## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

MARGERY WAKEFIELD	)	
Plaintiff	)	
vs.	)	CASE NO. 82-1313-Civ-T-10
THE CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA a/k/a THE	)	
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.	)	
Defendant	)	
Detendant	)	

#### SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Plaintiff, MARGERY WAKEFIELD (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff"), and THE CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC., (hereinafter referred to as the "Church"), hereby agree to settle all claims of Plaintiff and the Church against each other, including, but not limited to, those claims identified in the above-styled action, on the following terms and conditions:

1. It is understood by all parties to this Agreement that the settlement referred to herein is a compromise of doubtful and disputed claims, and that it is not intended to be, or construed as, in any form or fashion, an admission of liability by either Plaintiff or the Church, but is made in the full settlement and compromise of disputed claims which Plaintiff and the Church have against each other, and for which Plaintiff and the Church have denied, and still deny, liability. Moreover, the parties herein agree that liability for any claims, of any nature, which the Plaintiff and the Church have, or may have, against each other is expressly denied, and this settlement shall never be treated as an admission of liability, or responsibility, at any time, for any

purpose.

- 2. On execution of this Agreement, Plaintiff and the Church will execute a Mutual Release, an unexecuted copy of the original of which is attached hereto, and made a part hereof, as Exhibit "1".
- 3. On execution of this Agreement, the Church will remit to Plaintiff the sum of Two Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$220,000.00) and release any claim or interest in those certain funds provided to the Plaintiff by the Church in July, 1981, maintained in escrow by Plaintiff's counsel, which approximate Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000.00), with accumulated interest.
- 4. On execution of this Agreement, Plaintiff and the Church, through counsel, will execute a Joint Motion and Stipulation of Voluntary Dismissal, an unexecuted copy of the original of which is attached hereto, and made a part hereof, as Exhibit "2".
- 5. The Plaintiff and the Church hereby promise and agree, for the valuable considerations recited herein, to perform and comply with each and every term, condition, provision and undertaking contained in the transcript of in camera proceedings of July 11, 1986, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "3". By this reference the parties incorporate into this Settlement Agreement the said transcript in its entirety.
- 6. Within ten (10) days after the execution of this Agreement, Plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel, and the Church, and its counsel, shall execute, and exchange, affidavits of compliance attesting to the fact that they have complied with the terms and conditions of this Settlement Agreement pertaining to the delivery to each other of all documents which, by the terms of this Settlement Agreement, each party and their counsel is obligated to turn over to the other. The parties and their counsel agree that the form of the affidavit of compliance shall be that of the form attached hereto as Exhibit "4".

- 7. All parties to this Agreement and their counsel shall maintain in strict confidence the terms and conditions expressed herein, and will not disclose, in any form or fashion, either directly or indirectly, to any person or entity any term or condition contained herein, or any term or condition reflected in the Release to be exectued by the parties, an unexecuted copy of which is attached hereto, and made a part hereof, as Exhibit "1". However, nothing herein shall be construed to prevent any of the parties or their counsel from disclosing the fact that all claims which they have against each other have been amicably settled.
- 8. At the time of the execution of this Agreement, the parties represent to each other that they are not under the influence of any drug, narcotic, or other mind-influencing substance, condition or ailment such that their ability to fully understand the meaning of this Agreement and the significance thereof is adversely affected or otherwise impaired.
- 9. All parties have entered into this Agreement freely, knowingly, willingly, and voluntarily, without any threats, coercion, intimidation, or pressure of any kind whatsoever, and have executed this Agreement of their own free will.
- 10. Prior to the execution of this Agreement, Plaintiff and the Church, as well as their respective counsel, have engaged in sufficient deliberation and conducted an adequate investigation, either personally, or through other sources of their choosing, and Plaintiff and the Church have obtained the advice of counsel regarding the terms and conditions herein, so that the parties would be in a position to intelligently exercise their own judgment in determining whether to execute this Agreement.
- 11. The parties hereto have carefully read this Agreement, and fully and explicitly understand each of the terms and conditions herein.

- 12. The Plaintiff and the Church will each bear their respective costs with respect to this litigation and with respect to the negotiation and drafting of this Agreement, as well as with reference to all acts required of them by the terms and conditions of this Agreement.
- 13. To the extent that this Agreement inures to the benefit of persons or entities not parties to it, this Agreement is, nonetheless, made for their respective benefits and uses.
- 14. This Agreement shall not be construed against the party preparing it, but shall be construed as if both parties prepared it.
- 15. In the event any term or condition of this Agreement is determined to be unenforceable, such a determination shall not affect the enforceability of any of the other terms or conditions contained in it.
- 16. The parties hereto, including any officer, director, agent, servant, employee, representative, or attorney of, or for, any party, have made no statement, representation, or promise to the other party regarding any fact material to this Agreement except as expressly set forth herein. Moreover, except as expressly stated in this Agreement, the parties, in executing it, do not rely on any statement, representation, or promise by the other party.
- 17. The signatories to this Agreement have the full right, power, and authority to enter into this Agreement on behalf of the parties for whom they are signing.
- 18. This Agreement contains the entire agreement between the parties hereto, and its terms and conditions are contractual, and not a mere recital. No other prior, or contemporaneous agreements, oral or written, respecting the matters herein, which are not specifically incorporated herein, shall be deemed to in any way exist, or bind any of the parties hereto.

- The parties agree that this Settlement Agreement shall be filed with the Court under seal.
- 20. This Agreement and the mutual release provided for herein may be executed in two or more counter-parts, each of which shall be deemed to be a duplicate original, but all of which, together, shall constitute one and the same instrument.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement, on the date opposite their names.

DATED: aug 11, 1986

MARGERY WAKEFIELD

DATED: <u>August 13</u>, 1986

CHURCH OF SCHNETOLOGY OF

CALIFORNIA, INC.

Wakefield2:CS12

### MUTUAL RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS

THIS INDENTURE WITNESSETH: That I, MARGERY WAKEFIELD (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff"), for and in consideration of good and valuable consideration of which I herewith acknowledge I have received, do hereby for myself, and for my heirs, executors, administrators, personal resentatives, assigns, and representatives, fully acquit, release, remise and forever discharge THE CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC., (hereinafter the "Church"), as well as its officers, directors, employees, servants, agents, members, assigns, successors, and representatives, and L. Ron Hubbard, his heirs, his estate, and its executor, Author's Family Trust and its trustee, Mary Sue Hubbard, Author Services, Inc., The Church of Scientology International, The Church of Spiritual Technology, The Church of Scientology Western United States, The Church of Scientology Flag Service Org., Inc., Scientology Missions International, Religious Technology Center, Church of Scientology, Mission of Atlanta, Inc., Church of Scientology of Florida, Inc., Church of Scientology of Missouri, Inc., Church of Scientology Celebrity Centre International, The Founding Church of Scientology of Washington, D.C., Church of Scientology of Los Angeles, Inc., any other Scientology organization or entity, as well as all officers, directors, employees, servants, agents, members, assigns, successors and representatives of each of the forgoing persons and entities, of and from any and all claims, demands, damages, costs, expenses, loss of services, actions, and causes of action of every kind and nature, whether arising at law or in equity, known or unknown, for, or because of, or arising from, any act, omission, or occurrence, up to the present time, which I may have had, may now have, or may hereafter have, against the foregoing persons and entities, including but not limited to, those claims referred to in that certain action, now pending in

I have com 2 houses

the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division, styled Margery Wakefield v. The Church of Scientology of California a/k/a The Church of Scientology of California, Inc., Case No. 82-1313-Civ.T-10.

