

DOCKET NO. FST-CV15-5014808S)	SUPERIOR COURT
)	
WILLIAM A. LOMAS)	JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF
)	STAMFORD/NORWALK
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	AT STAMFORD
)	
PARTNER WEALTH MANAGEMENT, LLC,)	
KEVIN G. BURNS, JAMES PRATT-HEANEY,)	
WILLIAM P. LOFTUS)	
)	AUGUST 4, 2015
Defendants.)	

**MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO OBJECT TO MOTION
TO ADMIT *PRO HAC VICE***

Plaintiff, William A. Lomas (“Lomas”) moves for an extension of time, to and including August 11, 2015, within which to evaluate and object to Defendants’ Motion to Admit David Lagasse, *pro hac vice*, dated July 28, 2015. In support of this motion for extension of time Lomas represents as follows:

1. This case arises out of the withdrawal of Lomas from defendant, Partner Wealth Management, LLC (“PWM”), which then triggered a multi-million dollar obligation on the part of the defendants, Kevin Burns, James Pratt-Heaney, and William P. Loftus (the “Individual Defendants”) to buyout Lomas’ interest in PWM. Up until the time of Lomas’ withdrawal, Lomas and the Individual Defendants were the only members of PWM.

2. On or about July 29, 2015, PWM and the Individual Defendants moved the admission of David Lagasse of the New York law firm of Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky & Popeo. The Motion to Admit represents in a conclusory manner, without any supporting detail, that “Attorney Lagasse has a long-standing attorney-client relationship with defendants Partner Wealth Management, LLC, Kevin G. Burns, James Pratt-Heaney, and William Loftus” and “due to this long-standing relationship and Attorney Lagasse’s background and qualifications, he has

specialized skill and knowledge with regard to the defendants' affairs, which will be of benefit to them in litigating this matter."

3. Defendants' motion to admit Attorney Lagasse was served upon the undersigned via regular mail, and was not received until Friday, July 31, 2015.

4. Attorney Lagasse served as counsel to PWM and, upon information and belief, to the individual members of PWM, including Plaintiff Lomas. Lomas believes that this representation began sometime in late 2014.

5. Lomas is presently investigating whether to object to Defendants' motion and/or to move to disqualify Attorney Lagasse from representing Defendants in this matter on one or more of the following grounds: (i) Attorney Lagasse represented the individual members of PWM, including Lomas, and in connection with that representation may have received confidential information from Lomas related to the matters in dispute in this litigation; (ii) Attorney Lagasse represented PWM, and in connection with that representation may have received confidential information from Lomas as a 25% member of PWM; and (iii) at minimum, Attorney Lagasse was a participant in, and a witness to, a key meeting of the members of PWM on or about December 18, 2014, wherein facts relevant to the claims in this litigation were discussed, including whether to amend the limited liability company agreement for PWM so as to materially limit the buyout obligation the Individual Defendants owed to Lomas.

6. The undersigned counsel understands that Attorney Lagasse may have kept minutes and/or notes concerning the December 18, 2014 meeting, which will be discoverable and which may be admissible in evidence in this matter. Indeed, as a member of PWM until the effective date of his withdrawal on January 14, 2015, Lomas will be entitled to discovery of all

of Attorney Lagasse's communications and work-product related to the matters at issue in this litigation up until the effective date of his withdrawal.

7. Lomas and his counsel are presently gathering factual information and researching the law concerning these matters. In this regard, the undersigned has requested, via e-mail, that Attorney Lagasse produce copies of any engagement letters identifying the clients represented by him as well as the commencement date of the "long-standing attorney-client relationship" described in Defendants' motion.

8. Additional time is required to gather and assess the relevant information, to determine whether to object to Defendants' motion and, if so, to prepare and to file a proper objection and supporting memorandum.

9. This is Plaintiff's first request for extension of time concerning this matter and this case is not assigned to a trial list. Plaintiff intends to file any objection no later than August 11, 2015.

10. Defendants' appearing counsel has no objection to this motion for extension of time.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Lomas respectfully requests that his motion for extension of time be granted.

Dated: August 4, 2015
Hartford, Connecticut

THE PLAINTIFF,
WILLIAM A. LOMAS

By: /s/ Thomas J. Rechen
Thomas J. Rechen
McCarter & English, LLP
City Place I, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103
Tel.: (860) 275-6706
Fax: (860) 218-9680
Email: trechen@mccarter.com
His Attorneys

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on August 4, 2015, a copy of the foregoing was served by e-mail and first class mail, postage prepaid, to all counsel of record as follows:

Richard J. Buturla, Esq.
Mark J. Kovack, Esq.
Berchem, Moses & Devlin, P.C.
75 Broad St.
Milford, CT 06460

/s/Thomas J. Rechen
Thomas J. Rechen