

2. Defendants object to each of the Requests to the extent it seeks: (a) documents protected from disclosure by the attorney work-product doctrine; (b) privileged documents, including but not limited to those protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product doctrine; and (c) documents and tangible things prepared in anticipation of litigation by Defendants or their attorneys, agents or representatives. Defendants do not intend to produce privileged information, and any production of documents containing privileged information shall be deemed inadvertent and not a waiver of any privilege or objection.

3. Defendants object to each Request to the extent that it seeks the production of proprietary, confidential or trade secret information. Defendants will produce non-privileged documents responsive to such Requests and designate such documents as "Confidential," on the condition that such documents shall not be disclosed by Plaintiff and shall not be used by Plaintiff other than in connection with this litigation.

4. Defendants object to each Request to the extent that the documents sought are not relevant to the subject matter of this litigation or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

5. Defendants object to each Request to the extent that it is redundant of other requests.

6. Defendants object to each Request to the extent that it fails to limit the documents sought to a reasonable time period. Defendants will only produce documents for the period from

January 1, 2013 through July 9, 2015 unless Plaintiff identifies a specific basis why documents not encompassed by this time period are relevant.

7. By providing responsive answers and documents, Defendants do not concede that any of the documents are relevant to the issues in this litigation.

8. Defendants object to each Request to the extent that it is not described with reasonable particularity.

9. The specific responses and objections set forth below, and the information Defendants provide therein, are based upon information now available to Defendants after having made diligent efforts to ascertain documents responsive to the Requests. Defendants reserve the right to amend and supplement those responses and objections as appropriate if new or different information becomes available or known to Defendants.

10. Defendants respond to Plaintiff's Requests without waiving the right to object on any grounds to the admission of any document provided in response to Plaintiff's Requests in this or any other proceeding.

11. Defendants respond to Plaintiff's Requests without waiving the right to object at any time to any demand for further discovery involving the same subject matters.

12. Defendants object to each Request to the extent that it is overly broad or vague and any attempt to respond would be unduly burdensome, expensive and oppressive. In particular, but without limitation, Defendants object to each Request that requires it to identify "all" or "any and all" documents. The information provided in these responses is based upon,

and is therefore limited by, the records and information still in existence and thus far discovered and compiled in the course of preparation of these responses. Therefore, when Defendants' response to a Request indicate that they are producing "all" documents in their possession, custody, or control it means all existing documents in their possession, custody, or control and thus far discovered in the course of Defendants' diligent search. Consequently, Defendants reserve the right at any time to revise, correct, add to, supplement, modify or clarify the specific responses set forth below or the information contained therein.

RESPONSES TO DOCUMENT REQUESTS

Document Request No. 1:

All documents relied upon, referred to or reviewed in answering the Complaint.

Response to Document Request No. 1:

Defendants object to Request No. 1 on the ground that it is premature as Defendants have not served an Answer to the Complaint and therefore have not determined which documents they will rely upon in answering the Complaint. Defendants further object on the ground that this Request seeks all "documents" regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will not produce documents responsive to this Request at this time, but reserve the right to supplement their response to this Request.

Document Request No. 2:

All documents relating to any written or oral communication between Defendants and Lomas regarding the issues raised in the Complaint.

Response to Document Request No. 2:

Defendants object to Request No. 2 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome. Defendants further object on the ground that this Request seeks all "documents" regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce all relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request that are within their possession, custody or control.

Document Request No. 3:

All documents relating to any written or oral communication between and among Defendants regarding the issues raised in the Complaint.

Response to Document Request No. 3:

Defendants object to Request No. 3 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome. Defendants further object on the ground that this Request seeks all “documents” regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce all relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request that are within their possession, custody or control.

Document Request No. 4:

All documents relating to any written or oral communications authored between January 1, 2013 and January 13, 2015, between PWM and its counsel regarding the issues raised in the Complaint.

Response to Document Request No. 4:

Defendants object to Request No. 4 on the grounds that it specifically calls for documents that are protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and attorney work product doctrine. Defendants further object on the ground that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce relevant, communications responsive to this Request, provided that Plaintiff was also a party to such communications.

Document Request No. 5:

All documents relating to any written or oral communications between Pratt-Heaney, Burns or Loftus, and counsel for PWM regarding the issues raised in the Complaint.

Response to Document Request No. 5:

Defendants object to Request No. 5 on the grounds that it specifically calls for documents that are protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and attorney work product doctrine. Defendants further object on the ground that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome. Accordingly, Defendants will not produce documents responsive to this Request.

