
(2:52 p.m.)
THE CLERK: Next case, Torres, et al, versus Torres, docket number 2011-433, defendants' motion to dismiss, plaintiffs for a mental exam of defendant, plaintiffs to restrain discussion of case with defendant, plaintiffs to -ex parte to compel, defendants to dismiss with opposition and defendant Debtmerica to dismiss. That rounds it out, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We have a motion to continue that's been denied. Was that the hearing? Motions, all right. Let's go back.

Okay. For the record, shall -- actually we do have a record. It's being -- it's on? It's on?

THE CLERK: We do, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. For the plaintiff, please?
MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You're by yourself?
MR. TORRES: Yes, sir. Pro se -- well, with the co-plaintiff Jennifer Adams.

THE COURT: Ms. Adams. Okay. And?
MR. CARTER: Attorney Jeremy Carter with my partner Attorney Cindy Nuzzolo for the defendants, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So you have a motion to dismiss; is that correct?

MR. CARTER: We do.

THE COURT: All right. And there's other motions, too. Am I wrong?

MR. CARTER: There are. I think there's only one or two plaintiffs' motions, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Who has the motion for the examination?
MR. CARTER: That's the plaintiff.
THE COURT: Okie dokie. All right. It's your motion. Why don't you give me some of the fact background that I have a sense of.

MR. CARTER: The motion to dismiss?
THE COURT: Yes. I have a sense of what it is, but one of the essential arguments is that it's a little bit premature, that the death has not arisen?

MR. CARTER: Correct. Judge, I would suggest -- and I'm going to let Attorney Nuzzolo argue that one because, I would suggest, if you allow the Sophie Torres motion to dismiss, the whole stack of cards falls with it because this is essentially a case where plaintiff, Mr. Torres, is arguing about having a will with his mother, his mother's will, that he created, that had her sign giving him all this property.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. CARTER: And if -- I would suggest if the Court hears the argument from the defendant, all the other subsequent counts disappear because they're all based on the underlying will and the transfer, the undue -- the interference and the
|all the other counts go hand in hand basically with the underlying premise about this will. And with that, I'll let Attorney Nuzzolo argue.

MS. NUZZOLO: In essence, Your Honor, plaintiffs are basically arguing that Sophie Torres created a will. In addition to that will, she executed an addendum stating that she would not revoke the will, that the will would give certain properties for various reasons within the addendum.

Plaintiffs have --
THE COURT: Who'd she give that addendum to?
MS. NUZZOLO: The addendum was created by the plaintiff Mr. Torres.

THE COURT: No, no. But who'd she give it to?
MS. NUZZOLO: I believe she signed it and gave it to her son, the plaintiff.

THE COURT: For safekeeping?
MS. NUZZOLO: I'm not sure if she gave him the original or if she gave him a copy, Your Honor.

THE COURT: My point is, ordinarily we have these disputes resolved in probate court. So the creation of a will by Sophie was a free and valid -- was a right. Freely, validly is the question mark $I$ understand. But educate me as to the soundness of the legal principle that one can, without consideration, grant a irrevocable will. A will by definition is revocable.

MS. NUZZOLO: I agree with you, Your Honor. A will is revocable, and a promise to make it not revocable is no different than the promise to actually create the will. So where the plaintiff, in essence, has filed a complaint, counts one through four against Sophie Torres for what he -- what I would consider an anticipatory breach. He's claiming she's breached her contract with him to not revoke a will that provides property to him.

THE COURT: Has the will been revoked?
MS. NUZZOLO: It is my understanding that a new will has been created.

THE COURT: Is that accurate? When you say, "It's my understanding," you're representing her.

MR. CARTER: She's represented by an estate attorney, Judge, and it's our |understanding that she has created a new will which prompted this filing of the complaint.

THE COURT: Okay. So you now have a new will and it may or may not have been validly executed and it may or may not have various probate claims or defenses to it. So --

MR. TORRES: Me, Your Honor? Okay. Yes, sir.
Okay. Your Honor, first they are inaccurate as to the reasons for breach of contract and, secondly, the will was actually generated for my mother in order to take away from an existing will of my father of two lots in Florida, and they're waterfront lots, and give them to my adopted sister.

Be that as it may, this issue came to be when -- on the death of my father. When my dad died, in order to avoid filing a probate claim against the estate for monies that we agreed were in excess of $\$ 1,640,000$, we entered into a contract on approximately $\$ 2$ million worth of property.

