upon the effective date of the Binding Plea Agreement; and

This Waiver shall be deemed void and shall no longer have any effect in the event that the Court presiding over the matter of <u>United States v. Lerach</u> refuses to accept the Binding Plea Agreement.

READ AND AGREED TO:

Keker & Van Nest

Counsel for William S. Lerach

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S CFFICE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MMIL	9.17.2007
DOUGLAS A. AXEL RICHARD E. ROBINSON ROBERT J. McGAHAN Assistant United States Attorneys Major Frauds Section	Date
WILLIAM S. LERACH:	
WILLIAM S. LERACH	Date
JOEN W. KEKER	Date

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 29 of 31

any applicable statute of limitations, relating to the conduct charged in the Information;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY AGREED as follows:

LERACH hereby waives any affirmative defense based on the statute of limitations or any claims relating to preindictment delay relating to the conduct charged in the Information:

This Waiver shall be effective upon the effective date of the Binding Plea Agroement; and

This Waiver shall be deemed void and shall no longer have any effect in the event that the Court presiding over the matter of <u>United States v. Lerach</u> refuses to accept the Binding Plea Agreement.

READ AND AGREED TO:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DOUGLAS A. AXEL RICHARD E. ROBINSON

ROBERT J. McGAHAN Assistant United States Attorneys

Major Frauds Section

WITH TAM S LEVACE

Thank) King

Keker & Van Nest Counsel for William S. Lerach Date

9/n/07

9/17/07 Date Case: 1:02-cv-05893 Document #: 1400 Filed: 02/10/09 Page 38 of 39 PageID #:36116

Filed 09/18/2007 Page 30 of 31 Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6

CERTIFICATIONS

I, William S. Lerach, have resd this Statute of Limitations Waiver carefully and discussed it with my counsel, John W. Keker of Koker & Van Nest. I understand the terms of this Statute of Dimitations Waiver, and I voluntarily, knowingly, and willfully agree to all of those terms, after due consideration and without force, threat, or coercion. No promises, representations, or inducements, other than those set forth in this Statute of Limitations Waiver and the Binding Plea Agreement, have been made to cause me to enter into this Statute of Limitations Waiver. I am satisfied with the representation that Keker & Van Nest have

I am counsel for William S. Lerach in this matter. I have carefully reviewed and discussed the terms of this Statute of Limitations Waiver with Mr. Lerach. To the best of my knowledge. his decision to enter into this Agreement was informed and voluntary.

Counsel for William S. Derach

Case 2:07-cr-00964-UA Document 6 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 31 of 31

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Temeria Wylie, declare:

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

That I am a citizen of the United States and resident or employed in Los Angeles County, California; that my business address is the Office of United States Attorney, United States Courthouse, 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012; that I am over the age of eighteen years, and am not a party to the above-entitled action;

That I am employed by the United States Attorney for the Central District of California who is a member of the Bar of the United States District Court for the Central District of

California, at whose direction I served a copy of: PLEA AGREEMENT FOR DEFENDANT WILLIAM S. LERACH PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE 11 (c) (1)(C)

service was: John Keker, Esq.
710 Sansome Strect
San Francisco, California 94111

[] Placed in a closed [X] envelope, for collection and interoffice delivery addressed as follows:

[X] Placed in a sealed envelope for collection and mailing via United States Mail, addressed as follows:

[] By hand delivery addressed as follows: IN COURT

[] By e-mail as follows

20

[] By facsimile as follows

[] By messerger as follows:

[] By federal express as follows:

This Certificate is executed on ${\tt September\ 18,\ 2007},$ at Los Angeles, California.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

24

TEMERIA WYLIE

25

26

27

28