Document Request No. 6:

All documents relating to the calculation or determination of PWM's company value as defined in Section 8.8 of the Agreement for the year-ended 2014.

Response to Document Request No. 6:

Defendants object to Request No. 6 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request's demand for all "documents" is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks production of every document underlying the entry of every item of expense and revenue entered in the books and records of LLBH and PWM. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce financial statements and documentation set forth in PWM's accounting books and records that show the "company value."

Document Request No. 7:

All documents relating to the calculation or determination of PWM's management fee as referenced in Section 3.1 of the Management Agreement for the year-ended 2014.

Response to Document Request No. 7:

Defendants object to Request No. 7 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request's demand for all "documents" is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks production of every document underlying the entry of every item of expense and revenue entered in the books and records of PWM and LLBH. In addition, Defendants object to this Request on the ground that it is overbroad in that it seeks discovery from LLBH, a non-party to this action. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce financial statements and documentation set forth in PWM's accounting books and records that show the "management fee."

Document Request No. 8:

All documents or communications between PWM or the Individual Defendants and Jeffrey M. Fuhrman, Chief Operating Officer and Chief Financial Officer of LLBH Private, relating to the calculation or determination of the management fee for the year-ended 2014.

Response to Document Request No. 8:

Defendants object to Request No. 8 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object on the ground that this Request seeks all "documents" regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. In addition, Defendants object on the ground that Mr. Fuhrman is an employee of LLBH, which is not a party to this action and the

Request, therefore, seeks documents that are in the custody and control of a non-party. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce all relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request that are within their possession, custody or control.

Document Request No. 9:

All documents or communications between PWM or the Individuals Defendants and Focus relating to the calculation or determination of the management fee for the year-ended 2014.

Response to Document Request No. 9:

Defendants object to Request No. 9 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object on the ground that this request seeks all “documents” regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. In addition, Defendants object on the ground that this Request seeks documents from Focus, which is not party to this action. The request, therefore, seeks documents that are in the custody and control of a non-party. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce all relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request that are within their possession, custody or control.

Document Request No. 10:

All documents relating to the calculation or determination of EBPC as defined in Section 3.1 of the Management Agreement for the year-ended 2014.

Response to Document Request No. 10:

Defendants object to Request No. 10 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request’s demand for all “documents” is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks production of every document underlying the entry of every item of expense and revenue entered in the books and records of LLBH. In addition, Defendants object that this Request is overbroad in that it seeks discovery from LLBH, a non-party to this action. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce financial statements and documentation set forth in PWM’s accounting books and records that show the “EBPC.”

Document Request No. 11:

All documents relating to the calculation or determination of EBITA, as defined in the Asset Purchase Agreement entered into on December 1, 2009, between the Individual Defendants, Focus, and LLBH Private, for the year-ended 2014.

Response to Document Request No. 11:

Defendants object to Request No. 11 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request's demand for all "documents" is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks production of every document underlying the entry of every item of expense and revenue entered in the books and records of LLBH. The request is further overbroad in that it seeks discovery from Focus and LLBH Private, which are not parties to this action. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce financial statements and documentation set forth in PWM's accounting books and records that show the EBITA.

Document Request No. 12:

All promissory notes with outstanding balances issued by PWM.

Response to Document Request No. 12:

Defendants object to Request No. 12 on the grounds that it seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants are not in possession of any documents responsive to this Request.

Document Request No. 13:

All documents evidencing promissory notes issued by PWM with outstanding balances.

Response to Document Request No. 13:

Defendants object to Request No. 13 on the grounds that it seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants are not in possession of any documents responsive to this Request.

Document Request No. 14:

All documents relating to PWM's calculation or determination of the purchase price of Lomas' interest in PWM upon his withdrawal.

Response to Document Request No. 14:

Defendants object to Request No. 14 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object because this request implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Finally, Defendants object to this request to the extent it is redundant of other requests. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce relevant, non-privileged documents that show the calculation of the purchase price of Plaintiff's 25% membership interest under the Restated Operating Agreement that are within their possession, custody or control.

Document Request No. 15:

All documents or communications between or among the Individual Defendants relating to their obligations to Lomas upon his withdrawal.

Response to Document Request No. 15:

Defendants object to Request No. 15 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request seeks all "documents" regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Finally, Defendants object that this Request is redundant of Request No. 3 and refer Plaintiff to Defendants' response to Request No. 3.