THE COURT: With whom?
MR. TORRES: My mother and I.
THE COURT: And where is the contract?
MR. TORRES: The contract is attached as an addendum to the will and it's filed on my original complaint.

Also, Your Honor, the original will --
THE COURT: Where is it? I just want to look at it.
MR. TORRES: Okay.
MS. NUZZOLO: I believe it's referenced as exhibit A to plaintiffs' complaint, Your Honor.

MR. TORRES: Yes, it is.
THE COURT: Exhibit?
MS. NUZZOLO: Exhibit A.
THE COURT: Okay.
(Pause.)
THE COURT: This agreement is a binding agreement by and between Jesse Enos Torres III and his natural mother Sophie dated April 24th. It is intended to be a binding addendum? MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: I've never heard of that.

MR. TORRES: Well, it was a family matter.
THE COURT: No, no.
MR. TORRES: Okay. It is a bind --
THE COURT: My family life is irrelevant. My judge and law life is very important. I've never seen anything like this. I've never heard of an addendum to a will that's a contract. I've never heard of it.

MR. TORRES: I understand that, but I couldn't find any reason that it wasn't legal at the time or now, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I understand that, but we're still dealing with whether it's a contract or not.

MR. TORRES: Here's what happened, Your Honor, and the reason for that. As originally there was just going to be a contract between my mother and myself transferring the properties over. If you read further, it allowed her to live her life and do whatever she wanted with the properties while she was alive.

When we wrote the contract, there were things that she wanted to change in the will that was in full force and effect. After the contract was written, the addendum, with -she asked that a will be produced. So I had a copy of Quicken WillMaker which I used for my will and my neighbors have used it, and we drafted a new will with her there.

THE COURT: There's a problem. Don't you think that's kind of a problem that you'd be using a computer-generated
something for a third person? You drafted a will for your mother.

MR. TORRES: No, Your Honor. I just ran the keyboard. THE COURT: Same thing.

MR. TORRES: My mother sat down with me.
THE COURT: What do you think lawyers do? We run keyboards and then we look at it and fill in the blanks and then we say this is a good will for you, and you get the money from the client.

MR. TORRES: I understand that, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So you drafted a will for your mother.
MR. TORRES: No, Your Honor. What I did is I entered the
will for her. She actually sat down with me at the computer. I provided the computer skills just like a secretary. She read -- the WillMaker just asks one question after another. She provided all the answers to every single question without interference or guidance from me. The thing I did with it, I said, "Here it is. Take it to your attorney." The same attorney, Catherine Wilson.

Now the circumstances that he brings up of being suspect have been clearly refutiated by her next-door neighbors. I mean this was -- this was all done by my mother for her.

THE COURT: The addendum to the will of Sophie June Torres is a unilateral act by Sophie June Torres.

MR. TORRES: Um-hmm.

THE COURT: It doesn't permit, in my mind, a contract. You may have a contract between parties to do certain things, part of which is to recognize any contributions you may have made during her lifetime. There are many things that you could have, but it's not going to be -- have the effect of a will which is going to be post death disposition of property. There is no death.

MR. TORRES: I understand that totally, Your Honor. And if you continue, the permanent transfer of property rights granted at that time, the right to use the property for business and personal reasons to us which was one of the other things that went in because the property was in tremendous disrepair, and we had to expend a tremendous amount of money and time to fix all the properties at the time. So we received both permanent -- a permanent and persistent transfer of the property rights which at minimum as a lifetime tenancy of the properties --

THE COURT: No, it's not.
MR. TORRES: -- at the same time.
THE COURT: This is where you come in. This is -- I'm not disparaging Quicken Wills.

MR. TORRES: Um-hmm.
THE COURT: But there's a lot more involved in all of this, and when you come in here the last time I had some pretty smart lawyers do a go-around on the intricacies of 93A.

I knew you were here and you were listening. You could've blocked it out if you wanted. But the law is very complicated for a lot of reasons. Your mother wrote a will.

MR. TORRES: Um-hmm.
THE COURT: She wrote a subsequent will. That will will be probated. The will that she wrote will be probated. You may have a claim for monies from the estate, and this addendum that she may have signed may very well give support for some of the claims you might have. Are you with me on that so far?