Plaintiff hereby declares that no representations about the nature and extent of any injuries, disabilities, or damages allegedly sustained by Plaintiff and made by any physician, attorney or agent of any person or entity hereby released, nor any representations regarding the nature and extent of legal liability or financial responsibility of any person or entity released, have induced her to make this settlement; that in determining the amount of the settlement herein there has been taken into consideration not only the alleged ascertained injuries, disabilities, and damages, allegedly suffered by Plaintiff, but also the possibility that these alleged injuries may be permanent and progressive and recovery therefrom uncertain and indefinite, so that consequences not now anticipated may result from the events alleged in Case No. 82-1313-Civ.T-10.

Plaintiff agrees, as a further consideration and inducement of this compromise settlement, that it shall apply to all unknown and unanticipated injuries and damages allegedly resulting from the events alleged in Case No. 82-1313-Civ.T-10, as well as to those now disclosed.

It is understood by Plaintiff and the Church that the acceptance of the aforedescribed consideration, and the execution and delivery of this Release, is not to be considered, in any form or fashion, as an admission of liability on the part of any of the foregoing persons or entities, but is in the full settlement and compromise of disputed claims which Plaintiff has or may have, against the foregoing persons or entitites, and for which they have denied, and still deny, liability.

The Church, for and in consideration of good and valuable consideration of which it herewith acknowledges it has received, does hereby for itself, and for its officers, directors, employees, servants, agents, members, assigns, successors, and representatives, fully acquits, releases, remises, and forever discharges Plaintiff, and her heirs, executors, administrators, personal representatives, and assigns, of and from any and all claims, demands, damages, costs, expenses, loss of services, actions, and causes of action of every kind and nature, whether arising at law or in equity, known or unknown, for, or because of, or arising from, any act, omission, or occurrence, up to the present time, which it may have had, or may now have, against Plaintiff, including, but not limited to, those claims referred to in its Counterclaim filed in Case No. 82-1313-Civ.T-10.

It is understood by Plaintiff and the Church that the acceptance of the aforedescribed consideration, and the execution and delivery of this Release, is not to be considered, in any form or fashion, as an admission of liability on the part of Plaintiff, but is in the full settlement and compromise of disputed claims which the Church has against Plaintiff, and for which Plaintiff has denied, and still denies, liability.

The parties acknowledge that they have entered into this Release freely, knowingly, willingly, and voluntarily, without any threats, coercion, intimidation, or pressure of any kind whatsoever, they have executed this Release of their own free will, and with the advice of counsel. Finally, the parties acknowledge that they have carefully read this Release, fully and explicitly understands each of the terms and conditions herein, that the parties hereto, including any officer, director, agent, servant, employee, member, or representative, of, or for, any party, have made no statement, representation, or promise to the other party regarding any fact material to

this Release except as expressly set forth herein, and that, except as expressly stated in this Release, the parties, in executing it, do not rely on any statement, representation, or promise by the other party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties have executed this Release this day of August, 1986.

CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

n//

STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 10th day of August, 1986, by MERYL DUBAY, on behalf of the Church of Scientology of California, Inc.



Notary Public My Commission Expires: 11 any 1984

MARGERY WAKEFIELD

STATE OF COUNTY OF

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this \_\_\_\_\_\_ day of August, 1986, by MARGERY WAKEFIELD.

Notary Public My Commission Expires:

Wakefield4:Cs12

this Release except as expressly set forth herein, and that, except as expressly stated in this Release, the parties, in executing it, do not rely on any statement, representation, or promise by the other party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties have executed this Release this /3 day of August, 1986.

> CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

BY: MERYL DUBAY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this day of August, 1986, by MERYL DUBAY, on behalf of the Church of Scientology of California, Inc.

> Notary Public My Commission Expires:

MARGERY WAKEFIELD

STATE OF Michigan COUNTY OF Houghton

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 11th day of August, 1986, by MARGERY WAKEFIELD.

My Commission Expires Notary Public, Houghton County, Michigan

My Commission Expires April 11 1989

Wakefield4:Cs12

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

MARGERY WAKEFIELD	)	
Plaintiff	)	
vs.	)	CASE NO. 82-1313-Civ-T-10
THE CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA a/k/a THE	)	
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.  Defendant	)	
	)	
Deteriorit	)	

#### JOINT MOTION AND STIPULATION FOR DISMISSAL

Plaintiff, MARGERY WAKEFIELD, and Defendant, CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, do hereby move the Court for entry of an Order dismissing the above entitled action with prejudice on the grounds that the parties have entered into a Settlement Agreement wherein they have settled all claims arising out of this action.

WALT LOGAN

708 Jackson Street
Tampa, Florida 33602

Attorney for Margery Wakefield

PAUL B. JOHNSON

501 E. Kennedy, Suite 1207

Tampa, Florida 33602

Attorney for The Church of Scientology of California, Inc.

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

NANCY MCLEAN,

Plaintiff,

VS.

Case No. 81-174-Civ-T-17
Tampa, Florida
July 11, 1986
4:45 p.m.

CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY,

3

Defendants.

3

0

1

3

.

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

22

24

25

IN CAMERA
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH A. KOVACHEVICH

APPEARANCES:

Por the Plaintiffs
cLean, Burden, Wakefield
and Cazares:

WALT LOGAN, ESQUIRE
WAGNER, CUNNINGHAM, VAUGHAN &
MCLAUGHLIN
708 Jackson Street
Tampa, Florida 33602

MICHAEL FLYNN, ESQUIRE

LAWRENCE E. HELLER, ESQUIRE Woodland West Building, Suite 315 6400 Canoga Avenue, Woodland Hills, California 91367

FOR ATTORNEY USE ONLY

Exhibit III to Settlement Agreement

1 2	For the Defendants:	PAUL JOHNSON, ESQUIRE 501 E. Kennedy Tampa, Plorida 33602
3		BENNIE LAZZARA, JR., ESQUIRE
4		606 E. Madison Tampa, Florida 33602
5		MICHAEL LEE HERTZBERG, ESQUIRE
6		275 Madison Avenue New York, New York 10016
7	Court Reporter:	CLAUDIA M. FRY, CSR, RPR
8		C.P., C.M. P. O. Box 2434
9		Tampa, Florida 33601
10		
11	÷	e e
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

### PROCEEDINGS

July 11, 1986

\* \* \* \*

Gentlemen. You may remain standing since it'll probably be easier if you will, gentlemen. I'm putting — this is officially on the record so that there can be no misunderstanding about the negotiations that have been conducted today regarding the following cases. For the sake of clarity, will you please enumerate the numbers starting with the two case, et cetera, assigned to me, the McLean case and Burden case. Mr. Johnson do you have the numbers of the cases.