Document Request No. 16:

All documents relating to the Partner Wealth Management, LLC, - Make-Whole Payment Distribution prepared on April 14, 2015, including the data underlying the 2014 compensation numbers, the 2014 partner expenses, and the 2014 partner distributions.

Response to Document Request No. 16:

Defendants object to Request No. 16 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request's demand for all "documents" is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks production of every document underlying the entry of every item of expense and revenue entered in the books and records of PWM and LLBH. Defendants further object that this Request is overbroad in that it seeks discovery from LLBH, a non-party to this action. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving

them, Defendants will produce financial statements and documentation set forth in PWM's accounting books and records that show the PWM members' compensation, expenses and distributions for 2014.

Document Request No. 17:

All statements of the capital accounts of PWM members for the year ended-2014.

Response to Document Request No. 17:

Defendants object to Request No. 17 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce capital account statements for PWM's members for 2014.

Document Request No. 18:

All documents relating to distributions to PWM members for the year ended-2014.

Response to Document Request No. 18:

Defendants object to Request No. 18 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Finally, Defendants object that this Request is redundant of Request No. 16 and refer Plaintiff to Defendants' response to Request No. 16.

Document Request No. 19:

All documents relating to the LLBH Management Fee Reconciliation for 2014 signed by Bill Loftus as the Management Company representative and Justin Ferri as the Focus representative on April 8, 2015.

Response to Document Request No. 19:

Defendants object to Request No. 19 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce the LLBH Management Fee Reconciliation for 2014.

Document Request No. 20:

All financial statements for the year-ended 2014 for the following entities:

- (a) Partner Wealth Management, LLC

- (b) Focus Financial Partners, LLC
- (c) LLBH Private Wealth Management, LLC

Response to Document Request No. 20:

Defendants object to Request No. 20 on the grounds that it seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and are within the exclusive possession of non-parties over whom Defendants have no control and, therefore, Defendants cannot be made to produce such documents. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce unaudited financials for PWM and LLBH for the year-ended 2014. Further, Focus provided a copy of its 2014 audited financials to the Individual Defendants and to Plaintiff in connection with their ownership of Focus shares and Defendants will produce the Focus financial statements in the form received by the Individual Defendants. As neither PWM nor LLBH prepares audited financial statements, neither entity has any audited financial statements to produce in response to this Request.

Document Request No. 21:

All documents relating to the Agreement, including drafts, minutes, board notes, records of votes taken, and any correspondence referencing the Agreement.

Response to Document Request No. 21:

Defendants object to Request No. 21 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request's demand for all "documents" is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks production of every communication in which the Agreement is referenced. In addition, Defendants object on the ground that this Request seeks all "documents" regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request that are within their possession, custody or control.

Document Request No. 22:

All documents relating to the PWM Limited Liability Company Agreement dated January 1, 2015, including any drafts, minutes, board notes, records of votes taken, and any correspondence referencing the agreement.

Response to Document Request No. 22:

Defendants object to Request No. 22 on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous. Defendants further object that this Request's demand for all "documents" is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks production of every communication in which the Restated

Operating Agreement is referenced. In addition, Defendants object on the ground that this Request seeks all “documents” regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request that are within their possession, custody or control.

Document Request No. 23:

All written documentation of consents, agreements or approvals regarding the January 1, 2015 Limited Liability Company Agreement.

Response to Document Request No. 23:

Defendants object to Request No. 23 on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous. Defendants further object that this Request’s demand for all “written documentation” is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks production of every communication referencing consents, agreements or approvals of the Restated Operating Agreement. In addition, Defendants object on the ground that this Request seeks all written documentation regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request that are within their possession, custody or control.

Document Request No. 24:

All documents exchanged among Defendants or between Defendants and any other person regarding Lomas’ withdrawal.

Response to Document Request No. 24:

Defendants object to Request No. 24 on the grounds that it is redundant of Request Nos. 3 and 15, is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request seeks all “documents” regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Finally, Defendants object to the extent that this request seeks documents that are as readily available to Plaintiff as they are to Defendants. Accordingly, Defendants refer Plaintiff to their responses to Request Nos. 3 and 15.

Document Request No. 25:

All documents relating to the value of PWM for the year ended-2014.