MR. TORRES: I'm 100 percent, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So it's her will. It's her will. If she chooses to amend her will, she can do so.

MR. TORRES: Absolutely. And we're not arguing that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And she's done it.
MR. TORRES: I'm not arguing that she's going to give us
any properties. We don't want the properties.
THE COURT: That's not the point.
MR. TORRES: She owes me a million six. That's what I want.

THE COURT: That's different.
MR. TORRES: That's what our claim is for.
THE COURT: That's not what it is, though.
MR. TORRES: We claimed a breach of contract for her changing the will which is clearly stated in the addendum.

THE COURT: That's the point. It's not a breach of the contract. It's not a breach of a contract to change the will. What you said was on its terms --

MR. TORRES: I agree.
THE COURT: -- that this is an addendum to the will. MR. TORRES: Agreed, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's meant as an addendum. It's taken from your Quicken computer.

MR. TORRES: No. This was not, Your Honor. This was -THE COURT: Well, whatever.

MR. TORRES: This was handwritten.
THE COURT: My point is you handwrote it.
MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It's an addendum to the will.
MR. TORRES: Yes.
THE COURT: She has every right in the world to revoke or to amend or to codicil or to do anything she wants with her will.

MR. TORRES: Absolutely no agreement --
THE COURT: It's not a breach. If it's a will, and that's what you've called it, it's an addendum to the will. If it is a will, it's not a contract.

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, it has -- if you go onto the next page of it, there was a reason that the will was used as a trigger.

THE COURT: No. I'm going to tell you again. You can't use a will as a trigger. You can use a will as a document to be able to, postmortem, dissolve or distribute any properties that you own.

MR. TORRES: Which we -- that was part of what was there. But it was -- the will was part of -- the transfer property rights for tenancy and the actual will were given as part of a -- us not filing, which was viable to us at the time, a claim in probate court. She, in order to get us -- to prohibit us from filing a complaint against my father's estate --

THE COURT: How come you don't have a lawyer?
MR. TORRES: We are totally out of money because of the first part of this whole thing, Judge. It's -- I took -THE COURT: No. I'm sorry. I don't mean it that way, and you're welcome to be here. But what I'm trying to tell you is it's complicated.

MR. TORRES: I agree.
THE COURT: Number one, it's a will. Number two, you may
have had a verbal agreement and you may have writings that evidence that verbal agreement that may or may not be enforceable. They may or may not be presently enforceable, but it's not a will. For her to say that I am going to revoke my implicitly revocable will is -- it's not a revoca -- it's not an irrevocable trust. It wasn't an agreement. It wasn't a conveyance. It was by definition a will that is subject to
her change. addendum, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So she's done it. So tell me -- tell me where she could interfere with any of your contractual rights if she's simply exercising her right under the law to revoke and rewrite her will?

MR. TORRES: It's very clear, Your Honor. What it says is that if she -- she's allowed to change the will, but if she did, that all monies owed to me became due and payable.

THE COURT: But you're missing it. It's an addendum to the will.

MR. TORRES: Well, it was an independent contract attached to it.

THE COURT: It's not. It's not an independent contract. It's her will, and she gets to change her mind. It's a will and an addendum to the will.

What you could've done was to write a contract with her, and it could have been with fair consideration, and it could written -- been written and agreed to competently, and it could have expressed the will -- the terms and conditions in a clear and unambiguous way, and you may or may not have an enforcement arm against your mother for it.

There were ways of secure -- if she says that she owed you $\$ 1.6$ million and she wanted to make sure that you were

1 protected, she could've done something that would've protected you. There are many things that she could've done to protect you if that's what her intent was. But if it was her intent to will the property to you in the first instance and then in an addendum to do something else, that does not ripen until the very, very, very last moments -- excuse me. That can be changed until the very last moments arguably before her death.

MR. TORRES: What about the -- for instance, count two of the case, the court case?

MS. ADAMS: Johnson v. Starr.
MR. TORRES: Johnson v. Starr, Your Honor. Johnson v. Starr set up -- which was argued in his motion some very interesting arguments on this. One of which was -- in count one is what he refers to as far as it being an addendum and a time to perform doesn't come until the death. Count two of Johnson v. Starr provided -- the Court ruled that the services -- and in that case it was just a verbal contract -- that were provided by the plaintiff were fully due and payable and that those conditions -- because they entered into services which we'd argue that we not only gave her services, but we also gave her a -- the benefit of being able to use my father's whole estate for her benefit, and that under count two that all the monies that were owed for services quantum meruit were available to the plaintiffs. Why is it -- I don't see how that doesn't apply here as well.