MR. JOHNSON: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Do you, Mr. Logan?

MR. LOGAN: I sure do.

THE COURT: One case 81-174-Civil-T-17, McLean, M-C-L-E-A-N, versus the Church of Scientology and another case assigned to me is Burden versus Scientology, the number will be supplied subsequently, but I believe it's an '81 or '82 case, and then the two other cases that are assigned to Judges, they have consented for this Court to deal with in these settlement negotiations, are Judge Castagna's case which is Cazares, will you spell that.

MR. FLYNN: C-A-Z-A-R-E-S.

\_ ′

THE COURT: Versus --1 MR. FLYNN: Church of Scientology, et al, in number 2 82-1313. 3 THE COURT: Civil-T-15, that would be Judge Castagna's case. Wakefield case assigned to Judge Hodges, 5 that is the number that we don't know. 6 MR. JOHNSON: We'll furnish that, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: If you'll do that. Who is going to 8 9 speak? 10 MR. FLYNN: Insofar as the Burden case --11 THE COURT: For the record, identify yourself. MR. FLYNN: Michael Flynn, counsel for Tony E. 12 13 Burden. 14 MR. HERTZBERG: So the record is clear, it was our 15 understanding the entirety of the remarks that we're going to 16 make in these proceedings will be kept under seal in 17 perpetuity. 18 THE COURT: That is correct. The only reason it 19 might have to be reviewed will be for this Court to enforce 20 the settlement which is being recited into the record because it's my understanding that this proposed settlement of these 21 22 four cases will merge the merits into the settlement so it 23 would be the enforcement of the settlement, and that there 24 might be any subsequent matter that this Court might have to 25

address, correct?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am, except we were only able to put the concepts of the non-monetary aspects of the settlement, we don't have the final language, but we anticipate we'll have no problem because Mr. Heller and Mr. Plynn have settled other cases together, they have worked out the actual language, all we can do is give the concept.

figures and concepts and you can give me what the intent is of the concepts so if you have difficulty with the language, et cetera, if there's a problem with enforcibility of that, we can deal with that. But I certainly would not want to have any misunderstanding about the good faith intentions of all parties in settling and the intent that this settlement would be, in fact, enforcible; correct, gentlemen?

MR. HELLER: Yes.

THE COURT: Is that right?

MR. HELLER: Legally, yes. Lawrence Heller from Los Angeles. That is absolutely correct.

THE COURT: You understand that, Mr. Flynn?

MR. FLYNN: That is correct.

THE COURT: Mr. Logan?

MR. LOGAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, please recite this into

the record.

MR. HELLER: Mr. Johnson will recite it into the

record and Mr. Johnson reminded me and I guess I'm 1 reiterating what he says, we have not specifically discussed 2 the releases. Mr. Flynn of course is aware of the releases 3 4 that we've previously entered into, so in a number of cases which we've agreed upon, it's clear the releases herein will 5 в follow those general lines if not specifically follow the 7 releases that Mr. Plynn and I have agreed upon. 8 THE COURT: You're using that as your frame of 9 reference on all four of these Plaintiffs' cases or just on 10 the Burden case? 11 MR. HELLER: I'm speaking now on the Burden case 12 between Mr. Flynn and myself. 13 MR. JOHNSON: But yes, we're using that as a frame 14 of reference, there will be people named on the release that 15 we would present that are not parties to the lawsuit. 16 THE COURT: You don't have any problems with using 17 those releases, do you, Mr. Logan? 18 MR. LOGAM: I've never seen them, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Oh, you haven't? 20 MR. HELLER: They are pretty standard releases, if I'm correct, with some fairly specific language which we have discussed which specifically relate to the returning of documents and I think in one sense in the Cazares case, the

21

22

23

24

25

non-disclosure of certain material that underlies the cases

themselves. Other than that, they're quite standard and I

appreciate Mr. Logan hasn't seen them, there's nothing unusual, I should state for the record.

misunderstanding. You've done a fine job today in getting this case to the point where you postured it in the settlement posture. Now, let's not get hung up here. The intent is that there be a settlement, that the language that be used be consistent with the intent and spirit of settlement for certain sums of money in all four of these cases, as you're about to recite it. Let's hear the recitation.

MR. JOHNSON: Let me start it out, please. I'll ask my co-counsel to fill in. Your Honor, I would first say that the McLeans are not here because we're starting with the Burden case, but they want to be in here when their case is heard. I would like to give the language as to all four cases as we have agreed. How do we nandle that?

MR. PLYNN: Your Honor, with the indulgence of the Court, I'd like to make a 5:35 flight.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FLYNN: I was hoping we could do Burden first.

THE COURT: Let's do Burden.

MR. JOHNSON: All right. The amount of money in Burden is

That the non-monetary provisions were that the

pasen has been proposed in agreed upon. 2 MR. HELLER: Correct. 3 MR. FLYNN: Correct, both as to the number, the 4 monetary amount in as to the declaration. 5 MR. JOHNSON: Right, there is an agreement that will 6 be non-disclosed by either party of the amount of the 7 mometary settlement in any way or any form or any mention of 8 the amount of the settlement, all right. 9 10 Next, that all documents in the possession of the 11 attorney or Mrs. Burden or any people associated with the case that will be relating to the Church of Scientology Will 12 be returned or delivered to the Church of Scientology, both 13 14 documents we have turned over to them in discovery and the 15 documents they have developed during this discovery procedure 16 in preparation of the case. 17 MR. FLYNN: Except attorney/client privileged 18 material. 19 MR. JOHNSON: Of course. 20 MR. FLYNN: Those are documents relating to the case, relating to the Burden case as opposed to documents relating 21 22 to other cases. HR. HERTZEERG: On that point, I'd like to elaborate, 23 24 the understanding will be we get all copies of those 25 documents with the representation that they have been

Plaintiff, Mrs. Enross, will sign an affidavit or declaration

1

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

forthcoming with all of the documents, also includes but not be limited to the so-called seized documents that were obtained from the files in Washington, D. C.

MR. FLYNN: No, those are used in other cases so it does not contemplate those. I used those in the other litigation. It contemplates all the documents in the Burden case.

MR. HERTZBERG: In the Burden case.

THE COURT: In the Burden case, that's what I understand, all the rest has to be a complete return, if it's not complete, it's violative of the agreement.

MR. JOHNSON: All right. Yes, ma'am. Next, there will be an agreement that Mrs. Burden will not give any testimony in any proceeding either in law or administrative-wise relating to the Church of Scientology unless she's subpoensed.

Next, that if there should be any further litigation between the parties in this case, that any past activity, either those alleged in this lawsuit or matters that would be similar fact evidence that was developed during the course of this lawsuit, will not be used by either party against the other in any future litigation.

Mext, that Mrs. Burden will not voluntarily cooperate with any person adverse to Scientology in any proceedings against Scientology.