Response to Document Request No. 25:

Defendants object to Request No. 25 on the grounds that it is redundant of Request No. 6 and is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request's demand for all "documents" is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks production of every document underlying the entry of every item of expense and revenue entered in the books and records of PWM. Finally, Defendants object that this Request is redundant of Request No. 6 and refer Plaintiff to Defendants' response to Request No. 6.

Document Request No. 26:

All documents relating to Lomas' withdrawal from PWM.

Response to Document Request No. 26:

Defendants object to Request No. 26 on the grounds that it is redundant of Request Nos. 2, 3, 15 and 24, is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request seeks all "documents" regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Finally, Defendants object to the extent that this request seeks documents that are as readily available to Plaintiff as they are to Defendants. Accordingly, Defendants refer Plaintiff to their responses to Request Nos. 2, 3, 15 and 24.

Document Request No. 27:

All documents relating to the rights and liabilities of Burns, Pratt-Heaney, Lomas and Loftus as members in PWM.

Response to Document Request No. 27:

Defendants object to Request No. 27 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request seeks all "documents" regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Finally, Defendants object to the extent that this Request seeks documents that are as readily available to Plaintiff as they are to Defendants. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce the Original Operating Agreement, the Restated Operating Agreement and all amendments to same that are within their possession, custody or control.

Document Request No. 28:

All amendments to the Agreement.

Response to Document Request No. 28:

Defendants object to Request No. 28 on the grounds that it is redundant of Request Nos. 21 and 27 and refer Plaintiff to their responses to Request Nos. 21 and 27.

Document Request No. 29:

All amendments to the January 1, 2015 Limited Liability Company Agreement.

Response to Document Request No. 29:

Defendants object to Request No. 29 on the grounds that it is redundant of Request Nos. 22, 23 and 27 and refer Plaintiff to their responses to Request Nos. 22, 23 and 27.

Document Request No. 30:

All amendments to the LLBH Private Agreement.

Response to Document Request No. 30:

Defendants object to Request No. 30 on the grounds that it seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and are within the exclusive possession of non-parties over whom Defendants have no control and, therefore, Defendants cannot be made to produce such documents. Defendants further object to the extent that this request seeks documents that are as readily available to Plaintiff as they are to Defendants. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants are not in possession of any documents responsive to this Request.

Document Request No. 31:

All amendments to the Management Agreement.

Response to Document Request No. 31:

Defendants object to Request No. 31 on the grounds that it seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and are within the exclusive possession of non-parties over whom Defendants have no control and, therefore, Defendants cannot be made to produce such documents. Defendants further object to the extent that this request seeks documents that are as readily available to Plaintiff as they are to Defendants. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants are not in possession of any documents responsive to this Request.

Document Request No. 32:

All communications between PWM and Attorney David Lagasse relating to the November 30, 2009 Agreement, the January 1, 2015 Agreement and any other PWM matters including those related to Lomas' withdrawal.

Response to Document Request No. 32:

Defendants object to Request No. 32 on the ground that it seeks documents that are protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Finally, Defendants object that this Request is redundant of Request Nos. 4 and 5 and refer Plaintiff to Defendants' responses to Request Nos. 4 and 5.

Document Request No. 33:

All documents relating to the meeting of the members of PWM held on December 18, 2014.

Response to Document Request No. 33:

Defendants object to Request No. 33 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request seeks all "documents" regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Finally, Defendants object to the extent that this request seeks documents that are as readily available to Plaintiff as they are to Defendants. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request that are within their possession, custody or control.

Document Request No. 34:

All documents relating to the resolution of the members of PWM dated January 1, 2015.

Response to Document Request No. 34:

Defendants object to Request No. 34 on the grounds that it is redundant of Request Nos. 22, 23 and 29, is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request seeks all "documents" regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Finally, Defendants object that this Request is redundant of Request Nos. 22, 23 and 29 and refer Plaintiff to Defendants' responses to Request Nos. 22, 23 and 29.

Document Request No. 35:

All documents relating to the Management Committee's determination of PWM's value for the year ended-2014.

Response to Document Request No. 35:

Defendants object to Request No. 35 on the grounds that it is redundant of Request Nos. 6 and 25, and is vague, ambiguous and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request's demand for all "documents" is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks production of every document underlying the entry of every item of expense and revenue entered in the books and records of PWM. Finally, Defendants object that this Request is redundant of Request Nos. 6 and 25 and refer Plaintiff to Defendants' responses to Request Nos. 6 and 25.

Document Request No. 36:

All documents relating to any payments made to Lomas by PWM since his withdrawal.