THE COURT: You're here right now is you don't have an agreement. You're trying to enforce something else. You're trying to enforce a will which is by its terms revocable. You're trying to say that because she said that it was not going to be revocable that she couldn't change her mind. And I understand what you thought you were getting. You did it very inartfully, and you did it without the benefit of getting -- you used a different vehicle. You used a will.

MR. TORRES: The contract can't stand alone. An addendum,
Your Honor, just as a layman, when I looked up the term "addendum," it's just an attachment to another bod -- another article.

THE COURT: Well, that's again, with all due respect, it's not the way it is.

MR. TORRES: I made a mistake on that then. But the fact that the contra -- that that addendum does say we're settling our debt, we're willing to give you services. Everything else is there. We're going to do the following. We lived up to everything we said, then the last thing that will happen, and we've been on the property since this was signed, we've improved the properties, we've done thousands of hours worth of work on the properties, we provided thousands of dollars, we've not gone after my father's estate for a million six. All these things were done on the basis of this, and it clearly states that you're free to change your will, but if

1 you do change your will, and she did this under -- with full 2 knowledge. If you change the will --

THE COURT: Did she have a lawyer?
MR. TORRES: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: Did she have a lawyer?
MR. TORRES: It was given to her for a lawyer. It went to the same attorney that she had --

THE COURT: No, no. Did she have a lawyer?
MR. TORRES: Yes, she had a lawyer at the time, and it was the same lawyer that you just brought up her estate. It was Catherine Wilson. I called Catherine Wilson on this. I've done everything possible. I said, "Mom, make sure you go. You've go to" -- there's a sworn affidavit.

THE COURT: You drafted the will, not her. Don't tell me that you just --

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, it's Quicken WillMaker. If you've ever seen it, it's very simple.

THE COURT: No. We don't --
MR. TORRES: It just asks the question.
THE COURT: Well, I got it, but you drafted the will for her.

MR. TORRES: I typed it in, Your Honor. I did not -- I did not $d r$ - Jenny was there at the time.

THE COURT: You electronically, mechanically, drafted the will for her. She didn't do it herself. You're parsing the

1 words down. You drafted it.

MR. TORRES: I don't -- Your Honor, I've been a computer scientist for 35 years, and I don't agree with that. And I don't because of the fact that, for example, one of the things that I do, and I was --

THE COURT: No, you don't have to. I'm just trying to tell you that it's a very small ancillary part of the whole thing.

MR. TORRES: In software law, Your Honor, cogenerators that actually write stuff, same thing.

THE COURT: No, no, no. I just said it's a very ancillary part of the whole issue that you have in front of me. The question is whether or not the -- your mother has a right to change the will and whether that would be a breach of contract. That's not a breach of contract. It's a right that's bestowed by our general laws, for one.

Number two, --
MR. TORRES: I totally agree.
THE COURT: -- you may have a claim for services, but it's not because she -- it's separate and apart. It has nothing to do with her will or the addendum that she may have filed because the addendum has been nullified by the third and subsequent and perhaps a fourth and subsequent will.

MR. TORRES: Even though the addendum is -- all the addendum says is if you change your will, you --

THE COURT: No.
MR. TORRES: -- owe me the monies.

THE COURT: It's not a will then, is it?
MR. TORRES: I don't follow that one.

THE COURT: You're not part of the will. Don't you understand that piece? There are no conditional promises in a will. There are none.

MR. TORRES: Are you saying it's because the addendum is --

THE COURT: She can take -- she can decide to give you all the money tomorrow. She can decide to give you none of the money tomorrow. She can decide to cut you out of the will, she could omit you, she could -- she could if you were -- as a spouse, she could die without a will. A spouse is entitled to all sorts of benefits when there is no will. A spouse is entitled to waive the will. It's a very complicated process. It's very complicated, and the addendum to her will could've recited that she was going to give everything to the people in Disneyland, and then a week later, she could've said I'm going to give everyone to the church down the street, and then the last will could be I'm going to give it to whoever. That's what the right of it is. It's not a contract, it's a will. So you have no rights under the will until the will is being process -- probated. You have no rights under the will until it's being probated. You don't, and you can't breach a
|contract when it's a will. Terms mean something. So if your mother intended to amend her will by an addendum, a codicil -that's a term that we use quite frequently -- she has the right to be able to do it, and she can do it again if she wants to.