1	MR. HELLER: The last thing we agreed upon, Mrs.
2	Burden forthwith will not speak to anyone and we can
3	except I think her immediate family, about the facts that
4	underlie and act as the predicate for her complaint on file
5	in this matter.
6	THE COURT: You have any problem with that?
7	MR. PLYNN: No, we don't.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Is that it on the Burden case?
9	MR. HELLER: I think that's covers it.
10	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Is there any reason for Mr. Flynn to
12	remain?
13	MR. HERTZBERG: I wanted to add one thing. I
14	represent Mary Sue Hubbard who is a party in three of the
15	four cases we're discussing.
16	THE COURT: Your name is?
17	MR. HERTZBERG: Michael Hertzberg.
18	THE COURT: For the record.
19	MR. HERTZBERG: I want to be clear that on the
20	release Mrs. Hubbard will seek to have signed, I would like
21	the option to either join a general all-encompassing release
22	that will be tendered to the other side or enter into a
23	separate one to run between the Plaintiff and Mrs. Hubbard.
24	MR. FLYNN: No problem, Your Honor.
25	MR. LOGAN: The names on the settlement are in

•

regard to the lawsuit.

MR. JOHNSON: The names on the settlement, but the names in the releases was done and the other cases involving the Church of Scientology, there are other entities named in the release that are not parties to this lawsuit which --

THE COURT: They're covered by this release?

MR. HELLER: That's right.

MR. FLYNN: Talking about the entities as opposed to the individuals both, such as the same type of entities and individuals in the other cases. We have no problem with people associated with the Church or entities associated with the Church.

THE COURT: No problem?

MR. HELLER: Yeah, against Mr. Flynn, and I have entered into, in the past, a number of them have included these and they're strictly entities and associates associated with the Church of Scientology in California that are involved in --

MR. JOHNSON: And other Scientology organizations other than the Church of Scientology.

MR. HELLER: For instance, I'll give you a very specific relevant one, not only in the Burden action but the other actions is the estate of L. Ron Hubbard, they're not technically in this litigation, but of course, we're going to ask for a release for them in all of these actions. I didn't

	specifically say this, Mr. Plynn knows I didn't specifically
	state it to Mr. Logan, I assume that's there's no problem
	with it, I assume that there's no problem.
	MR. LOGAN: It's not.
	MR. FLYNN: No.
	THE COURT: The intent of this settlement is to
	settle the claims of Burden, McLean, Wakefield and Cazares
	with regard to all named parties as well as those persons who
	would be reasonably related thereto.
	MR. FLYNN: Correct.
	THE COURT: Isn't that right, Mr. Logan?
	MR. LOGAN: Right.
	MR. HELLER: Absolutely correct.
	THE COURT: Now. Does that complete Burden.
ļ	MR. HELLER: I believe so.
	THE COURT: Mr. Flynn, you're excused, take your
	client with you. And the rest of these are all going to go
	two, three and four, so you can leave.
	I would thank you, Mr. Flynn.
	MR. FLYNN: Thank you.
	THE COURT: You're excused. Thank you for your
	cooperation.
	Now, all right. Do you want to take the others and
	then McLean last? Who do you want to do next?
	MR. HELLER: Cazares.

THE COURT: All right. The Cazares settlement.

MR. JOHNSON: Judge, the Cazares' money figure is

THE COURT: All right.

MR. JOHNSON: The same non-monetary provisions that I've just outlined here as far as Burden apply equally to Cazares.

THE COURT: Are incorporated by reference.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. JOHNSON: And to supplement that, the non-disclosure as to activities --

THE COURT: Who is coming in?

MR. LOGAN: The McLeans, I signalled them not to.

MR. JOHNSON: — will include not only Mr. Cazares not discussing anything relating to the alleged wrongs of the Church, committed by the Church of Scientology, but any similar fact evidence that was developed during the course of this preparation for this trial, and further, there is an agreement that in any further litigation between the parties, that the slate is wiped clean, that is to say that neither the Church nor Mr. Cazares could present as a party, have any further litigation matters that occurred heretofore which are a part of this case either as alleged or similar fact evidence. In other words, the slate would be wiped clean in

the future. 1 MR. LOGAN: A specific paragraph we agreed upon was 2 the Plaintiffs shall not disclose to any person nor 3 disseminate in any fashion by writing or otherwise the contents or substance of the documents which shall be 5 returned to the Church of Scientology in California pursuant 6 7 to this agreement. 8 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am, that is correct. We 9 agreed to that language in addition to the broader language I 10 previously have given, we will not discuss anything related 11 to this case here. 12 THE COURT: All right. Is that the understanding 13 with regard to the Cazares case? 14 MR. JOHNSON: I think that includes everything, 15 doesn't it? 16 MR. LOGAN: Only reference to the settlement is that 17 the case has been settled. 18 MR. JOHNSON: There would be no indication any wise 19 to indicate whether it's a large settlement, small 20 settlement, five figures, six figures. 21 MR. HELLER: Or any payment whatsoever. 22 THE COURT: Right. 23 MR. HELLER: The case has been settled. 24 THE COURT: I think that it's understood, the case 25 has been settled. Is that a problem?

MR. LOGAN: No. 1 THE COURT: That's no problem. 2 MR. LOGAN: The case has been settled and the terms 3 of settlement are providential. MR. JOHNSON: Now you understand I incorporated by 5 6 reference all the matters he mentioned earlier in the Burden 7 discussion, we did that and that was the Burden --8 THE COURT: We did that and the Court did it, if you 9 recall. 10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Now, does that complete Cazares? 12 MR. HERTZBERG: As well, Your Honor, my standing . 13 option here on the release running in favor of Mrs. Hubbard 14 from the Plaintiffs. 15 THE COURT: No problem, correct, Mr. Logan? 16 MR. LOGAN: That's no problem. There's no 17 declaration in Cazares, so that's an over-incorporation. 18 MR. JOHNSON: That's correct. 19 MR. HELLER: There was a declaration we referred to 20 in Burden, there is none in the Cazares, that's correct. 21 THE COURT: With that opt out exception, all right. 22 Now the next case is Wakefield. 23 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am. Wakefield will have the 24 same non-monetary stipulations and agreements as was done in 25 Cazares and in Burden and in addition to that, that we will

agree to pay to Mrs. Wakefield 1 thousand dollars plus allow her to retain the monies being 2 held in escrow by Mr. Logan which is the amount paid in 3 settlement earlier in the case, plus accrued interest. MR. LOGAN: Tendered in settlement. 5 MR. JOHNSON: Tendered or paid in settlement. 6 7 THE COURT: How much is that again? 8 MR. JOHNSON: Judge, the new money would be 9 and he will retain his escrow 10 account. 11 THE COURT: And the escrow is how much? 12 MR. JOHNSON: Amounts to a little over 13 thousand, Judge. 14 THE COURT: Just so I have that. 15 MR. JOHNSON: May be 16 THE COURT: Whatever it is. 17 MR. LOGAN: We did have substantial negotiations or 18 conferences in front of Judge Jenkins and we did create a 19 record there. I would suggest that be subscribed to this 20 record and it all be treated in the same manner. 21 THE COURT: I don't think that's wise. 22 MR. LOGAN: You don't? 23 THE COURT: I don't think it's wise. The settlement terms are now being announced in front of this Judge. I will 25 tell you that at the conclusion of this, at the conclusion of

1	this, I will be the one to sign all four of these orders of
2	dismissal.
3	HR. LOGAN: Okay.
4	THE COURT: I will not incorporate anything else in
5	this record other than what is being spoken to me right now.
6	MR. LOGAN: Pine.
7	MR. HERTZBERG: I would like to clarify one point
8	which would apply to each of the cases, that Mr. Logan is
9	counsel, lead counsel in the Cazares, Wakefield and McLean
10	cases, and that is, that the return of the documents in his
11	case would include all of the seized documents.
12	THE COURT: Do you have any problem with that? You
13	don't have any need for the seized documents. You don't
14	MR. HERTZBERG: You're wiping the slate clean.
15	THE COURT: You don't have any need for the seized
16	documents?
17	MR. HERTZBERG: It's inter alia, the seized
18	documents.
19	MR. HELLER: Since there is no other litigation in
20	the lawsuit.
21	MR. LOGAN: No problem.
22	MR. HERTZBERG: With the representation
23	THE COURT: That this is complete.
24	MR. HERTZBERG: All we ask is all the other documents
25	except their privileged attorney/client communications which

4 5

MR. LOGAN: What do you mean other documents. Not memorandums and so on.