Response to Document Request No. 36:

Defendants object to Request No. 36 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object that this Request seeks all "documents" regardless of date or context and therefore also implicates attorney-client privileged communications. Finally, Defendants object that this Request is redundant of Request Nos. 16 and 18 and refer Plaintiff to Defendants' responses to Request Nos. 16 and 18.

Document Request No. 37:

All documents relating to any services provided to PWM by the consulting firm FA Insight LLC.

Response to Document Request No. 37:

Defendants object to Request No. 37 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will produce non-privileged documents responsive to this Request that are within their possession, custody or control, provided that such documents are relevant to the allegations in Plaintiff's Complaint.

Document Request No. 38:

All documents relating to any votes taken regarding PWM matters.

Response to Document Request No. 38:

Defendants object to Request No. 38 on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Finally, Defendants object that this Request is redundant of Request Nos. 21 and 28 and refer Plaintiff to Defendants' responses to Request Nos. 21 and 28.

Document Request No. 39:

A copy of the PWM corporate minute book.

Response to Document Request No. 39:

Defendants object to Request No. 39 on the ground that it seeks documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants are not in possession of any documents responsive to this Request.

Document Request No. 40:

For each person Defendants intend to call as a witness at the prejudgment remedy hearing and during the trial of this Action:

- (a) All documents and communications of such person(s) relating to this case and/or any issues in this Action, including any matters about which such person(s) will testify in this Action in deposition, at trial or otherwise;
- (b) All documents reviewed and/or consulted by or on behalf of such person(s) as a part of any participation in this Action;
- (c) All documents, including graphs, charts, models, exhibits, and/or drawings, upon which such person(s) has relied or upon which any such person(s) intends to rely in this Action in deposition, at trial or otherwise; and
- (d) All documents and/or things provided to such person(s) by Defendants or any agent of Defendants (including counsel for Defendants), in connection with this Action.

Response to Document Request No. 40:

Defendants object to Request No. 40 on the ground that it seeks documents that are irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as the

prejudgment remedy hearing in this action has already concluded. Accordingly, Defendants will not produce documents responsive to this Request.

Document Request No. 41:

For each person Defendants intend to use as an expert witness in this Action:

- (a) All publications, articles, books and/or papers authored, co-authored, edited or otherwise generated by such person(s);
- (b) All documents and/or things authored, co-authored, edited or otherwise generated by or on behalf of such person(s), and which refer and/or relate to any any opinions and/or testimony of any such person(s) rendered or to be rendered in this Action;
- (c) All transcripts, including all exhibits thereto, of any trial and/or deposition testimony of such person(s) in any prior litigation;
- (d) All documents and/or things reviewed and/or consulted by or on behalf of such person(s) as a part of any participation in this Action;
- (e) All documents and all things, including graphs, charts, models, exhibits, drawings and/or physicals, upon which such person(s) has relied or upon which any such person(s) intends to rely in deposition, at trial or otherwise in this Action;
- (f) All documents and/or things upon which any opinions and/or testimony of such person(s) in this Action are based;
- (g) All documents and/or things provided to such person(s), and/or any agent of such person, by Defendants or any agent of Defendants (including counsel for Defendants), in connection with this Action; and
- (h) All resumes, curricula vitae and/or other documents listing the education, experience and/or training of such person(s).

Response to Document Request No. 41:

Defendants object to Request No. 41 on the ground that it is premature as Defendants have not yet identified the expert witnesses they may call in this action or the specific subject matter upon which such experts may testify. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents that are protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine. In addition, Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks expert discovery above and beyond that authorized or permitted by the Connecticut Practice Book. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections and without waiving them, Defendants will not produce documents responsive to this Request at this time, but reserve the right to supplement their response to this Request.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DEFENDANTS

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Mark J. Kovac', written over a horizontal line.

Richard J. Buturla, Esq.
Mark J. Kovac, Esq.
BERCHEM, MOSES & DEVLIN, P.C.
75 Broad Street
Milford, CT 06460
Attorneys for Defendants,
Partner Wealth Management, LLC
Kevin G. Burns
James Pratt-Heaney
William P. Loftus

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 21st day of October 2015, I caused the foregoing to be served via electronic mail on counsel of record who agreed to accept electronic service as follows:

Thomas J. Rechen
McCarter & English, LLP
City Place I, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103
trechen@mccarter.com



Mark J. Kovack
Commissioner of the Superior Court