MR. TORRES: But does she have the right, Your Honor, to fraudulently make an agreement and avoid -- she wouldn't have had the properties to begin with --

THE COURT: I don't think --
MR. TORRES: -- had I filed a complaint in probate.
THE COURT: I don't think you're paying close attention to what I'm saying.

MR. TORRES: I am, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Your action does not spring from an addendum. Now let's see what the rest of it says. The motion to dismiss is all counts?

MR. CARTER: Yes, Judge. Different defendants but they go to all counts. The Sophie Torres motion to dismiss, she's only naming the first four.

MR. TORRES: Actually she's named in one other and one other by mistake. I believe it 17 or 18.

THE COURT: Plaintiffs' verified motion to restrain certain parties from discussing the case or the plaintiffs with the defendant?

MR. CARTER: That was already ruled on, Judge. That's not
before the Court today.
THE COURT: It says motion, that's why -- oh, I'm sorry. Next one. Hearing.

MR. TORRES: I'm sorry? Which one?
THE COURT: No, I'm sorry. That's fine. It's been
resolved?
MR. CARTER: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. TORRES: How was that resolved? I don't remember that.

MR. CARTER: It was denied. In your favor.
THE COURT: What is the --
MR. TORRES: Oh, okay.
THE COURT: Who's looking now -- are we having a mental examination?

MR. TORRES: It's not going to -- well, that is relevant to the other cases, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Excuse me?
MR. TORRES: It is relevant to the --
THE COURT: I want to see what we have here.
MR. TORRES: Okay.
THE COURT: Who brought that? That's your motion?
MR. TORRES: The --
MS. NUZZOLO: It's plaintiffs' motion, Your Honor.
MR. TORRES: Yes. That's my motion, Your Honor. Our

1 motion, excuse me.

THE COURT: Is that pending?

MR. CARTER: It is.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm going to get back to that in second. What is your position generally, and then I'll get back into detail.

MR. CARTER: Judge, my position generally is that this whole complaint stems from a family dispute. Mr. Torres is claiming that he deserves these five or six properties that his mother owned, has always owned with her husband, and as a result, he believes -- in theory he believes that his son has conspired with the -- with his mother to have her change the will.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. CARTER: And that's really the whole crux of the --

THE COURT: And why would you want a mental examination?
MR. TORRES: To find out if she was capable at the time, Your Honor, --

THE COURT: Of what?

MR. TORRES: -- of making a decision to breach the will. This goes back -- he --

THE COURT: To make a decision to do what? To write a new will?

MR. TORRES: To write a new will and to evict us from the property (indiscernible at $3: 16: 27$-- garbled speech).

THE COURT: How old is your mother?
MR. TORRES: She's 90, and she's as sane as I am, Your Honor, and I've got -- again, there's a ton of (indiscernible at 3:16:32 -- garbled speech).

MR. CARTER: So why does he want the medical exam?
MR. TORRES: Actually, I was going to say on that, Your Honor, that's why I brought it. I'm happy to drop that now because it's there.

THE COURT: It's dropped. It's dropped, and we won't talk about it again.

MR. TORRES: Okay.
THE COURT: So let's go back to the other matters. It's your position -- let me go back to the original complaint. Let's go over it.

Count one of it's resolved favorably to the defendant you say, Mr. Carter, will necessarily resolve --

MR. CARTER: The entire.
THE COURT: Okay. I'm just trying to -- it's a very long complaint by the way.

MR. TORRES: It's 11 years.
THE COURT: What?
MR. TORRES: Going on for 11 years, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I said it's a long complaint.
MR. TORRES: Yeah. Well, there's a lot of documents for 11 years, sir.

THE COURT: Count one. So it's your position, Mr. Carter, that count one ought to be dismissed for the reasons that we discussed; is that right?

MR. CARTER: Correct.
THE COURT: Okay. Let's assume that that it was dismissed. Let's assume that it was. They have a breach of contract of the farmhouse. Walk me through that. So this would be the same contract that was allegedly breached and so, therefore, do you agree with that?