MR. HELLER: Attorney/cient would not --

MR. HERTIBERG: The same as Mr. Plynn.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, she can't take all of you.

Let me try. All of the seized documents, whether they were procured in Washington or some other location, all of the legal documents, all documents and exhibits that were going to be used in aid of the prosecution of this case, either for identification or exhibits or discovery, they will be returned. The only exceptions to that is material which is the work product, created work product of Mr. Logan that needs not be returned, his mental processes, his memorandums with the exception of those items, everything else can be returned; right?

MR. LOGAN: That's right. As to Wakefield, they would return all psychiatric records and depositions of psychiatric personnel and we'll return the auditing.

MR. JOHNSON: That's agreed.

THE COURT: Is that agreed?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. One other matter is in addition that Ms. Wakefield will not disclose any of the matters relating to the substance of her complaint or any similar fact evidence or any other matters relating to her claim

against the Church. She will not disclose in any form any upper level materials or confidential Church materials that she has learned through her period of time associated with the Church of Scientology.

MR. LOGAN: We agree.

THE COURT: Agree to that, all right. Now, does that complete Wakefield?

MR. JOHNSON: I think so.

Ask them to come in, please. Fellas, pity the poor Court Reporter. There's five of you. You want to talk, that's why I'm stopping you. All right, ma'am, sir, you can come in and if you want to take a seat at the table, might be easier for you to be more comfortable for you. Fine. I'm having the attorneys remain standing because they're talking to me.

Now, the last case is this case, the McLean case.

I've already recited the names and number into the record.

The understanding of the settlement in this case, recite it,

Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, the monetary amount of settlement --

THE COURT: Loud enough so they can hear you.

MR. JOHNSON: The monetary amount of settlement is six hundred and eighty-seven thousand rive hundred dollars. The non-monetary aspect of the settlement is the same as we

Claudia M. Fry, CSR, RPR, C.P., C.M.

2

3

5

**6** 

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

have related heretofore and we would like to incorporate that by reference in this case.

MR. LOGAN: That doesn't --

THE COURT: I know that, you need to recite that specifically for the McLeans. I'm attempting to do that, at this time, incorporation by reference is acceptable, try and do it concisely and if you need to help him with regard to it Mr. Heller or someone else, do so.

MR. JOHNSON: All right. All documents in the possession of the Plaintiffs which arose out of discovery in this case, either was furnished by the Church of Scientology or obtained by them by discovery or obtained by the McLeans in any fashion and any source relating to the Church of Scientology will be turned over to the Church of Scientology, that the parties, neither the Plaintiffs or Defendants, will reveal the amount of the settlement in any fashion whatsoever, that the McLeans will not give testimony in any proceeding, either legal or administrative, concerning the Church of Scientology unless they are subpoenaed, that upon this settlement, the slate will be wiped clean concerning any activities or actions by the Church of Scientology toward the McLeans or them towards the Church of Scientology, beginning of time till the present time. This is to say if there should be other litigation between the parties, anything that's happened heretofore cannot be used or resurrected in

2

3

4

5

в

7

8

10

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the other litigation. That the McLeans will not voluntarily cooperate with any persons adverse to Scientology, any proceedings relating to Scientology.

THE COURT: All right. Is that your -- and then you wish to make reference with regard to your client.

MR. HERTIBERG: Yes.

THE COURT: Loud enough so they can hear you.

MR. HERTZBERG: Not only do I want to reserve the right to choose at some later date whether I want a separate release to run in Mrs. Hubbard's favor from the Plaintiffs or not, I will reserve the right to have a separate release run to Mrs. Hubbard or be in a general release involving all parties to the litigation, but I also want the record to be clear that with respect to all four of the cases that we've discussed, we will intend to incorporate in the provisions governing non-disclosure and in fact the burying the hatchet provisions apply to Mrs. Hubbard as well as the Church. In other words, that the Plaintiffs, the McLeans and the other Plaintiffs, will not discuss what they perceived that Mrs. Hubbard may or may not have done to them as well as to the Church because Mr. Johnson addressed those points, generally, he referred to the Church.

MR. JOHNSON: That's correct. When I'm using the Church of Scientology, I'm using a generic sense including all Scientology entities.

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One other matter relating to the McLeans is that in the releases we discussed in the other cases, the releases will include other individuals and entities other than the named parties in the lawsuit and in line with what has been done with other Scientology cases settled which we had discussed here today.

THE COURT: It is the understanding of the Court that not only in the McLean case but in all of these cases where the negotiations have been held and all settlements have been reached in all four cases, that the parties have arrived at settlements which will thereby provide benefits to the Plaintiffs who are settling for certain sums of money for non-disclosure with regard to circumstances concerning their complaints against the Church and other related entities, releases which will be prepared and have been used in previous cases will include not only the named parties in these various cases and specifically the McLean case, but in the other cases, but will include persons and legal entities that need to be named as parties to the release so that the releases are what they're intended to be, full and complete for everybody.

Now, is that your understanding?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.

MR. HERTEBERG: Yes.

THE COURT: Is that your understanding, Mr. Logan?

MR. LOGAN: Yes.

MR. HELLER: Excuse me, Your Honor, I hope I'm not misinterpreting. I see heads shaking going back and forth. I want to make sure that as long as they're here, it's the McLeans' understanding as well.

THE COURT: Absolutely, the Court was going to inquire of them next. Mr. Logan if you need to talk with your clients so that they understand that the purpose of this is payment of money, other return of documents in return for which this matter is concluded, stopped, finished, for everybody.

MR. LOGAN: There are some other questions that I believe we agreed upon, one to do with a New York judgment against Mr. McLean, that was going to be satisfied, there is still a case in Canada that was part of the settlement, that is going to be dismissed with prejudice, and there's no declaration so by incorporating, we've again over-reincorporated, there's no declaration involved in McLean, there's no declaration involved in McLean, there's no declaration involved in McLean, but there is no --

THE COURT: I gather in this situation, when you say no declaration, there's going to be no verbalized animosity; is that correct.

MR. LOGAN: Well, in my references as we stated in Burden, there is a specific declaration there and that's the

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

only case, so when we incorporate everybody from Burden, we've overdone it, that's what I'm pointing out.

THE COURT: So the declaration is opted out?

MR. LOGAN: Yes.

MR. HELLER: He's talking about the written affidavit.

THE COURT: The written affidavit?

MR. LOGAN: It's overdone it.

THE COURT: But the other things with regard to that, saying there's a settlement, the terms are sealed without specifying what those terms are, everybody understands that, and that cuts both ways. The Plaintiffs don't talk about it, the Defendant's don't talk about it.

MR. HELLER: Correct.

THE COURT: And what has been recited in the way of releases as I understand it is to make it full and complete in exchange for the money and the other things, dismisses all of the lawsuits and all of that. On the other hand, the Defendants feel that they're entitled to have it all completely concluded so their minds can be at rest, that everybody that should be named to be released and protected is named so this case is over. It's over. It's done.

MR. HELLER: And Your Honor for maybe to go on ad nauseum and completely say the McLeans under this also includes what we incorporated with respect to their speaking

24

about the facts of their complaint and facts in the document and everything up to today.

THE COURT: Well except their immediate family, again respecting Scientology, I think you did cover that for the Court.

MR. HELLER: I want to be ultra-complete.

THE COURT: I think it makes it clear that among the members of their own family if they want to talk about their feelings among their own family, that it not be limited to no talking about it, but to have disclosure to third persons who are not members of their immediate family, talking to the press, talking with people who might be potential litigants, this is what people are trying to avoid for the money and for everything, that is what you're being paid for, so this is over for both sides, that's in plain English.

MR. HELLER: Best expressed that way.

THE COURT: All right, now. You have recited your position, does that take care of your position?

MR. LOGAN: I'm sure counsel understands that there is a case that Scientology is not a party to, but may come up in California, the Randolph case.

MR. HELLER: My understanding of that case, without knowing anything specific about it, never seen the pleadings, I first knew of that, it is a malicious prosecution case dealing with a case that had been filed and should have

nothing to do with this case as I see it. Now, I don't pretend to know all the facts in this case, but --

MR. LOGAN: She's not constrained, Mrs. McLean is not constrained in the prosecution of that case in mentioning or — those are two different cases, so what she's constained about talking about are the facts of this case.

MR. JOHNSON: And any facts that arose out of this case or any things that were done by the Church of Scientology allegedly to her heretofore which was a part of this case, either the litigation or similar fact evidence, that you plan to use in this case.

MR. LOGAN: Yeah, that applies to any future litigation between the parties. I have no -- we have no problem with that.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

THE COURT: We're talking about future litigation between the parties and related parties in this case. The whole purpose of this is not to create a situation where these people are settling their claims with this party.

MR. JOHNSON: Just to follow up on that Judge, in addition to future litigation, I'll give you an example, for example, a number of years ago there was a mock funeral in Toronto, Canada, in which the Church of Scientology there in Toronto conducted that sort of thing, for example, things that occurred heretofore and which she complains about, that

sort of thing cannot then be discussed with anyone, not only the litigation, but cannot be discussed and publicized to anyone else.

THE COURT: Other than with members of their own family. Is that a problem?

MR. LOGAN: Your Honor, we have a scope problem.

THE COURT: A scope problem?

MR. LOGAN: You see, the other litigation that may or may not come up, it's not litigation between these parties.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this: Let me see if the Court can assist with regard to scope.

MR. LOGAN: Sure.

THE COURT: The name of the case is Randolph?

MR. LOGAN: Yes Nancy McLean versus Donald Randolph.

Mr. Randolph is, but the intent of this settlement in this case is for facts involved in the McLean versus Scientology and all the parties in this cause in this Court, but the facts and the discovery material and the parties that have been raised herein cannot be used in the other case so as to create potential problems as I perceive it for the Defendants in this case to be joined, if not by Mrs. McLean, by other people, and that is a justifiable concern because Mrs. McLean may not join people on her own, but you see other parties who

are in your lawsuit have a right to do what we call filing a cross-claim, then they become or file a cross-claim against someone else, third parties bring them into the case, so that even though you may not have intended to bring them in, other people bring them in and that's what the Defendants here are concerned with. Now, do you think, Mr. Logan, that assisted in making the parties realize that Scientologists and the people they represent, that the attorneys here do not want to

MR. LOGAN: I understand that, Your Honor, but — and they would agree not to affirmatively use that, but if in this case in the depositions they're asked about that area, certainly we can't create any privilege here in Tampa regarding out there. They would agree not to affirmatively use that if they're asked.

be confronted with that problem?

THE COURT: I think the appropriate thing for them to do is to say that is part of a Court sealed settlement which is true, that's part of a Court sealed settlement and before she would be permitted to answer any questions regarding that, there would have to be an order of the Court which means there would have to be argument that would have to be held by somebody before this Court before that document or those items could be released for disclosure. Now, let us not play games with this.

MR. LOGAM: Could I have five minutes with my

Solar clients? 1 THE COURT: Yes, you can have five minutes, go back 2 to the Jury room, walk through that door that way. 3 MR. HELLER: It's acceptable to us. 4 (Thereupon, there was a brief recess in the 5 6 proceedings.) 7 MR. LOGAN: There was an underlying case out in 8 California and the Defendants must know that part of these 9 documents like the funeral documents are of record in that 10 underlying case. 11 THE COURT: All right, filed? 12 MR. LOGAN: Yeah, we can limit it to those. I mean. 13 she has no control over those. 14 THE COURT: They've already been filed, already made 15 a public record? 16 MR. LOGAN: Yes. 17 THE COURT: You can't unring those bells, they're 18 already there. 19 MR. HERTZBERG: Your Honor, is it possible to have an 20 inventory of those prepared? 21 THE COURT: Well, I don't see why not, so you'd know 22 exactly what has been filed and what hasn't. 23 MR. HERTZBERG: That way, we'll eliminate a dispute 24 in the future. 25 THE COURT: Sure, as of today's date, July 11th,

1986, an inventory of the documents in that file so that we can be clear that that which has already been filed is filed, that which is not filed will not be filed in the future if it's material to the subject of this settlement and agreement, and should there be any future deposition or testimony required of this party and that also should be done prior to a trial so a trial Judge is not confronted with this difficulty right when a person's in the witness box. There should be an anticipation of a necessity for a Court ruling if required to determine the paramaters of a settlement agreement because they would have standing to be heard. I'm not telling you what would happen, but they would have standing to be heard and we all understand that based upon the terms of this agreement.

MR. LOGAN: It would seem the simple parameters would be what is of record in that underlying case which is a closed case.

THE COURT: Oh, is the case closed? Now are we talking --

MR. LOGAN: Yes, the underlying case is the underlying case to the present McLean v. Randolph case, it's a malicious prosecution case, and what we're talking about is the underlying case to the present malicious prosecution case. It's a closed item.