MR. TORRES: The farmhouse. No.

THE COURT: Do you understand what I'm doing?
MR. TORRES: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What I'm saying is that if they're successful, and I'm not making that ruling yet, but if they were -- if the Court were to find that count one should be dismissed, that it was -- that as a matter of law, she could not be found to have breached her own will. That's the way I'm couching it.

MR. TORRES: Agreed, Your Honor, counts one through four
will all be dependent on that.
THE COURT: Okay. So --
MR. TORRES: However --
THE COURT: No, no. I just want to --
MR. TORRES: Okay. Okay.
THE COURT: -- work through it.
MR. TORRES: Okay.

THE COURT: So that's one through four. Now then we have -- are we here for five, six? Are we working on those as well?

MR. TORRES: Um-hmm.
MR. CARTER: Yep.
THE COURT: Tortious interference. So if the Court makes a finding at one, how could you be tortuously interfering with a contract if there's no --

MR. TORRES: This brings up a very interesting point, Your Honor. All the rest of the complaints go back to when I was down in Mexico as a guest of the Mexican government to bring a corporation for a new technology I had. When we were there, I found out unfortunately about some very heavy criminal activities involved my family and the uncle, who, by the way, everything you see, if you allow me to go on, and I'm going to show you that we've got documentation on this.

THE COURT: No. I'm here because I have other people that want to get their cases heard as well, and I just can't do it like that.

MR. TORRES: Okay.
THE COURT: What I need to do is to have you responsive to my question, and my question is, is -- again, is the contractual relationship that you're referencing in the previous 148 paragraphs, were those that sounded in a contract between you and your mother --

MR. TORRES: Yes.
THE COURT: -- to the Court?
MR. TORRES: They absolutely should stand, Your Honor, because she would --

THE COURT: Why does it stand independent of it?
MR. TORRES: Because she never would have breached the -or she never would've changed her will had it not been for the specific interference of my son and uncle.

THE COURT: Except for one very important thing. It's not a contract so it's not to be tortious interference. So if one were to go out, if one were to stay, it sounds like the rest of them could. If one were to go out, it looks to me count five of necessity should be going out as well because you can't be tortuously interfering with a contract if there was no contract.

Then we have deliberate interference as to defendants Jesse, Erica --

MR. CARTER: Judge, I think that's duplicitous with the fifth count.

THE COURT: It may be. It may be, but I'm just going through them if you don't mind. And that seems to be wholly dependant upon whether it may be duplicative or not, but it doesn't -- it -- that appears to go out if one goes out, it appears to stay in if one stays in.

Malicious intent. So the defendants Jesse and Donald
Torres with the support of Debtmerica, LLC, did conspire. And
what did they conspire to do, change the will?

MR. TORRES: In that case, yes, Your Honor. They change -- they conspired to have my mother -- if it was alienation of affection, Judge, I know that's no longer legal in Mass. that would be exactly what it was. They conspired to get her to change.

THE COURT: Alienation of affections is a heart balm statute that we used to have when a woman or a man left their spouse for another.

MR. TORRES: Okay. Then I stand corrected, Your Honor. THE COURT: There's no spouses here; right? Okay. MR. TORRES: What they did is that none of these things -there would have no problem with any of the will, and the properties that are deteriorating right now because of their acts would have been repaired, rented, everything would've been fine had it not been for the specific interference of Donald Torres and my son, and that was done with monies that was not -- and it's part of a repeating pattern, Your Honor, that chases through two countries.

THE COURT: But if your mother was competent to change her will --

MR. TORRES: Um-hmm.
THE COURT: If your mother was competent to change her will, how does any of this affect that decision? By the way,
fordinarily you wouldn't even know what's in the will.
MR. TORRES: I know because she told me, and at the
time --
THE COURT: But ordinarily you wouldn't know, and tomorrow afternoon, she could change it again.

MR. TORRES: Absolutely.
THE COURT: She could give everything back to you, and you wouldn't know about it until her death.

MR. TORRES: I understand that, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Conspiracy to commit fraud.
MR. TORRES: Um-hmm.
THE COURT: What was that? If she was competent to write this will as you just said --

MR. TORRES: Because one's competent, Your Honor, if they're using -- if there's an attempt of a threat or extortion which there was in this case --

THE COURT: She has to bring a claim against them.
MR. TORRES: You know, she's not going to bring a -- the part that's difficult here is that she's not going to bring a claim against her family members.