MR. HELLER: My understanding, there is a malicious

19

21

24

23

25

statement simply saying that surely the Defendants know that certain documents are in this case. I'll speak for myself, but I think I'm speaking with prior discussions with other attorneys, we know nothing about the case. When I say nothing, I mean zero. My understanding of Your Honor's order as it was made just now was that the documents that are in the present case, which I understand is known as Nancy McLean versus Don Randolph, et al, it's possible that those are now of public record and that there is nothing we can do to

prosecution case, I should again say Mr. Logan made a

case, not anything like that, and that Your Honor's comments go to that case and we'll receive an inventory in that case.

ding that bell, not any other case, not any underlying

THE COURT: It's the current case you want an inventory on?

MR. LOGAN: I don't think there's any documents there. The documents are in the closed underlying case.

THE COURT: They're with the Clerk out there. It's Federal Court?

MR. LOGAN: Yes, it was Federal Court in Los Angeles.

MR. HELLER: I haven't the foggiest notion what documents there are.

MR. LOGAN: Nor do I.

THE COURT: You get the number of the case, you get

he

đ to

: be

that

k at

it is

at

is

:he

ΟË

t we

= to

t's

incomplete and they're just trying to make sure that what —
they're not trying to limit you to what you're entitled to do
properly, but on the other hand, they're trying to make sure
that they're protected in the future based upon the money
that they're paying you, which is reasonable. You would feel
the same way about it yourselves. You want to make sure that
things are being properly protected.

Now Mr. Logan, have you got some other language suggestions here? If not, we may have said enough. We need to know if that's acceptable to the McLeans.

MR. HERTZBERG: May I have a point of clarification, if you'll indulge me. I want it clear of course we cannot recoup from the Court files the documents that were filed in this underlying case.

THE COURT: In California.

MR. HERTZBERG: Details of which are unknown to us, all of us over here on this side, however merely because a document was filed once and resides in perhaps an inactive Court file in California should not mean that it's excluded from the scope of the copies that must be returned by the McLeans and which are also in the prohibition about discussion with others outside the immediate family.

MR. LOGAM: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: I know you missed part of that. In essence, what he is saying is that unless it is necessary to

deal with the case that is in California, documents that are contained in the underlying file and the current active file should not be discussed nor should they be excluded from the return of documents that are part of this settlement. If there are duplicate copies, if there are items that were procured from Washington or whatever, seized, that should be returned as part of the McLeans' good faith settlement in this case, then they ought to be returned. If there are items that are already on file out there, then they're on file out there. If you need to deal with those items on file in the prosecution of that case, nobody's trying to stop you from doing that. But they're just trying to make sure the Scientology Defendants that are settling this case are not being brought into a lawsuit out there in California 'cause that would cause them to feel as though this agreement was being breached and they would file a suit for breach of this settlement, wouldn't they.

MR. JOHNSON: You an be assured of that, Your Honor.

MR. HELLER: Your Honor, you know if we get an inventory and there are problems, I'm sure we can enter into a sealing order in that case to make sure those documents are only used for that case. I think I'm speaking without authority, I assume with the intents, underlying intents we discussed of my client, that would handle it.

THE COURT: I would think that it would. Do you see

1

2

3

5

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

a problem with that? 1 MR. HELLER: I need to go look at them and see what 2 3 they are. THE COURT: He needs to look at the file, but if 4 there's duplicate copies that you possess, they should be 5 6 returned, Mr. Logan. 7 MR. LOGAN: Sure. 8 THE COURT: Is that acceptable to your clients? 9 MR. LOGAN: Yes. 10 THE COURT: All right. The Court records the 11 nodding by the McLeans with regard to this in the 12 affirmative. Now, that would complete the Court's 13 understanding of all the four settlements in these cases, 14 correct? 15 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Johnson, Mr. Hertzberg? 17 MR. HERTZBERG: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Heller? 19 MR. HELLER: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Logan? 21 MR. LOGAN: Right, yes. 22 THE COURT: You may be seated Mr. and Mrs. McLean, 23 that's courteous of you to stand. You may be seated. 24 Now, this Court, even though it's not the Judge in 25 the two cases, Wakefield and Cazares, will want to see the

settlement proposal that you wish to file, the joint motion 1 for dismissal with prejudice, pointing out the merits of 2 these cases are now merged in the settlement so that nobody 3 has to worry about ever proving up allegations or defenses, 4 they are all merged, obviating the need for the record. See, 5 it's kind of important, here you're turning over records, I want to make sure there's no misunderstanding that everything 7 8 is merged in the settlement, the merits, namely, and anything 9 that needs to be enforced through the settlement, and I will 10 be the Judge that will sign from my two assigned cases, as 11 well as the case Cazares, it's Judge Castagna's case, and the 12 Wakefield case which is Judge Hodges' case, I will sign. They've already given me their approval to go forward with the settlement. I think that's consistent to follow through on it.

How many days do you want to get the papers to me? MR. LOGAN: Housecleaning, there are other Defendants who were not here because the definitive authority was with the lead Defendant, and correct me if I'm wrong, can you speak for those other Defendants?

THE COURT: They're speaking for them.

MR. LOGAN: They have spoken for them?

THE COURT: Yes, they have spoken for them. Now, the question is how long. Today is July 11th, take all the time you need except I better have it in less than a month.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

. 

MR. HERTIBERG: Within a month, we can have it.

THE COURT: That means that no later than August the — let me make sure that's a working day -- oh, it's a -- no, it's not a Friday, it's a Monday. August 11, that sounds like a good day to me and if people need to fly in town on Sunday, they can. August 11, I want all those papers so I can sign them. That's enough time to get everybody to sign, get all your language together, get everything done. And I don't want to hear about any problems.

MR. HERTZBERG: Your Honor, was it contemplated by the Court that counsel be present on that day?

THE COURT: Not necessary.

MR. HERTZBERG: I have a Court engagement.

THE COURT: No, sir, not necessary, all I'm looking for is papers to be delivered to me with all the signatures on all the papers that I need to see or at least a recognition that releases have been signed, agreements are in camera, sealed, in the custody of certain law offices, and based upon that, you acknowledge that that's all been accomplished. You submit to the Court and name each of the four of these cases or do them individually, this case is settled, the terms are acceptable, whatever you want to put in, joint motion for dismissal, the Court will retain jurisdiction for enforcement of the settlement agreement and it'll be done, it'll be over.

Man last

MR. LOGAN: What would be the disposition of the reporter's notes?

THE COURT: They're sealed, she deals with these notes all the time. She'll be ordered to have them sealed and she'll retain them. If you need to have it transcribed, it'll be transcribed, and she deals with things like that all the time here, criminal matters. Yes?

MR. JOHNSON: Judge also, I think it's self-evident that there will be no disclosure of the fact that these settlement discussions have taken place until the papers are finally signed.

THE COURT: Absolutely. I think all parties are directed not to release this to the news media because I think that is counter-productive to your accomplishment of the mission of settlement of this case. And as you well know, part of the terms of settlement is to not disclose it to outside persons, so I think that in the spirit of what you agreed to, the news media should not be informed regarding this at all.

Now, I don't mind on August 11th or whatever, that you have a joint news release that people want to issue out or you want to put something together, because you might as well think about saying we've settled these cases because as soon as it goes down there to get filed that these cases are dismissed, the questions are going to rise, so you might as

Claudia M. Fry, CSR, RPR, C.P., C.M.

well think about your language, each have settled, the terms are secret, and that's it. When everybody contacts the Plaintiffs, the Plaintiffs are going to say it's settled, the terms are secret, when they contacts Scientology, it's settled, the terms are secret.

MR. HELLER: That's an excellent idea. There won't be any ambiguity or misunderstanding.

THE COURT: I would target the news release on the same day, if one of you wants to come here. You, Mr. Logan, 'cause you're local, and Mr. Johnson may be local, to come and say Judge, here it is, will you sign it, I'm going to sign it, and then there goes the news releases and everything's done altogether at the same time. Is that all right?

MR. HELLER: Yes. The only thing, don't come to me with any problems, of course, I'm going to be rather west of here.

THE COURT: I'm being optimistically facetious, I don't want to see any difficulties. I think this is laid out adequately, I think it is a settlement that has been worked out in good faith and I want to commend both sides. I say that in the presence of those parties and I wish other parties were here. I want to commend both sides for this because you're resolving cases and I believe all factors considered, it's in the best interest of both sides to

amicably have these cases resolved. Yes? 1 MR. JOHNSON: Judge, we may have -- Cookie will 2 provide us the transcript of this, will she not? 3 THE COURT: If you wish to have it, she can. You 4 order it, you can pay her for it, and it will be sealed. Do 5 you want a copy of the transcript, Walt? 6 7 MR. LOGAN: Yes. 8 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would want it. 9 THE COURT: It's sealed, it's sealed, you understand 10 that, only with -- only use it for the --11 MR. HELLER: We understand we would use it for -12 purposes of preparation of anything of the settlement 13 agreement. 14 THE COURT: That's fine. 15 MR. HERTIBERG: We all understand on the record, we 16 understand it's sealed. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Logan, there's no question that you 18 understand this is sealed and since Mr. Flynn is gone, 19 representing one of the four people settling in this case? 20 MR. LOGAN: I represent Burden, too. 21 THE COURT: I know that, but you understand this is 22 sealed and cannot be used for any purpose, you understand 23 that? 24 MR. LOGAN: Yes. 25 THE COURT: Other than the preparation of making sure

you're getting the releases. 1 MR. HELLER: I'll take on the burden of informing 2 Mr. Flynn. In fact, I'll do it over the weekend. I have his 3 home number We will talk about the fact it is sealed and the 4 fact there's not to be any statements pending the signing of 5 6 the agreement. 7 THE COURT: And work on the news releases and all 8 that will be it, and you'll have control of that for both 9 sides. 10 MR. LOGAN: All of the terms of the settlement are 11 confidential, right, the return of the documents, 12 everything? 13 THE COURT: Everything. 14 MR. JOHNSON: That's right. 15 THE COURT: Everything, everything is confidential. 16 Your client wants to talk to you, Mr. Logan. 17 MR. LOGAN: Perhaps a deadline for the executory 18 exchange of documents. 19 THE COURT: Folks, when I sign that on August 11th, 20 all of that is supposed to be done, thirty days before I put 21 my John Hancock on this and it's says it's closed means the 22 executory is accomplished, period. 23 MR. HELLER: We'll get it to them in good time. 24 THE COURT: Documents, money, everything. 25 MR. HELLER: We'll get the documents for their

review in good time, there will be plenty of time to review 1 2 this disloque. THE COURT: I want the money and everything all done 3 so that it's all approved, it's all done, and when I sign it, 4 the settlement has been effectuated. What I'm doing is 5 merely ministerial on that day and the news releases are 6 7 ministerial on that day because everything executorial will 8 have been done. 9 MR. HELLER: You're speaking about passing the 10 checks at the time the clients sign the documents, not at the 11 time you sign the documents? 12 THE COURT: Oh, absolutely, when the releases and the 13 documents are signed, that's when the money should exchange, 14 that should be done before the 11th of August, absolutely. 15 Oh, yeah. 16 Now, have we got it said the way it should be said? 17 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. 18 THE COURT: That's all there is to say. 19 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. 20 THE COURT: You're excused. 21 MR. HELLER: Thank you. 22 MR. LOGAN: Thank you. 23 MRS. MCLEAN: Thank you 24 (Thereupon, the proceedings were concluded.) 25 \*\*\*\*

STATE OF FLORIDA )

COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH

I, CLAUDIA M. FRY, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court, Middle District, Tampa Division.

DO HEREST CERTIFY, that I was authorized to and did, through use of Computer Aided Transcription, report in shorthand the proceedings and evidence in the above-styled cause, as stated in the caption hereto, and that the foregoing pages, numbered 1 to 41, inclusive, constitute a true and correct transcription of my shorthand report of said proceedings and evidence.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand in the City of Tampa, County of Hillsborough, State of Florida, this 13th day of July, 1986.

CLAUDIA M. FRY, Official Court Reporter



#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

MARGERY WAKEFIELD	)	
Plaintiff	)	
vs.	)	CASE NO. 82-1313-Civ-T-10
THE CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA a/k/a THE	)	
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.	)	
Defendant	)	
	)	

### AFFIDAVIT OF COMPLIANCE

STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH

BEFORE, the undersigned authority, this day personally appeared WALT LOGAN, who, being duly sworn, deposes and states that Affiant has complied with the terms and conditions contained in that certain Settlement Agreement entered into in this action pertaining to the delivery of all documents which, by the terms of the Settlement Agreement, I am obligated to turn over to the other party and I have not retained any copy, record or facsimile of any of said docuements.

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED before me this

August, 1986.

My Commission Expires

Wakefield: CS13

Exhibit #4a

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

MARGERY WAKEFIELD	)	
Plaintiff	)	
vs.	)	CASE NO. 82-1313-Civ-T-10
THE CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA a/k/a THE	)	
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.	)	
Defendant	)	
	)	

## AFFIDAVIT OF COMPLIANCE

STATE OF Michigan COUNTY OF Houghton

Margery Wakefield, who, being duly sworn, deposes and states that Affiant has complied with the terms and conditions contained in that certain Settlement Agreement entered into in this action pertaining to the delivery of all documents which, by the terms of the Settlement Agreement, I am obligated to turn over to the other party and I have not retained any copy, record or facsimile of any of said documents.

Margery Wakefield

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED before me this <a href="https://link.nlm.nih.gov/l

Dun H

Notary Public, Houghton County, Michigan

My Commission Expires April 11, 1989

Wakefield5: CS12

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

MARGERY WAKEFIELD	)	
Plaintiff	)	
vs.	)	CASE NO. 82-1313-Civ-T-10
THE CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA a/k/a THE	)	
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.	)	
Defendant	)	
	)	

### AFFIDAVIT OF COMPLIANCE

STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH

BEFORE, the undersigned authority, this day personally appeared PAUL B. JOHNSON, who, being duly sworn, deposes and states that Affiant has complied with the terms and conditions contained in that certain Settlement Agreement entered into in this action pertaining to the delivery of all documents which, by the terms of the Settlement Agreement, I am obligated to turn over to the other party and I have not retained any copy, record or facsimile of any of said documents.

PAUL B. JOHNSON

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED before me this

s 15

day of

August, 1986.

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires the first the second and the second second

Wakefield: CS13