THE COURT: You don't understand what I just said. We protect people from coercive behavior from others.

MR. TORRES: Um-hmm.
THE COURT: The alleged victim is the one that brings it forward. The alleged victim has to say I was put in fear and

1 I was told I had to do something or they attempted to make me 2 do something, they attempted to get my money, they attempted to make me sign something.

MR. TORRES: May I, Your Honor --
THE COURT: It's not you, it's them that had to have that
fear.
MR. TORRES: I wasn't aware of that, Your Honor. What I'd like is that -- is it possible to withdraw my withdrawal of my motion for mental exam? Because I don't think --

THE COURT: No, no. I'm not going to get -- I'm doing these now. Where was the slander? What was the false statement and who published it?

MR. TORRES: They were made here and in Mexico --
THE COURT: Where?
MR. TORRES: -- and in California.
THE COURT: Where? Go back to the -- what did Jesse say?
MR. TORRES: Jesse said -- oh, I have it on one of the other documents, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, tell me what he said. You must know if it's --

MR. TORRES: Oh, about everything, Your Honor. He said that his father was no good, that his father had to take it -THE COURT: He said you were no good?

MR. TORRES: Yeah. That he didn't act like a man. What was the other (indiscernible at 3:24:03 -- garbled speech)?

MS. ADAMS: Stand on his own two feet.
MR. TORRES: Oh, he doesn't stand on his own two feet, and numerous other acts, and this has been ongoing not just with my mother, but with a lot of neighbors down in California, and --

THE COURT: The least of the issues right now. And defamation comes out of the same?

MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And intentional infliction of emotional distress comes from that as well?

MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Title 18 comes from that as well?
MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor. Well, that -- no. Actually title 18, those charges start to get into, Your Honor, attempts at extortion and death threats.

THE COURT: Against whom?
MR. TORRES: Donald Torres.
THE COURT: Against whom?
MR. TORRES: Donald Torres.
MS. ADAMS: Against us.
MR. TORRES: Oh, against us. I'm sorry, Your Honor. I thought -- I mixed it up.

THE COURT: How would he try to extort from you?
MR. TORRES: When $I$ went down to Mexico right after the dot com crash, I -- they -- he and his son had done some work

1 On the house and I started pulling away --

THE COURT: But how are they going to coerce defendant to breach the contract again?

MR. TORRES: How did he -- what they did, Your Honor, is they -- my son and I had a falling out.

THE COURT: No, no.
MR. TORRES: I disavowed him.
THE COURT: Sir, no.
MR. TORRES: How did they do it? Okay.
THE COURT: My point, listen. You're not -- I apologize. I'm not making myself clear.

They violated it by coercing Sophie to breach your contract. So if there was no contract and she chose to write out her own will, that has to fail.

MR. TORRES: Couldn't that be simply rewritten, Your
Honor, to --
the court: No.
MR. TORRES: NO?
THE COURT: No, it's not. I'm telling you, we're here to sort out your multiple counts.

MR. TORRES: Um-hmm.
THE COURT: One of my functions for these kinds of cases is to be a gatekeeper of sorts. So far I'm seeing that all of this is wholly dependent upon what happened with the addendum. MR. TORRES: Just the fact that she --

THE COURT: Except for the fact that your son was saying bad things about you. I'd love to be able to make a ruling in your favor, write it out and hand it to all my children because they're fresh to me all the time. So if I could just if I was able to give you the relief you want, I'll be -I'll be -- I'm in your shoes. I'll slap injunctions on my daughter as quick as a New York minute, so.

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, it's a little different when Hell's Ang -- when they bring in Hell's Angels to threaten your life.

THE COURT: That's not what you said. You said that you -- your son was saying that you were a bad dad, you don't stand on your own two feet.

MR. TORRES: No, no. I thought were ahead on the new -the other, --

THE COURT: No, that's what I was saying about the slander.

MR. TORRES: -- the RICO conspiracy counts.
THE COURT: I was talking about the slander.
MR. TORRES: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought we jumped ahead to the RICO.

THE COURT: I was talking about the slander.
MR. TORRES: Okay. No, the slander's different. Oh, I'm sorry. Then yes I understand what you're saying, Your Honor. THE COURT: I'm trying to help you along with this. You
funderstand you might have some claims against your mother or possibly against the estate. You might, --

MR. TORRES: Um-hmm.
THE COURT: -- but not this way.
(Pause.)
THE COURT: Count nine is for slander, you have to plead with particularity. Now here's the story. Ms. Adams and Mr. Torres, let me just tell you how I view it right now. I find that every one of those -- every one of those -- every one of those counts except for the slander which has problems and I suggested to you a little bit too facetiously, I take everything that you're saying seriously, but I was trying to make a point that people can say things about others, children about their parents, and just because they say something that's unflattering, it doesn't mean that the words themselves will amount to a legally enforceable cause of action. That's what I meant by that.

Everything depends upon -- every one of those depends upon the finding that $I$ must make on whether this is a contract. So I'll let you sum up, and then since it's your motion, you can sum up, and then I'll hear from you summing up again. And I use the word "sum up" deliberately.

MR. TORRES: I understand, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Counsel?
MS. NUZZOLO: Your Honor, our argument is that there is no
contract. There was a will that was created, and that sophie Torres has a right to change that will time and time again throughout her lifetime so long as she is competent with testamentary capacity.

Even if that addendum is deemed a contract in any way, shape or form, the performance on that does not come until the time of death. So to pursue counts for breach of contract are inappropriate and cannot be claimed at this time. It is basically an anticipatory breach of contract which can not be claimed until the time of performance. Time of performance has not arrived. Therefore, the claims are not ripe. There is no cause of action at this time.

THE COURT: You said it much nicer than $I$ did.
MS. NUZZOLO: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What do you say? Because that's the narrowest issue.

MR. TORRES: That issue? If it's not found to be a contract, Your Honor, then $I$ would say that you have no choice but to rule in their favor.

However, Your Honor, there's one last thing in the complaint and that is the ability to amend. And what I'd like leave to do is to amend the complaint to include, which is the most relevant to me, the $1,600,000$ plus or minus dollars that are owed to me and to amend the complaint to include a mechanic's lien or, for lack of a better term, a complaint for
the services that we rendered on the properties.
THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to deny or grant it right now.

MR. TORRES: Um-hmm.
THE COURT: I'm not going to do that. It's separate and apart from this. You have to plead. You heard me, I don't mean to be say lecturing, but I'm trying to advise different folks that courts by constitutional imperative are welcoming venues for people to come in to get their things resolved. Defendants, the other party, are required to come in, but it doesn't mean that we're going to be unfair to them. So when you bring a complaint, you have to be prepared to make sure that it sticks.

MR. TORRES: I understand, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What you're suggesting -- and I'm just not going to sort out exactly what legal remedies you might have in the future because I alluded to them. I'm not sure whether or not it should be by an amendment. I'm not going to tell you you can't move to amend, but I'm going to today permit you to amend. It's done by a -- it's done. It's done by motion, and --

MR. TORRES: May I ask one just question, Your Honor?
THE COURT: No. And the other part of it is that you have a valid claim for services rendered and for monies spent and for obligations created. You're going to have to find a way
to fairly state those claims and to prosecute them correctly. MR. CARTER: Judge, just on that point alone, that wouldn't apply. Those services rendered claim under any kind of a theory wouldn't apply to Debtmerica and Jesse Torres IV. THE COURT: Again, I don't know. I'm here. What I'm saying is I'm going to take this entire case, I'm going to find out where the one stands. If it stands up then subject to some pruning down the road then all of them stand.

MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And if one does not stand then all of them go, and I'm going to dismiss slander as not being actionable because it's not properly plead. It's not plead with particularity for the Court to be able to review it to determine whether facially it's a kind of actionable speech or writing that would have the requisite damage claim. And there's -- it's so many things that one looks at in the statement itself, as to whether or not it's opinion, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

So that's what I'm going to do. I'm going to take the matter under advisement, and it sounds like -- it sounds like that you ought to find a way to get an attorney to find out exactly what you have in terms of any obligations that your mother might have presently or upon her death, but not through this vehicle unless -- unless the -- unless one stands. If one stands, we'll see you back in the pretrial conference. If

```
1 it doesn't, that's the end of the case so far as I'm
MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right?
MR. TORRES: Thank you very much.
(End of proceeding.)
```
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